Finite and non-finite complementation, particles and control in Aromanian, compared to other Romance varieties and Albanian

Our Aromanian data come from Diviakë, Libofshë and Fier, three locations close to one another in South Albania, and from Këllez, also in South Albania. Section 1, on finite complementizers, shows that Aromanian supports analyses of complementizers as wh- pronouns independently developed for other Romance languages. Section 2 elaborates a proposal originally put forth for Albanian, where the subjunctive particle is identical to the Linker – namely that the main role of subjunctive particles is introducing a variable EPP argument, subject to control. Section 3 argues that the impossibility of embedding sentences directly under V-v (a sort of 'Agree Resistance Principle') leads to the overall shape of complementation in Romance, determining the obliquization strategy represented by Prepositional introducers of non-finite sentences – as well as to the nominalization (relativization) strategy of section 1.

1. Finite complementation

1.1 Complementizers as wh- pronouns

All four Aromanian varieties under consideration, Diviakë (D), Libofshë (L), Fier (F) and Këllez (K), have a finite complementizer *k* which has the same general properties as standard Romanian *c* /kə/, introducing indicative complements to verbs of knowing, saying etc., as illustrated in (1).

(1)   a.   mini **mundɛsk k** atseu u zinə məni   **D**
              I think that he will come tomorrow
              'I think that he will come tomorrow'

   a'.   mini esku **kutʃunit k** atseu (nu) (ma) dɔrm
              I am happy that he not Progr sleeps
              'I am happy that he is not sleeping'

   b.   m **aspari k** vini asɛra   **L**
              to.me it.seems that he.came yesterday
              'It seems to me that he came yesterday'

   c.   ɲ ar **dz s k** eu vini   **F**
              to.me they.have said that he came
              'They told me that he came'

   c'.   nu o **ʃtiu k** tsi məki eu
              not it I.know that what eats he
              'I don't know what he eats'

   d.   am **v dzut k** eł ari faptə mult luk   **K**
              I.have seen that he has done a lot of work
              'I saw that he did a lot of work'

A second finite complementizer of standard Romanian, namely *ca*, co-occurs with the subjunctive particle *s* ; *ca s* may be adjacent in Early Romanian (Hill 2013a), though in standard Romanian *ca* and *s* must be separated by Topic/Focus material. In the varieties of Diviakë, Libofshë and Fier, the second finite complementizer, with essentially the same distribution as Romanian *ca*, takes the form *tsi*, as in (2)-(4). Normally it co-occurs with the subjunctive particle *si/s* . The latter is independently known to be compatible with control and non-control readings of the embedded sentence – and this remains true when the *tsi* complementizer is present. For

instance, control examples with 'want' include (4a), while non-control readings with the same verb include (2a)-(3a). In most examples *tsi* and the subjunctive particle are directly adjacent, though they can also be separated by a Topic or Focus, for instance in (2a), or (3a-b).

(2) a.   mini **vɔi** **tsi** atseu **s** (nu) u   məkə   **D**
                I   want that he   Prt not it   eats
                'I want him to eat it'

      b.   mini ʎi   **dzɛs** **tsi** **s** ɣa   straɲəʎi
                I   to.him say that Prt he.wash the.clothes
                'I tell him to wash the clothes'

      c.   am   **agr ʃ t**   **tsi** **s** mək
                I.have forgotten   that Prt I.eat
                'I forgot to eat'

      d.   am   inʃɛtə   ka ma **ninti** **tsi** **s** mək
                I.have gone.out   more before that Prt I.eat
                'I left before eating'

      e.   esti **p n**   **tsi** **s** məˈkəm
                is bread   that Prt we.eat
                'It is bread for us to eat'

