OANA SĂVESCU CIUCIVARA, *A Syntactic Analysis of Pronominal Clitic Clusters in Romance. The View From Romanian,* Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2011, 124 p.

The book we are presenting here is a revised version of Oana Săvescu's PhD thesis supervised by Richard S. Kayne, defended at New York University. The aim of her study is to give an appropriate account for several **challenging phenomena** related to clitic clusters in Romanian: (i) the Romanian data does not seems to confirm the Person Case Constraint (strong version: "the direct object has to be third person"; weak version: "if there is a third person, it has to be third person" − Bonet 1991: 182[1]); (ii) Romanian differs from other Romance languages in that in preverbal position both case and person count for the range of possible combinations, while in postverbal position (after gerunds and imperatives) clitics do not exhibit person restrictions; (iii) singular and plural clitics behave differently regarding syncretism: only plural clitics manifest syncretism, and this fact seems to be relevant for the ordering possibilities in the clitic cluster, and for their position with respect to the verb.

The **theoretical framework** assumed in the book is the cartographic perspective (as in Cinque 1999[2]), with several annotations (the IP field is more fine-grained, and there is more flexibility in the ordering of functional projections). The author also assumes a movement approach to cliticization, in the spirit of Kayne (1975)[3] (p. 17). In the model put forth here, clitics enter the derivation with their person and case features fully specified and undergo XP-movement to specifiers of Person and Kase projections in order to check uninterpretable person and case features in a Spec-Head configuration. Unlike in the current minimalist analyses (Chomsky 2000[4], 2001a[5], 2001b[6]), Person and Case are checked in different functional projections. The operation Agree takes place between the features of the clitics and the features comprised in the Person and Kase heads. The movement of clitics to their final position, which obeys locality constraints, is triggered by the need to check/delete uninterpretable features on the Person and Kase heads, which count as Probes.

In Chapter 2, *The Case of Romanian* (pp. 19−45), the author presents the general properties of Romanian pronominal clitics, and the co-occurrence restrictions they are subject to. The properties discussed in detail are: clitic placement, the coordination of clitics, singular preverbal and postverbal clitic clusters, plural clitics (syncretism and word order with 1st and 2nd person plural clitics, on the

---

[1] E. Bonet, *Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance,* PhD thesis, MIT.

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

[3] R. Kayne, *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle,* Cambridge, Mass,, MIT Press.

[4] N. Chomsky, "Minimalist inquiries: The framework", in: R. Martin, D. Michaels, J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays in Minimalism in honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 89−155.

[5] N. Chomsky, "Derivation by Phase", in: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in a Language*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1−52.

[6] N. Chomsky, "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy", *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics,* 20, p. 1–28.

one hand, and with 3rd person plural clitics, on the other hand), and related phenomena from Western Romance. The conclusions of this chapter are as follows (p. 45): (i) Romanian challenges the Person Case Constraint, which seems not to have cross-linguistic validity; (ii) singular clitics exhibit a morphological dative case distinction for all persons; in this respect, Romanian singular clitics are similar to clitics in Balkan Slavic languages; (iii) the distribution of clitics in postverbal position is not regulated by person; (iv) plural Romanian clitics exhibit case syncretism in certain cases; (v) the presence vs. absence of case syncretism of plural 1st and 2nd person clitics was shown to correlate with variability in word order.

Chapter 3 (p. 46−58) critically discusses the *previous analyses of clitic ordering*: the templatic/morphological approach (Perlmutter 1971[7], Bonet 1991, 1995[8]), and the syntactic approaches (Anagnostopoulou 2003[9], 2005[10], Béjar and Rezac 2003[11]).

Chapter 4 (p. 59−85) puts forth an analysis for singular clitics. These clitics are subject to two simultaneous co-occurrence restrictions: a Case restriction (the dative clitic has to precede the accusative one) and a Person requirement (1st person clitics always have to be the first ones in the cluster). Investigating preverbal singular clitics, the author assumes the following functional sequence of the Person field in Romanian (p. 70): Person1P>Person 3P>Person 2P>Refl3P>Person 3P>CP>TP>K-dat>K-acc>…>V. This analysis is extended to postverbal Romanian clitics − for which the dative-accusative order is still maintained; with gerunds and imperatives, the person projections are not merged, and thus clitics move in KP − and to Western Romance (French, Spanish, Catalan) clitics.

Chapter 5 (pp. 86−116) offers an account of plural clitics. The grammatical clitic clusters in Romanian are (p. 89): (i) clusters in which the plural IO ends with *-i*, and the DO is either singular or 3rd person of any number; (ii) clusters of 1st and 2nd person clitics in which both the order of clitics is accusative-dative and the clitics exhibit the syncretic forms. The analysis of the 1st and 2nd plural clitic clusters contains two assumptions: (i) *ni/vi/li* have uninterpretable dative case features to check, and they need to move to a case licensing position; they cannot remain in situ; (ii) the ungrammaticality of clusters involving IO *ni/vi/li* and DO *vă/ne* is due to an intervention effect. After presenting other explanations for the dative-accusative order, the author proposes the following explanation (p. 103): after the accusative clitic *vă* moves to KP-acc, no further movement of the clitics takes place, in other words, the IO *ne* remains in the argument position in which it was generated. For explaining the reverse order of these clusters in postverbal position (after gerunds), Oana Săvescu Ciucivara assumes that the gerund does not have a TP projection (it only has an AspP one), and proposes that plural 1st and 2nd person clitics are case syncretic because they are underspecified for case. It results that when a KP is merged into the structure, any of the two clitics − underspecified for case − can be a candidate for movement; however, it is the indirect object that moves in Spec,KP, since it is higher in the structure than the DO clitic. Extending this analysis to the Romance languages in general, the author

[7] D. Perlmutter, *Deep and surface constraints in syntax,* New York, Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

[8] E. Bonet, "Feature structure of Romance Clitics", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* 13, 607-647.

[9] E. Anagnostopoulou, *The syntax of ditranzitives. Evidence from clitics,* Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

[10] E. Anagnostopoulou, "Notes on the Person Case Constraint in Germanic (with special reference to German)", in: R. D'Alessandro, S. Fischer, G. H. Hrafnbjargarson (eds.), *Agreement Restrictions,* Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 15-47.

[11] S. Béjar, M. Rézac, "Person Licensing and the Derivation of PCC effects", in: A. Pérez-Leroux, Y. Roberge (eds.), *Romance linguistics. Theory and Acquisition: Selected Papers from the 32nd Symposium on Romance Languages,* Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 49−62.

formulates the following two-part generalization (p. 115): (i) when the accusative-dative word order can obtain in Romance, both clitics need to be case syncretic; (ii) when at least one of the clitics in case is NOT syncretic, the order is dative-accusative.

As it is shown in the conclusions, this book brings new data from Romanian that can contribute to a deeper cross-linguistic analysis of clitic clusters. Even if Romanian has some properties that set it apart form the other (Romance) languages, in the current minimalist framework one can offer analyses than can accommodate the data in a coherent system.

Adina Dragomirescu
"Iorgu Iordan − Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics,
Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest