ON THE LEFT PERIPHERY OF INDEPENDENT SUBJUNCTIVES IN ROMANIAN: TOPICS, FOCI AND COMPLEMENTIZER DELETION*

MARIA AURELIA COTFAS[1]

Abstract. The paper looks at the left periphery of Romanian Independent Subjunctives (ISs) (complements to volitional verbs), taking into account recent discussions on the hierarchy of topic positions and on Focus Fronting (FF) phenomena. We show that the LP of ISs disallows Shifting Topics, but is compatible with both Familiar and Contrastive Topics, which are not liable to the Interface Root Restriction (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010). As for Focus Fronting, we show that instances of corrective and mirative Focus (or what has been defined for Romanian as 'plain' (exhaustive) focus) are also allowed, in spite of the (typically) non-root like behaviour of complements to intensional verbs. An interesting observation that we bring forth is that there is a clear correlation between complementizer deletion and the semantic import of 'contrast' entailed by some dislocates: *ca*-deletion is strongly preferred whenever contrast among (more or less salient) alternatives is at work (contrast among focal alternatives, comparative likelihood, thematic contrast). This, in turn, correlates with the marked prosodic contour of the left dislocated elements, which renders superfluous the lexicalization of the complementizer. FF in our ISs systematically correlates with *ca* deletion, which could thus be a means of discourse-activation, such that the implicature triggered is grounded to the speaker, not the matrix subject. On the other hand, if FF in Romanian resembles (contrastive) clefts in English, it need not be a root phenomenon after all.

Keywords: focus fronting, topic, subjunctive, complementizer deletion.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of the present work is to offer a (more) comprehensive account of the left periphery of what have been dubbed 'independent' subjunctives in Romanian (Cotfas 2012) – more so than has previously been done, to our knowledge, given that we take into account more recent developments on the (fine-grained) articulation of the left periphery, beyond Rizzi (1997 and subseq.) –

* This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-RU-TE-2014-4-0372.

[1] University of Bucharest, maura_cotfas@yahoo.com.

RRL, **LXII**, *3*, p. 253–278, Bucureşti, 2017

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

namely, Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl (2007), Bianchi, Frascarelli's (2010, 2012) account on the type(s) and hierarchization of Topics, as well as phenomena concerning Focus in the left periphery (Bianchi 2015, Bianchi *et al.* 2015, Bianchi *et al.* 2016). Another significant contribution is the discussion of instances of (subjunctive) complementizer deletion *in spite of* the presence of dislocates, contrary to the commonly-held belief that the complementizer (*ca*) must become overt whenever the left peripheral field is activated. The increasing frequency of complementizer-less dependents (with an active left periphery) raises the question of why such deletion should be possible, whether it is related to the nature and properties of the dislocates themselves, as well as what role is left for the complementizer to fill. All in all, this optionality (manifest in more cases than previously assumed) is illustrative of a "weakening" of sorts of the subjunctive complementizer. We take this to show that, indeed, in point of both sentence typing and finiteness, the subjunctive particle (*să*) is all that is needed, since a clause introduced by *să* is definitely [+ finite], in view of (subjunctive) verb morphology, and [+ declarative] (or, at least, [- interrogative])[2]. Typologically, this might indicate, as observed by Hill, Miseska-Tomic (2009), that Romance Balkan is under the infuence of the Slavic Balkan pattern, where typing features are clustered on inflectional versus complementizer heads (2009:12).

In point of framework, as already stated, we start from Rizzi's (1997 and subsequent) well-known description of the split CP, but, more importantly, we take into account recent findings on the articulation of left peripheral domains, as documented in a series of works discussing the typology and interpretation of both Topics and Foci. As far as the former are concerned, Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl (2007, 2016) and Bianchi, Frascarelli (2010, 2012) argue against their random occurence in the C-domain and suggest instead that Topics come in different guises, each associated with a specific semantics and a designated place in a pre-established hierarchy. As for focused constituents, we discuss the phenomenon of Focus Fronting, identifying structures in which the constituent bearing the most prominent pitch accent appears in a left-peripheral position. We show that in Romanian, too such instances of dislocation of prosodically-marked items can be associated with the two typical "flavours" discussed for Italian, namely the 'corrective import' and the 'mirative import', even though Romanian appears to merely require exhaustivity on the fronted focus constituent (cf. Giurgea 2016).

All in all, our findings that the left periphery of ISs in Romanian allow both Familar Topics and Contrastive Topics, but not Shifting Topics (or Hanging Topics) is consistent with Bianchi, Frascarelli's (2010) and Bianchi *et al.*'s (2016) contention that such types of topics are not constrained by the IRR (Interface Root Restriction) and that what is required for Contrastive Topics, for example, is that

[2] The subjunctive occurs in embedded interrogatives only under the interrogative complementizer *dacă*, or with a wh-item.

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

they be hosted in clauses expressing propositions – a condition fulfilled by complements of volitional predicates. Moreover, the fact that *ca*-deletion is quasi-obligatory in Focus Fronting instances (FF), both under the corrective and the mirative import, points to a correlation between complementizer deletion and the discourse update potential of the subordinate clause.

The organization of the paper is as follows: section 1 (very briefly) discusses the general particularities of the C-domain, starting with the split CP of Rizzi (1997) but dwelling on the more detailed account of Topics and Foci in the framework hinted at above. Section 2 examines the left peripheral domain of Romanian independent subjunctive complements (ISs). Their temporal independence and ability to freely obviate control correlates with a more productive and apparently richer C-domain (than that of other types of subjunctives, cf. Cotfas (2012)). Besides the 'canonical' make-up of *ca* > dislocated element > *să*, we look at instances of complementizer deletion *in the presence* of dislocates and discuss what motivates it or whether it correlates with the presence of a particular type of dislocate (topic vs. focus; among topics, which type is more felicitous with the phenomenon). Section 2 is divided into three sub-sections: the first introduces ISs and the subjunctive left periphery, more generally; the second deals with Topics and the third looks at FF instances in ISs. Section 3 draws the conclusions.

2. ON THE MAKE-UP OF THE LEFT PERIPHERY

2.1. Rizzi (1997 and subseq.)

No discussion on the structure of the left periphery can ignore Rizzi's (1997) account of the functional heads and the projections in the operator layer of clauses, as given in (1):

(1) Force Top* Foc Top* Fin (IP)

The Force head is the one that "looks outside" and determines clause-typing, whereas Fin is responsible for determining the finiteness features, having thus direct bearing on the type of I/T head it combines with. In between, there are special functional heads Topic and Focus, whose specifier positions host topicalized or focused material dislocated from the IP for discourse reasons. While in some languages the Top and Foc heads are overtly signaled via specific particles, in others these may well be null heads – as is the case in Romanian, English and many other languages. The standard assumption is that in finite clauses, Romance languages express the Force head overtly (via complementizers

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

such as *che/que*, etc., which are followed by Top and Foc), whereas Fin is overtly expressed in non-finite complements via prepositional complementizers (*di/de, a/à*), which can be preceded by Topics. There is a great deal of cross-linguistic variation, though, since other languages may have complementizer-like elements in Fin in finite clauses, preceded by dislocated material, or others may overtly mark both Force and Fin (e.g., Welsh), with Top and Foc sandwiched in between – as seems to be the case of Romanian as well, with *ca* and *să*[3]. In the cartographic account, the Foc projection marks the partition between the focus and the presupposition and there can be as many Topic projections as there are topicalized constituents. In recent work, both the free iteration of Topics in the LP, as well as the contention that fronted focused material is always contrastive have come under closer scrutiny and the make-up of the left periphery has been significantly re-shaped. We tackle these amendments in what follows.

2.2. Against the randomness of Topics: Topic types and topic hierarchy

Focusing on Italian and German, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) show that Topics are neither fully recursive, nor are they always given elements. They identify three main types of Topic, distinguished in terms of both phonological and syntactic properties, showing that there is a clear correlation between discourse roles and the formal properties of Topics (in sentences displaying more than one topic element). The authors therefore propose a hierarchy of functional (Top) heads in the C-domain, along the lines of (2):

(2) a. Shifting topic$_{[+aboutness]}$ >Contrastive topic > Given/Familiar topic[4]
b. [$_{ShiftP}$ AS-Topic [$_{ContrP}$ C-Topic [$_{FocP}$… [$_{FamP}$ Fam-Topic [$_{FinP}$ Fin [IP..

These three types of Topics can co-occur and are all realized by Clitic Left Dislocation in Italian, but they are distinguished by different pitch accents and different syntactic properties.