(3) a.   **vɔi** **tsi** tini **z** iɲ   məni   **L**
                I.want that you Prt come tomorrow
                'I want you to come tomorrow'

      b.   ma tsə **dzɛk** atsea **tsi** **s** o   bei
                Progr to.you I.say to.you that Prt it   you.drink
                'I tell you to drink it'

      c.   o **cisi**   **tsi** **s** o   fak mini
                it I.started   that Prt it   I.make I
                'I began to do it'

      d.   am   vənit **tsi** **s**   ti vəd
                I.have come that Prt you I.see
                'I have come to see you'

      e.   esti pəni **tsi** nu   **s** məki
                it.is bread that not Prt he.eats
                'It's not bread for him to eat'

      e'.   o   **fɛtʃ**   tʃələmənu **tsi** **z** inə ɣa mini
                him I.made   the.boy   that Prt comes to me
                'I made the boy come to me'

(4) a.   mini **vɔi** **tsi** **s** dɔrm (mini)   **F**
                I   want that Prt sleep I
                'I want to sleep'

      b.   eu   **ag rʃɛ (tsi)** **si** **z** ɣa   kəmɛʃa
                he   forgot that Prt Prt he.wash the.shirt
                'He forgot to wash the shirt'

      c.   eu   vini **d nint** **tsi** **s** vənɛm   mini
                he   came before that Prt   came   I
                'He came before I did'

Note however that *tsi* need not co-occur with the subjunctive particle, as illustrated in (5).

(5) a.   ɲ   ar   **dz s** **tsi** eu   vini   **F**
                to.me they.have   said   that he   came

'They told me that he came'

b.   ɲ   ar   **dzɛs** **tsi**   eu   ini   məni   **L**
to.me they.have   said   that   he   comes tomorrow
'They told me that he comes tomorrow'

c.   u   **f ts** **tsi**   skəpi   kənəli   **D**
him   I.made that   escapes   the.dog
'I made the dog escape'

A fact which will be of particular interest for our analysis is that in Aromanian, *tsi* is also the wh-pronoun for 'what', though specialized interrogatives like *kai* 'who', *o kui* 'to whom' are equally present. As a relative pronoun, furthermore, *tsi* takes both animate and inanimate antecedents (cf. French *que*, inanimate as an interrogative, but taking both animate and inanimate restrictors as a relative). We illustrate these conditions with the data from Fier and Libofshë in (6)-(7). Këllez, to whose complementizer system we will return, has similar data for wh-pronouns, as in (8). An argument in favour of the conclusion that pronoun *tsi* and complementizer *tsi* are not merely homophonous, but instantiate the same lexical item, comes from the fact that *tsi* cannot embed any wh-item (including non-homophonous ones), though the sequence *kə*+wh- is attested, for instance in (1c') above.

(6)   a.   **tsi**   fats   **F**
             what you.do
             'What do you do?'

      b.   nu   ʃtiu   **tsi**   fak
             not   I.know what I.do
             'I don't know what I do'

      c.   nu   ʃtiu   **tsi**   **s**   fak
             not   I.know what Prt   I.do
             'I don't know what to do'

      d.   esti   atseu   **tsi**   ɲə   grɛsti
             he.is the.one that to.me he.calls

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

(7)   a.   **tsi**   fats   **L**
             what you.do
             'What do you do?'

      b.   esti   eu   **tsi**   vədi   tatuna
             he.is the.one that I.see   always
             'He is the one that I always see'

      c.   esti   eu   **tsi**   mi   ɣrɛʃti tatuna
             he.is the.one that me   calls   always
             'he is the one who always calls me'

(8)   a.   **tsi**   fats   **K**
             what you.do
             'What do you do?'

      b.   **tsi**   **s**   fak
             what Prt   I.do
             'What should I do?'

      c.   ei   nu   ʃti   **tsi**   **s**   fake
             they   not   they.know   what Prt   they.do
             'They do not know what to do'

      d.   omu   **tsi**   mi   atʃamɛ totəna / **tsi**   ved   totəna

the man   that   me   calls   always/ that   I.see   always
'The man that always calls me/that I always see'

In Këllez, the finite complementizer, occurring in the same environments as Romanian *ca* or Aromanian *tsi*, takes the form *ta*, as in (9). This particle also surfaces in a few examples of Fier where it precedes *tsi* (and *s*), as in (10).

