Direct Object movement and the Structure of the Romanian left periphery
Alexandra Cornilescu, University of Bucharest
acornile@fx.ro

1. Background

In a series of comparative studies, Barbosa (1998, 2000) discusses the LP, i.e., the CP > TP area, in Romance distinguishing two distinct LP configurations, in terms of the number of operator positions to the left of the verb. Operator positions are A’ positions created by extraction, as opposed to the A’ topic positions, which, in her view, represent adjunctions to the operator positions.

Accordingly, there are languages with only one operator position, namely Spec T, a position which accommodates question and other quantificational operators. Such languages are Catalan, Portuguese, and, in Barbosa’s description, Romanian. Secondly, there are languages like Italian, which have two operator positions, SpecT, and a higher position, SpecFocusP, which in Italian is characteristically held by contrastively focused constituents.

(1) a Catalan
\[ CP [C^0 [IP Topics [IP Focus / Wh/Op QP [r [ Fin+ I +V]......t....]]]

b Italian
\[ CP C^0 [FocusP Topic* [FocusP FocusQP[Focus^0]][IP Topic* [IP wh-P [Fin+ I +V]..t...t]]

In what follows we discuss the structure of the Romanian Left Periphery (=RLP) concentrating on the syntax of DO movement, therefore on OVS sentences. The syntax of the DO is more constrained, and thus more illuminating. Depending on its internal properties, the DO in OVS sentences is topicalised and not resumed by clitic or left dislocated and clitic-resumed. In contrast the IO may always be resumed, while the subject is never resumed. We would like to establish the following claims:

1. The RLP, like the Italian one, contains two operator positions, the specifier(s) of a TopicP and SpecT or Spec Finiteness. As far as object movement is concerned, these positions may be characterised in morphosyntactic terms and are not associated with any single P(eripheral)-feature (in the sense of Chomsky (1998)). SpecT attracts constituents that check a D feature. Spec Top attracts constituents that check an N feature. In both cases no special prosodic marking is required.

2. Romanian has a generalised TP, like Spanish (cf. Zubizarreta (1998), also Hill (2002) for Romanian), since the T head may check both head-related features (Case, φ), and non head-related features (P-features like [+Focus] and operator features, like +wh).

3. The two positions are associated with particular semantic properties, SpecTop is associated with strong presuppositional readings, such as the proportional readings of quantifiers, SpecT may be associated with non-
presuppositional readings (such as informational focus). This semantic partition, this semantic contrast between Spec Top >SpecT, may be reinterpreted in pragmatic, information packaging terms by saying that the orientation of the RLP yields and ordering of the constituents from given to new, i.e. from presuppositional to non-presuppositional information.

The outline of the paper is as follows: In sections 2-5, we present the rules which displace constituents to the LP in Romanian: Topicalisation, Operator (Question) Movement, Focus Movement and Clitic Left Dislocation. Stress is laid on the consequences of the analysis for the syntax of the clause in Romanian. Section 6 discusses some ordering constraints on preverbal DPs and their semantic and pragmatic relevance, section 7 presents the conclusions of the paper.

1.1. General assumptions

The following assumptions, largely derived from Chomsky (1998, 1999) will be implicit in the analysis below

1. Case and Agreement are reflexes of a single operation; which a DP can undergo only once. The Case-Agreement mechanism is implemented as the valuing of uninterpretable [ϕ]-features through Agree (Agr, DP) where Agr = T or v, a process which also values the [Case-] feature of an NP. Case features are irreducible, both for DPs and for heads like T and v. (Martin (1999), Rezac (2001)).

A reasonable assumption is that ϕ -features and K may be disjoint (Rezac 2001). In clitic doubling languages the ϕ-features of light v may be expressed by the clitic, while the transitive verb has the K+Acc feature.

2. Clitics target functional categories of the verb independently present in the inflectional domain. In many Romance languages, Romanian included, pronominal clitics are attracted to Tense. Cliticization amounts to this movement from the lexical domain onto a functional head

3. Cyclicity. We will assume (cf. Boeckx (2001)) that Move is initiated only when the head that drives it, and thus the landing site has merged. When the landing site is projected, Form Chain occurs, strictly observing Shortest Move.

4. A final more general problem regards reconstruction, and the level where movement applies. A difference should be made (cf. Sauerland and Elbourne (2002)) between partial reconstruction, which feeds binding dependencies and generally connectivity effects and total reconstruction where the whole of the moved constituents is interpreted in situ.

In partial reconstruction situations, illustrated by wh-Movement in questions like (2a), the wh-word is interpreted in its higher position, while part of the wh-phrase has reconstructed (see (2b)), to allow the pronoun to be bound by the quantifier.

(2) a [Which relative of hers\textsubscript{j}] did every student\textsubscript{i} invite t\textsubscript{i} ?

b [Which relative.] did every student\textsubscript{i} invite [relative of hers\textsubscript{j}]
In total reconstruction, the whole of the moved phrase is understood in the lower position. A typical example of total reconstruction is (3), involving SSR: the subject *an Austrian* can take scope below *likely*.

(3) a. An Austrian is likely to win the gold medal.
   b. --- is likely [an Austrian to win the gold medal]

Most analyses of total reconstruction assume that movement is followed by some undoing operation, either the constituent is lowered at LF, or adopting the copy theory of movement, the lower copy in the chain is interpreted at LF, while the higher is pronounced.

Sauerland & Elbourne (2002) propose an alternative analysis which expresses the view that scope taking movement must not be completely undone. Their proposal, which we adopt here, is that total reconstruction is due to purely phonological movement. Movement that takes place in the stem, before spell-out must be visible at LF and cannot totally reconstruct. Constituents that totally reconstruct are in situ at LF and undergo PF movement.

The analysis also relies on the several general results established in earlier work on Romanian, and on Romance DPs in particular.

a. Like most Romance languages, Romanian is a VSO language, which may check Nominative Case in a post verbal position. The real A-position occupied by subjects is postverbal. Preverbal positions are A’ positions, as will also appear below. (see Barbosa (1998, 2001) for Romance and Dobrovi Sorin (1994), Cornilescu (1998), Alboiu (2000) for Romanian).

b. Noun phrases are analysable either as DPs or as NPs. Weak quantifier phrases, many students, may be analysed as NPs in line with research that regards weak determiners as quantitative adjectives or cardinality predicates (cf. Giusti (1991), Zamparelli (1995), Cornilescu (2002)). NP--> DetP ^ N'. Lexical noun phrase are always endowed with interpretable φ-features.

