MAIN CLAUSE *CĂ* 'THAT' IN ROMANIAN

Virginia Hill

Abstract: Romanian *că* 'that' is the Force head of subordinated clauses (Hill 2004). In this paper I point out that the complementizer *că* 'that' may occur in root (vs. subordinated) declarative clauses as well, but only in certain environments, which I identify as being the speech act domain promoting the speaker's point of view. I argue that in such contexts, main clause *că* 'that' marks the border between various pragmatic sub-fields derived at the left periphery of clauses, rather than typing the clause, as it does in CP complements to V or N. In particular, main clause *că* 'that' draws the border between the injunction field and the Mood adverbial field (Cinque 1999), and between the latter and the discourse pragmatic field (ForceP-FinP).

Keywords: main clause phenomena, *că* 'that', left periphery, pragmatic features, cartography

1. Introduction

One important contrast between main and subordinated clauses in Romanian declaratives is that only the subordinated clauses display the lexical complementizer 'that', which is obligatory. The lack of a complementizer in root/main declarative clauses led to a formal representation of the left periphery (LP) in these domains as a collapsed CP/TP (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Alboiu 2002) or as a truncated TopP-FinP (Rizzi 2004). In this paper I point out that the complementizer *că* 'that' may occur in root (vs. subordinated) declarative clauses, as in (1), where its syntactic behaviour has yet to be understood.

(1) Hai (că) bineînțeles (că) vine până la urmă.
PRT that obviously that comes up to end
'C'mon, s/he'll obviously come in the end.'

I argue that in such contexts 'that' marks the border between various discourse fields derived at the left periphery of clauses, rather than typing the clause, as it does in CP complements to V or N; so it is intra-phasal versus inter-phasal. The contribution of this paper concerns the understanding of how much conversational pragmatics gets encoded in syntax, how such encoding is integrated at the left periphery, and what elements of such a field qualify as exclusive Main Clause Phenomena (MCP).

2. The left periphery of Romanian declaratives

Cinque's (1999) hierarchy of MoodPs in (2) is applicable to Romanian, as shown in (3):

(2) [$\text{Mood}_{\text{SPEECH ACT}}$ [$\text{Mood}_{\text{EVALUATIVE}}$ [$\text{Mood}_{\text{EVIDENTIAL}}$[……]]]
cinstit 'frankly'> *din nefericire* 'unfortunately'> *precis* 'surely'

(3) a. Cinstit, din nefericire nu-l vrem.
frankly from unhappiness not him want-1PL
'Frankly, unfortunately we don't want him.'
b. *Din nefericire, cinstit nu-l vrem.
from unhappiness frankly not him want-1PL

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

c. Din nefericire, precis nu vine.
from unhappiness surely not comes
'Unfortunately, surely (I bet) s/he's not coming.'
d. *Precis, din nefericire nu vine.
surely from unhappiness not comes

Also, as in Cinque (1999), epistemics such as *pesemne* 'likely' follow the Moods and precedes the TP (4):

(4) a. ?Cinstit, din nefericire bineînțeles pesemne până la urmă nu va
frankly from unhappiness of course likely up to end not will.3rd SG
veni.
come
'Frankly, unfortunately of course it is likely s/he won't come in the end.'
b. (*pesemne) cinstit (*pesemne) din nefericire (*pesemne) bineînțeles….[1]
likely frankly likely from unhappiness likely of course

All these elements are speaker-oriented, so they are expected not to be compatible with hearer-oriented constructions, such as interrogatives (5a), in out-of-the-blue contexts. The exception is the speech act *frankly*, which may switch to hearer-orientedness: in (5b), *frankly* conveys the speaker's appeal to the hearer's frankness, rather than or in addition to expressing his/her own point of view.

(5) a. (*din nefericire) (*bineînțeles) (*pesemne) cine le va cumpăra?
from unhappiness of course likely who them will buy
b. Cinstit, cine le va cumpăra?
frankly who them will buy
'Frankly, who will buy them?'