[3] For space considerations, this is a very sketchy presentation of Rizzi's theory. For relevant discussions and examples, we refer the reader to Rizzi (1997, 2001, 2004).

[4] In later accounts (Frascarelli, Hinterhölzl (2016), handout), these two have been separated, with G-Top higher and Fam-Top lower, separated by a functional projection GP (Ground Phrase), where the IP moves in cases of Right-Dislocation:

(i) Force > Shift-Top > Contr-Top > Foc > **G-Top** > **GP** > **Fam-Top** > FinP > IP.

So, Fam-Tops are the lowest in the CP field and can be either right-dislocated (if there is IP movement to the GP phrase) or, when no such movement occurs, appear in the left periphery. Fam-Topics are associated with 'strong familiarity', whereas G-topics with 'weak familiarity'. The authors borrow these terms from Roberts (2003) and show that Fam-Topics (in Italian) are more likely to appear right-dislocated (i.e., constituents that mark strong familiarity in that they have been explicitly mentioned in previous discourse).

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

The Aboutness-Shift (AS) Topic occupies the most prominent position and is never iterated. Its role is to newly propose or re-introduce a topic and thus mark a shift in the conversation. It corresponds to Reinhart's (1981) sentence topic, which functions as an instruction on how the common ground (CG) of a conversation can be updated by providing the entity under which the proposition should be stored (i.e., the entity identifying the 'file cards'). By this token, the AS topic constitutes a conversational move and pertains to CG management, abiding by the Interface Root Restriction (3). AS Topics are therefore predicted to felicitously appear only in root clauses, which clearly have context update potential, and in root-like embedded clauses (see below).

(3) *Interface Root Restriction* (IRR) (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010)
Information Structure phenomena that trigger an update of the discourse context must occur in clauses endowed with illocutionary force.

Syntactically, (in Italian) AS Topics can be realized by both Hanging Topics (HT) and CLLD. Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010, 2012) analyze them as an independent speech act, outside the scope of the illocutionary operator of the clause (see (8) below)

Contrastive Topics are CLLD elements which introduce alternatives in the discourse, that is, they create oppositional pairs with respect to other topics. In order to account for the availability of C-Topics in embedded clauses that lack update potential in Italian, Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) propose a modification of the classical account of C-Topics given by Büring (2003), which relates them to the question under discussion (as yielding partial answers to some implicit or explicit super-question): according to Bianchi and Frascarelli, C-Topics pick up an entity from a salient set of entities and introduce the implicature that the predicate expressed by the Comment (the rest of the clause, which is the sister of the C-Topic) does not hold, or may not hold, for the other members of the salient set. Under this view, C-Topics are not amenable to the IRR, because their interpretation does not require association with illocutive force. Unlike AS Topics, they can be used in embedded contexts which do not count as 'root-like'[5] and which have no discourse update potential, such as complements to factive and volitional verbs. The only requirement is that the subordinate clause should have a propositional denotation

[5] Alongside root clauses, complements to *verba dicendi* and belief verbs have a proper update potential, achieved via compatibility presupposition (see *Section 2* for more details). Complements to factive, desiderative or negated verbs of saying and belief do not have a proper update potential, because consistency w.r.t. the context set is vacuous or not guaranteed. Thus, while Shifting Topics are only allowed in those contexts which do constitute a conversational move (root or root-like), C-Topics are also possible in the other contexts, a clear proof that they are not subject to the IRR (Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010).

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

(this explains why they are not allowed in "central" adverbial clauses, which do not denote propositions, but event-modifiers).

For English, the distinction between AS Topics and C-Topics is reflected in the opposition between Left Dislocation and Topicalization/Argument Fronting. This distinction corresponds to the fact that C-Topics do not constitute an independent speech act, but are within the scope of the illocutionary operator of the clause.

(4) a. This book, leave it on the table ! (CLLD: AS Topic)
b. *This book, leave on the table!
c. Those petunias, did John plant them?/ when did John plant them? (LD: C-Topic)
d. *Those petunias, did John plant?/ when did John plant?
(Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010: 27)

Given-Topics (or Familiar Topics) are low-toned constituents which resume background information and whose role is to ensure conversational continuity. Thus, they do not affect the discourse dynamics and do no pertain to CG management, so they are by no means constrained by the IRR. This means that they can appear in both root and root-like or non-root-like embedded clauses. Unlike both Shifting and Contrastive Topics, Given/Familiar Topics can be iterated, since more than one constituent can be Given. Being the lowest Topic type in the left periphery, they operate lower than the proposition level. In multiple Topic constructions, Familiar/Given Topics are always preceded by either Shifting or Contrastive Topics, since it may so happen that one proposes a shift or a contrast while also dislocating a given constituent to facilitate retrieval of information. In (5), we have a C-Topic above a Given/Familiar Topic:

(5) comunque l'**inglese** ...[..].**Io, inglese –** [..]non **l**'avevo mai fatto.
however English I English not CL.3MS.ACC-had ever done
'English, though […] I had never studied English before.'
(Bianchi, Frascarelli 2010: 15)

2.3. Focus in the Left Periphery

Focus(ing) is a very complex discourse phenomenon, at the interface between syntax, semantics and prosody. Prosodic prominence correlates with specific interpretive import and, syntactically, focused constituents allow displacement to the left peripheral domain, yielding what is known in the literature as Focus Fronting (FF):

(6) a. They invited JOHN. (focus *in situ*)
b. JOHN they invited __. (focus *ex-situ* or Focus Fronting).

According to Rooth (1992), whenever there is Focus in a structure, a set of alternatives is evoked with respect to the ordinary denotation ([[α]]°) of the

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

constituent bearing the focus feature. This set of alternatives constitutes the focus value of α ($[[\alpha]]^f$). Syntactically, a focus operator (~ *v*; *v* a free variable) is adjoined to α at LF, so the alternatives will be generated at a compositional level above the focused-marked item. Semantically, this operator introduces (via presupposition) a contextually relevant element which represents either a distinct alternative to the (ordinary) denotation of α (the individual case), or a set including the denotation and one or more distinct alternatives (the set case). Under this analysis, focus (with all its pragmatically different uses) does not require dislocation to the C-domain, since it is fully interpretable *in situ*. However, as observed in the example above, such movement is possible and associated with different prosodic profile and semantic import. As observed in a variety of recent papers (Bianchi, Bocci 2012, Bianchi 2015, Bianchi 2016, Bianchi *et al.* 2015, 2016), the two 'flavours' of FF in Italian are corrective contrast and mirative import:

(7) A: Hanno invitato Marina.
have.3PL invited Marina
'They invited Marina.'
B: GIULIA hanno invitato (, non Marina).
Giulia have.3PL invited not Marina
'They invited Giulia (, not Marina).' (Bianchi *et al.* 2015:3)

(8) [Context: Anna tells about a customer complaining for nothing]
Pensa te! COL DIRETTORE voleva parlare!
think you with-the manager wanted.3SG speak.INF
'Guess what! He wanted to speak with the manager!' (Bianchi *et al.* 2015:5)

Bianchi *et al.* (2015, 2016) argue that FF (unlike focus *in situ*) is a means by which the domain of focus is disambiguated: FF signals that the compositional level at which the focus alternatives are exploited is higher, i.e., it is the proposition level. They also show that the special interpretations associated with FF are conventional implicatures and that these are syntactically encoded in the operator layer, triggering displacement.

2.3.1. *Corrective Focus*

Corrective focus is a specific use of contrastive focus and it refers to contrast across utterances. That means that there needs to be an antecedent proposition (*the corrected proposition*) which *the corrective proposition* makes reference to (and amends/corrects), introducing one salient alternative active in the discourse situation. The post-focal material in the corrective sentence is necessarily given, since it repeats the background of the corrected antecedent. The contribution of the corrective utterance is to induce the idea of incompatibility with the previous utterance (the antecedent).


BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

(9) *Corrective import*: There is one alternative proposition, already introduced in the context, which is *incompatible* with the proposition expressed in the corrective reply. (Bianchi *et al.* 2015:9)

The implicature triggered by the corrective claim is that the antecedent proposition (*p´*) cannot be added to the CG (their intersection must be null) and that accepting the proposition at hand *p* into the CG necessarily means that *p´* must be denied. The authors argue that this is a conventional implicature rather than a presupposition.