(9)   a.   u   s   **vram   ta**   **z**   vina   mɛni   **K**
              Fut   Prt   I.want   Comp   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   **vinit   ta**   **s**   ti   ved
              I.have come   Comp   Prt   you   I.see
              'I have come to see you'
(10) a.   esk   **kutʃ   nit**   **(ta)**   **tsi**   ti   vɛd   **F**
              I.am   happy   Comp   that   you   I.see
              'I am happy to see you'
      b.   mini   iʃai   **dininti (ta)**   **tsi**   **z**   vənɛi
              I   went.out   before   Comp   that   Prt   you.came
              'I left before you came'

The coincidence between complementizer *tsi* and wh-pronoun *tsi* is to be evaluated against a set of recent proposals that profoundly modify the conception of the category COMP/C. In the classical generative categorization (Bresnan 1972), function is paramount, in the sense that the role sentential introducers have in turning main sentences into complement sentences defines their categorial content. In Kayne's (1976) systematization of French, the lexical coincidence of complementizer *que* and of relative pronoun *que* is taken into account – but resolved in favour of treating both as COMP. In more recent years, the issue of the lexical coincidence of complementizers and wh-pronouns in Romance has been re-examined, leading several scholars to conclude that a complementizer is just (a special type of) a wh-pronoun. The observation that these different elements are lexically identical is compatible with weaker explanations, including in particular grammaticalization; Roberts and Roussou (2003) propose that this should be construed as a process whereby the argument DP, i.e. the pronoun, shifts to functional category status (C, or one of its cartographic articulations) (cf. also Bayer 2001).

The range of proposals we are interested in adopts the stronger view that complementation is relativization – and therefore requires a wh-pronoun (a demonstrative in Germanic, etc.). Two different approaches can be distinguished. The earlier approach of Manzini and Savoia (2003, 2005, 2011) takes wh- pronouns and complementizers to be lambda operators (the standard assumptions for wh- pronouns). They are differentiated from one another in that the wh-pronouns introduces an individual variable, while the complementizer introduces a propositional variable, restricted by the embedded propositional content. Consider for instance the direct question of Fier in (6a) and the complement sentence in (4a). In (6a), with the structure in (11), *tsi* introduces an individual variable corresponding to the internal argument of the verb. The structural role of *tsi* is the same in (12), corresponding to example (4a) – except that the variable has propositional content.

(11)   [tsi x [fats x]
(12)   [mini vɔi   [tsi x, x: s dɔrm mini]

A variant of the same general idea is proposed by Arsenjievic (2009), Kayne (2010), according to whom sentential complements are relative clauses headed by an abstract noun. They argue that Complex NPs such as *the fact/ the claim /the belief etc. that* should be analysed as relative clauses. They then proceed to analyse all sentential complements as involving an abstract version of these nominals. In essence, while Arsenjievic and Kayne propose that all complement clauses are in reality relatives, Manzini and Savoia can be taken to argue that they are rather headless (free) relatives.

Before proceeding we should acknowledge a number of issues that these treatments raise. One set of issues relates to the status of the C category, once complementizers and wh-pronouns are identified, hence obviously assigned to the same category, say Q(P), leaving the C category potentially deprived of membership. In reality, Rizzi's (1997) influential proposal on the cartographic organization of the left periphery already categorizes one C position as Fin, acknowledging its verb-related nature. This is the position targeted by V2 phenomena – while a higher C position (perhaps the Rizzian 'Force') appears to be targeted by imperatives. Given that these V-related positions are by now embedded into generative theory as Cs we may keep this label for them.[1] For similar reasons of descriptive ease, we keep the descriptive term complementizer rather than substituting it with clumsier periphrases such 'propositional relativizer' etc.