These elements also occur in embedded clauses containing reported speech (6). The exception is *frankly*, which may be included in the embedded domain, but it conveys the point of view of the present speaker, not of the reported speaker, and it is separated from the clause by significant intonation breaks. For such contexts, it is, therefore, doubtful that *frankly* is really embedded.

(6) Spunea că, (#cinstit), (din nefericire) (bineînțeles) (pesemne) până
said-3rd SG IMPERF that frankly from unhappiness of course likely up
la urmă nu va veni.
to end not will-3rd SG come
'S/he said that, unfortunately, of course s/he's likely not going to come, frankly.'

Beside the adverbial type of Moods, the high LP also displays particles that express the speaker's point of view either by resorting to injunctive force (e.g. *hai*, *las'* 'c'mon', 'ok', etc.) or by conveying Mood values. When Mood values are present, the particles occur in complementary distribution with the corresponding adverbial based element (e.g. particle *zău*

[1] In (4b) the epistemic cannot precede the Mood elements, unless it is read as an adverbial modifier (e.g., in Spec, AdvP: *pesemne cinstit* 'in a likely honest/frank way') or the evaluative is read as a PP instead of its grammaticalized evaluative form (e.g., 'likely from unhappiness' versus 'likely unfortunately').

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

or Mood *cinstit*, but **zău cinstit/*cinstit zău*). When such particles are present, they precede the Mood evaluative element under the default intonation (7). Hence, we consider them merged higher than the MoodP sequence.

(7) Hai zău/(*?zău hai), din păcate nu vine.
PRT PRT PRT PRT from sins not comes
'C'mon honestly, unfortunately s/he's not coming.'

Constructions as in (7) cannot be embedded (8a), although they may precede interrogatives (8b) under the same conditions as *frankly* in (5b). In interrogatives, they precede constituents in TopP, as in (5c).

(8) a. Spunea că (*hai zău), din păcate nu vine.
said-3rd SG IMPERF that PRT PRT from sins not comes
'C'mon honestly, unfortunately s/he's not coming.'
b. Hai zău, cine le cumpără?
PRT PRT who them buys
'C'mon, frankly, who's going to buy them?'
c. Hai zău, Ioana unde se duce?
PRT PRT Ioana where REFL goes
'C'mon, really, where's Ioana going?'

To sum up, the data show that the LP of Romanian root clauses displays the hierarchy in (9a), where at least injunctive particles and speech act elements precede the interrogative pronouns. If the wh-element is in FocusP in Rizzi's (1997) hierarchy, having TopP at a higher level, then the injunctive particle and the speech act particle precede TopP. In fact, they must be preceding ForceP – i.e. the highest level of CP associated with clause typing features – since ForceP is necessarily present (hence the interrogative reading), but cannot accommodate the particles discussed, it has different features.

(9) a. $_{PartP}$ hai > $_{MoodPspeechact}$ zău/cinstit > $_{MoodPevaluative}$ din (ne)fericire/din păcate > $_{MoodPevidential}$ bineînțeles > $_{Modepistemic}$ pesemne > TP
b. [$_{PartP}$ hai [$_{MoodPspeechact}$ zău/cinstit [$_{ForceP}$ …]]]

At first sight, (9b) would indicate that resistance to embedding, as seen in (6), (8a), is limited to the elements located above ForceP.

3. The location of the complementizer *că* 'that'

Sentential complements to declarative verbs display the obligatory complementizer *că* 'that', as in (10).

(10) Spune *(că) nu vine.
say-3rd SG PRES that not comes
'S/he says that s/he wont come.'

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

Under a cartographic approach, this *că* 'that' qualifies as Force. That is, constituents with Topic and contrastive Focus readings may only follow versus precede it (11a), and it can also precede indirect interrogatives (11b).

(11) a. Spune (*la mare) (*pe Ioana) că (la mare) (pe Ioana) o trimite, nu pe Zoe.
says to sea PE Ioana that to sea PE Ioana her sends not PE Zoe
'S/he says that, to the sea, s/he's sending Ioana, not Zoe.'
b. Mă întreba că ce- am de gând să fac?
me asked that what have-1SG of thought SĂ do.1st SG SUBJ
'S/he asked me what I intend to do.'