Weak quantifier phrases must, however, be analysed as DPs when they are clitic doubled, since otherwise they wouldn't be compatible with the clitic. This is suggested by the fact that bare NPs (=BNPs) which cannot be reanalysed as DPs, cannot be clitic doubled. When weak quantifier phrases are clitic doubled they are interpreted like strong DPs, having only the strong proportional reading (cf. Dobrovie Sorin (1994)). Strong DPs (definites, demonstratives, etc.) are always DPs.

In the following sections we briefly examine the mechanisms which move constituents to the LP.

2. A’ positions and A’ Movement rules. Romanian Topicalisation

It is traditionally assumed that except for hanging topics, topicalised DPs appear in the CLLD construction in Romance. This, however, is an oversimplification. Barbosa (1998) (2001) mentions the existence of an English type of topicalisation in European Portuguese and other Romance languages, a rule which displays island effects and licenses PGs. Such properties are indicative of A Movement. The moved NPs are neither contrastively stressed, nor resumed by clitics. Topicalisation, we claim, is present in Romanian as well,
as an LF and as a PF rule; we briefly characterize it below regarding its syntax and the semantic interpretation of topicalized noun phrases.
2.1. Topicalisation, an extraction rule with typical A’-properties

Just as in European Portuguese (EP), displaces a noun phrase without having it resumed by a clitic, and also without contrastive intonation. In Romanian only NPs (weak quantifier phrases, and BNPs) may be affected by this rule.

(4) a Carne întotdeauna g
Meat always find(you) in refrigerator.

b Multe studente vezi adesea la concert.
Many students see(you) often at concert.

You often see many students at concerts.

Since clitics are Ds, and since as example (4a) shows, this rule may displace BNPs, it is plausible to assume that constituents attracted to this position in Romanian check a [+N] feature. The Top head incorporates an uninterpretable [+N] feature. If this characterisation of the Top head is correct, strong DPs, which must check a D feature are predicted not to appear in this position.

Indeed, an important and so far unexplained difference between Romanian and other Romance languages is that in Romanian definite DPs simply do not appear to the left of the verb if they are not clitic doubled. In contrast, in EP, even topic definite DOs may appear undoubled in preverbal position: Compare:

(5) a O teu livro, comprei t de certeza.
The your book, will buy(I) of course

b Cartea ta voi cump ãra cu sigurantã.
Your book, will buy (I) with certainty.

'I will buy your book certainly.'

Topicalisation has A’ movement properties. Thus, it is sensitive to strong islands, a reliable diagnostic of wh-Movement. Here are examples:

(6) CNPC

b *Tort musafirii au plecat înainte de a mînca t
Cake guests-the have left before to eat.

'Cake the guests left before they could eat.'

Topicalisation may license PGs, though PGs are fairly restricted in Romanian. Again this characterizes the topic NPs as syntactic operators:
(7) a Carne de pasăre am cumpărat fără să plătesc de la un prieten fermier.
Chicken have (I) bought without SA(subj) pay froma firned farmer
b Cârţi englezeşti cumpără mereu deşi nu citeşte români.
English books buy (they) continuously althoug not read(they)
An important property of topicalised constituents is that they do not need to be adjacent to the verb. Other DPs or adverbials may separate a topicalised constituent from the verb:

(8) a Carne de porc cine cumpăra pentru revelion?
Pork who buys for the New Year's Eve party?
b Carne de porc rareori mananc seara.
Pork seldom eat (I) in the evening.

2.2. Topicalisation and reconstruction

Let us turn to the interpretation of topicalised constituents and their scope properties. All the three logically possible situations obtain: the topic DO has only wide scope over the other arguments, reconstruction is impossible; the topic DO has only narrow scope; total reconstruction is involved; the sentence is ambiguous, allowing both possibilities above. Let us illustrate the three cases.

Only wide scope readings are harder to obtain. What we are trying to get are configurations where the object takes scope over another operator, so the topic position creates the appropriate order of the constituents. In the examples below a topicalized DO QP scopes out of negation, so the LF order, corresponding to the only possible reading is QP>NegP.

(9) a Multe n-am făcut cind trebuia şi acum regret.
Many not-have (I) done when I had to and now regret(I)
b Două probleme din test n-ai rezolvat corect. ştii care?
You didn't correctly solve two problems on the test. Do you know which ones?

Ambiguous sentences are common. At least cardinals and lexical quantifiers easily produce scope ambiguities in combination with other operators; this in
(10a), the same two poems by Eminescu, or different poems are known by every pupil.

(10) a  Două poezii de Eminescu ție fiecare elev. (two> every, every > two)
   Two poems by Eminescu knows every pupil.
   'Every pupil knows two poems by Eminescu.'

   b  Cîteva muzee din oraș au vizitat toți turiștii.
   A few museums from city have visited all tourist-the
   'All tourists have visited a few museums.'

Examples where total reconstruction is required for the only interpretation are also available. Example (11a) involves the distributive particle cât + cardinal, approx. 'groups of + cardinal", which must be c-commanded by the distributive fiecare 'every' to be licensed at LF; the câte DO will reconstruct totally. In example (11b), the determiner vreun / vreo 'some, any' is inherently [-specific] NPI and must reconstruct below negation.

(11) a  Câte două premii a primit fiecare concurent.
   Some two prizes has received every competitor.
   'Each competitor got two prizes.'

   b  Vreun creion roșu n-ai găsit pe masă?
   Any pencil red not-have(you) found on table?
   'Didn't you find any red pencil on the table?'

Under the proposal of Sauerland and & Elbourne (2002), strong and wide scope reading will be viewed as represent A' movement to Spec Top in the stem. At LF the NP is in a position which allows it to be interpreted as a generalised quantifier and/or to have wide scope. In contrast, when the reading is a narrow scope, weak one, the topicalised NP undergoes total reconstruction. Movement to the SpecTop occurs at PF and has no interpretative consequences. Hence the air of "stylistic variation"; for the purposes of LF, the NP is in situ.

