

Expressing Contrast in Romanian: the conjunction *iar**

Gabriela Bîlbîie and Grégoire Winterstein – Laboratoire de Linguistique Formelle Université Paris Diderot – Paris 7/CNRS

Abstract: This paper studies the Romanian conjunction *iar*. After a general introduction to the connective and the existing approaches, we defend an approach of *iar* as an information structure sensitive item. We describe two constraints on the use of *iar* that account for a wide range of data. We then use our analysis to compare the system of Romanian conjunctions to that of other languages, especially with Russian, which uses a connective that appears similar to Romanian *iar*.

1. *An overview of iar*

1.1 *The conjunction iar and the Romanian coordination system in a Romance perspective*

The usual semantic functions of coordination markers (e.g. additive, adversative, corrective or contrastive uses) are cross-linguistically covered by a different number of lexical items. For example in Romance languages, French, like English, has a two-marker system (i.e. the additive *et* ‘and’ and the adversative *mais* ‘but’), while Spanish has a three-marker system by lexicalizing, in addition to *y* ‘and’, the distinction between the corrective *sino* and non-corrective *pero*, just like in German (see Anscombe and Ducrot (1977)). The Romanian system is even more complex: apart from the additive *și*, it operates a distinction similar to Spanish between the corrective *ci* and the adversative *dar*, but intriguingly it has a fourth item used in so-called ‘contrastive’ contexts: the conjunction *iar*. A schematic overview of these differences across languages and the equivalences one can draw between the uses of each conjunction is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Conjunction space in four languages

French	Spanish	Romanian	Russian
<i>et</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>și</i>	<i>i</i>
	<i>pero</i>	<i>iar</i>	<i>a</i>
<i>mais</i>	<i>sino</i>	<i>dar</i>	<i>no</i>
		<i>ci</i>	<i>a</i>

* We would like to thank Romanian speakers who accepted to judge our examples, and the audience at Going Romance 2009. We are grateful to Frédéric Laurens and Jean-Marie Marandin for stimulating discussions on this topic.

A prototypical example of the Romanian *iar* is given in (1):

(1) Ioana făcea duș, **iar** Maria vorbea la telefon.

Ioana was taking a shower, IAR Maria was talking on the phone

At first sight, a conjunction similar to *iar* appears in several Slavic languages (cf. (Jasinskaja & Zeevat, 2009), (Repp, 2009), (Niculescu, 1965)): Russian, Bulgarian and Slovak have a conjunction *a* with an ‘intermediate’ meaning between the additive *i* and the adversative *no*, as the Russian example in (2) shows:

(2) Vera prinimala vannu, **a** Lena razgovarivala po telefonu.

Vera was taking a shower, and Lena was talking on the phone

As for its etymology, *iar* is assumed to come from Latin (lat. **ea hora > eară*), cf. O. Densusianu, cited in Niculescu (1965). Initially, it was used as an adverbial with a temporal meaning, and later, acquired its adversative meaning¹ under the influence of Slavonic language. In the synchrony, the connective *iar* is sometimes equivalent to expressions introducing ‘opposite’ subordinate clauses, such as *pe când*, *în vreme ce* (‘while, whereas’), etc.

In the traditional Romanian literature, the conjunction *iar* is considered as an intermediate link between additive and adversative coordination, i.e. it is said to be semantically related both to the additive *și* and to the adversative *dar* (see Niculescu (1965) for the double additive-adversative behaviour of *iar*). Other works (Bâtea (1988)) analyze *iar* as a purely additive conjunction, similar to *și*, since all uses of *iar* appear to be (strictly) included in the set of uses of *și*. More recent works (Zafiu (2005), Guțu-Romalo (2005)) integrate *iar* in a three-level system of Romanian adversative coordination, where the connectives differ in terms of the *opposition* they mark between the conjuncts: a) denial of expectation(s), rendered by the conjunction *dar*, b) correction and substitution of the first conjunct (which is explicitly negated), marked by the conjunction *ci*, and finally, c) thematic contrast (as a sub-type of non-oriented semantic contrast), marked by the conjunction *iar*.

The question arising from these insights into *iar* bears on the empirical evidence available to treat *iar* either as a complex marker with a double behaviour, as an additive or as an adversative item. More precisely, the question is whether the conjunction *iar* has some specific constraints, which set it aside from the additive *și* and the adversative *dar*. The general goal of this paper is to answer these questions by looking in detail at the discursive, syntactic and semantic factors, which characterize *iar* in Romanian. In order to do this, we first draw up an inventory of *iar* uses, then focus on the main discursive constraint on *iar*, and analyse consequences on its semantics and syntax. A section details the double contrastiveness requirement on *iar*, in

¹ It seems to be a more general phenomenon found in other Romance languages too: temporal adverbials have acquired, with the time, an adversative meaning (cf. French *or* < lat. *ad-hora* or North Italian *mo* < lat. *modo*).

order to clearly define the semantic relation between the conjuncts coordinated by *iar*. Finally, we give a formal and unified description of the other conjunctions in competition to *iar*, which allows us, on one hand, to distinguish between the Romanian *iar* and the Slavic *a*, and on the other hand, to observe that the Romanian *dar* has a behavior closer to the main adversative conjunctions found in Romance rather than to the Russian *no*.

