CHAPTER NINE

THE COMPLEMENTIZER SYSTEM OF AROMANIAN (SOUTH ALBANIA)

M. RITA MANZINI, LEONARDO M. SAVOIA

Università degli Studi di Firenze
mariarita.manzini@unifi.it; lsavoia@unifi.it

We present an outline of finite complementation in varieties of Aromanian spoken in South Albania, in contact with Albanian, setting it in the context of the literature on Romanian, on Italian varieties and on Albanian. First, like Romanian, Albanian and some Italian varieties, Aromanian has two finite complementizers, connecting roughly to indicative and subjunctive mood. We show that the subjunctive complementizer is homophonous with the *wh*-pronoun 'what', 'which', reproducing a pattern independently documented for Abruzzese or Sardinian. The fact that homophony with wh-pronouns is not distributed randomly provides some support for current proposals to the effect that finite complementation in Romance involve a relativization strategy.

Second, we investigate the distribution of the subjunctive particle, which is treated as a low complementizer (Fin) in recent cartographic approaches to Romanian and to other language with control into finite sentences (Greek, Calabrian and Sicilian varieties). We review alternative proposals to the effect that the subjunctive particle is not connected to the complementizer or modality system, but rather to the expression of the EPP (control). We show that distributional facts (for instance the particle position with respect to negation) are neutral as to the solution adopted and do not especially favour the cartographic solution. We also indicate how the complementation system of Aromanian bears signs of the contact with Albanian, for instance in the borrowing of the Albanian subjunctive particle *të* as a complementizer in Aromanian (*ta*), and in the borrowing of Albanian *në* for the expression of hypotheticals.

1. Finite complementizers

1.1 The Romanian context

Romanian has two finite complementizers namely *că* and *ca*. The former introduces indicative sentences, complement to verbs of knowing, saying etc. In (1) we report both a 17th century example (Early Romanian, ER) and a current day one (Standard Romanian, SR).

(1) a. Cunoaşti-se **că** au fost neaşezaţi
know-REFL.3 that have been unsettled
"One can tell that they were not settled"
(Ureche, Hill 2013a: 552)

b. Stiu **că** mama a plecat
I.know that mother has left
'I know that mother has left'
(Dobrovie-Sorin 1994: 84)

More complex evidence attaches to the other complementizer of Romanian, namely *ca*. This introduces subjunctive complements and hence co-occurs with the ~~subjective~~ particle *să*, as exemplified for ER in (2a). Note that *ca să* are adjacent in (2a); in SR, adjacency is not allowed, but *ca* and *să* must be separated by topic/~~F~~focus material as in (2b).

(2) a. Vrîndŭ Cazimir crai **ca**
wanting Cazimir prince that
să dobândească ţara…
~~Prt~~ grab.SUBJ country.the
'Prince Cazimir wanting to grab the country…"
(Ureche, Hill 2013a: 552)

b. Vreau **ca** mâine **să** vină Ion.
I.want that tomorrow PRT come John
"I want that tomorrow John comes"
(Dobrovie-Sorin 1994: 109)

As anticipated, one focus of the theoretical literature is on the exact status of the *să* element. Dobrovie-Sorin (2001: 55) summarizes the known evidence about it. First "like Comp elements, subjunctive particles are sentence initial, preceding negation as well as clitics, and may head embedded clauses in the absence of any other Comp element; but like Infl elements, subjunctive particles are strictly adjacent to the verb cluster … and can co-occur with *wh*-elements". An example of *să* introducing a

clause alone ~~from ER~~ is provided in (3a); in (3b) we provide a SR example. In (3c) we provide an example of co-occurrence with a *wh*-pronoun.

(3) a. i-au zis în taină **să** o ia
him-has told in secret PRT her take
"He told him in secret to take her"
(Ureche, Hill 2013a: 549)

b. Doresc **să** trăiască în România.
I.wish PRT live in Romania
"I wish I lived in Romania"

c. Am cu cine **să** plec.
I.have with whom PRT I.leave
"I have someone to leave with"
(Dobrovie-Sorin 1994: 98, 108)

In short, the various sentential introducers just reviewed include the *k*-forms *ca* and *că* and the subjunctive particle *să*. A dedicated projection hosting the subjunctive particle, namely MoodP, has been proposed by Rivero (1994) (see Jordan (2009) for a more recent endorsement). However both Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) and Hill (2003a, b) attribute the status of complementizers to all finite introducers of Romance—arguing that the I-like character of the subjunctive particle can be gotten around by other means. Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), assuming a standard [CP [IP]] structure of the sentence, has essentially two positions to choose from to ~~locate~~ them, namely I and C; indeed she takes a cautious stance with respect to "the proliferation of functional projections such as TenseP, AGRP, NegP" (100). The two *k*- forms are fairly obviously Cs on ground of continuity with other Romance language and on grounds of simple internal evidence, for instance the fact that they precede all sentential material, including ~~T~~opics and ~~F~~oci. The matter of *să* is more complex. For Dobrovie-Sorin *să* may be generated in C, thus accounting for its C-like characteristics, ~~insofar as it~~ incorporate~~s~~ with I (thus accounting for its I-like properties). In order to accommodate *ca*, one must then have recourse to CP-recursion.

Hill (2013a, b) works in a different framework, including the split CP analysis of Rizzi (1997), which implies the existence of several C positions, namely $C_{Force,}$ C_{Focus} and C_{Fin}, in this sequence. Within this framework, Roberts and Roussou (2003) propose that subjunctive particles including *na* of Greek and *mu* particle in Southern Italian (Calabrian. Sicilian) dialects appear in the lowest C position, where they can be

preceded by other complementizers in superordinate C positions. Though Hill's results are ultimately not very different from Dobrovie-Sorin's, she does have at her disposal two different C positions for Romanian sentential introducers, namely Rizzi's Fin(iteness) and Force. The subjunctive particle *să* merges in the lower C position, i.e. Fin, while the *ca* complementizer (and of course the *că* complementizer as well) merge in Force. This means specifically that Topic and Focus material precedes *să* while it follows *ca/că*.

1.2 The Aromanian evidence

The finite complementation system of Aromanian closely recalls that of Romanian, but also contains interesting elements of variation. Our Aromanian data come from a corpus collected by fieldwork in the South Albanian neighbouring towns of Diviakë, Libofshë and Fier, and from the more distant town of Këllez, also in South Albania. Unless otherwise noted, data reported here are from the variety of Fier. We use descriptive glosses, notating *that*-type introducers as Comp, and the so-called subjunctive particle as Prt.

To begin with, Aromanian has a finite complementizer *kə* which has the same general properties as standard Romanian *că* /kə/, introducing indicative complements to verbs of knowing, saying etc, as in (4).