2.3. Conclusions on TopP

a) Nominal constituents attracted to SpecTopc check a [+N] feature and also φ features. No pragmatic feature is at stake, no special prosody is required

   b) Since the weak NPs (QPs) which reach this position at LF are given a strong interpretation a second characteristic of this position is in terms of its semantic properties: it harbours NPs having a strong proportional interpretation <<<e,t,t> and/or having wide scope. DPs in this position have presuppositional readings.

   c) NPs in Topic position may perform very different informational roles: from topics or links in (12) down to informational focus in (13)

(12) a  Unde găsesc niște carne?
   Where find(I) some meat
   'Where can I find some meat?'
t.
Meat I found.
I found meat.

3. The second A’ position: the Operator SpecT position

3.1. On the syntax of non-d-linked questions

In any language, a crucial element in defining the LP is the manner in which questions check their [+wh] feature. We will examine questions introduced by the interrogative pronouns are cine 'who', ce 'what'. It has been persuasively shown (see Barbosa (1998), (2000) for Romance, Comorovski (1994), Cornilescu (1999) and Alboiu(2000) for Romanian) that the residual V2 analysis (cf. Rizzi (1991)) is not adequate for Romance, and for Romanian in particular.

Instead we adopt the analysis in Barbosa (op.cit.) saying that "the crucial property that distinguishes Romance from English is that [+wh] Infl does not raise up to C." In Romance, the question feature is checked in the specifier of the highest projection where the verb raises. We have assumed that this head is T⁰. More accurately, we might describe this as the Finiteness head, allowing the Finiteness feature to syncretize with the Tense head or, in different constructions with the Mood head. Since we are not interested in verb movement, simplifying, we will assume that the wh-feature is checked in SpecT.

In both Romance and Germanic, the clause typing strategy requires that a wh-operator should be in an appropriate checking configuration with a clausal head bearing a [+wh] feature. But while in Germanic this head is C⁰ in Romance, and in Romanian in particular it is T⁰. Since the wh-Criterion can be specified at the IP level, root questions can be bare IPs in Romance.

Strong arguments in favour of this position for Romanian are the following:

a) There are no matrix/ embedded clause asymmetries; therefore, in root questions, the verb does not raise to a higher position (=C⁰) than in declarative sentences (=T⁰). In embedded questions, even if C⁰ is projected for independent reasons, it is not specified for ±wh, the question feature is still checked in T⁰, since C cannot function as an attractor for the wh-word.

(14) Ce a cumpărăt Ion ieri?
What has bought Ion yesterday
'What did John buy yesterday?'

(15) Mă întreb ce a cumpărăt Ion ieri?
(I) myself wonder what bought Ion yesterday.
'I wonder what Ion bought yesterday.'
b) Furthermore, in embedded questions, if the complementizer is lexically filled the \textit{wh} phrase follows the complementizer. Thus, like other languages (e.g. Spanish, cf. Suner (1993)), Romanian has a class of "semi-questions", of embedded questions introduced by a declarative complementizer. Such structures strongly suggest that the \textit{wh}-feature is not checked in Spec\textit{C} in Romanian:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(16)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a) Imi repro\textcircled{8}ează că de ce nu mă ocup mai mult de gospodărie.
To me- (he) reproaches that why (I) not see more to housework
\textquote{He reproaches me that I do not do more housework.}'
\item b) ? Imi repro\textcircled{8}ează de ce nu mă ocup mai mult de gospodărie.
To me- (he) reproaches why (I) not see more to housework
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

c) In root questions, the order Aux -Su- V which is indicative of T to C in English is as impossible as it is in declaratives. The subject remains postverbal yielding the order Wh-Aux-V-Subject.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(17)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a) * Ce a Ion vrut ?
What has Ion wanted ?
\textquote{What did Ion want ?}'
\item b) Ce a vrut Ion
What has wanted Ion
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

c) Crucial evidence that the \textit{wh}-feature is checked in the Spec\textit{ of} the highest projection where the verb raises is the fact that questions display \textit{adjacency effects}. No constituent (argument or adjunct) may intervene between the question operator and the verb. Sentences (18a) with the subject intervening between the \textit{wh}-word and the verb, and (18b) with an adjunct intervening between the question word and the verb are severely ill-formed.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(18)]
\begin{enumerate}
\item a) *Pe cine Ion ajut
PE whom Ion helps.
\item a' Pe cine ajută Ion ?
PE whom helps Ion
\textquote{Whom does Ion help ?}'
\item b) *Cine acolo pleacă mîine ?
Who there leaves tomorrow ?
\item b' Cine pleacă acolo mîine?
Who leaves there tomorrow
\textquote{Who leaves there tomorrow ?}'
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Results so far.

1. A first group of elements subject to adjacency, that is, which \textit{must} appear in Spec\textit{T} are question words . 2. The properties of question words are indicative of the properties of elements which appear in Spec\textit{T}: interrogative pronouns are intrinsically BQs and operators. The two question operators are projected as Ds and have a deficient $\phi$ matrix. 3. Question operators are non-
presupposition], and as to information packaging, they are standardly interpreted as information foci.

3.2. Negative Quantifiers and other BQs

Vallduvi (1992) for Catalan, Barbosa (op.cit) for EP show that other types of BQs (such as negatives) behave like question operators, since when they are preverbal, they must be string adjacent to the verb. In this, they differ from left dislocated and topicalized constituents which do not show adjacency effects. This important point carries over to Romanian, where, as first stressed in Alboiu (2000), all bare quantifiers (nimeni 'nobody', nimic 'nothing', cineva 'somebody', ceva 'something', oricine 'anyone', orice 'anything', etc.) must be string adjacent to the verb when fronted.