1.2 *An overview of the uses of iar*

As mentioned above, Romanian *iar* is used in most cases with its specific use, i.e. a ‘contrastive’ meaning (cf. (3)). Two constraints are mentioned in the Romanian literature regarding this use: unlike *și*, (a) *iar* coordinates only clausal constituents, and (b) it cannot be followed by a tensed verb, as shown in (3). In the next section, we come back to these constraints.

- (3) a. Dan mănâncă o banană, {**și** / ***iar**} bea un suc.
Dan is-eating a banana, {and / IAR} is-drinking juice
 b. Dan mănâncă o banană, **iar** Maria bea un suc.
Dan is-eating a banana, IAR Maria is-drinking juice
 c. Dan mănâncă o banană, **iar** apoi bea un suc.
Dan is-eating a banana, IAR then is-drinking juice

Additive uses of *iar* include a narrative *iar* (4), introducing a digression from the main story line (i.e. topic change, cf. Jasinskaja & Zeevat (2009)), as well as an ‘epistemic’ *iar* (5), always used with an anaphoric expression (cf. Zafiu (2005)).

- (4) Ninge, e ora două noaptea, **iar** eu scriu.
It's snowing, it's 2 o'clock in the morning, IAR I'm writing
 (5) E optimist, **iar** asta mă miră.
He is optimistic, IAR this surprises me

In specific contexts, *iar* can have an adversative use and convey a denial of expectation with a mirative effect (i.e. the expression of surprise about the fact that both situations hold), as shown in (6):

- (6) Sunt 40 de grade afară, **iar** Maria are trei pulovere pe ea.
There are 40 degrees outside, IAR Maria has three pulls on her

As the section 3 shows, this semantic versatility of *iar* is understandable on the ‘similarity and dissimilarity’ account of the contrastive meaning, as proposed by Umbach (2005).

2. *Constraints on iar*

In what follows, we focus on the specific contexts where *iar* is preferred. There are some constraints, which apply to all uses of *iar*, while others seem to be specific to the prototype utterance given in (1).

2.1 Information Structure

A general requirement on conjuncts introduced by *iar* is the fact that they must contain at least two contrastive pairs, which would explain the ungrammaticality of *iar* in (7a-b) and its felicity in (7c).

(7) a. Ioana mănâncă un măr, {***iar** / **și** / ***dar**} o pară.

Ioana eats an apple, {IAR / and / but} a pear

b. Ioana e căsătorită, {***iar** / **și** / **dar**} flirtează.

Ioana is married, {IAR / and / but} flirt

c. Maria e medic, {**iar** / **și** / ***dar**} Ion (e) profesor.

Maria is doctor, {IAR / and / but} Ion (is) professor

What makes two pairs to be contrastive (the so-called *double contrastiveness* constraint) is dealt with in section 3.

We observe that in its contrastive uses, *iar* apparently stands in a free distribution with the additive conjunction *și*, as we can see in (8) (it is for that reason that some approaches consider *iar* to be an equivalent of *și*).

(8) Ioana merge la Paris, {**iar** / **și**} Maria la Viena.

Ioana is-going to Paris, {IAR / and} Maria to Vienna

The goal of this section is to show that there are constraints on the information structure of the second conjunct in a *iar* coordination. These requirements will correlate with the property of double contrastiveness presented in the next section and ultimately form the basis for explaining the difference between *iar* and *și*.

Observe (9) and (10). Even if the additive *și* is possible, speakers show a strong preference for using *iar* instead of *și*² in these contexts.

(9) A: Unde vei fi pe 1 și pe 10 iulie 2010?

Where you will be on 1st and 10th July 2010

B: Pe 1 iulie, la Paris, {**iar** / **?și**} pe 10 la Roma.

On 1st July in Paris, {IAR / and} on 10th in Rome

(10) A: Când vei ajunge la Paris și când la Roma?

When you will arrive in Paris and when in Rome

B: La Paris pe 1 iulie, {**iar** / **?și**} la Roma pe 10.

In Paris on 1st July, {IAR / and} in Roma on 10th

Descriptively, the main difference between (9) and (10) concerns the relative order of the places (Paris and Rome) and the dates (1st and 10th July). The preferred placement of the element that answers the question is at the end of the conjunct, whereas the elements already present in the question appear right after *iar*. Let's now take look at (11).