(4) a. ɲ ar dzəs **kə** eu vini
to.me they.have said COMP he he.came
"They told me that he came"

a'. dzɛk **kə** va z in
they.say COMP FUT PRT come
"They say that they will come"

b. nu o ʃtiu **kə** **tsi** məki eu
not it I.know COMP what he.eats he
"I do not know what he eats"

A second finite complementizer co-occurs with the subjunctive particle. In Aromanian, this second finite complementizer, with essentially the same distribution as Romanian *ca*, takes the form *tsi*, as in (5), while the subjunctive particle with which it often (but not always) co-occurs takes the form *s(i)*. In most examples *tsi* and the subjunctive particle are directly adjacent, recalling the situation described for ER, and contrasting with SR. The two introducers can of course also be separated by a Topic or Focus. The particle is compatible with control and non-control readings

of the embedded sentence—and this remains true when the *tsi* complementizer is present. For instance with 'say', object control in (5a') alternates with absence of control in (5a); in the latter example the modal reading contrasts with the non-modal reading of the complement in (4a-a'). Similarly, *tsi* embedding under 'not know' in (5b) has the reading of English 'if' (the polarity complementizer, Adger and Quer 2001)—contrasting with (4b) above. Control and non-control readings alternate with 'want' in (5f-f'), and control is also found with 'forget' in (5e).

(5) a. ɲ ar dzəs
to.me they.have said
tsi eu vini
COMP he he.came
"They told me that he should come"

a'. tsə dzəʃ **(tsi)**
to.you I.told COMP
s (nu) tə puɲ
PRT not you you.sit
"I told you to sit down"

b. atsei nu o
they not it
ʃti **tsi** mini esk aˈo
they.know COMP I I.am here
"They don't know if I am here"

c. mini mənduɛsk **tsi**
I think COMP
s (nu) u vɛd
PRT (not) him I.see
"I think that I am (not) seeing him"

d. eu vini dənint **tsi**
he came before COMP
s vəˈnɛm mini
PRT I.came I
"He came before I did"

e. eu agərʃɛ **(tsi)** **si**
he forgot COMP PRT
z ɣa kəmɛʃa
PRT he.wash the.shirt
"He forgot to wash the shirt"

f.	mini	vɔi	**tsi**	eu **z**	in
	I	want	COMP	he PRT	comes
	"I want him to come"				
f'.	mini	vɔi	**(tsi)**	**s**	dɔrm (mini)
	I	want	COMP	PRT	I.sleep (I)
	"I want to sleep"				
g.	tə	ɣas	**(tsi)**	**s**	u fats
	you	I.let	COMP	PRT	it you.do
	"I let you do it"				

We shall return to the subjunctive particle in section 2. For the time being, what interests us is the distribution of the two complementizers and also the observation that the second complementizer, *tsi*, contrary to both SR and ER, coincides lexically with the interrogative pronoun for 'what', as in (6b-b'), though specialized interrogatives pronouns like *kai* 'who', *o kui* 'to whom', *ju* 'where' are equally present in the language, as in (6a, c, d). Furthermore, *tsi* occurs as a relative pronoun in (6f-f'), taking animate antecedents as well. This recalls the distribution of French *que*, which is inanimate as an interrogative, but takes both animate and inanimate restrictors as a relative (Sportiche 2011, Manzini 2014).

(6)

a.	**kai** jini/ vin					
	who comes/came					
	"Who comes/came?"					
b.	**tsi**	fats				
	what	you.do				
	"What do you do?"					
b'.	nu	ʃtiu	**tsi**	**(s)**	fak	
	not	I.know	what	PRT	I.do	
	"I dont know what I do/what to do"					
c.	nu ʃtiu		**o kui**	**s**	i	grɛsk
	not I.know		to.whom	PRT	to.him	I.call
	"I don't know who to call"					
d.	nu ʃtiu		**ju**	va		
	not I.know		where	FUT		
	s	nɛdz/nɛg				
	PRT	he.goes/I.go				
	"I don't know where he goes/to go"					
e.	esti	atseu	**tsi**	ɲə	grɛsti	
	he.is	that	~~which~~	to.me	he.calls	
	"He is the one who calls me"					

e'.	esti	atseu	**tsi**	mini
	he.is	that	who	I
	o	vəd	tətuna	
	him	I.see	always	

"He is the one whom I always see"

The complement sentences in (6) reproduce some of the patterns already examined in (4)-(5). Thus the reading of (6b') without the subjunctive particle is the equivalent of a *that* sentence in English—while the subjunctive particle introduces a control reading; recall that both control and non-control readings are possible with subjunctive particles, as in (6d). From the point of view of the distribution of wh-pronouns it will be noticed that they normally co-occur with subjunctive particles. In (4b) above, furthermore, we illustrated an example where *kə* precedes interrogative *tsi*. However in our corpus of Aromanian there are no examples where the complementizer *tsi* embeds a wh-item (including non-homophonous ones). We may provisionally take this to support the conclusion that pronoun *tsi* and complementizer *tsi* are not merely homophonous, but instantiate the same ~~*wh-*~~ lexical item, leading to the mutual exclusion of complementizer *tsi* and other *wh*-elements. We shall review further arguments in favour of the lexical identity of *wh*-pronoun and complementizer *tsi* in the next section.

1.3 Comparison with Italian dialects and analysis

Within the Romance family, languages which are like SR, ER and Aromanian in presenting two *k-(ts-/tʃ-)* complementizers have been documented and analyzed by ~~by~~ Ledgeway (2003, 2005), Manzini and Savoia (2005, 2011) in Central and Southern Italy. In these Italian varieties, one of the *k-* complementizers occurs with indicative complements and/or with matrix verbs of knowing, saying, etc.; this is normally /ka/. The other complementizer introduces subjunctive complements and/or verbs of wanting, commanding, etc.; this is normally /kə/ or /ki/. In Ledgeway's (2003, 2005) analysis both complementizers are merged in Fin, where /ka/ checks indicative and /kə/ checks subjunctive. However, in the presence of topics and foci, C moves from Fin to Force. Crucially Force is always spelled out as /kə/.

Reference to Fin and Force by Ledgeway implies the adoption of Rizzi's (1997) model of the left periphery, already mentioned in connection with Hill (2013a, b) above. In general, cartographic approaches

are based on the idea that once morphemes and lexical items are properly sequenced, there is only one possible mapping to the universal template of functional categories. Therefore the correct sequencing of morphemes/lexical items ~~maps~~ reveals their intrinsic properties as well, as encoded in the universal functional hierarchy. For Ledgeway, /ka/ can only be sequenced as Fin, since it occurs to the right of left peripheral material, while /kə/ can also be sequenced as Force. Thus their sequence effectively yields their content.