Thus if two (B)NPs or DPs have been fronted, they may appear in either order, function of discourse considerations. This is apparent in examples (19) below, where we assume that the two fronted nominals occupy SpecT and SpecTop. But if one of the two lefthand phrases is a BQP, the linear order among the phrases is not free anymore, as apparent in examples (20) The topicalised constituents must precede the BQP, which must remain verb-adjacent in SpecT:

(19) a Aproape un sfert din clasã mai mult de 5 nu au putut lua la examen.
'Almost a quarter of the class couldn't get more than five in the exam.'

b Mai mult de 5 aproape un sfert de clasã nu au putut lua la examen.
'More than 5 almost a quarter of the class couldn't get
'Almost a quarter of the class couldn't get more than five in the exam.'

(20) a Mai mult de 5 nimeni nu a putut lua la acest examen.
'More than 5 nobody could take in the exam.
'Nobody could get more than five in the exam.'

b *Nimeni mai mult de 5 nu a putut lua la acest examen.
'Nobody more than five could get in the exam.

In the second place, as expected these QPs are in complementary distribution with pre-verbal wh-phrases, which confirms the hypothesis that they occupy the same position as question words, namely SpecT:

(21) a Cine nu dâ nimic pe gratis ?
'Who doesn't give anything for free ?

b *Cine nimic nu dâ pe gratis ?

Who nothing not gives for free

c *Nimic cine nu da pe gratis ?

Nothing who not gives for free ?
To conclude, there is a subset of quantifier expressions that are fronted by A’ Movement (say "Operator movement"), without requiring contrastive focus. Morphosyntactically they are BQPs, i.e., D constituents in Romanian (cf. Deprez (2000)) that have an incomplete φ matrix. Semantically, they lack lexical restrictions and cannot have the strong proportional reading, even when they have wide scope. Informationally, as noticed by Vallduvi (1992), they cannot function as discourse topics or links. It is clear that these BQPs and Wh-phrases occupy the same position. Since these QPs and Wh-phrases must be string adjacent to the verb, they will occupy SpecIP position, the specifier of the highest position to which the verb raises.

Characterizing the T head so far. a) The T head in Romanian may incorporate operator features like +wh. b) As to the morpho-syntactic features in T, they are inferable from the properties of the constituents that may appear only in SpecT when fronted: these are BQPs, therefore, Determiners with an incomplete φ-matrix. We will assume that there is a [+D,-ϕ] feature in T^0, marking by [-ϕ] a defective φ-matrix. Spec T attracts DPs, rather than NPs. No prosodic marking is required. c) Interpretative problems. Since SpecT is the only LP position that accepts BQPs, SpecT is an LP position which may accommodate non-presuppositional material (such as information focus). As known, BQPs do not have the generalised quantifier interpretation since they lack a lexical restriction. The semantic contrast between SpecTop and SpecT comes out clearly when there are at least two fronted constituents.

4. Focus Movement (=FM)

In many Romance languages, FM is an instance of quantificational A’-movement to either Spec Focus P (Italian, cf. (Rizzi (1997)), or SpecT (Spanish, Catalan, cf. Vallduvi (1992), Barbosa (2001)). DPs which undergo FM have operator properties: they cannot be resumed by clitics and are sensitive to cross over. Notice also that in Italian (cf. Rizzi (1997)), or Spanish (cf. Escobar Alvarez (1995)), strong DPs undoubled by clitics may move to the LP only under FM, that is, when they are contrastively stressed. For reasons that will appear below, this is not possible in Romanian, where strong DPs at the LP are always dislocated.

(22) a GIANNI ho visto ti
Gianni have(I) seen.

b *Pe Ion am v
PE (Acc) Ion have(I) seen.

Romanian is quite different regarding Focus Movement; it is better described as focus in situ language, since there is no position or projection at the LP where contrastive focus is consistently checked. (see Cornilescu (2002) for details). Furthermore, contrastive stress on left-handed DPs does not correlate with any other syntactic property of the DPs. Objects fronted by Clitic Left Dislocation which are resumed by clitics, as well as by topicalized objects,
which are not resumed by clitics, are equally capable to bear contrastive stress. Focus Movement does not seem to play a role in NP/DP syntax.
(23) a CARNE nu trebuie sa mănci, nu legume.
Meat not should SA(subj.) eat (you) not vegetables
'It is meat that you should not eat, not vegetables.'
b PE ION l-am angajat, nu pe Petru.
PE (Acc) Ion him-have(I) hired, not PE (Acc.) Petru.
'It is Ion, that I have hired, not Petru.'

To justify the existence in Romanian of an independent FM rule, i.e., a rule
which employs the [+Focus] feature of a functional head to cause movement to
the LP, it is necessary to see whether there are any constituents which, like
Italian definite objects, occur in postverbal position normally, but may occur
preverbally only under stress, signalling an emphatic or contrastive focus
reading. Such is, for instance, the case of certain manner adverbs like bine
'well', ill', repede 'fast', tare 'strongly'. They are normally postverbal and do
not appear between the subject and the predicate. These adverbs may be
fronted only with emphatic ( contrastive ?) stress, acquiring a quantificational
degree reading, as apparent from the translation. This suggests that perhaps
such sentences are part of the exclamative constructions of Romanian, so that
this type of adverb fronting is an example of quantificational movement.

(24) a Ion vorbeste bine engleze te.
Ion speaks well English
'Ion speaks English well.'
b ???Ion bine vorbeste engleze te.
Ion well speaks English.
c BINE vorbe ste Ion engle ze te.
Well speaks Ion English.
'How well John speaks English!'
d *BINE Ion vorbe ste engle ze te
Well Ion speaks English
e REPEDE ai terminat de citit romanul.
Fast have(you) finished reading the novel
'How fast you've finished reading the novel!'

Focused adverbs show adjacency effects (see (24d), which suggests that it is
the operator T head which licenses the [+Focus] feature. TP is a generalised T
phrase in Romanian, just as in Spanish, as stressed by Hill (2002). Therefore
to the extent that a rule of FM exists it targets SpecT, as elsewhere in
Romance (cf. Alboiu (2000)).