(11) La film cu Ioana, la teatru cu Maria.

To the movies with Ioana, to the play with Maria

² We use question marks to indicate that the use of the discussed item is less natural than the use of the equivalent conjunction.

We want to observe the behavior of this sequence in two different contexts and for that, we build two different questions and answers with the most natural *iar* and *și* respectively.

(12) [Context: speaker A knows that speaker B is going both to the movies and to see a play]

A: Cu cine vei merge la film și cu cine la teatru?

With whom you will go to the movies and with whom to the play

a. B: La film cu Ioana, **iar** la teatru cu Maria.

To the movies with Ioana, IAR to the play with Maria

b. B: Cu Ioana la film **și** cu Maria la teatru.

With Ioana to the movies, and with Maria to the play

(13) [Context: speaker A knows that speaker B has two girls, Ioana and Maria, and that he goes with each of them to different places]

A: Unde ieși cu copiii weekendul ăsta?

Where do you go out with your children this weekend

a. B: Cu Ioana la film, **iar** cu Maria la teatru.

With Ioana to the movies, and with Maria to the play

b. B: La film cu Ioana **și** la teatru cu Maria.

To the movies with Ioana, and to the play with Maria

We can account for these facts by appealing to notions of *contrastive topic* and *informational focus*, related to those defined in (Büring, 2003).

- *Informational foci* are defined as the constituents that answer a question. These constituents are usually marked by a specific prosodic contour (e.g. the so-called *A-accent* in English).
- *Contrastive Topics* (henceforth CT) are elements that have already been mentioned, or are salient in the discourse.
- The informational structure of an utterance can be made explicit by using an overt question (e.g. one that specifies the elements that will be CT).

Our hypothesis is then that *iar* must be followed by a contrastive topic and cannot be immediately followed by an informational focus. This explains the different preferences between (9) and (10), as well as for (12) and (13), for the order of the elements in the conjuncts.

What we have invoked until now have been speakers' *preferences*. In order to obtain clearer acceptability judgments, we test both contexts mentioned in (12) and (13) by varying the placement of the prosodic stress, i.e. intonational focus, thereby forcing the identification of the informational focus.

(14) a. La film (voi merge) cu IOANA, {**iar** / și} la teatru cu MARIA.³
To the movies (I will go) with Ioana, {IAR / and} to the play with Maria

b. Cu IOANA merg la film, {**și** / #**iar**} cu MARIA la teatru.

With Ioana (I will go) to the movies {and / IAR} with Maria to the play

³ The use of CAPS marks the prosodic stress (i.e. intonational focus).

- c. Cu IOANA merg la film, {**iar** / ?**și**} la teatru cu MARIA.
With Ioana I will go to the movies, {IAR / and} to the play with Maria
- (15) a. Cu Ioana (merg) la FILM, {**iar** / ?**și**} cu Maria la TEATRU.
With Ioana (I will go) to the movies, {IAR / and} with Maria to the play
- b. La FILM - cu Ioana {**și** / #**iar**} la TEATRU cu Maria.
To the movies with Ioana {and / IAR} to the play with Maria
- c. La FILM - cu Ioana, {**iar** / ?**și**} cu Maria - la TEATRU.
To the movies with Ioana, {IAR / and} with Maria to the play

Our hypothesis is confirmed:

- The first element following *iar* cannot bear a prosodic stress (i.e. be an informational focus).
- The conjunction *și* is possible in these contexts: the linearization constraint on the placement of contrastive topics and informational foci is specific to *iar*.

Further evidence for the different behaviour of *iar* and *și* is the fact that with *iar*, the conjuncts are separated by a clear intonational phrase break (signaled by an obligatory comma in prescriptive grammars), unlike *și*, which allows an integrated prosody.

- (16) a. Paul citește (,) **și** Maria doarme.
Paul is reading, and Maria is sleeping
- b. Paul citește, | **iar** Maria doarme.
Paul is reading, IAR Maria is sleeping

The fact that the first constituent following *iar* is a contrastive focus also explains why we cannot have an associative adverb like *și*⁴ ‘also’ or *nici* ‘neither’ associated to the noun head of the CT Phrase, as shown in (17a-b).

- (17) a. Ioanei îi plac merele, {**și** / ***iar**} [**și** Mariei]_F perele.
Ioana likes apples, {and / IAR} also Maria pears
- b. Ioanei nu-i plac merele, {**și** / ***iar**} [**nici** Mariei]_F perele.
Ioana doesn't like apples, {IAR / and} either Maria pears
- c. Ioanei îi plac merele, **iar** [Mariei]_{CT} de asemenea.
Ioana likes apples, IAR Maria too

The associative adverbs *și* and *nici* have narrow scope on their associate, which usually is an informational focus in the discourse. Given our hypothesis, it follows that *iar* is infelicitous in these examples. On the other hand, *de asemenea* ‘too’ can have wide scope on the entire conjunct, because of its mobility (see (Camacho, 2003) for the related ‘high scope interpretation’ of *también* ‘too’ in Spanish). Therefore, *Maria* is a focused element in (17a-b), while in (17c) can be construed as a contrastive topic.