However Manzini and Savoia (2011) find that the varieties they consider do not display the asymmetries observed by Ledgeway, since both foci and topics appear under *ka* as under *kə*/*ki*. The examples in (7)-(8) illustrate the relevant facts with a Center-South variety and with a Sardinian variety. Note the distribution of the two complementizers with different types of matrix verbs, as well as the possibility of an embedded left periphery with both. From data like (7)-(8), Manzini and Savoia (2005, 2011) conclude that the two complementizers occupy very much the same position. It is also important to note that mood is not a completely accurate predictor of the complementizer; thus Guglionesi's *kə* may very embed indicative forms of the verb (not illustrated here).

(7) a. m annə ðəttə
to.me they.have said
ka krɛ mənənə
that tomorrow you.came
"They told me that tomorrow you would come"

b. m annə ðəttə **ka** u kɛʃə
to.me they.have said that the cheese
tsə l annə tɔtə i ɣwajjɛunə
MP it they.have taken the boys
"They told me that the cheese was taken by the boys"

c. vujjə **kə** krɛ purə
I.want that tomorrow also
lɔrə mənəssənə
they come(SUBJ)
"I want them as well to come tomorrow"

Guglionesi (Abruzzi)

(8) a. m anta nau **ka**
to.me they.have said that
ɣraza bbenizi
tomorrow you.come

“They told me that you will come tomorrow”

b. m anta nau **ka**
to.me they.have said that
u libru ḍaza leddzju
the book it you.have read
"They told me that the book you read"

c. ɛstɛ mmendzus **ki** fintsaza
it.is better that even
juanni bɛndzɛðɛ kraza
John comes tomorrow
"It is better that John as well comes tomorrow"

Paulilatino (Sardinia)

The data in SR (2b), where *ca* can only co-occur with *să* when they are separated by topic or focus material, lend support to the idea that *ca* obligatorily occupies the Force position, and it can occupy the Force position only by moving from the Fin position in the presence of topics or foci. However this distribution appears to be connected to normative Romanian, and is not true in ER or in Aromanian.

Manzini and Savoia propose a characterization of systems with two finite complementizers that abstracts from Rizzi's distinction between Fin and Force. They argue that better insights into their distribution can be gained from looking at their intrinsic lexical content. In Abruzzese and Sardinian dialects, while *ka* specializes in the complementizer role, the *kə*/*ki* complementizer overlaps with the *wh*-pronoun in interrogatives and in relatives, as in (9), or at least in relatives, as in (10).

(9) a. kə ffi
what you.do
"What are you doing?"

b. ɛ kkullə kə vvadə sɛmbrə
he.is that I.see always
"He is the one that I see all the time"

Guglionesi

(10) a. ɛs kussu ki bbiɔ zɛmpɛrɛ
he.is that that I.see always
"He is the one that I see all the time"

b. kiɛ bbeniði
who comes
"Who comes?"

Paulilatino

The data in (9)-(10) connect to recent ideas in the literature to the effect that *k*- complementizers in Romance are *wh*-quantifiers, whether they lexically overlap with *wh*-pronouns or not. Specifically Arsenijevic (2009), Kayne (2010) argue that complementizers are relative pronouns introducing a relative clause headed by an abstract noun with propositional content. Manzini and Savoia's (2003, 2011) proposal is that no abstract propositional Noun is involved, therefore complement sentences in Romance are more like free relatives; the difference between an ordinary *wh*-pronoun and a complementizer is that the former introduces an individual variable, the so-called complementizer introduces a propositional variable. Consider for instance the direct question of Fier in (6b) and the complement sentence in (5f'). In (6b), with the structure in (11a), *tsi* introduces an individual variable corresponding to the internal argument of the verb. The structure of *tsi* is the same in (11b), corresponding to example (5f')—except that its variable has propositional content.

(11) a. [*tsi* x [*fats* x]
b. [*mini* *vɔi* [*tsi* x, x: *s dɔrm mini*]

In relation to the Abruzzese and Sardinian data in (7)-(10), Manzini and Savoia further argue that "the *ka* complementizer is a definiteness element, effectively the counterpart to a definite determiner, so that the LF of the Guglionesi example in [7a] would be of the type in [12a]. By contrast, the LF of a sentence like the *Guglionesi* example in [7c] could include an indefinite quantification, corresponding to a free variable bound by existential closure, as sketched in [12b]".

(12) a. I think the x: x he comes tomorrow
b. I think for some x: x he comes tomorrow

In terms of (12), Manzini and Savoia (2011) predict that "of the two complementizers present in languages like Guglionesi … it is always the indefinite complementizer that overlaps with a *wh*-quantifier. This is because the other complementizer effectively introduces a definite description, which is hardly compatible with *wh*-quantification—while the indefinite complementizer introduces a propositional variable subject to existential closure, more or less like the argumental *wh*-variable". Manzini and Savoia (2005, 2011) support this prediction with a comparative study of the complementizer and wh-system in 213 Italian dialects. The

declarative complementizer generally presents the same lexical base *k-* as *wh*-pronouns, though it may or may not coincide with a *wh*-phrase (generally 'what', but sometimes also 'who'). In particular crucial evidence is provided by about a quarter of all varieties (55 of them) that have two finite declarative complementizers; only the complementizer introducing subjunctive sentences can coincide with a wh-pronoun.

Aromanian, on a different branch of the Romance family, can now be seen to comply with the prediction as well. As we saw, not only it has two finite complementizers—but one of them also overlaps with the *wh*-interrogative and relative. As expected, it is the subjunctive complementizer (i.e. the one co-occurring with *si*) that displays the overlapping with the *wh*-system.[1] Of course it is also logically possible to have double complementizer systems in which no overlap with the *wh*-system is found. As it turns out, SR is of this latter type. Thus the various sentential introducers that we have reviewed in section 1.1 differ from both *wh*-pronouns, including *ce* 'what', *cine* 'who', *care* 'which'. These systems are compatible with a treatment along the lines of (11)-(12), though they provide no evidence for it.

Finally, a two-complementizer system similar to that of Aromanian is documented for the in-contact language, Tosk Albanian (Manzini and Savoia 2007). In the variety of Gjirokaster, sentential complements are introduced by *sɛ* and *tʃə*; *sɛ* is excluded from most contexts including the subjunctive particle *tə*, as in (13a), which require *tʃə*, as in (13b). The latter overlaps with the *wh*-pronoun for 'what', as in (13d); this holds true despite the fact that standard orthography distinguishes *që* (the complementizer) from *ç* 'what'. In any event *tʃə/që* also introduces relative clauses, as in (13c). The similarity of Aromanian and Albanian does evoke a contact scenario; yet Romance varieties of Central and Southern Italy and Sardinia show that the Aromanian distribution is a Romance feature not depending on contact.