Vallduvi (1992) argues that in Catalan, focus-preposed constituents are
syntactically distinct from preposed quantificational operators (including wh-
operators). The same is clearly true for Romanian, where FM, to the extent that
it exists, plays no role in DP fronting, and DPs reach the LP by virtue of their
categorial properties:[+D, ± ϕ], which is a feature of the T head, and + N,
which is a feature of the Top head. In either position the DP may incorporate a
[+Focus] feature. Notice in particular examples like the following one, where
the question operator in SpecT is preceded by a contrastively stressed DP in
SpecTop. Thus the contrastively focussed term is not adjacent to the verb,
even if Focus Movement requires adjacency.
Thus, in languages like Romanian, the unity of the contrastively focused constituents lies in their interpretation more than in their syntax.

5. Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) in Romanian

The last construction involving DPs at the LP is CLLD, a structure associated with the following properties, crosslinguistically attested: resumption by the clitic, scopal specificity, lack of weak cross over effects and fixing of cross-over, impossibility of parasitic gaps. In the analysis of CLLD in romance and elsewhere, there is disunity among linguists, since some support a base-generation + adjunction to IP/CP analysis, others support a movement analysis to some LP projection. It is however likely that the different points of view adopted by linguists actually reflect very different empirical properties of the construction in different languages, beyond the similarities noted above. It is desirable then to review the relevant properties of CLLD in Romanian.

5.1. A note on Clitic Doubling

However, before discussing the properties of CLLD in Romanian, since clitic constructions in one language are likely to be related, one should remember that Romanian is a Clitic Doubling (=CD) language. In Romanian, all nouns denoting persons, like copil 'child' in (26a) may, and certain types of DPs, such as proper names and definite pronouns must, be clitic doubled in the Accusative. As predicted by Kayne's Generalization, for Case reasons, the doubled Acc acquires the preposition pe on'.

(26) a L-am v
Him-have(I)seen PE(Acc) child.
a' Am văzut copilul.
Have(I) seen child-the.
'I saw the child.'

b L-am întâlnit *Ion / pe Ion.
him-have(I) met PE(Acc) Ion.
'I met Ion.'

The existence of the CD construction has consequences on the properties of the clitic and of the lexical double. In Cornilescu (2002), following Franco (2000) for Spanish, we have shown that in Romanian, the double behaves like a true argument (rather an adjunct). This means that the double has active \( \varphi \)- and Case features, and that it occupies an A- position. As a result the double is integrated in the Case /Agreement system of the language. That is why, for Romanian, Kayne's old intuition that the Prep shows up in doubling constructions to check the uninterpretable case of the double still proves
correct. On the other hand, as in all clitic constructions, it is the clitic which checks the uninterpretable feature of the \([T +v+V]\) head. While the double is the real argument, the clitic may be interpreted as an agreement marker. According to Franco (2000), in different degrees, Romance pronominal clitics are in the process of acquiring the status of object verbal inflection (agreement markers). We have shown in Cornilescu (2002) that Romanian clitics are rather advanced in this process. Actually in clitic constructions, the clitic spells out a D feature and also \(\phi\)-features of the T head, which is thus \([c(D, \phi)+ T^0]_T\).

We retain for the analysis of CLLD that in Romanian, the lexical double is a true argument and that clitics may be viewed as agreement markers, introducing a D+\(\phi\) features matrix in T. Let us not return to the properties of CLLD in Romanian.

5.2. Some relevant properties of CLLD in Romanian

In this section we review some characteristic properties of CLLD constructions in Romanian, arguing for a movement analysis of this construction.

5.2.1.

While in some languages (e.g. Catalan, cf. Villalba (2002), a left dislocated DP is separated by a break from the rest of the clause, in Romanian, no intonational break is necessary, and oftentimes no break is possible (see 27b'), while adjacency to the verb is required (see 27b''). Consider the question-answer pair in (27):

\[(27)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Pe cine a arestat politia ?} \\
& \quad \text{PE whom has arrested police-the} \\
& \quad \text{‘Whom did the police arrest?’} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Pe Ion l-a arestat.} \\
& \quad \text{PE (Acc) Ion him-have (they) arrested} \\
& \quad \text{‘They arrested Ion.’} \\
\text{b'} & \quad \text{Pe Ion, l-au arestat.} \\
\text{b''} & \quad \text{Pe Ion politia l-a arestat.} \\
& \quad \text{PE (Acc) Ion the police him-have(they) arrested}
\end{align*}

5.2.2.

Secondly, CLLD DPs are not associated with any unique pragmatic role (such as topic (Cinque (1990), or link (Vallduvi (1992), Villalba (2002)). Rather, in Romanian the dislocated phrase may have any informational role. Consider the discourses below, noting the different interpretation of the CLLD-ed DP from the point of view of information packaging. The dislocated DP may be part of a wide focus sentence as in the first discourse (28). It may function as a link, as in (29), as a rhematic focus (as in (30)), and in stark contrast with Italian and other Romance languages, it may even be a contrastive focus/topic, as in (32).

\[(28)\]
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Ce s-a întîmplat ?}
\end{align*}
What has happened?
'What happened?'

b Pe I on l-a arestat politia.
PE (Acc) Ion him-has arrested the police.
The police arrested Ion.

(29) In clasa erau studente. Pe două le examina profesorul.
In classroom were students. PE(Acc) two them-examined the teacher.

(30) There were students in the classroom. The teacher was examining two of them

(31) a Pe cine a arestat politia?
PE whom has arrested police-the
'Whom did the police arrest?'
b Pe I on l-a arestat.
PE (Acc) Ion him-have (they) arrested
'They arrested Ion.'

(32) a CARTEA TA am cumpărat-o.
Book-the your have(I) bought-it
I bought your book,( not his).

This flexibility in the interpretation of CLLD casts doubt on the adequacy for Romanian of an analysis that motivates CLLD in terms of some P-feature like Topic or Link as recently proposed by Villalba (2002) for Catalan. The compatibility of this construction with virtually all information structure interpretations suggests that the syntax of this construction depends on the more abstract morpho-syntactic properties of Case and Agreement, as also noticed for Topicalization.

5.2.3.