Another issue to be considered is that both conventional relative clauses and free relatives create islands – while finite complement sentences do not. Here Manzini and Savoia's idea that internally-headed free relatives are involved may turn out to be useful. We assume that the embedded structure that we have arrived at in (12) is all that is required to build a propositional free relative, hence a complement sentence. Consider however relatives or free relatives built on an individual variable; we may want to assume that this requires an abstract DP layer of structure. It is this additional layer that creates the DP-over-CP (bi-phasal) structure corresponding to the (Complex NP) Island. One may also wonder about the status of complement clauses vis-à-vis wh-islands, assuming that the latter violate (Relativized) Minimality (Rizzi 1990, Chomsky 1995). Again, as in the discussion that precedes, the content of the wh- pronoun may be relevant; specifically, it is reasonable to propose that the propositional wh- operator that we conventionally call a complementizer does not count as an intervener for wh- arguments and adjuncts.

It must also be mentioned that though the lexical overlapping of wh- pronouns and complementizers in many Romance languages provided an important clue as to the real nature of the latter, several Romance languages have finite complementizers that are not syncretic with wh-pronouns at all. In fact, standard Romanian is a case in point. Thus *c* and *ca* are distinct from the wh-pronouns series *care* 'which', *ce* 'what', *cine* 'who', *cui* 'to which'. We take it that the lack of lexical coincidence simply means that a specialized lexicalization is available for the propositional wh- pronoun (the so-called complementizers) and wh-pronouns introducing individual variables. As we will see in the next section, another fact concerning specifically two-complementizer systems is rather more interesting from a theoretical point of view, namely that only one of the two complementizers overlaps with wh- pronouns.

1.2   *Two-complementizer systems*

---

[1] A related issue is whether we can derive the complementary distribution of complementizers and V2 in German (den Besten 1984) if C hosts V2, but not complementizers. A crucial observation is in many languages, V2 and overt complementizers co-occur (e.g. Yiddish, Santorini 1989). An equally important fact is that though the absence of complementizers may be a necessary condition for V2 in some languages, it is not a sufficient condition in any language, V2 being restricted by syntactico-semantic constraints on 'embedded root phenomena' (Haegeman 2012). These considerations potentially weaken the original argument in favour of complementizers and V2 being hosted by the same C functional head.

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).

(13) a. jam   ɛ   **sigurt sɛ**   dɔ   vijə
          I.am fs. sure   that fut. he.comes
          'I am sure that he will come'

      b. tə   **atʃ tʃ**   t   a   laɲɛ
          to.you I.said that Prt him/her   you.washed
          'I told you to wash him/her'

      c. ai   ɐʃt buri   **tʃ   t**   θərrɛt   ʃpɛʃ
          he   is   the man   that you he.calls   always
          'He is the man that always calls you'

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

Yet the similarity of Aromanian and Albanian does not appear to be a contact phenomenon, or a Balkan feature, since similar conditions characterize Romance varieties of Central and Southern Italy and Sardinia (Ledgeway 2003, 2005, Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2011). In Italian varieties the complementizer occurring with complements to verbs of knowing, saying, believing etc. like Romanian *c* or Aromanian *k*, is normally *ka*, as in (14a), (15a). The complementizer introducing complements of verbs of wanting, commanding, of *before/after* adjuncts etc., much like Romanian *ca* and Aromanian *tsi*, is normally *kə* or *ki* in Italian varieties, as in (14b), (15b).

(14) a. m   annə   ðəttə   **ka**   u kɛʃə   tsə l annə   tɔtə i ɣwajjɛunə
          to.me they.have said   that   the cheese MP it have   taken the boys
          'They told me that the boys took the cheese'

      b. vujjə **kə**   krɛ   purə lɔrɛ   mənəssənə
          I.want that   tomorrow   also they   come
          'I want them as well to come tomorrow'   *Guglionesi* (Abruzzi)

(15) a. m   anta   nau   **ka**   u libru   dˌaza   leddzju
          to.me they.have said   that   the book   it you.have read
          'They told me that the book you read'

      b. ɛstɛ   mmendzus   **ki**   fintsaza juanni   bɛndzɛðɛ   kraza
          it.is better   that   even John   comes   tomorrow
          'It is better that John as well comes tomorrow'   *Paulilatino* (Sardinia)