Given that the corrective import requires a set of alternative propositions, the focus operator must be attached at the propositional level (syntactically, higher than TP). Consequently, the corrective implicature (or what the authors dub the Focus-based implicature) will be merged at a layer above the focus operator:

(10)



2.3.2. *Mirative Focus*

In contexts such as the one in (11) below, the F-marked element is presented (by the speaker) as surprising or unexpected.

(11) ALLE MALDIVE sono andati in viaggio di nozze!
to-the Maldives PERF.3PL gone in journey of wedding (Bianchi *et al.* 2015: 8)

Unlike corrective focus, mirative focus can appear in an out-of-the-blue context, so it does not need any discourse antecedent to relate to. More precisely, the unexpectedness may be relative to some contextual alternatives or it may well be that the alternatives are drawn from shared or general background knowledge. The only contribution of the mirative import is to imply that the asserted proposition *q* is less likely/more unexpected than some other alternative (*p*) whose likelihood is established with respect to some sort of standard or, in Kratzerian terms, to a stereotypical ordering source representing the 'normal course of events'.

(12) *Mirative import*: There is at least one focus alternative proposition which is *more likely* than the asserted proposition with respect to a contextually relevant modal base and a stereotypical ordering source. (Bianchi *et al.* 2015: 9)

Bianchi *et al.* (2016) argue that the mirative import is also a conventional implicature, being non-deniable by the speaker and insensitive to higher operators. (such as the Polar Question operator).

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

3. THE LEFT PERIPHERY OF ROMANIAN INDEPENDENT SUBJUNCTIVES

3.1. Briefly on the Left Periphery of subjunctive complements in Romanian and on Independent Subjunctives (ISs)

One of the well-known areal features that Romanian shares with the other Balkan languages and Italian dialects which have been in contact with Greek is subjunctive mood marking via a specific mood particle (instead of inflection, like in most Romance varieties)[6]: *să* in Romanian, *na* in Greek, *da* in Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, *të* in Albanian, *ku* in Salentino. In addition, Romanian also has a subjunctive complementizer, *ca*, while many of the others use a general indicative complementizer when necessary. The complementizer may or must be absent when no lexical material intervenes between itself and the subjunctive particle.

For Romanian, the status of the particle *să* has been more widely discussed than that of *ca*, since the latter has all the qualities of a typical complementizer. Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) talks about the ambiguous status of *să*, showing it displays both inflectional as well as complementizer-like behaviour. According to Isac (1997:190), the MP (hosting *să*) lies "at the borderline between the left-periphery and the inflectional layer", displaying properties of both. Likewise, Alboiu takes *să* to be "at least the highest verbal functor and at most a low C head" (2007:196).

Since a) *ca,* when overt, is always above *să*, b) the adjacency of *ca* and *să* is deemed substandard in complement clauses[7] and c) the consensus is that *ca* is lexicalized whenever the LP field is activated, so that, when they do co-occur, *ca* and *să* are always separated by Topics, Foci or Subjects (which may not necessarily be topical or focal according to Giurgea this issue), many analyses converge in placing *să* in (the highest) MP projection (which may be taken to

[6] In Romanian, special subjunctive person endings are only found in the 3rd person; otherwise, the subjunctive forms are identical with those of the indicative (except for the copula 'be', which has root suppletion in the whole subjunctive paradigm).

[7] The general agreement is that the adjacency of *ca* and *să* as some sort of complex complementizer (introducing complement clauses) is characteristic of substandard variants (i). The standard variant of (i) is (ii), where *ca* has been deleted/is not lexicalized:.

(i) Vreau ca să plec.
want.1SG that SBJV leave.1SG

(ii) Vreau să plec
want.1SG SBJV leave.1SG

The ban on *ca* adjacent to *să* is suspended in purpose clauses (probably because *ca* has richer features in this case, introducing the purpose interpretation):

(iii) Am rezolvat treaba repede, ca să plec mai devreme.
have.1 solved work-the quickly that SBJV leave.1SG more early
'I have done my work quickly, so I can leave earlier.'

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

coincide with the lowest C-head in the (split) operator field, i.e., Fin) and *ca* in the highest C° position, i.e., Force. Consequently, the structure of embedded (modalized) complements in Romanian would follow the pattern in (13), with *ca* residing in Force (like the indicative complementizer, *că*) and *să* in Fin/M_2 (this higher Mood position is in complementary distribution with a lower M_1, where the other modal auxiliaries (for conditional, presumptive, future) are merged, immediately under negation and above T/Agr, where the verb raises to) (Cotfas 2012: 69):

(13) C_{Force} > (Top > Foc) > C_{Fin}/M_2 > Neg > M_1/[Agr > T] > Asp > ... V

ca	să	nu	vină/		fi	venit
that.SBJV	SBJV	not	come.3.SBJV/		PRF	come.PRT
că		nu	ar/va/o	veni	/ fi	venit
that.IND		not	MOD AUX.	come.INF/	PRF	come.PRT

As a specific subjunctive complementizer, *ca* differs significantly from its indicative counterpart *că*, mainly in that the latter is never optional, regardless of whether there is left-dislocation or not. The presence of *ca* is not required for either typing or finiteness: the particle *să* is enough to encode both types of information.

If we are to follow the contention that the lexicalization of *ca* is constrained by the presence of Topics or Foci in the LP, then we distinguish between two types of subjunctives: *să*-subjunctives (with an inert LP) and *ca*-subjunctives (with an active LP field). The case of the latter is more clear-cut, as shown above, in the sense that *ca* and *să* each have their own designated position in an articulated split CP (Force and Fin). With *să*-subjunctives, the problem is somewhat trickier: do we assume that they have no complementizer (Force) at all or that this head is null? Or, maybe, Fin and Force form a syncretic head? These are questions which have been tackled (more or less extensively) in the literature and the discussion of which is beyond the scope of the present analysis. What our paper contributes to the discussion is to show that *there can also be să-subjunctives with an active left periphery*. We thus bring further evidence for the obsolescence of *ca* and its increasing optionality in specific environments that have to do with left-dislocation phenomena.

Given that this phenomenon of complementizer deletion is by far not uniform – in actual fact, it seems to be highly favoured with particular types of dislocates and since, when present, *ca* is the leftmost C-element, the question that follows is: what is it about some dislocates that allows or facilitates the deletion/ non-lexicalization of *ca* and what does that tell us about the uses and the role of *ca*, more generally? In the following two sections, we will attempt to formulate an answer.

As for the exact nature of Independent Subjunctives, these are those complements selected by volitional and desiderative verbs (intensional predicates): *a vrea* ‘want’, *a dori* ‘wish’, *a spera* ‘hope’, *a prefera* ‘prefer’. In Cotfas (2012), a distinction is made between Independent, Restricted and Anaphoric subjunctive complements in point of control properties and temporal specification. Independent

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

Subjunctives, as the name suggests, are the freest of the three in that they do not yield O(bligatory) C(ontrol) (they unproblematically allow disjoint subjects and, when null, the embedded subject is a *pro*, not PRO) and are not temporally constrained by the selecting predicate, being able to host both syntactic and semantic tense. By way of consequence, their LP is richer than that of the other dependents, given that the range of items to be dislocated is more generous: next to various objects, one can left-dislocate embedded subjects and/or different types of (disjoint) time adverbials.

Before looking more closely at topics or foci in the LP of ISs, we should first settle the issue of whether our subjunctives count as root-like embedded clauses or not. A clear-cut answer to this question would go a great way towards delimiting what types of Topics or FF instances we should expect to find in their periphery. As already shown in section 1 above, root-like embedded clauses abide by the IRR and thus allow a wider range of dislocates than non-root-like complements.

As shown by Farkas (2003) (in Bianchi 2016), various types of selecting predicates, especially the so-called attitude verbs, may introduce embedded contexts which the proposition in the complement clause updates. Not just root clauses, therefore, but also embedded ones have update potential and are thus subject to the IRR in (3) above. Verbs of saying and belief are such predicates: they have been shown to select root-like complement clauses in the sense that these clauses may address the current Question-under-Discussion via a process of 'exportation' or compatibility presupposition (Bianchi 2015, 2016).