(13) a. jam ɛ sigurt **sɛ** dɔ vijə
I.am FS. sure COMP FUT he.comes
"I am sure that he will come"

b. tə θatʃ **tʃə**
to.you I.said COMP
t a laɲɛ

[1] Manzini and Savoia (forthcoming) revise somewhat their characterization of the two complementizers, simplifying it, in the light also of Giorgi's (2009) analysis of the Romance subjunctive.

PRT him/her you.washed
"I told you to wash him/her"

c. ai ɐʃt buri
he is the man
tʃə tə θərrɛt ʃpɛʃ
COMP you he.calls always
"He is the man that always calls you"

d. tʃə məndɔn **sɛ**
what you.think that
tʃə bən ai
what do he
"What do you think that he is doing?"

Gjirokastër (Albania)

1.4 Motivating the analysis. Intermediate conclusions

Suppose that so-called complementizers are in reality *wh*-pronouns, as they superficially seem to be in many languages where they lexically coincide with the *wh*-pronoun for 'what', 'which'. What we have failed to address so far is the question why. Why couldn't propositional content be embedded without the benefit of a *wh*-operator? In this connection, it is worth remembering that typologically, it is normal for embedded sentences to take a form~~at~~ quite radically different from that of main sentences. One strategy that is particularly widespread and well-studied involves the nominalization of the sentence. While the verb~~al form~~ takes on a nominal inflection, the case array is rearranged, so that in particular the subject turns up as an oblique (genitive). This kind of complementation is well-known for instance from Turkish (Kornfilt 1997). Similarly, the embedding of a finite sentence in Romance is a form of nominalization. This is particularly evident in approaches such as Kayne (2010), Arsenjievic (2009) where finite embedded sentences are relative clauses headed by an abstract noun; but the same is true of Manzini and Savoia's (2011) approach where the embedded complement is effectively a free relative.

In this perspective, therefore, the question why (in Romance, in Albanian) finite sentential embedding would take the form of a relativization translates into the more general question why nominalization is necessary for propositional embedding. The standard minimalist theory of argument embedding provides a fairly intuitive answer to this question. Embedding of a DP in one of the core argument positions of the sentence involves an Agree operation; in an ordinary

transitive sentence, the internal argument Agrees with *v*, licensing accusative Case, while the external argument agrees with I licensing nominative case. Now, suppose that instead of DP we tried to embed a CP. A DP has a phi-feature set that can satisfy the *v* or I probe—but CP is radically deprived of such features. Therefore it cannot enter into an Agree relation, which on the one hand leaves the probe without a suitable goal and on the other hand, deprives the sentential complement of case and hence of Visibility. From this point of view, there is no Case Resistance of CPs in the sense of Stowell (1981)—rather a resistance to Agree, formulated by Manzini and Savoia (forthcoming) as in (14).

(14) *Agree Resistance Theorem*
CPs cannot enter into Agree relations with v, I probes because of their lack of phi-features.

The nominalizing strategies adopted by many languages in order to embed sentential complements are a way to circumvent the impossibility of embedding CPs. The treatment of sentential complements as (free) relatives, either headed by an abstract nominal or by a *wh*-element (the so-called complementizer), is the way of nominalizing sentential content adopted by the Romance languages. It is relevant to note in this connection that Manzini and Savoia (forthcoming) extend the application of (14) in Romance to infinitival sentences. Specifically, they propose that the Prepositional introducers of non-finite sentences in Romance (including the SR short infinitive and the ER and Aromanian long infinitive) are really means to turn these sentences into obliques—the obliquization strategy being a different way to circumvent (14).

In conclusion, the two finite complementizers system of Aromanian, while generally similar to that of Romanian, has an interesting additional property, namely that the subjunctive complementizer *tsi* lexically overlaps with the *wh*-pronoun for 'what'. This reproduces the distribution of Central and Southern Italian varieties and Sardinian. The fact that homophony with *wh*-pronouns is not randomly distributed is taken by Manzini and Savoia (2011) as an argument in favour of the *wh*- status of complementizers. In this respect, Aromanian adds an interesting tassel to the overall picture.

2. The subjunctive particle

2.1 The subjunctive particle and control

Subjunctive particles (henceforth Prt) with the general characteristics of Romanian *să* are present in Balkan languages, including Albanian (Manzini and Savoia 2007) and Greek (Roberts and Roussou 2003), but also Romance languages of Calabria, Sicily and Salento (Manzini and Savoia 2005). We have already seen in section 1.1 that Prts can in principle be associated with an I-related node (say MoodP, Rivero 1994) or with a C node (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994). In split CP approaches, where the *k*- complementizer occupies the highest C node(Force), the Prt is naturally construed as the lowest C node, i.e. Fin (Hill 2013a).

Issues relating to the categorization and position of Prt are strictly connected to the issue of control into finite sentences. The facts of SR are clearly laid out by Jordan (2009). Basically with obligatory control verbs (Landau 2013), *să* clauses display obligatory coreference of the embedded subject with the matrix subject, as shown in (15a). *să* complements of non-obligatory control verbs, on the other hand, can either display control or disjoint reference, as in (15b-c). Note that even when a non-control reading is available, as in (15c) and a nominative subject can therefore be lexicalized, the latter can only appear in peripheral position. Thus it can be postverbal as in (15c) or it can be topicalized between *ca* and *să*, but it cannot intervene between the particle and the verb.

(15) a. Mara încearcă să scrie o scrisoare
Mara tries PRT writes a letter
"Mara tries to write a letter"

b. Mara vrea să plece
Mara wants PRT leaves
"Mara wants to leave"

c. Mara vrea să plece Radu
Mara wants PRT leaves Radu
"Mara wants Radu to leave"

Romanian

Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) suggests that control into Romanian subjunctive clauses is made possible by the same incorporation between I and C that is responsible for the mixed properties of the subjunctive particle. The binding domain for PRO is the matrix sentence, not the embedded sentence, determining the possibility (and necessity) of control by a matrix argument. In Landau's (2004, 2006) theory the presence of

PRO, hence of control, can be determined either by lack of agreement (as in English infinitivals) or by lack of independent temporal specification (as in Balkan finite control). Within a movement theory of control, Boeckx and Hornstein (2006) allow for control into finite clauses by assuming that tenselessness gives them (i.e. their C phase) a defective character. In these latter two models, presumably, Prt plays a role in the determination of the tenseless character of the embedded sentence, hence in its control status.