In many languages the dislocated element meets some semantic or discourse condition, variously identified as "referentiality" (Cinque (1990)), "specificity" (Sportiche (1995) among many), [-Focus] in Kalluli (1998), etc. In contrast, in Romanian all *lexical DPs*( strong and *weak DPs* alike) may be CLLDed (see the examples in (33)). The only nominals which do not dislocate are BQPs (35b) and BNPs (35a). These restrictions show what features are involved in licensing CLLD for DOs. BNPs are incompatible with CLLD because they do not project a D layer in Romanian (cf. Deprez (2000)) and cannot check the D feature of the clitic. BQPs cannot match the phi-features of the clitic. The Acc clitic is fully specified for Gender Number Person, while BQPs like *nimeni* 'nobody', *ce* 'what' etc. are unspecified for Gender and have default Number (singular). Notice that Dative clitics, which are not specified for Gender may double Dative BQPs. It follows that, at least for DOs, licensing CLLD requires checking both a D feature and a complete phi-set.
(33) a  Cărtile / două cărți / multe cărți / niște cărți le-am adus ieri
   The books / two books / many books / some books them- have I
   brought yesterday.
   'I brought the books / two books / many books / some books
   yesterday.'

(34) a  *Carne o găsești în frigider.
   meat it find (you) in fridge
   b  *Ceva l-am găsit în sertar.
   something him-have (I) found in the drawe.

These facts suggest a selectivity between the clitic and the nominal it doubles,
best captured by means of a head complement or head spec relation,
established between the clitic and the double at First Merge, where a "big DP"
is created. We thus assume that in clitic doubled construction, the verb selects
a complex DP, where a clitic head takes a DP/PP complement: [DP [D' D^0
Chechetto (2000), a.o.)

(36)        DP
          r   u
          D    DP
 |     PP
  cl

5.2.4.

From an interpretative point of view, left dislocated constituents always have
wide scope and object level readings. (see Dobrovie-Sorin (1994)). For weak
DPs, CLLD may be viewed as type shifting rule assigning them the strong
proportional reading and filtering away the cardinal reading. (cf. Cornilescu
2001).

5.4. Towards a movement analysis

There is considerable variation in the properties of CLLD even in one
language. (cf. Aoun and Benmamoun (1998)), and a movement approach to
CLLD is not always adequate (but see Bocxh (2002)). However, we believe
that in Romanian a movement analysis can be defended. Some major
arguments for movement involve sensitivity to islands and partial reconstruction
effects, word order facts.

Sensitivity to strong island has been detected and discussed for Romanian
CLLD ever since Dobrovie-Sorin (1994). The examples below show that one
cannot extract constituents out of strong islands by CLLD.

(37)   CNP island
   a  *Pe Ion am întâlnit fata care l-a vazut anul trecut la cinema.
     PE Ion have (l) met the girl who him-has seen last year at cinema.
'Ion, I met the girl who saw him at the cinema last year.'

**Adjunct islands**

b *Pe Ion am plecat înainte sa-l examineze profesorul.
PE Ion have(I) left before SA (subj) him-examine the teacher.
'Ion I left before the teacher examined him.'

(Partial)reconstruction phenomena have been studied by Chechetto (2000) for Italian and Villalba (2002) for Catalan. Both authors assume that dislocated DPs reconstruct to a position which is above the subject in Spec vP, but below the subject in its Nominative position; (the NomP, if projected, is some higher, middle-field position in Romanian, the closest FP below T, cf. Cornilescu (1998)). Obviously, the intermediate reconstruction site is also below the pre-verbal subject, as in (23):

(38) DP\textsubscript{preverbal} SU >... DP\textsubscript{Nom} SU > reconstructed DP\textsubscript{DO} > [ vP DP\textsubscript{SU} v'...]

What is at stake is *partial* reconstruction, since a dislocated DP always has wide scope and will not undergo total reconstruction. The evidence for reconstruction involves various types of interpretative dependencies which cannot be understood in the absence of reconstruction.

**Principle C effects** Consider the following examples, under the interpretation indicated by the referential indices:

(39) a Tema lui la matematică ȃi-o face Ion mai tîrziu.
Homework-the his at mathematics to-himself it-does Ion more late.
'Ion will do his maths homework later'

b *Tema lui Ion la matematică, ȃi-o face proi mai tîrziu.
Homework-the Ion's at mathematics, to-himself-it-does pro more late
'Ion will do his maths homework later.'

c. ??* Tema lui la matematică ȃi-o face mai tîrziu IONi.
Homework-the his at mathematics to-him-it does more late Ion
'ION will do his maths homework later'
If the left dislocated DP reconstructs to Spec vP, then example (39b) is interpretable as a Principle C violation (see (40)), since the DP *tema lui Ion* 'Ion's homework' reconstructs lower than the subject *pro* in NomP; this explains why (39b) is not acceptable. In contrast, in (39a), the subject *Ion* may be assumed to be in NomP, in a position which allows it to correctly bind the pronoun reconstructed in the outer Spec vP. Example (39c), with the lexical subject under contrastive focus in Spec vP creates another instance of Principle C violation, as one can check in (38). This suggests that reconstruction is to a position above the lexical subject in vP, because had the DP object reconstructed to its vP internal position, it would have obviated Principle C.

*Principle A effects* Reconstruction of the object in Spec vP will make possible Principle A effects, in the sense that a pronoun contained in the dislocated DP may come under the c-command domain of the subject in its NomP position. On the other hand, if the subject remains in its lower position under contrastive focus, the appropriate configuration for binding no longer obtains.

(41) a Pe cumnatul lui, *pro*, îl detesta de mult.
    PE(Acc) brother-in-law-his him-hated(he) for long.
    'He has long hated his brother in-law'

b Pe cumnatul lui, îl detesta de mult ION ????j
    PE(Acc) brother-in-law-his him-hates for long Ion.
    It is Ionj who had long hated hisi/j brother inlaw for a long ti

Thus in (41a) the only reading is with the pronoun *lui* 'his' bound by *pro*. This reading involves reconstruction. In sentence (41b), a disjoint interpretation of Ion and *lui* 'his' is at least strongly preferred.

*Result:* On the strength of such arguments, it may be accepted that *CLLD involves movement*. Specifically, constituents which undergo left dislocation first target Spec vP, the clitic moves to T and the double is then attracted to the LP.
5.5. The landing site of the dislocated element: specification or adjunction?