Given their semantics, these verbs induce doxastic modal bases (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997): the proposition expressed by the complement clause is true in all the worlds compatible with the subject's belief worlds. By uttering a sentence like *Maria* ***dice/pensa*** *[che Gianni e/sia andato in Cina]* 'Maria says/believes that Gianni went to China', the speaker, while proposing to add the proposition to the CG, does not commit himself to the truth of that proposition, but commits instead the attitude-holder, i.e., the grammatical subject (Maria). Thus, the proposition is 'exported' to the CG via a sort of 'indirect update'. However, adding the embedded *p* to the CG can only be achieved as long as this does not result in an inconsistency. More precisely, the discourse participants presuppose that Maria's belief state does not support any proposition logically inconsistent with the CG, such that information about Maria's attitudinal state can update the CG, "as if Maria were a virtual participant in the conversation" (Bianchi. 2015:12)

In order for this 'exportation' to work and thus achieve the (indirect) update potential, a doxastic modal base is more appropriate than a buletic one, since only the former has a non-empty intersection with the CG. This explains why complements to volitional verbs, as well as those selected by negated *verba dicendi* or belief verbs and factives do not count as root-like: exportation of *p* into the CG either does not guarantee consistency (given the non-realistic modal base introduced by volitional verbs and its likely vacuous intersection with the CG) or

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

the update will simply be non-informative (the case of factive predicates, since these always presuppose the truth of their complements).

Let us now return to the complements under discussion, that is independent subjunctives (ISs). Taking into account the above considerations, they do not count as root-like embedded contexts, are not subject to the IRR and therefore should have no (indirect) update potential. We therefore expect that out of the three types of Topics introduced in section 1, only Given and Contrastive Topics should be allowed. As for Focus Fronting, the accounts sketched above would predict that neither corrective, nor mirative focus should be compatible with the contexts under analysis. However, here we observe an interesting fact, namely that the two types of prosodically-prominent Focus *can* appear in the LP of ISs (i.e., to the left of *să*), in which case *ca* is no longer necessary and sometimes is even dispreferred. It is as if their marked prosodical contour renders redundant the lexicalization of *ca*.

3.2. Topics in the LP of Independent Subjunctives

In this section, as in the next one, we will focus on instances of left dislocation with *ca*-deletion, since these are the contexts that our study mainly contributes to the present discussion.

As predicted by their characteristics, Shifting Topics are not compatible with the LP of our complements (with or without *ca*), as they affect the conversational dynamics, by specifying the file card under which the proposition must be added to the Common Ground (see section 1.2). Indeed, all the examples of topics we have found are either contrastive or have various degrees of linking with the context (qualifying as Given).

Ca deletion is possible with given DP dislocates (active and semi-active), but especially so when a contrast is obvious, that is when the opposing entities, part of a salient discourse set, are clearly spelled out. When the contrast is less clear-cut, we might be dealing with merely Given Topics or else instances of 'orphaned' sentences where the dislocated entity is a C-Topic whose opposing pair is merely implied. The difficulty to tear the two Topics apart is further compounded by the fact that they are both instances of CLLD and we have no prosodic evidence to rely on, since our samples are examples found in corpora or (mainly) online sources. This is actually one of the major drawbacks of our study – all the more so for FF instances. Written evidence is opaque w.r.to how actual speakers might (have) utter(ed) the sentences under discussion; an analysis of the intonational contour of our dislocates would definitely have gone a great way towards a more clear-cut distinction (i.e., between the H* contour specific to C-Topics and the L* one typical for Familiar ones, according to Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007). We leave this for further more in-depth research.

In the next examples, all with complementizer deletion, the DPs (in bold) function as Contrastive Topics: in (14), the dislocate is an active entity, having

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

already been introduced and clearly standing in opposition with another given entity (for which a different predicate holds). The two are rendered in italics and previous context is provided in between square brackets. In (15), the bolded constituent is the subject, and we can have pre-verbal subjects in the neutral order in independent clauses (Giurgea, this issue). It remains to be established whether this can be extended to embedded contexts as well, but the example is interesting for (at least) two reasons: first, a contrast is clearly implied and *ca* is absent; secondly, *ca*-deletion can be due to a 'cacophony' effect (a stylistic rule of Romanian that bans especially sequences of the syllables *ca-/că-* + /k/+Vowel). Even though we might speculate that this could have been the triggering factor of the observed deletion, it is clear that the phenomenon has (by) now extended to other occurrences (i.e., it appears with dislocates whose phonetic contour would not yield a cacophony effect[8]). Moreover, as will hopefully become clearer below, *ca*-deletion systematically correlates with a specific semantic import and prosodic profile of the dislocate (i.e., contrast).

(14) [O tot aud pe *mămica*, care spune că nu vrea să îmbătrînească, dar *eu* vreau!
'I heep hearing *mummy* saying that she doesn't want to grow old, but *I* do!']
Aş vrea **noi** să creştem, dar *ea* să rămână la fel.
would.1SG want we SBJV grow.1PL but she SBJV stay.3 the-same
'I would like (for) us to grow up, but for her to stay the same.'
(http://www.europalibera.org/a/24989739.html)

(15) [Oricât de mulţi *musafiri* erau la noi, *eu* tot lângă tata stăteam …
'no matter how many guests we had, I would still sit next to my dad']
uneori musafirii ziceau că ar fi bine **copiii** să mănânce
sometimes guests-the said that would.3 be good children-the SBJV eat.3
în altă parte.
elsewhere
'Sometimes the guests said that it would be better that the children eat elsewhere.'
(http://asteptandminunile.blogspot.ro/2010_03_01_archive.html)

In the next set of examples, the contrast is perhaps less obvious, but this does not preclude the contrastive interpretation: it often happens that what we see in such contexts is just one of the members of a contextually salient set (and the property ascribed to it). In (16), all the dislocated DPs are clearly active, since they have been mentioned in the immediate discourse, but there is, nonetheless, an

[8] Interestingly, we can find examples illustrating 'the other side of the coin', i.e., rather than *ca*-deletion, the insertion of another element (in between *ca* an *să*) that would make sure that the complementizer and the first syllable of the dislocate are not adjacent (attested examples):
(i) a. (…ne îndârjim atât de tare) ***ca*** **ai noştri *copii*** să nu se rateze…..
REFL harden.1PL so strongly that our children SBJV not REFL fail.3PL
'We force ourselves so hard to make sure that our kids should not fail …'
b. Noi preferăm ca ai noştri copii să meargă desculţi pe timpul iernii şi să ….
We prefer that our kids SBJV walk.3PL barefoot during winter and ….

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

underlying opposition at work: with the speaker ('I') in (16a), with 'the (extension of the) lens' in (16b). In (16b) we have both a Shifting and a Contrastive Topic, in B's answer. The former appears in the matrix clause (*în cazul meu* 'in my case/as for me') and the latter in the LP of the subjunctive dependent.

(16) a. **[**învăț cu *copilul* ....deseori eu sunt diferită de metoda doamnei, dar *eu* am făcut şcoala pe vremea plumbuitului, 'I study with my child ...often my methods are different from the teacher's, but I was schooled during the Dictator's time…']
nu aş vrea **copilul** să urmeze metoda comunistă.
not would.1SG want child.the SBJV follow.3 method.the communist
(https://bloguluneitipeoarecare.wordpress.com/2016/04/12/gramatica-e-mama-la-toti/)

b. **[**A: Sistemul de prindere este tip ventuză, care e foarte micuță, la fel ca şi camera. În locul tau nu m-aş complica cu cabluri […]**]** 'The grip system has a sucker to it, which is tiny, just like the camera. If I were you, I wouldn't complicate things with cables..']
B: ai dreptate […] ***În cazul meu*** aş vrea **camera** să
have.2SG right in case-the my would.1SG want camera.the SBJV
o prind de oglinda retrovizoare şi să am pe parbriz
CL.ACC fix.1SG on rear-window and SBJV have.1SG on windshield.the
doar *prelungirea lentilei*
just extension-the lens-the.GEN
'You're right. As for me, I'd like to fix the camera on the rear window and have only the extension of the lens on the windshield.'
(http://forum.softpedia.com/topic/761216-recomandare-camera-video-pt-filmat-deplasarea-autovehicolului/page__st__720)

Finally, let us observe that even when the topic is an entity which has not been previously entered in the discourse *as such*, the larger context still allows for some backgrounding (shared knowledge), marking it as semi-active and triggering implicit contrast with the (active) familiar entities. In (17a), 'the children' have not been previously mentioned, but the entity is 'accommodated' *via* the earlier mentioning of 'schools'. Here, the opposition is again with the speaker and it is the first conjunct that introduces the property that holds of the speaker ('see the doctor before the priest'), set in contrast with what is being predicated of the children (in schools), i.e., take first-aid lessons first and religion classes later. Similarly, in (17b) the discourse is about various adjustments that the speaker needs done to his motorcycle seat, in point of length (and comfort), colour, seams and, obviously, the material to be used, each of which needs to have certain specific characteristics. In (17c), 'the job' can be considered given – or at least accommodated by all the previous details related to hazard prevention measures.