Force *că* has [–qu] features at all times, so it does not interfere with wh-movement (12a), and it cannot be used for exclamatives, unlike its Romance equivalent *que* (12b, c). Thus, *că* 'that' is generally classified as being only a [–qu] complementizer in Romanian (i.e., a 'conjunction' in Coteanu et al. 1998: 147).

(12) a. Pe cine spui că a invitat?
PE whom say-2nd SG that has invited
'Whom do you say s/he invited?'
b. Qu'elle est belle! French
that she is pretty
'How pretty she is!'
c. *Că (e) frumoasă (e)!
that is pretty is

However, some linguists have noticed contexts where *că* 'that' has irregular uses (especially Teodorescu 1972; Vulpe 1980), as it may occur in root clauses in certain discourse triggered expressions. Such constructions are discussed in the next section.

4. Main clause *că* 'that'

Some Mood constituents and all the epistemics may optionally be separated from the TP by *că* 'that', as in (13). Teodorescu (1972: 93-101) noticed in a traditional grammar framework that such constructions do not qualify as bi-clausal.

(13) a. Pe bune (că) vine.
on good that comes
'Really/frankly, s/he comes.'
b. Bineînțeles (că) vine.
of course that comes
'Of course s/he's coming.'
c. Pesemne (că) vine.
likely that comes
'S/he'll likely come.'

This observation has been confirmed in formal grammar (Hill 2007): the Mood element is of adverbial nature and adverbs do not combine with the copula *be* (lexical or null) to form a

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

predicate (only adjectives allow for that), as in (14a, b); so the structure in (13) must be mono-clausal, not bi-clausal with a deleted *be*. Furthermore, such elements are highly grammaticalized and behave as Xº (versus XPs), since they allow no modifiers (15a) or substitution through PPs when used for Mood, as opposed to their predicative use (15b). Hence, the syntactic properties of these Mood elements must differ substantially from the properties of the AdvPs, especially when it comes to c-selection (i.e. they select 'that' indicatives, whereas AdvPs do not).

(14) a. (*E) bineînțeles (că) vine.
is of course that comes
b. (*E) fără indoială (că) vine.
is without doubt that comes

(15) a. (*Foarte) normal că vine. // ok. Vorbeşte foarte normal.
very normally that comes speaks very normally
'Obviously s/he comes.'// 'S/he speaks very normally.'
b. (*în mod) normal că vine. // ok. Vorbeşte în mod normal.
in way normal that comes speaks in way normal
'Obviously s/he comes.'// 'S/he speaks normally.'

Vulpe (1980: 64-68) points out that interjections often resort to this 'expletive' *că* 'that' to create "false subordination". Some of these particles are onomathopoeia, while others are injunctive or have Mood values, as mentioned in the previous section:

(16) a. Hop (că) le ies ceia nainte. (from Vulpe 1980: 64)
oops that them come those in front
'Oops, those ones come up in front of them.'
b. Hai (că) viu, nu te teme. (from Vulpe 1980: 65)
PRT that come-1st SG PRES not REFL fear
'Ok, I'm coming, don't be afraid.'
c. Zău (că), din păcate, nu ştiu.
PRT that from sins not know-1st SG PRES
'Honestly, unfortunately I don't know.'

These examples attest that *că* 'that' occurs in main clauses, since there is no evidence of a higher propositional domain (e.g. interjections are not generating vP/TPs). Hence, we label this element as a Main Clause (MC) *că* 'that' and conclude that it cannot be a standard complementizer, so its status needs re-assessment.

5. Tests

A formal analysis of MC *că* 'that' needs to consider its distribution at the LP, the word order around it, its interaction with complementizers and with constituent movement to the LP. These are the criteria for the following tests.