Manzini (2009) however points to a number of questions that remain open. First, "at least in Albanian the verb independently carries subjunctive morphology; therefore a modal characterization of the particle is not necessary to express the modal character of the construction it enters into". Vice versa "a modal construal of the particle is not sufficient to explain why obligatory control and raising interpretations are licensed in the contexts where it is present", as opposed to languages where subjunctive is externalized by other means. The comparison between Romanian and other Romance languages is particularly telling given their lexical and syntactic continuity. Let us assume that for some reason in Romanian (as in other Balkan languages) the expression of the subjunctive requires a particle as well. Why wouldn't Romance languages like Italian or French or Spanish licence control into their subjunctive sentences, despite the lack of a particle? If the crucial property for control is modality and the subjunctive particle (or lower complementizer) is simply an end towards the expression of the relevant modal system—why wouldn't languages endowed with purely inflectional subjunctives also licence control into finite sentences? The same query holds if for modality we substitute tenselessness (Landau), defective phases (Boeckx and Hornstein) or C-I incorporation (Dobrovie-Sorin). In which way exactly does the subjunctive particle determine these properties? Why aren't subjunctive inflections sufficient to determine them?

In answer to these questions, Manzini and Savoia (2007), Manzini (2009) remove the subjunctive particle entirely from the domain of modality or modal complementizers and suggest that at least in Albanian it should be connected to the expression of the EPP/subject of predication. The basic data of Albanian are worth setting down briefly; indeed recall that the Aromanian varieties which form the primary empirical target of the present discussion are spoken in South Albania in contact with Albanian. We illustrate standard Albanian, as transcribed from native speakers of Gjirokastër (South Albania) by Manzini and Savoia (2007). The subjunctive particle is *tə* (or *të* in standard spelling). (16a) is an example of object control, cf. (13b) above; (16b-b') illustrate the alternation between control and disjoint reference in the same context.

(16) a. i θatʃ **tə** mə flirte
to.him I.said PRT me he.called
"I told him to call me"

b.	ɛrða	tə	**t**	a	jap
	I.came	PRT	to.you	it	I.give
	"I came to give it to you"				
b'.	ɛrði		**t**	a	ʃɔhi
	s/he.came		PRT	him	he.sees
	"S/he came to see him"				

Gjirokastër

A large part of the discussion of Manzini and Savoia (2007) is devoted to establishing that particle *të* is not merely homophonous with the article *të* of Albanian but they are the same item (ultimately going back to the IE demonstrantive, cf. the neuter Greek article/clitic *to*), which importantly prefixes adjectives (Campos 2008), genitives (Manzini and Savoia 2011), and relative clauses (Kallulli 2008). In other words (article) *të* has the distribution of what is generally called a linker (den Dikken 2006), see Campos (2005), Campos and Stavrou (2005), Lekakou and Szendrői (2012), Manzini and Savoia (2014), Franco et al. (2015) on linkers (henceforth Lkrs) in various Balkan languages including Aromanian. The characterization that Manzini and Savoia (2007) propose for Prt *të* is that "*të* introduces the EPP argument of the embedded sentence as a variable … the *të* variable can be identified with the matrix subject, mediating therefore the apparent coreference between the matrix subject and the embedded subject as lexicalized by the D inflection". Manzini (2009) further elaborates this analysis in the following terms: "it is natural to construe *të* as introducing not so much a variable as a lambda-operator … the embedded sentence is turned into a predicate-abstract assigned a value by a matrix argument".

This complex of ideas leads Manzini and Savoia (2007), Manzini (2009) to propose an original solution concerning the categorization and positioning of *të*. Prt *të* exactly like Lkr *të* is categorized as D and is taken to turn the embedded sentence into a predicate, by abstracting on the EPP argument and opening a variable corresponding to it. Hence the proposed structure for (16a) is as in (17). In (17) IP is a potentially closed proposition (including an EPP argument represented by the finite verb inflection) which is reopened by the D variable/lambda-operator. In the absence of controllers one may assume that the variable is existentially closed and its referential value identified by the finite inflection (or a left-peripheral or right peripheral lexical subject).

(17) i θatʃ [$_{CP}$ [$_{D}$ tə] C [$_{IP}$ mə fliɾte

Informally, control is a predication structure and the so-called subjunctive particles is a linker, of the type ordinarily seen in adjectival or relative clause predication and in genitive modification. This account differs both from the movement theory of control and from Landau's (2013) PRO algorithm. However in a recent development, Landau (2015) himself proposes a predicational take on control. In discussing English predicates which obligatorily take control complements, for instance (18a), Landau argues in favour of the structure in (18b). D is a 'minimal pronoun', interpreted as a variable in its Merge position—and as an operator (a lambda abstractor) in the [Spec, Fin] position it moves to. The projection FinP is therefore a predicate, which gets saturated by the matrix argument *John*. In fact, Landau also seems to perceive the potential connection with Lkrs structures since he comments that the position he calls Fin (from Rizzi 1997) should really be recast as den Dikken's (2006) Relator. Importantly for present purposes, Landau argues that predication control is not disrupted by the presence of a finite I. The latter may very well transmit phi-features to D by Agree, but this does not prevent predication from taking place.

(18) a. John managed to stay healthy
b. managed [$_{Fin/RelP}$ D [Fin/Rel [$_{TP}$ ~~D~~ to stay healthy

In short, different lines of research converge on the conclusion that control is a predication operation, depending on the presence of an EPP variable, introduced by a lambda-operator. The theory of control is outside the scope of the present contribution. However its potential consequences for the analysis of Prt are directly relevant. One may consider that the D element that plays a crucial role in the structures in (17) and (18) is always abstract, i.e. not only in English, but also in Balkan languages—in which case Prt can only an instantiation of C_{Fin} or some other Mood or C related category. But Manzini and Savoia (2007) add to the general picture the specific proposal that in subjunctive Prt languages of the Balkan type, Prt is connected to the expression of the EPP variable. This proposal concerning subjunctive particles is in turn connected with the proposal in section 1, according to which finite complementizers ~~in turn~~ *wh*-pronouns of sort. In both instances, the proposed account revolves around ~~on~~ the idea that so-called complementizers are pronominal-like, introducing a variable bound either by sentential content (finite complementizers) or by argumental content (so-called subjunctive particles).

In what follows, we will seek to evaluate proposals concerning the categorization and position of Prt based on its distribution. We will

conclude that associating it with one of the C positions of a cartographic C field does not have any clear advantage. The D/Lkr analysis of Prt seems therefore as viable as its C_{Fin}/Mood analysis from the point of view of distributional facts.