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

(17) a. [[..]să facem *şcoli* şi să aducem medici în mediul rural [..], să facem spitale de vindecare nu catedrale de mântuire. Nu *mă* deranjează nici catedrala ortodroxă nici cea musulmană dar ..
'Let's build schools and let's bring doctors in the countryside, let us erect hospitals for healing, not catedrals for redemption. I do not mind the othodox cathedral or the muslim one, but ..']
aş vrea să ajung la doctor înainte de preot şi aş vrea
would.1SG want SBJV get.1SG to doctor before of priest and would.1SG want
copiii să înveţe lecţii de prim ajutor înainte de ora de religie.
childern-the SBJV learn.3 lessons of first aid before of class-the of religion
'I'd like to get to the doctor before (getting to) the priest and I'd like that children should learn first aid lessons before religion lessons.'
(http://www.contributors.ro/cultura/de-ce-sustin-finalizarea-noii-catedrale-patriarhale/)

b. [Vreau şaua refacută, despărţitor de pasager, […] Mă interesează să am mai mult confort. *Motocicleta* este culoarea 'sunset yellow' şi *cusăturile* trebuie să se încadreze cu culoarea. şi.. 'I want the seat redone, a passenger partition [..] I am interested in more comfort. *The motorbike* is 'sunset yellow' in colour and the seams must fit in with the colour and'..]
Aş vrea **materialul** să fie unul mai aderent.
would.1SG want material-the SBJV be.3SG one more adherent
'I'd like the material to be a more adherent one'
(http://www.motociclism.ro/forum/index.php?/topic/680380-retapitez-scaune-moto/page-27)

c. [Sunt 99% sigur că nu s-a respectat norma de protecţia muncii. Nimeni nu mai verifică dacă se fac întăriri ale malurilor, dacă şanţul e mai adînc de 1.5 m.
'I am 99% sure that labour protection laws were not abided by. Nobody ever checks whether the banks are sustained, whether the hole is deeper than 1.5m']
Toată lumea vrea **lucrarea** să fie terminată repede şi cu cheltuieli minime!
everyone wants job-the SBJV be finished quickly and with expenses minimal
'Everyone wants the job to be done quickly and with minimal expenses!'
(http://www.ziare.com/stiri/accident/muncitorul-prins-sub-un-mal-de-pamant-la-mihailesti-giurgiu-a-fost-salvat-1080591)

In the examples above, we have subjects which are dislocated. This raises the question of whether we might be dealing with instances of subject to object raising[9] (SOR), given the (marginal) possibility of cliticization on the matrix verb, i.e., *îl/o vreau să fie...* 'him/her/it want.1SG SBJV be...'*)*. In spite of examples of this type (21 hits on a quick search), the realization of the embedded subject as a differentially-marked object in the matrix is definitely marginal (??/**îl vreau pe el să .../ o vreau pe ea/Maria să vină...* 'him/her(CL) want.1SG DOM him/her/Maria SBJV comes…'), which shows that SOR is unlikely in such cases..

Given the empirical evidence discussed above, we contend that complementizer deletion is quite common in the LP of ISs in Romanian, especially when the topic is or can be construed as contrastive.

[9] I thank Ion Giurgea for pointing this out to me. Just like with some raising passive constructions which are becoming more productive in Romanian, such constructions could be due to the influence of English (cf. *I want the job to be finished on time*).

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

3.3. Focus Fronting and Independent Subjunctives

Unlike the case with topics, it is significantly less easy to find relevant examples which display Focus Fronting – with either of the two interpretations illustrated above. As already mentioned, the oral corpora are not extensive enough to offer sufficient samples, and the mark of FF is, first and foremost, prosodic.

In spite of this, instances of FF built on the patterns discussed in section 1 are fully grammatical in the LP of our subjunctive complements. Moreover – and more interestingly – these seem to go hand in hand with complementizer deletion. Namely, whenever there is FF with either corrective or mirative interpretation, the complementizer is dropped and it looks like this deletion is the norm rather than an option. This is the judgment of many speakers, including my own, and has also been confirmed by the results of a (so far) small-scale study on 20 respondents who were confronted with scenarios similar to those under (18) and (19) below. More precisely, they were either shown small exchanges between two speakers (A and B), where B reacted to A's statement by correcting some piece of information (for corrective focus) or presented with a specific context and a speaker's reaction (of surprise) (for mirative focus). In both cases, they were told to read the bolded item as prosodically-marked and given three variants to assess and choose from: one with FF and an overt complementizer, one with FF and no complementizer, plus a third variant where the F-marked element appeared left-most, in the periphery of the matrix clause. Asked to give grammaticality scores (1 to 5) for each of the three variants, a bit over 90% of our respondents preferred the complementizer-less variants (mostly scores of 5, with slightly more 5s for FF in the periphery of the matrix, especially with mirative focus). Importantly, there were clear responses that the rejected variant featuring an overt complementizer (B_2 for corrective focus, A_2 for mirative)

(18) a. A: Am auzit că Maria vrea să-şi ia *cățel*./ vrea să guste *prăjitura.*
'I heard that Mary wants to get a puppy/ wants to taste the cake.'
B_1: Nu, nicidecum! Vrea **PISICĂ** să-şi ia! / **PISICĂ** vrea să-şi ia!
no, not at all wants cat SBJV-3S.DAT gets/ cat wants SBJV-3S.DAT gets
Nu, nicidecum! Vrea **LIMONADA** s-o guste./**LIMONADA** vrea
No, not at all! wants lemonade-the SBJV-it taste / lemonade-the wants
s-o guste!
SBJV-CL.ACC tastes
'No, not at all! She wants to get A CAT / to taste THE LEMONADE!'
B_2: Nu, nicidecum! ??Vrea ca **PISICĂ** să-şi ia! / ?? ca **LIMONADA**
No, not at all wants that cat SBJV-3S.DAT gets / that lemonade.the
s-o guste!
SBJV-it tastes
b. A: Cică Matei vrea s-o invite (*sâmbătă*) *pe Alina* (*sâmbătă*) în oraş.
'They say that Matei wants to take out Alina on Saturday.'
B_1: Nu-i adevărat! Vrea **pe ANA** s-o invite. /**Pe ANA** vrea
not-is true wants DOM Ana SBJV-CL.ACC invites /DOM Ana wants

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

s-o invite!
SBJV-CL.ACC invites
'That's not true! He wants to take out Ana!'

B_1': Nu-i adevărat! Vrea **DUMINICĂ** s-o invite / **DUMINICĂ** vrea
not-is true wants Sunday SBJV-her invites / Sunday wants
s-o invite!
SBJV-her invites
'That's not true! He wants to take her out on Sunday!'

B_2: ??Nu-i adevărat! Vrea ca **PE ANA** s-o invite / Vrea ca
not-is true ! wants that DOM Ana SBJV-CL.ACC invites / wants that
DUMINICĂ s-o invite!
Sunday .. SBJV-her invites

(19) a. [Context: A tells B about a party where she and a friend went to last night]

A_1: Îți vine să crezi? Ăia nu ştiau ce băuturi să-i
you.DAT comes SBJV believe.2SG those not knew what drinks SBJV-her
mai aducă şi ea (**APĂ**) vrea (**APĂ**) să comande!!
more bring.3 and she (water) wants (water) SBJV orders
'Can you believe it? Those people were piling boose in front of her and she wants to order water!!'

A_2: Îți vine să crezi? Ăia nu ştiau ce băuturi să-i
you.DAT comes SBJV believe.2SG those not knew what drinks SBJV-her
mai aducă şi ea vrea ca **APĂ** să comande!!
more bring.3 and she wants that water SBJV orders

b. [Context: A and B talk about plans for the New Year]

A: Poftim?? (**La mare**) Vreți (**la mare**) să mergeți de Revelion?
pardon (at seaside) want.2PL (at seaside) SBJV go.2PL on New Year's
Ați înnebunit?
have.2PL got-mad
'What? Do you want to go TO THE SEA on New Year's Eve? Are you mad?'