5.1 Distribution and word order

The examples presented so far, especially in (13) and (16), show that MC *că* may surface after a Mood element or particle when it introduces the clause by itself. Hence, the

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

expectation is that when several of these elements co-occur, MC *că* 'that' should be possible after each of them. The example in (17) shows, however, that this is not the case:

(17) Ioane, hai **că** zău (*că,) din nefericire bineînțeles (*că) pesemne **că** şi din
Ion-VOC PRT that PRT that from unhappiness of course that likely that and for
cauza veniturilor, mie nicodată nu mi se va acorda o bursă
cause-the income-GEN.TOP me.TOP never.FOC not me REFL will grant a scholarship
'Ion, c'mon, frankly, unfortunately, possibly because of my income, too, I will obviously NEVER be granted a scholarship.'

In (17), MC *că* 'that' occurs only at two points: between the injunctive and the first element of the MoodP string; and between the epistemic and the clause. The 'clause' must necessarily be a ForceP since it contains two TopP constituents followed by a constituent with contrastive Focus. So this lower MC *că* 'that' must be in its Force location, although it does not need to check the clause typing feature, since clause typing is established by default as [-qu]. Along these lines, we must re-adjust (9b) as in (18):

(9) b. [$_{PartP}$ hai [$_{MoodPspeechact}$ zău/cinstit [$_{ForceP}$…]]]

(18) [$_{PartP}$ hai [$_{ForceP?/MC}$ **că** [$_{MoodPspeechact}$ [$_{MoodPeval}$ [$_{MoodPevid}$ [$_{ModPepist}$ [$_{ForceP/MC}$ **că**….]]]

This analysis explains why MC *că* is optional, whereas the complementizer *că* is obligatory: the complementizer responds to lexical selection (s-selection features), while the MC *că* is a marker for borders in the functional domain that encodes conversational pragmatics (it responds to c-selection only). That is, MC *că* separates the field for injunction/illocutionary force from the field of MoodPs, and the MoodPs from the domain of discourse pragmatics (TopP; FocusP). The word order in (17) indicates that the low MC *că* must be located in Force, although Force is not activated for clause typing. For a systematic labelling, I will assume that the higher MC *că* 'that' merges in a recursive inert Force as well. This labelling will be re-discussed later in relation to extractions.

5.2 Embedding

The prediction of (18) is that embedding should be allowed at the level of either of the MC *că* 'that', whenever *că* is associated with clause typing. It also predicts that the material merged above the high MC *că* 'that' is not embeddable. These predictions will be confronted with the empirical evidence in this section.

Let us start with the lexical material above the highest MC *că* 'that', illustrated through the use of *hai* in (19):

(19) a. Ziceam că hai că o veni el.
said that PRT that will come he
'I said/thought that chances are he must be coming.'
b. *Ziceam că hai (că) vino mai repede.
said that PRT that come-2nd SG IMP more quickly
Intended: 'Come quickly, I said.'

The particle *hai* is generally associated with imperative verbs and it is classified as an injunctive (Croitor-Balaciu 2006). When used as an injunctive, *hai* resists embedding, as in

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

(19b). This result is in line with the classification of imperatives and vocatives as MC phenomena cross-linguistically (e.g. the analysis of subject licensing in English imperatives, in Zanuttini (2008). However, it is important to note that in the injunctive use, *hai* can never be associated with a *că* 'that' complement. When such association occurs, as in (19a), *hai* receives a different interpretation, as an evaluative, evidential or epistemic (versus injunctive), and so it can be embedded in certain contexts (i.e. in "free direct speech"). Hence, MC *că* 'that' occurs in complementary distribution with illocutionary Force and counteracts clause typing for any value; e.g. (18) is incompatible with injunctions.

With respect to MoodP modals, (18) predicts that they should be compatible with embedding when the higher MC *că* 'that' becomes associated with an active Force head. The data, however, indicates variation in the results, depending on the type of selecting verb, the type of modal, and the ability of the modal to select MC *că* 'that' under (18).