As a last remark, we can check that indefinites can appear after *iar*, but that their use is restricted by the fact that they must be contrastive topics. This means that the indefinites must be construed as part of the background of

⁴ Romanian distinguishes between the conjunction *și* and the associative adverb *și*.

the utterance. This is in conflict with the fact that, once introduced in the discourse, an entity is usually not referred to with an indefinite, but rather with a definite determiner. This is how we account for the difference in quality between *B*'s answers with *iar* in (18) and (19).

(18) A: Ce i-ai oferit Mariei și ce i-ai oferit Ioanei?

What did you offer to Maria and what did you offer to Ioana

B: Mariei (i-am oferit) o carte, {**iar** / și} Ioanei un stilou.

To Maria (I offered) a book, {IAR / and} to Ioanei a pen

(19) A: Cui i-ai oferit o carte și cui i-ai oferit un stilou?

To whom did you offer a book and to whom a pen

a. B: I-am oferit o carte MARIEi {**și** / ?**iar**} un stilou IOANEi.⁵

I offered a book to Maria {and / IAR} a pen to Ioana

b. B: I-am oferit cartea MARIEi {**iar** / și} stiloul IOANEi.

I offered the book to Maria {IAR / and} the pen to Ioana

Given the form of *A*'s question, both answers should be fine from an informational structure point of view. However, in (19), the book and pen have already been directly introduced. Marking them as contrastive topics (with the use of *iar*) indicates this, and in this case the use of the definite would be preferred with *iar* (19)b. Since *și* lacks this requirement, indefinites are felicitous in (19)a.

It is however possible to build some contexts such that indefinites are felicitous. Thus, generic indefinites are felicitous as contrastive topics as shown in (20):

(20) O casă costă 200.000 de euro, **iar** o mașină 20.000.

A house costs 200.000 €, IAR a car 20.000 €

In (21) (attested on the web), the indefinite *un invitat* 'a guest' is felicitous because no specific guest has been introduced, yet it can be construed as an element of the previously introduced wedding, i.e. it can function as an already introduced element that contrasts with another part of the wedding, namely the bride.

(21) Halal nuntă! Mireasa are ochii vineți, **iar** un invitat e în papuci.

Halal wedding! The bride has purple eyes, IAR a guest is in slippers

2.2 Syntax

Traditional Romanian literature considers that '*iar*' only coordinates clausal constituents with finite verbs. The heterogeneity of elliptical coordinations suggests that '*iar*' can coordinate sequences of phrases where we cannot reconstruct a finite verb (i.e. *fragments*, cf. (Bîlbîie, 2009) and (Abeillé,

⁵ *Iar* is better if the meaning is *unul dintre stilouri* 'one of pens' or if the first contrastive element in the first conjunct is first in the sentence (before the verb):

(i) O carte, i-am oferit MARIEi, {**și** / **iar**} un stilou - IOANEi.

A book, I offered to Maria, {and / IAR} a pen to Ioana

Bîlbîie & Mouret, 2010))⁶. *Iar* can coordinate clauses (a) with a verbal head, (b) with non-verbal head or (c) fragments, provided that the first phrase following *iar* is a contrastive topic. In (22a), the head of the second conjunct is the VP *doarme* ‘is sleeping’, in (22b) the NP *câtă tristețe* ‘what a sadness’, while in (22c) there is no head at all.

- (22) a. Ioana citește, **iar** [[Maria]_{NP} [doarme]_{VP}]_S.
Ion is-reading, IAR Maria is-sleeping
 b. Să-ți vezi copilul crescând, câtă bucurie, **iar** [[să-l asîști murind]_{VP}, [câtă tristețe]_{NP}]_S!
To see your son growing up - what a joy, IAR to see him dying - what a sadness
 c. Ioana mănâncă mere, **iar** [[Maria]_{NP} [pere]_{NP}]_S.
Ioana eats apples, IAR Maria pears

Instead of a syntactic constraint, it is the semantic type of the *clause* that matters. *Iar* connects clauses whose semantic type is a subtype of *message* (cf. (Ginzburg & Sag, 2000)): propositional content (for declaratives, cf. (22a)) or outcome (for imperatives, cf. (23))⁷.