2.2 The Aromanian evidence and the split CP approach

Aromanian examples where the *s* particle co-occurs with the *tsi/ta* complementizer have already been provided in (5). Sentences introduced only by *s*, are provided in (19); they allow both a control and a non-control reading, for instance in the causatives in (19g-h). The division between the two sets of examples is purely a matter of convenience. Their interpretive properties, and also the range of matrix verbs that licence the constructs is exactly the same. A notable exception is the construal of the future tenses via a non-inflected auxiliary *va* which introduces Prt and a finite verb, as in (19a). In this auxiliary structure (characterized by a single event reading) the complementizer is impossible, as it is reasonable to expect.

(19) a. mini/ voi va **z**
I/you FUT PRT
dɔrm/ durɲits
I.sleep you.sleep
"I/you will sleep"

b. mini filli **(tsi)**
I began COMP
s lədzɛsk un libər
PRT I.read a book
"I began to read a book"

c. eu mbari **s** lədzɛi libru
he stopped PRT he.reads the.book
"He stopped reading the book"

d. vɔi **s** o fak/ dɔrm/ u
I.want PRT it I.do/ I.sleep/him
vɛdz/ mi ɣau
I.see/ me I.wash
"I want to do it/to sleep/to see him/to wash myself"

d'. mini vrɛm **s** o vəˈdɛm
I wanted PRT him I.saw
"I wanted to see him"

d”.	mini	am	vrut	**s**	durˈɲɛm
	I	have	wanted	PRT	I.slept
	“I have wanted to sleep”				
f.	mini	nu	pɔt	**z**	
	I	not	can	PRT	
	vəˈnɛm	məninti	asɛra		
	I.came	earlier	yesterday		
	“I was not able to come earlier yesterday”				
g.	nu	tə	ɣas	**s**	o fats
	not	you	I.let	PRT	it you.do
	“I don’t let you do it”				
h.	mini	u	fak	**s**	arəd
	I	him	I.make	PRT	he.laughs
	“I made him laugh”				

As also illustrated in (5), the *s(i)* particle occurs lower than the complementizer *tsi/~~ta~~*, cf. (19b) and lower than left dislocated material (~~T~~opic, ~~F~~ocus), cf. (20b) below, while it precedes all object clitics. On the other hand, there is considerable variation in the relative position of *si* and of the negation. In Fier, if there is a single copy of *si*, it yields the order *si nu*. The particle however can also be doubled, in which case *si s nu* in (20a) and *s nu s* in (20c) are equally possible orders. The doubling of *si* in the absence of the negation is also attested, for instance in (20c’). If we turn to the nearby variety of Libofshë we also find a preference for the order *si nu*, but the examples in (21) show that the alternative order *nu si* is allowed in the same context—in the absence of doubling of the *si* element.

(20)

a.	mini	mənduɛsk		**si**
	I	think		PRT
	s	**nu**	o	vɛd
	PRT	not	him	I.see
	“I don’t think I see him”			
b.	mini	vɔi	**tsi**	**tini**
	I	want	COMP	you
	si	**s**	**nu**	dɔrɲ
	PRT	PRT	not	you.sleep
	“I don’t want you to sleep”			

	c.	tsə	dzəʃ	**tsi**	**s**	**nu**	
		to.you	I.told	COMP	PRT	not	
		s	o fats/		məts	ni ts un tsəva	
		PRT	it you.do/		eat	nothing	
		"I told you not to do it/eat anything"					
	c'.	tsə	dzəʃ	**si**	**s**	o	fats
		to.you	I.told	PRT	PRT	it	you.do
		"I tell you to do this"					
(21)	a.	ɲ	ar		dzɛs	**tsi**	
		to.me	they.have		said	~~that~~	
		s	**nu**/	**nu**	**s**	dɔrm	
		PRT	not/	not	PRT	I.sleep	
		"They told me not to sleep"					
	b.	ma	tsə	dzɛk	atsea	**tsi**	
		PROGR	to.you	I.say	to.you	~~that~~	
		nu s/	**s**	**nu** o	bei		
		not PRT/PRT		not it	you.drink		
		"I am telling you not to drink it"					

Libofshë

Standard accounts of Prt consider ~~macro~~ data such as the position of Prt with respect to the finite complementizer and ~~T~~opic/~~F~~ocus material, but do not account for subtler variation such as (20)-(21). An early attempt at discussing and capturing microvariation is Roberts and Roussou's (2003), who compare the evidence on Greek to that on Calabrian. For Calabrian, they propose that the Prt *mu/mi* occupies the MoodP position (Rizzi's Fin), where it is preceded by Neg and by C/Op (Rizzi's Force), as in (22b). On the contrary, the Greek particle moves from Mood to C/Op, as in (22a), and this accounts for its complementary distribution with the complementizer *oti* and presumably for the fact that it precedes Neg.

(22) a. $[_{C/OpP}$ oti/na $[_{MP}$ t_{na} [TP . . .

b. $[_{C/OpP}$ chi/pe $[_{NegP}$ no $[_{MP}$ mu/mi [TP . . .

On the basis of (22a), one may surmise that double occurrences of the Aromanian Prt *si* are to be imputed to movement from Mood to C/Op, without deletion of the lower copy. However, doubled *si* can be preceded by *tsi* (i.e. the complementizer)—which means that the highest occurrence of *si* is lower than Rizzi's Force, or Roberts and Roussou's C/Op. Furthermore, on the basis of a single Neg position we cannot account for the fact that Neg in Aromanian can either be sandwiched between two

copies of *si*, as in (20c) or follow both of them as in (20a-b); more than one Neg position must be involved, as in (23).

(23) a. [si [$_{Neg}$ nu [si [$_{Neg}$ nu
b. Condition: only one *nu* externalized

Manzini and Savoia (2007) analyze partially similar microvariation in Albanian and Arbëresh (Italo-Albanian) varieties. In Albanian (24) the subjunctive Prt *tə* (standard spelling *të*) combines with the negation *mɔs,* specialized for modal environments (imperatives, subjunctives, etc.). In the Arbëresh vatrieties of Ginestra and Barile in (25) the particle *tə* can appear both to the right and to the left of *mɔs*, and in fact it may be doubled independently of the presence of the negation.

(24) a. **tə** **mɔs** ɛ vɛʃim
PRT not him/her we.dress
"Let us not dress him/her"
b. **mɔs** **t** a vɛʃim
not PRT him/her we.dress
"Let us not dress him/her"
Gjirokastër

(25) a. iʃ mə mir **tə**
it.is more good PRT
mɔs **t** a bətʃ
not PRT it you.do
"It is better for you not to do it"
Ginestra

b. jamən kundɛnt **tə** **(mɔs)**
I.am happy PRT not
t a ʃɔ
PRT him I.see
"I am glad not to see him"
Barile

Manzini and Savoia (2007) conclude that the *mɔs* negation is specialized for the C field, as suggested in (26) by the label NegC. This means that contrary to (23), no copy of Neg in the I field is available, hence Neg cannot follow ~~the lower copy of~~ Prt. Therefore the overall string takes the simplified form in (26).