It has often been proposed, since Cinque (1991), that the topic-comment articulation of the sentence is licensed by "rules of predication" (Chomsky 1977) that require that the topic be "base-generated in a position of adjunction to the XP (IP or CP) that is predicated of it. In the spirit of Kayne (1994), Rizzi (1995) assumes that topics in general, CLLD topics included, are introduced by the usual X' schema": a Topic Phrase headed by a Top head, which defines a kind of "higher predication". Barbosa (2001) constructs an elegant argument meant as evidence that the configuration of adjunction is the required one for topics and that Romanian fits rather well into the clause structure suggested by Vallduvi for Catalan, in (1a) above, where the LP has only one operator (Spec) position, namely Spec T. Topics are adjoined to this unique operator position, therefore they are TP/IP adjoined.

Barbosa's argument relies on the well-established premise that adjunction to an argument is not allowed. She examines the structure of subjunctive complements. These may be introduced by the C⁰ (and then they are CPs), but also by the mood marker M⁰, and then they are the MPs, not CPs. Consider now the following paradigm.

\[(42)\]

```plaintext
\[a\] Vreau [CP ca [MP mîine [MP
Want(I) [that tomorrow SA(subj) come Ion
'I want that Ion should come tomorrow.'

\[b\] * Vreau [MP mîine [MP
Want(I) tomorrow SA(subj) come Ion

\[c\] Vreu [MP MîINE [M
Want(I) [tomorrow SA(subj) come Ion

\[d\] Mîine să vinâ Ion
Tomorrow should come Ion.
'Ion should come tomorrow.'
```

In (42a), the adverb is adjoined to the MP, below the C⁰ ca 'that', which is the boundary of the CP argument. The absence of ca 'that' signals the absence of a CP projection. In (42b), the MP is the argument of the verb vreau 'I want', the adverb mîine 'tomorrow' has been adjoined to it, in violation of the ban against adjunction to arguments. In contrast, (42c) is perfect, the fronted focused adverb occupies the specifier position of the MP, the projection headed by M⁰ sa.

Taking into account these data, Barbosa (2001) concludes that in Romanian "the preverbal field can be further divided into two: the position that is adjacent to the verbal string, which is an A' position produced by movement, and the recursive position for topics'. More generally, she concludes that "dislocated topics are adjoined to the XP that is predicated of them, as long as it is not to an argument".

This argument, though correct, rests on incomplete data. It makes two claims: the RLP has only one A' position, preceded by adjoined topic positions;
b) topics are placed in adjunction positions. Consider now the following perfect indirect question:

\[ (43) \quad \text{Nu stiu PE CEILALTI unde sa-i trimit.} \]

\[ \quad \text{I don't know the others where to send them} \]

\[ \quad 'I don't know where to send the others.' \]

It is beyond doubt that \textit{unde} 'where' is a \textit{wh}-words which occupies the operator position SpecT in (1a) above. It is also beyond doubt that the embedded clause is a selected argument. Accepting the general point that arguments cannot be adjoined to, it follows that the DP \textit{pe ceilalti} 'the others' is in the \textit{specifier position of a higher A'-projection}. Notice also that \textit{pe ceilalti} 'the others' is dislocated, so the CLLD is in a specified position not in a position of adjunction.

Therefore there are (at least) two A' specifier position in the Romanian preverbal field. The acceptability of examples in (42c),(43) seems to depend on the fact that contrastive stress is needed to mark the boundary of the embedded clause in the absence of the complementizer. What is essential in the absence of the complementizer is that the leftmost element be stressed probably for reasons of phonological (re)bracketing. We have arrived at the following results: a) There are (at least) two A' Spec positions at the Romanian LP. This argument confirms our hypothesis about SpecTop and SpecT as A' LP positions. b. CLLD constituents (may) occupy specifier positions at the LP.

5.6. The DP/ PP asymmetry and the derivation of CLLD constructions

There is an asymmetry in the distribution of CD and CLLD: Only Acc PPs may CDed, but both DPs and PPs direct objects may be CLLDed. In other words PPs appear both before and after the V, while doubled DPs appear only to the left of the V, as summarised in (45)

\[ (44) \]

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a} & (\text{Pe copil}) \quad (\text{pe copil}) \text{ în parc.} \\
& (\text{PE child}) \quad \text{him-find (you) (PE child) in park} \\
& \text{You can find the child in the park.}' \\
\text{b} & (\text{Cartea }) \quad (*\text{cartea}) \text{ pe masă} \\
& \text{book-the (you)-it find (book) on table} \\
& \text{You can find the book on the table.'} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ (45) \]

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a} & \text{PP cl-V} \\
\text{b} & \text{cl-V PP} \\
\text{c} & \text{DP cl-V} \\
\text{d} & '*\text{cl-V DP} \\
\end{array} \]

The problem that arises is why DPs, as opposed to PPs, can't appear postverbally in the CD construction. The answer might start from the result mentioned above. In Romanian, the double is a true argument which has active \( \varphi \) and Case features. The Case feature of the double needs to be valued through Agreement with the clitic in T. The clitic in T is thus an attractor, and Case must be checked through internal Merge (=Move) to the SpecT position.
Checking of the $\phi$-features is sufficient for Case as well. In contrast in the PP construction Case is checked internally to the PP, which is why the PP may be postverbal. As suggested by Torrego (1998), a functional preposition like PE (Acc) probably includes a D feature in its specification. this explain why the PP headed by PE may appear as the complement of the clitic in the big DP (see (36)), and also why the PP may be attracted to T. This is because the complex T-head with the adjoined clitic is specified for D and $\phi$-features as well, T [+D, +$\phi$(cl)]. Thus the doubled PP may and the DP must land in SpecT to check its case by agreement with the clitic.

**Conclusion and consequences:**

CLLD is an A’ movement rule stranding a resumptive clitic. SpecT appears to have mixed properties. Licensing a DP through agreement characterises this position as head-related. On the other hand, since SpecT licenses [Focus], [+wh] etc., it is an operator position. Different types of features are checked in different specifiers, so T is a multiple specifier head.

The most important property of SpecT is that it has an optionally strong D feature, realized either as a cl+ $\phi$-features, in which $[T+\text{cl}+\phi]_T^D$ can attract dislocated constituents, or realised as [+D,- $\phi$], in which $[T+\text{D} -\phi]_T^D$ can attracts BQPs, but not BNPs.