- (23) Maria să citească mai multe cărți, **iar** Ion să fie mai ordonat!
Let Marie read more books, IAR Ion be more disciplined

The constituent distinguished as contrastive topic must be a ‘major constituent’ in the sense of Hankamer (1971), namely a dependent of some predicative head, but not a head itself. So, the first position in the conjunct corresponds to a preposed constituent, which can be a subject (24)a, a preposed complement (24)b or a fronted adjunct (24)c.

- (24) a. Ioana doarme, **iar** [Maria]_{NP} citește.
Ioana is-sleeping, IAR Maria is-reading
 b. I-am dat Ioanei un măr, **iar** (*i-am dat) [lui Petre]_{NP} (i-am dat) o banană.
I gave to Ioana an apple, IAR (I gave) to Petre (I gave) a banana

⁶ *Iar* is the most used conjunction in gapping constructions, such as (24)c, since it is compatible with the general semantic constraint required in gapping: remnants and correlates must be contrast pairs.

⁷ We observe that *iar* is less preferred than *și* in interrogatives and exclamatives, especially if the WH-word immediately follows *iar*. This fact is expected under the discursive analysis given in 2.1.

- (i) a. Cine vine azi la mine, {**și** / **?iar**} mâine la tine?
Who is-coming today to my place, {and / IAR} tomorrow to your place
 b. Cine lucrează, {**și** / **?iar**} cine pierde timpul?
Who works, {and / IAR} who wastes his time
 (ii) a. Câtă grijă are Ion față de pisică, {**și** / **?iar**} Dan față de câini!
How much does John care about his cat {and / IAR} Dan about his dog
 b. Cât de mult muncesc eu, {**și** / **?iar**} cât de puțin ea!
How much I do work {and / IAR} little she does

c. La mare plouă, **iar** [la munte]_{PP} ninge.

On the seaside it's raining, IAR in the mountains it's snowing

The head, if any, must follow the contrastive topic phrase, (25b). Therefore, the linearization constraint imposed in these 'contrastive' constructions would be (25), which states that the conjunction *iar* introduces a clause and precedes the contrastive topic phrase of that clause, which in its turn precedes a non-empty list of elements (including the head, if any).

(25) *Linear Precedence Constraint:*

***iar* < [XP_{CONTRASTIVE TOPIC} < *nelist*(...)]_s**

These assumptions allow us to easily account for the ungrammaticality in (26), which is described by all Romanian works as violating a requirement that a finite verb cannot immediately follow *iar*. If now we compare (26) to (27), we observe that it is not a question about the verbal category, but about its function. A finite verb may occur as first constituent in the clause with *iar*, provided it is not the head of that clause (27).

(26) *Ninge la Braşov, **iar** [plouă [la Bucureşti]]_s.

It's snowing in Braşov, IAR it's raining in Bucharest

(27) Bebeluşul [nu prea vrea [să pape]], **iar** [să bea⁸] [nici atât].

The baby doesn't want to eat, IAR to drink even less

However, this syntactic constraint can be solved with verbal predicative heads, if we put in the contrastive topic position the same verb but with its non-finite form, e.g. supine.

(28) A: Unde plouă şi unde ninge în ţara voastră?

Where it rains and where it snows in your country

B: De plouat, plouă la mare, **iar** de nins ninge la munte.

For rain, it rains on the seaside, IAR for snow it snows in the mountains

Iar can coordinate main clauses and subordinate clauses too. If *iar* coordinates two subordinate clauses, it doesn't allow the reiteration of the complementizer in the second conjunct, unlike *şi*, cf. (29)-(30). This fact directly derives from the discursive constraint discussed above, since nothing can occur between *iar* and the CT Phrase. Complementizers can immediately occur after *iar* only if they introduce the CT Phrase (31).

(29) a. Mi s-a spus că Ion citeşte {**şi** / ***iar**} că Maria doarme.

It has been told to me that Ion was-reading {and / IAR} that Maria was-sleeping

b. Mi s-a spus că Ion citeşte, **iar** Maria doarme.

It has been told to me that Ion was-reading, IAR Maria was-sleeping

(30) a. M-a întrebat dacă Ion vine azi {**şi** / ***iar**} dacă Ana vine mâine.

He asked me if Ion would come today, {and / IAR} if Ana would come tomorrow

b. M-a întrebat dacă Ion vine azi, **iar** Maria mâine.

⁸ The finite verb *să bea* is the subjunctive form of the verb 'to drink'.

- He asked me if Ion would come today, IAR Ana tomorrow*
- (31) De Paște, mergem la munte, **iar** dacă e frumos, și la mare.
On Easter holidays, we go to the mountains, IAR if the weather is fine, to the seaside too.

The discursive constraint discussed under 2.1. also explains why there may not be a strict syntactic parallelism between ‘contrastive’ conjuncts when *iar* is used. If the contrastive topic cannot be the element answering a question, we observe in (32) an asymmetry in the linearization of contrastive pairs, due to their informational status (word order is asymmetrical in order to avoid a focussed constituent after *iar*).