To begin with, speech act modals like *cinstit* 'frankly/honestly', *zău* 'really/honestly' resist embedding, as shown in (9b). The facts that led to (9b) are presented again, in (6) and (8a), for convenience. The example in (6) is indecisive about the embedded status of 'frankly' and about its being anchored to the speaker or to the hearer or both; (8a) clearly excludes the embedding of 'frankly'. The situation in (6) suggests that MoodP might be embedded, but the the interpretation of the modal is related to a higher location, in the matrix, above the complementizer *că* 'that':

(6) Spunea că, (#cinstit), (din nefericire) (bineînțeles) (pesemne) până la
said-3rd SG IMPERF that frankly from unhappiness of course likely up to
urmă nu va veni.
end not will-3rd SG come
'S/he said that, unfortunately, of course s/he's likely not going to come, frankly.'

(8) a. Spunea că (*zău), din păcate nu vine.
Say-3rd SG IMPERF that PRT from sins not comes
'C'mon honestly, unfortunately s/he's not coming.'

Identifying the trigger for movement in speech act modals is a complex process that goes beyond the scope of this paper. For our purpose, it is sufficient to notice that there are other factors involved in the reading on the *frankly* class, in addition to the modal features (e.g. the encoding of strong point-of-view features), and that may interfere with its syntactic behaviour.

The other modals may all be embedded. However, the level of embedding differs from one class to another. In order to establish their level of embedding (i.e. below the highest or the lowest *că* 'that'), we use examples where *că* is recursive, as in (20), and only the highest *că* 'that' (under V selection) qualifies as a clause type:

(20) Bănuiesc că, din păcate, probabil că n- o să vină.
guess-1st SG PRES that from sins probably that not will SĂ come-3rd SG SUBJ
'I guess that, unfortunately, s/he's not likely to come.'

The first observation is that evidentials can be embedded, but only under verbs of saying or thinking, and when the embedded domain qualifies as "free direct speech"; that is, the code-switching between direct and indirect speech is only partially implemented, as in (21):

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

(21) Operatorul meu bine instruit îți spune că bineînțeles că se poate…
operator-the my well instructed you says that obviously that REFL can
'My well-trained operator tells you that obviously it is possible.'

Verbs that do not allow for free direct speech do not embed evidentials, with or without *că* 'that' recursion (22a). For such contexts, the evidential may only occur in the matrix, so it can be anchored to the speaker's point of view.

(22) a. S- a nimerit că (*bineînțeles (că)) a venit la timp.
REFL has happened that of course that REFL has come at time
'It happened that s/he came in time.'
b. Bineînțeles (că) s- a nimerit că a venit la timp.
of course that REFL has happened that has come at time
'Of course it happened that s/he came in time.'

On the other hand, embedding seems to be much easier for evaluatives (23a). It is important to notice, however, that this flexibility coincides with the fact that the evaluatives tested never occur with MC *că* 'that' in root clauses (23b). The few that select MC *că* 'that' show the same resistance to embedding as the speech act modals and the evidentials (23c).

(23) a. Ne-a scris că din păcate nu se poate rezolva.
us has written that from sins not REFL can solve-INF
'S/he wrote to us that unfortunately it cannot be solved.'
b. Din păcate (*că) nu se poate rezolva.
from sins that not REFL can solve-INF
'Unfortunately, it cannot be solved.'
c. Bine *(că) se poate rezolva.
well that REFL can solve-REFL
'It is good that it can be solved.'

The situation in (23) indicates that embedding may not be entirely a question of semantic/modal properties, but also a syntactic constraint. In particular, the evaluatives that do not select MC *că* 'that' display a phrasal constituency, as PPs (*din fericire*, *din păcate*) whereas the evaluatives that select MC *că* 'that' have been re-analyzed as Xº elements (*bine că*). It is reasonable to consider that evaluative PPs are in the Spec, MoodP of an empty Mood head, and that null heads in the pragmatic field do not c-select ForceP, even an inert one.

Along these lines, it is not surprising that epistemics, which have all been re-analyzed to Xº, may all take MC *că* complements in free direct speech (24a), but they disallow the recursive *că* 'that' in non-discourse related complements (24b):

(24) a. Spunea că probabil (?că) n-o să vină.
said that probably that not will
'S/he said that s/he'll probably not come.'
b. S-o fi nimerit că probabil (*?că) n-a venit.
SE would be happened that probably that not has come
'It migh have happened that s/he has probably failed to come.'