(26) [tə [$_{NegC}$ mɔs [tə

Despite the ~~simplification introduced by~~ (26) with respect to (23), the basic fact remains that at least two positions are available to Prt. This makes a match to theories of the left periphery such as Rizzi's (1997), Roberts and Roussou's (2003) not immediately obvious, as discussed above for (23). Nothing prevents us from inscribing microvariation facts in a revised, more complex hierarchy including perhaps Fin1 and Fin2, as proposed by Hill (2013) for non-finite contexts. However this does not reveal anything more than the bare facts.

In general, cartography postulates that if one sequences the morphemes right, then because of the existence of a universal categorical template, one has considerably restricted the field of assumptions as to what the morphemes are, in fact in the ideal case found a unique match for their content. The alternative is to take a more traditional stance—namely starting with individual lexical items and with the properties of those lexical items, in themselves and as they interact with other contents under syntactic ~~m~~erge and semantic composition. What core grammar does is enforce certain scopal and selectional constraints, apart from which morpheme order may vary and may not in any event reveal any deep generalization.

In practice, in Aromanian the complementizers *tsi* and *ke* precede ~~al~~ sentential material with which they can co-occur. In other words, they close off sentential material, as one expects ~~under~~ their construal as propositional relativizers. This leaves the *si* particle, which occurs lower, though it always precedes all object clitics, hence at least as high as the edge of IP. As we saw in the previous section, the evidence concerning specifically Albanian *tə* suggests to Manzini and Savoia (2007) that Prts may have been wrongly associated with categories such as Mood or C—and should be reanalysed as pronominal like linkers, enabling a predication relation between the embedded predicate they introduce and a matrix argument—i.e. control. Suppose we conclude that *si* is in turn dealt with as a D element.[2]

---

[2] There is intriguiging, independent evidence from other Romance languages for the nominal (re)analysis of *se*/*si*. The subjunctive Prts *si* of Aromanian and *să* of Romanian are ~~indeed~~ connected to the Latin and Romance *si/se* 'if' elements, i.e. the polarity complementizers. In several South-Italian and Corsican dialects polarity *si* incorporates a pronominal element *iḍḍu* (Manzini and Savoia 2005), as in the examples in (i)-(ii) – where the pronominal element appears to externalize the pronominal content we associate to Aromanian *si*.

(i) s-iḍḍu ɣi (tu) vɛni t aspɛttu
if-it that (you) come you I.wait.for
'If you are coming, I am waiting for you' *Trinità d'Agultu* (Sardinia)

From this perspective we expect that ~~their~~ position is comparable to that of the EPP argument, closing the inflectional domain (including clitics in the Romance languages) and therefore lower than complementizers, topics and foci. In turn, the doubling of subjunctive Prts can be equated to the doubling of subject clitics (see Manzini and Savoia 2005 for examples involving Northern Italian varieties), as illustrated in (27) for example (20c').

(27) … dzəʃ [$_{CP}$ [$_{D}$ si] C [$_{IP}$ [$_{D}$ s] o fats

Furthermore, our microvariation data reveal that basically all logically possible orders between Prt and the negation are attested, without any ~~prejudice~~ for the working of either. In other words scope considerations allow either order, and both are externalized. Under these conditions the negation clitic can also vary between an IP-internal lexicalization and a CP-internal one, as schematized in (28a) for examples (20a-b) and in (28b) for example (20c).

(28) a. … [$_{CP}$ [$_{D}$ si] C [$_{IP}$ [$_{D}$ s] [$_{Neg}$ nu]…
b. … [$_{CP}$ [$_{D}$ s] [$_{~~neg~~}$ nu] C [$_{IP}$ [$_{D}$ s]…

Importantly, our argument is not that (27)-(28) is more restrictive than standard cartographic approach. On the contrary, we are saying that cartographic hierarchies must be relaxed to make room for the observed variation—so that they have no explanatory edge over a weaker theory not encompassing them.

2.3 Borrowing and reanalysis

We have so far not commented on the contact between Aromanian and Albanian; the Aromanian data we presented are all from bilingual Aromanian-Albanian speakers. The alignments between Albanian and Aromanian that we considered so far are all inscribed within the more general alignment of so-called Balkan languages, beginning with control into finite sentences and the presence of subjunctive particles. This does not prevent us from observing more specific contacts between Aromanian and Albanian. These are seen fairly obviously in lexical borrowings, for

---

(ii) s-iḍḍu ki ~~jjɛ~~ vulissi vinissi
if-it that I wanted I.came
'If I wanted to, I would come' *Camporeale* (Sicily)

instance the aspectuals *filli* ‘began’ and *mbari* ‘stopped’ are Albanian roots, not Romance ones—but they can also be seen in the functional lexicon.

A fact worth signaling is the presence of an optional *ta* introducer in the variety of Fier considered here which optionally precedes the subjunctive complementizer *tsi*, as in (29). In the variety of Këllez, *ta* substitutes for *tsi*, as illustrated in (30).

(29) mini iʃai dininti **(ta)**
I went.out before COMP
tsi **z** vənɛi
~~that~~ PRT you.came
“I left before you came”

(30) a. u s vram **ta**
FUT Prt I.want COMP
z vina mɛni
PRT he.come tomorrow
“I would want him to come tomorrow”

b. i dzɛk **ta** **s** zjinə
to.him I.say COMP PRT he.come
“I told him to come”

c. am vinitə **ta** **s** ti ved
I.have come COMP PRT you I.see
“I have come to see you”

Këllez

There are no obvious counterparts for it in other Romanian/Romance varieties—but an obvious match for it in Albanian, namely the *të* particle. The borrowing of *të* into Aromanian leads to a redefinition of this element, which no longer represents the subjunctive Prt, hence in present terms a D operator/variable, bearing on an individual referent, but rather a complementizer, namely an operator introducing a propositional variable. In other words we are not in the presence of a simple borrowing but of a reanalysis of the *të/ta* head. Specifically its nature as a variable is preserved though now it is associated to a propositional content.

Independently of the chosen framework one may wonder whether the reverse is attested, namely the reanalysis of a complementizer into a particle. Indeed the subjunctive Prts *si* of Aromanian and *să* of Romanian are connected to the Latin and Romance *si/se* ‘if’ element, i.e. the polarity complementizer (Adger and Quer 2001, cf. fn. 2). In this instance, historical change causes a complementizer, i.e. an operator introducing a

propositional variable, to shift to the role of Prt, i.e. in present terms a D element. Something very similar happens with Ancient Greek *hina* vs. Modern Greek *na* (Roberts and Roussou 2003).