- (32) a. [Ninge]_F la Brașov, **iar** la București [plouă]_F.
It’s snowing in Brașov, IAR in Bucharest it’s raining
- b. [La film]_F merg cu Ioana, **iar** cu Maria [la teatru]_F.
To the movies I go with Ioana, IAR with Maria to the play

To sum up, we observe that all linearization constraints (on additives, on head finite verb, on complementizers, and word order more generally) are due to the main discursive constraint mentioned in the beginning of this section, i.e. the contrastive topic value on the first constituent following *iar*.

3. *Double contrastiveness*

In this section we look in more detail at the already mentioned double contrastiveness constraint on the use of *iar*. On the basis of our observations, we then compare the semantics of *iar* with that of its apparent counterpart in Russian: the connective *a*. We argue that the two connectives have different semantics and we underline their differences by showing that the so-called adversatives connectives of Romanian and Russian do not have the same distribution and thus do not give the same space of use for *iar* and *a*.

3.1 *Double contrastiveness and quantification*

The example in (33) illustrates the double contrastive pair constraint on *iar*.

- (33) Ioana a mâncat un măr, **iar** Ion o pară
Ioana has eaten an apple, IAR Ion a pear

The constraint states that to be felicitous, *iar* requires the presence of two pairs of elements such that an element of each pair is present in each conjunct, and such that the elements in each pair are *contrastive*: they must belong to the same domain and be different (cf. (Zeevat, 2004) for a discussion of the requirements on contrastiveness).

In (33), the two pairs are ⟨*Ioana, Ion*⟩ and ⟨*apple, pear*⟩. Each pair is contrastive: the elements are either persons or fruits, but not the same person or fruit.

The examples in (34) show that a single contrastive pair is not enough to license *iar*, be it in the subject (34a) or object (34b) position:

- (34) a. *Ioana citește **iar** Maria.
Ioana is reading IAR Maria
 b. *Ioana a mâncat un măr, **iar** o pară.
Ioana has eaten an apple, IAR a pear

Example (35) involves two pairs of items yet is not felicitous:

- (35) ?Ioana a mâncat un măr, **iar** Ion un fruct.
Ioana has eaten an apple, IAR Ion a fruit

We argue that this infelicity is due to the non-contrastive nature of the pair $\langle \text{apple, fruit} \rangle$. This non-contrastiveness is characteristic of an $\langle \text{hyperonym, hyponym} \rangle$ pair and is linked to the impossibility of deriving a scalar inference from the assertion of the hyponym, even though the items are linked by a logical entailment relation, i.e. “*John ate a fruit*” does not implicate “*John did not eat an apple*”. If two items are linked by logical entailment and are such that they do give rise to quantity implicatures (see (Geurts, 2010) for a coverage of actual approaches to quantity implicatures and exhaustification), the use of ‘*iar*’ is licensed:

- (36) Paul a răspuns la toate întrebările, **iar** Maria la câteva.
Paul answered all the questions, IAR Maria some of them

In this case, there is a strong tendency to exhaustify the weaker member of the pair $\langle \text{all, some} \rangle$ and thus to derive the implicature that Maria did not answer all the questions. This is also true if the two conjuncts of (36) are switched (i.e. *iar* is symmetric: the order of its conjuncts does not seem to affect the meaning of the whole; this is not true for most adversative connectives, e.g. *but* is asymmetric in this sense).

3.2 Predicate negation: comparison with *dar* and *și*

There is one type of contrastive pair that does not interact as expected with *iar*: the pairs formed by two antonymous verbs, e.g. a pair formed by a verb and its negation as in $\langle \text{liking football, not liking football} \rangle$. In the examples (33) and (36), the use of *iar* was far preferred over the use of the connective *dar* ‘but’, essentially because the use of *dar* would carry further inferences that *iar* lacks (we will refer to these inferences as *argumentation inferences*). However, this is not the case for pairs based on antonymous verbs: in (37), the use of *dar* is slightly preferred to the use of *iar* by most speakers.