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

The free direct speech in (24a) is more successful at embedding the epistemic + CP, as predicted in (18)), whereas (24b) rules it out. In the latter, 'probably' can be embedded, but only if analyzed as an XP vs Xº, hence, without MC că 'that'. Thus, epistemics replicate the condition on XP evaluative in embedded context.

All the discussion so far focused on sentential complements with *că* 'that' and indicative verbs, where embedding of the MoodP field is possible under certain conditions, depending on the type of selecting V, the semantics of the modal and the phrasal constituency of the modal. Other type of sentential complements, namely those with unvalued tense features (e.g. subjunctive, infinitive) do not allow for the embedding of the elements of (18) at all, although they do have a ForceP and even a complementizer of the 'that' type. Consider the following examples:

(25) a. *Ar vrea ca cinstit/din fericire/bineînțeles/pesemne Ioana să plece.
would want that frankly/from fortune/of course/perhaps Ioana SĂ leave-SUBJ
b. Ar vrea ca mâine Ioana să plece.
would want that tomorrow Ioana SĂ leave-SUBJ
'S/he would like for Ioana to leave tomorrow.'

The subjunctive complement in (25) has a CP field, since, as in (25b), it displays a 'that' complementizer followed by topic (and focus). However, Mood elements are not compatible with this field (25a) – unless intonation breaks are in place, which would be graphically signalled by commas. When that is the case, the modals are still interpreted as anchored to the speaker, not to the agent of 'want'. We can say that switch from indicative to subjunctive complementation excluded the possibility of embedding at the level of high MC Force, and allows for embedding only at the level of lower MC Force in (18). The situation becomes even more restrictive as we lose in finiteness features. That is, infinitives have already been shown to disallow topic and focus constituents in their left periphery (Hill 2007), let alone Mood elements:

(26) a. Am decis [a oferi premiul lui Ion.]
have decided to offer the prize to Ion
'We've decided to offer the prize to Ion.'
b. Am decis [(?*premiul.TOP/*premiul.FOC) a-l oferi lui Ion].
have decided prize-the.TOP prize-the.FOC to it offer to Ion

Such data indicate that infinitives lack a ForceP altogether, and are truncated to FinP.

In brief, out data on MC *că* 'that' show that this element occurs in main clauses at two points, where it marks the border between different functional fields in the pragmatic domain (18). As border markers, we consider them Force elements for c-selection purpose only. Any of these 'that' may be used to check the clause typing when s-selection occurs, although, of course, not both of them may fulfil such function at the same time. Several factors interact to decide which one of 'that' is converted to embedding Force in indicative clauses. However, outside the indicative inflection, the conversion depends on the strength of finiteness: subjunctives allow only for the embedding of the lower MC 'that' (spelled-out as *ca* vs *că*), whereas the infinitives disallow ForceP completely. This is sown in Table 1.

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

Table 1: Conversion of MC 'that' to embedding 'that'

Clause type		High ForceP	Low ForceP	FinP/TP
Main Clause		√	√	√
Embedded	indicative	(√)	√	√
	subjunctive	X	√	√
	infinitive	X	X	√

6. Extraction and exclamatives

This analysis of *că* 'that' in Romanian main clauses relies on the dis-association of the MC 'that' from the clause typing features of a regular complementizer. If that is correct, then we expect MC *că* to behave differently from the embedding *că* in environments with wh-movement, since only clause typing features on Force would ensure an escape hatch for extractions. This is confirmed in (27):

(27) a. A spus **că probabil că** nu va mai cumpăra casa.
has said that probably that not will more buy house-the
'He said that he'll probably not buy the house.'

b. Ce a spus *(că), probabil, nu va mai cumpăra?
what has said that probably not will more buy

c. Ce a spus *(că) probabil (***că**) nu va mai cumpăra?
what has said that probably that not will more buy

d. Ce spunea **că**-ar fi scris **că** ne trimite?
what said that would be written that us sends
'What did he say she might have written she'll send us?'