The examples above show that any type of constituent can be fronted for corrective or mirative purposes: DPs (subject or objects, definite or indefinite), PPs, adverbial phrases). Moreover, deletion is not limited to cases where the embedded and matrix subject are co-referent, for which one might consider assuming a more reduced structure (i.e., one without Force, correlated with control):

(20) În general le vorbesc cum aş vrea **MIE** să mi
in general them.DAT talk.1SG like would.1SG want me.DAT SBJV me.CL.DAT
se vorbească .. (http://cetin.ro/camara-mihai/)
REFL talks
'I generally speak to them as I would like to be spoken to.'

(21) Aş vrea **LOR** să le dai cartea (nu mie) /
would.1SG want them.DAT SBJV CL.DAT give.2SG book.the (not me.DAT)/
PE EI să-i iei în excursie (nu pe mine)
DOM them SBJV-CL.ACC take.2sg on trip (not OBJ me)
'I'd like to give the book to THEM (not to me) / to take THEM on the trip (not me).

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

In compliance with the (semantic) characteristics of each type of Focus, corrective instances yield contrast across utterances, with the F-marked entity as discourse-new (rhematic) and the post-focal material discourse-given, whereas mirative uses are not in themselves contrastive, merely implying that the asserted proposition is less likely than some 'normal' alternatives in the evaluation world.

Note now that (20) clearly shows an example of FF which is neither mirative nor corrective, but just contrastive. Thus, the fact that it can appear in an embedded clause has nothing surprising. Indeed, Giurgea (2016) shows that Focus Fronting in Romanian does not have as restrained an interpretation as has been claimed for other Romance languages: FF in Romanian need not be solely (strictly) corrective or mirative. The restriction to closed sets of contextually salient antecedents is also deemed too strong for Romanian, since FF is manifest in examples which clearly operate on open sets. The proposal is thus that 'plain focus' (that FF instance which has no focal particles, no mirative or exclamative import) is exhaustive, i.e., it carries an exhaustivity implicature, which requires rejection of *any* alternative not entailed by the clause. In this respect, Romanian FF resembles English clefts (the contrastive type), for which similar claims have been made. Therefore, even though in Romanian fronting does not require a closed set of salient alternatives, FF often has corrective import, which can be accounted for via exhaustivity.

In spite of the scarcity of naturally-occurring (written) examples with FF, there are some which, even if they do not fully abide by the typical corrected-corrective pair relation, clearly involve a contrast across utterances – always yielding the exhaustivity presupposition, i.e., the idea that the speaker rejects one or more alternative propositions. In (22a) below the same speaker first introduces an entity ('David') (the name of a soap opera character) and then (in the second conjunct) it is as if s/he changes his/her mind, amending the previous thought. Similarly, in (22b), the speaker reacts to a post in a forum requesting for the actual electronic text of a novel. Instead, one of the users posted a mere summary – and it is this that the speaker makes reference to. So, the 'comment' is a salient entity in the context. In (22c), the F-marked and discourse-new DP *colegii* 'my colleagues' amends the allegation that the speaker's election as a group leader was influenced by his relation with Victor Ponta (and the latter's position as the president of the party). Under (23) and (24) we have other (naturally-occurring) relevant examples. Note that in these examples movement of the focus into the matrix would be infelicitous, because the focal alternatives (the focus domain) do not contain the matrix verb (various forms of *want*; e.g., in (22a) the alternatives are Esteban's staying and David's staying, etc.):

(22) a. nu vreau să -l jignesc pe David dar vreau **Esteban** să rămână
not want.1SG SBJV-CL.ACC offend.1SG DOM David but want.1SG Esteban SBJV stays
'I wouldn't want to offend David but I want **Esteban** to stay.'
(http://dyanasmen.blogspot.ro/2010/05/ninos-ricos-pobres-padres- saracii.html)

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

b. eu vreau **cartea** să o citesc.... nu comentariu sau povestire....
I want.1SG book-the SBJV CL.ACC read.1SG … not comment or summary
'I want to read **the book**, not some comment or summary.'
(http://www.calificativ.ro/fantana_dintre_plopi_de_mihail_sadoveanu-a109.html)

c. [Întrebat dacă faptul că Victor Ponta este preşedintele PSD a reprezentat un atu în câştigarea funcției de lider de grup, Ilie Sârbu a răspuns: 'Asked if the fact that V.P. is the president of PSD gave him the upper hand in winning the group leader nomination, Ilie Sârbu answered:']
"Nu cred, nu. *Eu* am spus ieri că vreau vot şi vreau
not think.1SG no. I said yesterday that want.1SG vote and want.1SG
colegii să spună cine va fi liderul.
colleagues-the SBJV say.3PL who will be leader-the
'I don't think so, no. I did say yesterday that I want(ed) a vote and that I want **my colleagues** to decide who the leader will be.'
(http://www.mediafax.ro/politic/ilie-sarbu-faptul-ca-ponta-e-presedintele-psd-nu-a-fost-un-atu-pentru-castigarea-sefiei-grupului-7067510)

(23) a. [vreau să vă spun că îmi face plăcere întâlnirea cu *voi*. Nu aş vrea să vorbesc foarte mult *eu*, avem un timp la dispoziție în care.. 'I want to tell you that meeting you gives me great pleasure. I do not want to talk too much myself, we have some time during which ..']
aş vrea **voi** să întrebați.
would.1SG want **you** SBJV ask.2PL
'I'd like **you** to ask questions.'
(http://www.interlic.md/2009-06-25/in-rom-nia-va-fi-creata-o-agentzie-speciala-pentru-procesarea-cererilor-de-redob-ndire-a-cetatzeniei-10833.html)

b. [*Noi* trebuie să revenim la această temă [...] Şi recomand tuturor să-şi cumpere *hamster* [...].Eu încerc să-l conving pe hamsterul meu să facă gimnastică, dar *el* înțelege că nu produce nimic, şi preferă să lenevească. 'We have to return to this subject…and I recommend that you all buy a hamster [..] I try to persuade my hamster to do some gymnastics but it knows that nothing gets produced so it prefers to laze about']
Şi tare aş vrea **noi** să înțelegem, să nu fim ...
and really would.1SG want we SBJV understand.1PL SBJV not be.1PL
'And I'd like so much that WE understand, that we shouldn't...'
(http://www.europalibera.org/a/27949943.html)

(24) a. eu voiam **mie** să-mi apară Founder şi *la restu* Admin
I wanted me.DAT SBJV-me.CL.DAT appear.3 Founder and at rest-the Admin
I would have wanted 'Founder' to appear next to my name, and 'Admin' next to the others'.
(http://forum.cs16.ro/topic/143117-cs16-support-plugin-adminchatamxx/)

b. Dacă citeai sus, vedeai că am spus că voiam
if read.IMPF.2SG above, see.IMPF.2SG that have.1 said that wanted.1SG
Simona să câştige împotriva *Sharapovei!*
Simona SBJV win.3 against Sharapova.DAT
'If you had read above, you would've seen I said I wanted that it should be Simona who wins against Sharapova!'

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

b'. [...] nu prea o susțin constant, dar au fost și meciuri pe
not too her support.1SG constantly but have.3PL been also matches DOM
care voiam **ea** să le câştige!
which wanted.1SG she SBJV CL.ACC win.3
'I am not a constant fan, but there've been matches that I wanted HER to win!'
(http://www.digisport.ro/Sport/TENIS/VIDEO+Sharapova+n-a
+mai+jucat+finala+la+Wimbledon+din+2011)

4. TAKING STOCK AND DRAWING CONCLUSIONS

Our paper has set out to offer a more detailed analysis of the left periphery of subjunctive complements selected by volitional and intensional verbs in Romanian, in light of recent findings on the hierarchization of Topics and topic types and Focus Fronting phenomena. Among Romance, Romanian is special in sharing significant characteristics with other Balkan languages, particularly when it comes to subjunctive marking: it has a subjunctive particle (*să*) and a typical subjunctive complementizer (*ca*), so any discussion of the LP of subjunctive complements has to take into account the position occupied by these two elements and their interaction with dislocated constituents (Topics and Foci). In a Split CP a la Rizzi (1997), the particle occupies the Fin head and the complementizer the highest C-head, Force, with Top and Foc in between. Our present analysis does not have anything new to say about this distribution. Indeed, in (standard) *ca*-subjunctives (those where the complementizer is overt and the LP is active/activated), the Force head and the Fin head are never adjacent, with Topics and Foci intervening in between. The pre-verbal non-topicalized types of subject discussed by Giurgea (this issue) arguably occupy the same position in the periphery of our complements (possibly SpecFin). For space considerations, we did not take this issue into account in the present analysis, but we leave it for future investigation.