- (37) a. Lui Ion îi place fotbalul, {**dar** / *iar*} Mariei nu(-i place).
Ion likes football {DAR / IAR} Maria does not (like it)
 b. Lui Ion îi place fotbalul, {**dar** / *iar*} Maria îl detestă.
Ion likes football {DAR / IAR} Maria hates it

This is a puzzling fact for two reasons:

1. The use of *dar* apparently does not convey the previously mentioned argumentation inferences, i.e. there is no intuition that the fact that Ion likes football should influence the taste of Maria regarding this sport.
2. Russian, which sports a connective similar to *iar* is not parallel to Romanian for examples like (37). There, the use of the adversative conjunction *no* is strongly dispreferred compared to that of *a*, which would be the equivalent of Romanian *iar* (cf. (Jasinskaja and Zeevat, 2009)):

(38) Oleg ljuvit futbol, {**a** / ??**no**} Maria ne ljuvit.
Oleg likes football, {A / NO} Maria does not like it

On the other hand, a connective that does work like *dar* in (37) is the French adversative *mais* ‘but’:

(39) Oleg aime le football, {**mais** / **et**} pas Marie.
Oleg likes football, {but / and} not Marie

At first glance, in (39), *mais* is preferred by most speakers over the more neutral *et*, just like Romanian *dar* is preferred over *iar*, although both are felicitous. We will follow (Winterstein, 2010) in assuming that there is a difference in interpretation between *et* and *mais* in (39), although space prevents us to fully develop this account. The main point we borrow from Winterstein’s analysis is that the use of *mais* in (39) must convey an argumentative opposition between its conjuncts (in the spirit of (Anscombe & Ducrot, 1984)): the first conjunct must argue for a given conclusion while the second one must argue against this conclusion. In the case the conclusion is not explicit, speakers have to accommodate it. In (39), since the two conjuncts involve antonyms, an obvious choice for the argumentative conclusion is a proposition similar to “*Do Oleg and Maria both like football?*”. Umbach (2005) proposes a similar analysis, but her approach is less flexible: there is no possible way for her to accommodate an argumentative goal different to the one given above, even though it is easy to imagine contexts where the opposition would be different.

3.3 A blocking analysis of Romanian connectives

To be more explicit about the differences between the meaning of the connectives in Romanian and Russian, we will adopt the same approach as the one used by Jasinskaja & Zeevat (2009). They describe the semantics of a given connective *CONN* by specifying the features that each conjunct connected by *CONN* must obey. Often enough these features are expressed as conditions on the type of question that the conjunct can answer. We will consider the following set of features:

- *SINGLE* indicates that each conjunct answers a question with a single wh-element, as in (40):

(40) A: Who came?
 B: John came and Mary came.

Therefore, the negated feature \neg SINGLE marks that each conjunct comes as an answer to a question with at least two wh-elements:

(41) A: Who did what?

B: John laughed and Mary cried.

- WHETHER specifies that each conjunct answers a polar question:

(42) A: Did John and Mary come?

B: John did, but Mary did not.

- WHY marks the fact that each conjunct counts as an argument for a given conclusion, i.e. specifies an indirect argumentative use: each conjunct gives a reason for adopting a conclusion which has to be different from both conjuncts.

- 2nd marks the fact that the second conjunct is conclusive regarding its argumentative goal. This feature, as well as the WHETHER and the WHY one are exemplified in (43) where the second conjunct in *B*'s answer is understood as a better argument for “*not buying the ring*” than the first conjunct is for “*buying the ring*”.

(43) A: Should we buy this ring?

B: It's nice, but expensive.

- CORRECTION is used for marking the second conjunct as a correction of the first:

(44) It's not a car, but a Volkswagen.

Besides these features, Jasinskaja and Zeevat also describe a blocking mechanism, which prevents the use of a connective if a more specialized one exists. This adds negative properties to the connectives, i.e. it restricts the contexts of use of the connective since a ‘better’ connective exists.

We can now describe the set of (positive and negative) features that characterize all the connectives we have mentioned up to now. We first give the description of the three Russian connectives that is given by Jasinskaja and Zeevat in Table 2.

<i>i</i>	SINGLE
<i>a</i>	\neg SINGLE, \neg (WHETHER, 2 nd , WHY)
<i>no</i>	WHY, WHETHER, 2 nd

Table 2: Russian connectives

The reader can check that the descriptions of *a* and *no* are consistent with (38): *a* is preferred because the two conjuncts are understood as a question of the form “*Do Oleg and Maria like football?*” rather than something like “*Does Maria like everything that Oleg likes?*”. In the latter context, *no* would be the favored connective since the utterance would have all three positive properties, whereas the former question lacks the argumentative flavor of *no*.

French only sports two connectives of interest here: the plain additive *et* (equivalent to the English *and*) and the adversative connective *mais* (roughly similar to *but*). As we already mentioned earlier, *mais* conveys an

opposition between its conjuncts, which is reflected by stating that it has the *WHETHER, 2nd* feature. The difference between French *mais* and Russian *no* is that the opposition can be direct, i.e. the conjuncts do not necessarily serve as indirect arguments as witnessed in (39).

<i>et</i>	\neg (<i>WHETHER, 2nd</i>)
<i>mais</i>	<i>WHETHER, 2nd</i>

Table 3: French connectives

We now turn to the properties of the Romanian connectives. We will study four of them, even though our main interest lies in the study of *iar*. Their feature description is given in Table 4.