In (27b), the higher 'that' is converted to embedding 'that' and as such, it allow for wh-movement to cross through its field. On the other hand, double spell-out of 'that' in (27c), which should be grammatical according to (27a), interferes with wh-movement. This interference is not due to the recursion of 'that' per se, since such recursion is grammatical in (27d). The problem in (27c) comes from the properties of the lower 'that', which does not qualify as an embedding element; hence, it does not ensure an appropriate escape hatch for wh-movement (i.e., a Spec licensed by clause typing).

The lack of clause typing features on MC *că* is also confirmed by the fact that it can never be clause initial in exclamatives, as mentioned in (12) and repeated below:

(12) b. Qu'elle est belle! French
that she is pretty
'How pretty she is!'

c. *Că (e) frumoasă (e)!
that is pretty is

The contrast in (12b) versus (12c) also attests to the fact that French MC 'that' in this environment is associated with clause typing features ([wh] in Zanuttini and Portner 2003),

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

whereas the Romanian equivalent is not. In Romanian, 'that' has to be licensed differently in order to be compatible with exclamatives; more precisely, a speech act element (e.g. *Doamne!*), carrying the exclamative as a speaker's point of view feature, must achieve a Spec-head relation with *că* 'that'; or a speech act head (e.g. *hai*) must c-select the *că* 'that' constituent. Thus, there is always some kind of interjection, particle or exclamative expression that precedes *că* in exclamatives:

(28) Doamne, că frumos mai e!
goodness that pretty more is
'Goodness, how pretty it is!'

Briefly, the data in this section confirms that when *că* 'that' is used as a MCP, it has different properties from the embedding 'that'. More precisely, it is not associated with clause typing; it is only used as a marker of the functional domains in the conversational pragmatics field, and the borders it marks signal the truncation levels that can be converted to an embedded field.

7. Conclusions

The distribution of MC *că* indicates that a truncation approach to MCP is needed (e.g. along the lines in Haegeman 2010) to understand the switch from MC to embedded contexts. Such an approach indicates that: (i) the Discourse domain has a tiered structure, and needs a more fine-grained syntax (for conversational pragmatics versus discourse pragmatics); (ii) particles and other conversational pragmatic items have merge sites in different fields; e.g. in the injunctive field (e.g. *hai*), or in the E-field (evaluatives, evidentials, epistemics); (iii) "injunctiveness" is an exclusive MCP (never embedded). (iv) conversational pragmatics as MCP is compatible only with *realis* (Emonds 2004), expressed through indicatives, but discourse pragmatics (topic, focus) may also occur in *irrealis* contexts (e.g. subjunctives) depending on the strength of finiteness features.

Virginia Hill
University of New Brunswick, Saint John
mota@unbsj.ca

References

Alboiu, G. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian.* Bucharest: Editura Universității din Bucureşti.

Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Coteanu, I., Seche, L., Seche, M. (eds). 1998. *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române.* Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic.

Croitor-Balaciu, B. 2006. Interjecția. In V. Guțu-Romalo (coord.), *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. 1, *Cuvântul*, 657-685. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)

Emonds, J. 2004 Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions. In D. Adger, C. De Cat and G. Tsoulas (eds.), *Peripheries*, 75-121. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Haegeman, L. 2010. Speculations on the syntax of adverbial clauses. In K. Grohmann and I. Tsimpli (eds.), *Exploring the Left Periphery*. *Lingua* 120 (3): 628-648.

Hill, V. 2007a. Romanian adverbs and the pragmatic field. *The Linguistic Review* 24: 61-86.

Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281-339. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, L. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3, 1-27. New York: Oxford University Press.

Teodorescu, E. 1972. *Propoziția subiectivă*. Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Vulpe, M. 1980. *Subordonarea în frază în dacoromâna vorbită*. Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Zanuttini, R. 2008. Encoding the addressee in the syntax: Evidence from English imperative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26 (1): 185-218.

Zanuttini, R. and Portner, P. 2003. Exclamative clauses: At the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 79 (1): 39-81.

BDD-A9842 © 2010 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 22:57:10 UTC)