It is also interesting to consider how 'if' is expressed in Romanian varieties. In SR hypotheticals are introduced by a complex form *dacă.* The place of the polarity complementizer in Aromanian hypotheticals appears to be taken by *ma*, as in (31b), which is also attested as progressive particle in main sentences, as in (31a). The English equivalent would be if one expressed hypotheticals by gerunds, e.g. 'you coming, I will wait for you', as in (31). The data from Libofshë in (32) show that *ma* can also introduce indirect yes/no questions. Incidentally, example (32b) shows that as we may expect of an aspectual element, *ma* is embedded lower than the Focus *mini* 'I'.

(31) a. **ma** o fak
PRT it I.do
"I am doing it"

b. **ma** vəniʃ va
PRT you.came FUT
s t ɛstept
PRT you I.wait.for
"If you came, I would wait for you"

(32) a. nu ʃtiu **ma** viɲ / vin eu
not I.know PRT you.come/he.comes he
"I don't know whether you are coming/he is coming"

b. nu ʃtiu mini **ma** o / ti ved
not I.know I PRT it / you see
"?I don't know if I see it/you"

Libofshë

In the variety of Fier, the all purpose polarity complementizer *në* 'if' of Albanian (Turano 2004: 97) is borrowed to introduce just embedded interrogatives, as in (33), completing our brief survey of borrowing and reanalysis in the complementizer domain.

(33) nu ʃtiu **nə** jin/ **n** i grɛsk
not I.know if I.come if to.him I.call
"I don't know whether I come/I call him"

2.4 Conclusions

In section 1, we argued that Romance complementizers, i.e. C_{Force} in the split CP framework of Rizzi (1997), are in reality *wh*-pronouns which turn the propositional content into a free relative. In this section, we have seen that subjunctive Prts, which have been argued to represent lower complementizer positions, i.e. C_{Fin}, are better reanalysed as linker elements connected to the lexicalization of the subject of the sentence. The overall picture of sentential organization that we propose is inspired by the IP-CP structure of Chomsky (1995) rather than by the cartographic proposals. Specifically, the microvariation evidence we consider does not favour a refinement of functional hierarchies (e.g. two Fin positions for the doubling of Prts) over weaker solutions, not involving a precompiled functional sequence.

References

Adger, D., J. Quer, 2001, "The syntax and semantics of unselected embedded questions", *Language*, 77, 107–133.

Arsenijević, B., 2009, "Clausal complementation as relativization", *Lingua*, 119, 39–50.

Boeckx, C., N. Hornstein, 2006, "The virtues of control as movement", in: W. Davies, S. Dubinsky (eds), *Special Issue on Raising and Control*, *Syntax*, 9, 118–130.

Campos, H., 2005, "Noun modification, pseudo-articles, and last resort operations in Arvantovlaxika and in Romanian", *Lingua*, 115, 311–347.

Campos, H., 2008, "Some notes on adjectival articles in Albanian", *Lingua*, 119, 1009–1034.

Campos, H., M. Stavrou, 2005, "Polydefinites in Greek and Aromanian", in: O. Tomić (ed.), *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 137–173.

Chomsky, N., 1995, *The Minimalist program*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press.

Chomsky, N., 2001, "Derivation by phase", in: M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press, 1–52.

Den Dikken, M., 2006, *Relators and linkers*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C., 1994, *The syntax of Romanian*, Berlin, De Gruyter.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C., 2001, "Head-To-Head Merge In Balkan Subjunctives", in: M. L. Rivero, A. Ralli (eds), *Comparative syntax of Balkan languages*, New York, Oxford University Press, 44–73.

Franco, L., M. R. Manzini, L. M. Savoia, 2015, "Linkers and agreement", *The Linguistic Review*, 32, 277–332.

Giorgi, A., 2009, *About the Speaker: Towards a Syntax of Indexicality*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hill, V., 2013a, "The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive", *The Linguistic Review*, 30, 547–583.
Hill, V., 2013b, "The emergence of the Romanian supine", *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, 3, 230–271.
Jordan, M., 2009, *Loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian diachronic syntax*, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Florida.
Kallulli, D., 2008, "Resumption, relativization, null objects and information structure", in: J. Hartmann, V. Hegedus, H. van Riemsdijk (eds), *Sounds of Silence: Empty Elements in Syntax and* Phonology, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 235–264.
Kayne, R., 2010, *Comparisons and contrasts*, New York, Oxford University Press.
Kornfilt, J.,1997, *Turkish*, London, Routledge.
Landau, I., 2004, "The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 22, 811–887.
Landau, I., 2006, "Severing the distribution of PRO from Case", in: W. Davies, S. Dubinsky (eds), *Special Issue on Raising and Control, Syntax*, 9, 153–170.
Landau, I., 2013, *Control in generative grammar. A research companion*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Landau, I., 2015, *A two-tiered theory of control*, Cambridge, Mass, The MIT Press.
Ledgeway, A., 2003, "Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: La doppia serie di complementatori", *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia*, 27, 89–147.
Ledgeway, A., 2005, "Moving Through the Left Periphery: The Dual Complementizer System in the Dialects of Southern Italy", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 103, 339–396.
Lekakou, M., K. Szendrői, 2012, "Polydefinites in Greek: Ellipsis, close apposition and expletive determiners", *Journal of Linguistics*, 48, 107–149.
Manzini, M. R., 2009, "Pro, pro and NP-trace (raising) are interpretations", in: K. Grohmann (ed.), *Phase theory: Features, Arguments, Interpretations*, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 131–180.
Manzini, M. R., 2014, "Grammatical categories: Strong and weak pronouns in Romance", *Lingua*, 150, 171–201.
Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2003, "The nature of complementizers", *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 28: 87–110.
Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2005, *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, Alessandria, Ed. dell'Orso.
Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2007, *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax. Investigations into Romance and Albanian dialects*, London, Routledge.
Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2011, *Grammatical Categories*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2014, "Linkers in Aromanian in comparison to Albanian and Romanian", *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 36, 83–104.
Manzini, M. R. L. M. Savoia, Forthcoming, "Finite and non-finite complementation, particles and control in Aromanian, compared to other Romance varieties and Albanian", *Linguistic Variation.*
Rivero, M.-L., 1994, "Clause structure and V-Movement in the languages of the Balkans", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 12, 63–120.

Rizzi, L., 1997, “The fine structure of the left periphery”, in: L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 281–337.
Roberts, I., A. Roussou, 2003, *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Sportiche, D., 2011, “French relative *qui*”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 42, 83–124.
Stowell, T., 1981, *Origins of phrase structure*, Ph. D. Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
Turano, G., 2004, *Introduzione alla grammatical dell’albanese*, Firenze, Alinea.