<i>și</i>	SINGLE	\neg CORRECTION
<i>iar</i>		\neg SINGLE, \neg CORRECTION, \neg (<i>WHETHER, 2nd</i>)
<i>dar</i>	<i>WHETHER, 2nd</i>	\neg CORRECTION
<i>ci</i>	CORRECTION	

Table 4: Romanian connectives

Like the Russian *a*, Romanian *și* is characterized by the feature SINGLE, thereby blocking uses of *iar* that do not involve at least two pairs of elements. This is how the double contrastiveness constraint is accounted for. For *dar*, the observations in (37) to (39) lead us to hypothesize that the proper set of positive constraints is the same as for French. This has the consequence that the Romanian *iar* gets more restricted than the Russian *a*: *iar* will not be used in contexts with the properties *WHETHER, 2nd*, whereas *a* will be felicitous as long as *WHY* is absent.

This also allows to draw the same difference in interpretation for (37) as we mentioned for the French (39): *iar* will be felicitous if the utterance lacks an argumentative flavor (i.e. it will lack the *2nd* feature) just as the French *et* is preferred in those cases ; otherwise it will be *dar / mais* ‘but’ that is used. The fourth connective *ci* is given for completeness sake, and we only give it the *CORRECTION* feature, making it equivalent to the Spanish *sino*.

3.4 Taking stock

This section was a first shot at describing the semantics of *iar* by comparing it with other Romanian connectives, and other systems of connectives in Russian and French. Our conclusion is that *iar* is more restricted than the Russian *a* because of the broader range of uses of *dar*, which resembles the French *mais* by lacking the requirement of indirect argumentative opposition.

4. *Conclusion*

This paper gave an account of the particular syntax and semantics of the Romanian connective *iar*. We focused on two constraints that account for a large part of the distribution of *iar*. First, we argued that there is an informational structure constraint on the phrase that appears after *iar*. We then detailed the “double contrastiveness constraint” which served as a starting point to present an analysis of the distribution of the four main Romanian connectives and underline the differences between *iar* and its apparent Russian counterpart *a*.

References

- Abeillé, Anne, Bîlbîie, Gabriela & François Mouret. (submitted). “A Romance perspective on Gapping Constructions”. In Hans Boas & Francesco Gonzalvez Garcia, eds., *Romance in Construction Grammar*. Constructional Approaches to Language Series. John Benjamins.
- Anscombre, Jean-Claude & Oswald Ducrot. 1977. “Deux ‘mais’ en français”. *Lingua*, 43.23-40
- Anscombre, Jean-Claude & Oswald Ducrot. 1983. *L’argumentation dans la langue*. Pierre Mardaga, Liège.
- Bâtea, Ion. 1988. “Conjuncția iar în limba română contemporană”. *Limba română*, XXXVII.21–28.
- Bîlbîie, Gabriela. 2008. “Against Syntactic Reconstruction in Romanian Gapping”. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11.119-134.
- Camacho, José. 2003. *The Structure of Coordination. Conjunction and Agreement Phenomena in Spanish and Other Languages*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Guțu-Romalo, Valeria. ed. 2005. *Gramatica limbii române*. Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest.
- Büring, Daniel. 2003. “On D-trees, beans, and B-accent”, *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 26:511–545.
- Geurts, Bart. 2010. *Quantity Implicatures*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan & Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: the form, meaning and use of English interrogatives*. CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Hankamer, Jorge. 1971. *Constraints on Deletion in Syntax*. PhD thesis. Yale University.
- Jasinkaja, Katja. & Henk Zeevat. 2009. “Explaining conjunction systems: Russian, English, German”. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 13*, Stuttgart.
- Niculescu, Alexandru. 1965. “Observații asupra conjuncțiilor adversative în limbile române. Conjuncția adversativ-copulativă”. In

- Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice. Contribuții gramaticale*. Editura Științifică, Bucurest.
- Repp, Sophie. 2009. *Negation in Gapping*. Oxford University Press.
- Umbach, Carla. 2005. "Contrast and information structure: A focus-based analysis of *but*", *Linguistics*, 43(1).207–232.
- Winterstein, Grégoire, 2010, "Linking argumentativity and information structure in the meaning of adversatives". *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 14* ed. by Martin Prinzhorn, Viola Schmitt & Sarah Zobel.
- Zafiu, Rodica. 2005. "Conjuncțiile adversative din limba română: tipologie și niveluri de incidență". In Gabriela Pană-Dindelegan, ed., *Limba română – structură și funcționare. Actele celui de-al 4-lea Colocviu al Catedrei de Limba Română*. Editura Universității din București. 243-258.
- Zeevat, Henk. 2004. "Contrastors ". *Journal of Semantics*, 21.95–112.