What the present study does contribute to the discussion is to draw attention to the existence of cases where our subjunctives do have an active LP, but no overt complementizer. What is interesting about these subjunctives is that, structurally, they are *să*-subjunctives, but, unlike what has so far been taken to be a *să*-subjunctive in the literature, they have an active and full-fledged left periphery. Such instances of complementizer deletion point to a further weakening of the subjunctive complementizer – which can be deemed to be (already) 'weak' in the sense that a) it is only activated /lexicalized as long as we have left dislocation for discursive reasons, b) subjunctive complements do not need it in order to be phasal (the cycle can be closed at the C_{low} level), c) it is not needed, either for typing or for finiteness (*să* is enough for both types of information). It appears therefore that the only role left for *ca* was to 'host' peripheral elements. Our paper shows that, in actual fact, this is not always true about *ca*. Namely, it is not *always* needed to the

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

left of Topics or Foci, but instead it can (or should) be dropped. Hence the enhanced 'weakening' mentioned earlier.

This evidence immediately brings to the forefront several important and related questions: What is it exactly that triggers *ca*-deletion? What do the contexts that allow (or require) *ca*-deletion have in common and how can we account for it in a principled way? Last but not least, since *ca* is required or needed in fewer cases than expected, what is it that it does do, when it is there?

On a more general level, we have shown that the LP of ISs in Romanian (with or without *ca*) allows and rejects similar types of topics allowed and banned in other languages, and that it is also compatible with FF phenomena. In accordance with the IRR (in (3)), Shifting Topics are disallowed, whereas Contrastive and Familiar/Given ones are allowed, since these are not sensitive to the IR Rule: Contrastive Topics require propositions and they needn't appear in root-like clauses, whereas Familiar Topics are compatible with any type of clause.

As far as Focus Fronting is concerned, our complements can host both mirative and corrective F-marked elements and these go hand in hand with complementizer deletion, which is highly preferred (see the results of our survey). This in turn goes hand in hand with the possibility of matrix realization of the F-marked element in what can be called 'root transportation'.

One question that comes to mind is why these sub-types of FF should be allowed in the LP of subjunctive complements, given that they are not root-like: due to the semantics of the selecting predicate, a non-realistic modal base is activated, such that our complements do not have (indirect) update potential and consistency with CG is not guaranteed. There is more than one way we could account for this, drawing either on the semantic import of FF (and its interaction with complementizer deletion) or on the very prosody of the dislocates (and how it affects *ca* deletion).

One way to accommodate FF under our intensional predicates would be to take *ca* deletion as a diagnostic for root-like behavior. This behavior is not possible in other Romance languages, but Romanian (independent) subjunctives are different from their Romance counterparts in various respects: ours have specialized particles and complementizer, do not impose obligatory control or syntactic obviation, etc. So what is impossible in one language need not be the same in the other – if some particular circumstances are met. These special conditions would have to make sure that the complement is – or becomes – discourse active, so that the proposition is grounded to the speaker, not the matrix subject. This way consistency could be coerced, such that the intersection with the CG should be non-null. More precisely, what is proposed for updating is the implicature (i.e., the *speaker*'s (not the syntactic subject's) commitment that *p* is either incompatible with any other alternative or less likely than what is expected).

Syntactically, in Bianchi *et al.* (2015: 12–14), the implicature trigger is implemented as a functional head in the LP, which always activates a lower FocP

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

in order to introduce the (set of) alternative propositions ([$_{FP}$ Force ... [$_{FaiP}$ FAI°$_{[mir]/[corr]}$ [$_{FocP}$ YP$_i$ $_{[+foc]}$ Foc°$_{[+foc]...}$ [$_{TP}$ ... <YP$_i$ > ...]]]]). This functional head, which the authors dub the FAI° (Focus-associated implicature), bears an implicature-triggering (active) feature that also provides specific instructions to the prosodic component. The FAI (its active features) will thus act as a syntactic trigger for movement. For Romanian ISs, assuming the existence of the FAI head in the relevant contexts (i.e., those that count as discourse active because there is some speaker implicature at stake), it can be the case that the activation of FaiP (always by prosodically-marked elements signalling speaker implicatures) interferes with the realization/lexicalization of the Force head hosting *ca*. In this view, *ca*-deletion would be motivated by the need that the implicature carried over by the left-dislocated phrases be 'visible' or able to be targeted or accessed by the matrix C-layer, where the speaker's coordinates are located, according to Giorgi (2010). This would also account for the possibility of root realisation of the focused phrases, which was shown above to be highly accepted by our respondents (in those cases when the preference/desire is already part of the common ground).[10]

This tentative conclusion on discourse activation is also consistent with cases of complementizer deletion with C-Topics, which have been argued to embed a Foc P. In point of prosodic profile, they resemble Foci (i.e., the H* contour). In point of semantics, they are given because the entities are salient, but what makes them discourse-active is the import of contrast. They are not sensitive to the IRR but are not incompatible with root-like clauses.

Alternatively, bearing in mind that FF in Romanian resembles English clefts and that the exhaustivity implication is actually embeddable (as shown by others, including Giurgea 2016), the solution is (more) straightforward: unlike other Romance languages (viz. Italian), FF in Romanian need not be a root phenomenon after all – so it is perfectly compatible with/under intensional predicates (just as English clefts are[11]). *Ca* deletion is then motivated by the marked intonational

[10] Note that in Romanian, unlike English, there is no apparent asymmetry w.r.t. *ca* deletion in pre- vs. post-verbal position: with focus fronting, *ca* can be deleted (and deletion is preferred, at least according to my judgement) in pre-verbal position as well:

(i) (Ca) ION să o invite în oraş ar fi vrut ea, nu Matei.
(that) ION SBJV her invite.3SG in town would.3SG PRF wanted she not Matei
'She would have wanted ION (not Matei) to have invited her out.'

(ii) (Ca) MÂINE să plec ar fi fost bine, nu luni.
(that) TOMORROW SBJV leave.1SG would.3SG PRF been good not Monday
'That I should leave tomorrow (not on Monday would have been best.'

This lack of asymmetry obviously needs to be investigated further, but data and speaker judgements support this idea.

[11] Cf.

(i) I liked it that it was Fred who told her.
(ii) I would rather it were you who breaks the news to her.
(iii) I want it to be you that ……

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

contour of the dislocates. What all the contexts which allow *ca* deletion have in common is the idea of contrast: contrast across focal alternatives, comparative likelihood or thematic contrast. They also share a marked prosodic profile, which is only to be expected, since the semantic notion of contrast is singled out by specific intonation. For parsing reasons, *ca* helps the parser to identify the left-most boundary of the complement clause, but peripheral prosodically-marked elements might also help achieve the very same purpose, rendering the complementizer superfluous, so that, for economy and parsing reasons, it is no longer pronounced.[12]

There is independent evidence that the lexicalization of *ca* has effects on interpretational phenomena such as the licensing of negative polarity items. In (25a) below, a matrix negation can license the negative pronoun *nimeni* 'nobody' in the *să*-subjunctive, which is negative in meaning, as the traslation shows. A functional negator can appear on the embedded inflection (25b), yielding upon the whole structure the meaning of a double negative. Once *ca* is lexicalized in contexts like (25a), i.e., with the licenser in the matrix, the NPI in the embedded clause is less accessible, given the marginality of (26a, b) – as compared to (25a):

In these cases (as with FF in Romanian ISs), the alternatives could be introduced right below the bouletic modal operator (at the level of the possible worlds it introduces) and then denied via the exhaustivity implicature.

[12] Interestingly, complementizer deletion is also frequent with fronted (deictic time) adverbials. These can be either (contrastively) focalized (occupying SpecFoc or SpecFAI), topicalized (SpecTop) or merely left-dislocated (arguably occupying Rizzi's (2004) SpecMod (modifier)). Regardless of their exact position, even when they are not necessarily focalized, the complementizer can be absent. Importantly, this happens particularly in those cases when there is a clear temporal mismatch between the time specification of the matrix verb and that of the adverbial (see (i), (ii), (iii)). This mismatch seems to have a similar contribution to that of prosodically-marked elements, in that it signals that the two elements (the verb and the adverb) belong to separate domains, so that the adverb cannot modify the matrix predication, but marks the beginning (the left-most boundary) of the embedded domain.