A more general result can also be obtained. Since Inflection is pronominal in Romanian, it may act like a clitic with respect to the subject, attracting the subject to SpecT, on condition that Inflection in T optionally has the EPP property. 

In null subject clitic doubling languages, the subject may thus be analysed as left dislocated. We may generalise to the subject a property which is obligatory for dislocated Acc DPs. We may claim that for head-related reasons the subject too may be attracted to SpecT. This way of envisaging the data expresses the old intuition that Romanian has an AgrS prverbal position.(expressed, for instance, in Hill (2002)) Generalising we may say that SpecT may be a head related position for any doubled DP: the DO, the IO, the Subject.

One more consequence of the analysis is interesting from a comparative perspective. We have seen that SpecT attracts either constituents which are doubled by clitics and check both D and Phi features or constituents which check D but have a defective phi matrix. Consider now, definite direct object which are not doubled. They are strong DPs, so they can check D, however they need to check a completephi-matrix. and this is not possible as long as the T head lack the clitic and is [+D,-$\phi$]. Predictably, these constituents cannot be attracted to SpecT and further; this is indeed the case.

(46) *Cartea am pus pe raft.
Book-the have(I) put on shelf.
'I put the book on the shelf.

6. **Information packaging effects**
A very general result of this analysis is that the constraints on the distribution of the DPs at the RLP follow from the morpho-syntactic internal properties of these DPs (as also argued by Zamparelli (1995) and Deprez (2000). The pragmatic properties of these DPs follow from two factors: a) the discourse where a sentence is embedded, as in all the examples above; b) the relative left-right order of the LP constituents, which goes from presuppositional to non-presuppositional readings and from given to new. In this last section, we consider the inter-relation of syntax and discourse constraints in sentences with two preverbal DPs

1. Consider first one sentence with a dislocated Acc PP and a BQP.

   (47) Pe Ion(,) orice îl impresioneaz
       PE(Acc) Ion anything him-impresses 'Ion is impressed by anything.'

   (48) TopP
        PP Pe Ion Top
        Pe Ion T' PP
        Top TP
        BQP [+D] T' orice tPP T0
        cl T0 +D r u
        +phi v T [+D]

   The presence of the BQP, orice 'anything' subject to adjacency, forces the dislocated element, pe Ion, to move from a lower SpecT to some higher Spec, say SpecTopP. SpecTop requires the features [+N, +ϕ] and strong readings. CLLDed DPs/PPs always have strong readings and it is likely that the N and ϕ features of the lexical double may percolate to the whole DP/PP. Consequently, dislocated phrases may always be accommodated to higher topic positions.

   In such a configuration (48) the preferred interpretation of the dislocated element is as a topic or link. A pause has become possible, too. The dislocated presuppositional given element is opposed to the operator which has a non-presuppositional reading, emphatic focus.

2. Consider now the interaction between topicalised and dislocated constituents, neither of which show adjacency effects. Predictably, both orders are possible. Here are two examples.

   The answer in (49b) has only one prosodic interpretation. Both left hand phrases are stressed in a characteristic rise-fall intonation which signals a contrastive topic + contrastive focus reading. Moreover, they are strictly ordered as shown by the unacceptability of (49c). The noun phrase mentioned in the question is a link or topic. The second left-hand DP, Ion corresponds to
the new information, and could have appeared in the clause final position typical for focus, as in (49d). Its appearance at the left periphery forces it to undergo stress strengthening (Reinhart (1998)) especially because the verb which is background information needs to be destressed. Syntactically, the sentence raises no problem. The dislocated subject is in SpecT, and the BNP appears in SpecTop, as it should.

\[(49) \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Cine are bani?} \\
& \quad \text{Who has money} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Bani ION are} \\
& \quad [\text{TopP BANI [TP ION are]}] \\
& \quad \text{Money ION has} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{*ION bani are} \\
\text{d} & \quad \text{Bani are ION.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(50) \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Ce are ION?} \\
& \quad \text{What has ION} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{ION, BANI are} \\
& \quad [\text{TopP1 ION [TopP2 BANI are]}] \\
& \quad \text{ION money has} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{*BANI ION are.} \\
& \quad \text{Money ION has} \\
\text{d} & \quad \text{ION are BANI} \\
& \quad \text{ION has money}
\end{align*}
\]

Consider now the second discourse. The informational roles are the same: the leftmost DP ION is contrastive topic (link) and the second nominal, the NP bani 'money' is both rhematic and contrastive focus; it corresponds to the question word, but gets strong stress to de-accent the backgrounded verb.

While the informational roles are the same, the syntactic positions are not. In the analysis we have proposed whether at LF or PF, object BNPs can only reach SpecT since they cannot check a D feature in T, and unlike other weak nominals they do not have dual DP/NP analysis. Assuming that BNPs are in TopP, and cannot appear in SpecT because they cannot check a D feature, it follows that the contrastive topic has targeted the specifier of a higher Topic phrase; therefore the TopP phrase is recursive, as has often been remarked.

7. Conclusions

1. The Romanian clause disposes of a multiple spec generalised TP/IP phrase. The T/I head may check head related features (Case), as well as operator features (+wh, +focus)
2. The RLP disposes of (at least) two operator positions, SpecT the only position which accommodates BQP (adjacency) and Spec Top, a position which can accommodate NPs (weak nominals, BNPs).
3. Left dislocated constituents pass through SpecT to check their features, but may move higher appearing in any LP position.
4. From an interpretative perspective, at LF, SpecTop harbours constituents that have presuppositional readings (topics, contrastive topic contrastive
focus), while SepcT may also accommodate non presuppositional readings (including information focus).
From the point of view of information packaging, the left to right order of the constituents corresponds to a given-to new orientation.
5. The examination of the RLP shows that P-features play a more modest role in determining the syntactic distribution of DPs at the LP. Thus the pragmatic interpretations associated with the same position vary considerably.
6. The constraints on the distribution of the noun phrases at the RLP follow more from their morpho-syntactic internal properties than from peripheral features
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