(i) Dacă **vreau** **mâine** **să** mă despart de tine, mâine mă despart
if want.1SG.**PRES** **tomorrow** SBJV me break.1SG up of you, tomorrow me break-up.1SG de tine of you
'If I want to break up with you TOMORROW, I break up with you TOMORROW'
(http://www.hotnews.ro/stiri-esential-8522258-audio-noua-inregistrare-unei-presupuse-convorbiri-intre-vintu-sebastian-ghita-a)

(ii) **vreau** **mâine** **să** fac şi eu reţeta, dar …
want1SG.**PRES** **tomorrow** SBJV make.1SG and I.NOM recipe-the but ….
'I want to cook the recipe tomorrow, but...'
(https://www.retetecalamama.ro/retete-culinare/deserturi-dulciuri-de-casa/ciocolata-de-casa-batonul-copilariei.html)

(iii) **Voiam** **mâine** **să** îți dau flori, dar dacă nu ieşi din casă..
wanted.1SG.**IMPF** **tomorrow** SBJV you.DAT give.1SG flowers, but if not get.2SG out-of house
'I wanted to give you flowers tomorrow, but since you don't get out...'
(https://ask.fm/ale_bu2000)

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

(25) a. **Nu** vreau [*să* vină **nimeni** la petrecere]
not want.1SG SBJV come.3 nobody at party
'I don't want anybody to come to the party'/I want nobody to come to the party'
b. **Nu** vreau [*să* **nu** vină **nimeni** la petrecere]
not want.1SG SBJV not come.3 nobody at party
'I don't want nobody to come to the party.'
(= I want there to be people who attend)

(26) a. ?**Nu** vreau [*ca* **nimeni** să vină la petrecere][13]
not want.1SG that nobody SBJV come.3 at party
b.??**Nu** vreau [*ca* mâine să vină **nimeni** la petrecere] /
not want.1SG that tomorrow SBJV come.3 nobody at party
[*ca* la petrecere să vină **nimeni**...]
that at party SBJV come.3 nobody

Taking into account all of the above, we can conclude that the main role left for *ca* is to unambiguously mark the leftmost boundary of the subjunctive clause – e.g., when no discourse activation is at stake. Significantly, its lexicalization can also help disambiguate contexts which, in the absence of *ca*, are potentially ambiguous. Compare to this end (27a) and (27b) below: (27a) (in the absence of prosodic evidence) is ambiguous between a) an interpretation where the DP "the boy" is the (post-verbal) subject of the main verb (i.e., the attitude-holder, the wisher), binding an embedded co-referent *pro* subject in the embedded *să*-subjunctive and b) an interpretation in which somebody else than the boy, some 3rd person entity (*pro*) wishes for him to eat more meat; (27b), however, with an overt complementizer, can only have the interpretation in b) (with the dislocate functioning as a Fam-Topic rather than contrastive or Focus)

(27) a. Ar vrea băiatul să mănânce mai multă carne.
would.3SG want boy-the SBJV eat.3 more much meat

[13] A quick search on the internet will show that examples like (26a) are quite common (all counting as negative). However, when the n-word is no longer pre-verbal, the marginality increases (26b) – suggesting that acceptability might be influenced by the distance between the NPI and its licenser: the longer the distance, the less acceptable the example. This difference in acceptability between examples of the type in (26a) (with preverbal subject N-words) and (26b) (with post-verbal N-words) is beyond the aims of our paper, but interesting to look into.

Importantly, grammaticality is improved when *ca* is *absent* but the LP is active (my judgement, shared by others as well). That is, compared to (26a) above, (i) is more acceptable and the same goes for (26b) vs. (ii), (iii). Negation in both *ca*- and *să*-subjunctives and the interplay between the position of Neg and complementizer deletion obviously needs more attention.

(i) Nu vreau nimeni să vină (mâine la petrecere). (Nici tu!)
not want.1SG nobody SBJV come.3 (tomorrow at party) (nor you)
(ii) N-aş vrea mâine să vină nimeni (la petrecere)
not-would.1SG want tomorrow SBJV come.3 nobody (at party)
(iii) N-aş vrea la petrecere să vină nimeni (mâine).
not-would.1SG want at party SBJV come.3 nobody (tomorrow)

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

'The boy would like to eat more meat' OR
'S/he would like (for) the boy to eat more meat.'

b. Ar vrea ca băiatul să mănânce mai multă carne.
would-3SG want that boy-the SBJV eat.3 more much meat
'S/he would like (for) the boy to eat more meat.'

As for points for further research, perhaps the most important endeavour would be to consult available spoken corpora so that we could analyze the intonational pattern of dislocates and (also) have prosodic evidence for the different types of Topics and Foci in the LP of Independent Subjunctives. The difference between corrective and merely contrastive focus with respect to the position of the corrected item would also be worth looking into. Finally, there is the optionality/obligatoriness issue to be settled: to what extend – particularly with FF – can we claim *ca* deletion as obligatory (i.e., syntactic)? Speakers clearly prefer it, our small scale study has confirmed it, but more conclusive evidence is needed to seal the matter and to account for it in a principled way.

REFERENCES

Alboiu, G., 2007, "Moving Forward with Romanian Backward Control and Raising", in: W. Davies, S. Dubinsky (eds), *New Horizons in the Analysis of Control and Raising*, Dordrecht, Springer, 187–211.

Alboiu, G., V. Hill, 2012, "ECM as both A and A-bar Movement: Evidence from Romanian Evidentials", paper presented at *ACED 14*, University of Bucharest, June 2012.

Bianchi, V., 2015, "Focus Fronting and the Syntax/Semantics Interface", in: U. Shlonsky (ed.), *Beyond the functional sequence*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bianchi, V., 2016, Lectures on Information Structure (Topics and Foci), University of Bucharest, 17–18 September.

Bianchi, V., M. Frascarelli, 2010, "Is topic a root phenomenon?", *Iberia* 2, 1, 43–88.

Bianchi, V., M. Frascarelli, 2012, "On how to be rooted in a context", paper presented at the *35th GLOW Colloquium*, University of Potsdam, March 2012.

Bianchi, V., Crushina S., Bocci G. 2015. "Focus Fronting and Its Implicatures", in: E. Aboh *et al.* (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013: Selected Papers from Going Romance*, Amsterdam 2013, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 3–18.

Bianchi, V., G. Bocci, S. Cruschina, 2016, "Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures", *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 9, 1–54.

Büring, D., 2003, "On D-Trees, Beans, and B-Accents", *Linguistics & Philosophy*, 26, 5, 511–545.

Crushina. S., 2012, *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Frascarelli, M., R. Hinterhölzl, 2007, "Types of topics in German and Italian", in: K. Schwabe, S. Winkler (eds), *On information structure, meaning and form*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 87–116.

Frascarelli, M, R. Hinterhölzl, 2016, "German scrambling meets Italian RD", paper presented at the *42° Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, Università del Salento, Lecce, February.

Cotfas, M.A., 2012, *On the Syntax of the Romanian Subjunctive: Control & Obviation*, doctoral dissertation, University of Bucharest.

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)

Dobrovie-Sorin, C., 1994, *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
Giorgi, A., F. Pianesi, 1997, *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Giorgi, A., 2010, *About the Speaker: Towards a Syntax of Indexicality*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Giurgea, I., this issue, "Preverbal subjects and Topic marking".
Giurgea, I., 2016, "Focus Fronting in Romanian", talk given at the *The XVIth International Conference of the Linguistics Department*, University of Bucharest, November 24-26.
Hill, V., O. Mišeska Tomic, 2008. "Subjunctive Complements to Verbs in Romance and Slavic Balkan", in: M. Tadić, M. Dimitrova-Vulchanova, S. Koeva (eds.), *Proceedings of The Sixth International Conference: Formal Approaches to South Slavic and Balkan Languages*, 7–15.
Isac, D., 1997, "Not in the Mood", *Symposium of Romance Languages*, XLII, 3-4, Bucharest, 185–214.
Reinhart, T., 1981, "Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics", *Philosophica*, 27, 53–93.
Rizzi, L., 1997, "The fine structure of the left periphery", in: L. Haegeman, (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 281–337.
Rizzi, L., 2001, "Reconstruction, weak island sensitivity, and agreement", in: C. Cecchetto, G. Chierchia, M. T. Guasti (eds), *Semantic Interfaces*, Stanford, CA, CSLI, 145–176.
Rizzi, L., 2004, "Locality and the left periphery", in: A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 223–251.
Selkirk, E., 2008, "Contrastive focus, givenness and the unmarked status of 'discourse-new' ", *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 24, 3/4, 331–346.

BDD-A26353 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 22:00:07 UTC)