Ledgeway (2003, 2005), who refers to the two Southern Italian complementizers as CA and CHE, finds that in a corpus of 11 early texts, "out of a total of 327 examples of CA-clauses … a mere 10.1% were found to contain one or more elements in the left periphery, whilst from a total of 1061 examples of indicative clauses introduced by CHE, … 41,8% were found to host one or more elements in the left periphery" (2005: 360). Adopting Rizzi's (1997) model of the left periphery, Ledgeway argues that "CA and CHE are invariably merged in … Fin° … as an overt reflex of the different modal specifications (indicative vs subjunctive) they check in Fin°, from which automatically follows the claim that CA only occurs in indicative clauses and CHE only in

subjunctive clauses'" (372). However, "the appearance of topics and foci forces the complementizers CA and CHE to move out of Fin° to target' Force°" (376); "this movement operation is spelt out morphologically only in the case of the indicative complementizer CA which invariably surfaces as CHE' (374-375). In other words, for Ledgeway, the bipartition of complementizers is defined by Rizzi's categories of Fin and Force, so that CA only occurs in the Fin position, while CHE occurs both in Fin and in Force.

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 reveals their intrinsic properties as well, as encoded in the universal functional hierarchy. For Ledgeway, CA can only be sequenced as Fin, since it occurs to the right of left peripheral material, while CHE can be sequenced as Force. The sequencing effectively yields their content, in a classical demonstration of cartographic reasoning. Manzini and Savoia (2011) however find that the Italian varieties they consider do not display the asymmetries observed by Ledgeway, since foci and topics appear both under *ka* and under *kə*/*ki*. This despite the fact that modern varieties otherwise match early varieties, of which they are historical continuators. The examples in (14)-(15) already illustrate the relevant facts, since both complementizers embed topics/foci. Therefore Manzini and Savoia conclude that the two complementizers occupy very much the same position – essentially as in non-articulated models of the left periphery with a single C slot (Chomsky 1995 ff.).

Insights on double complementizer systems can be gained from looking at their intrinsic lexical content, rather than at their position. While the *ka* complementizer specializes in the role of sentence introducer, the *kə*/*ki* complementizer overlaps with wh- pronouns in interrogatives and in relatives, as in Abruzzese (16), or at least in relatives, as in Sardinian (17).

(16) a.   kə   ffi
             what   you.do
             'What are you doing?'
    b.   ɛ   kkullə kə   vvadə sɛmbrə
             he.is   that   that   I.see   always
             'He is the one that I see all the time'   *Guglionesi*
(17) 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*

Manzini and Savoia (2011) argue that "the *ka* complementizer is a definiteness element, effectively the counterpart to a definite determiner", so that the structure of the *Guglionesi* example in (14a), with *ka* lexicalized, would be of the type in (18a). By contrast, the structure of the *Guglionesi* example in (14b), with *kə* lexicalized "could include an indefinite quantification, corresponding to a free variable bound by existential closure", as in (18b). In these terms, Manzini and Savoia obtain "the generalization 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".

(18) a.   They told me the x: x the boys took the cheese
    b.   I want for some x: x they too come tomorrow

Vice versa, Manzini and Savoia observe that in at least some Italian varieties, there is no one-to-one correlation between the lexicalization of the *kə/ki* complementizer and the subjunctive inflection on the verb, since *kə* can also embed an indicative, as in Abruzzese (19). In any event, they argue that an indicative vs. subjunctive characterization of the two complementizers *ka* and *kə* would not help in explaining why only the subjunctive complementizer would overlap with wh-pronouns, since the latter display no sensitive to the indicative/subjunctive distinction. Thus the interrogative in (16a) is found in a main context which does not admit the subjunctive – and the relative in (16b), (17a) is equally in the indicative.

(19)   pɛntsə kə   vɛ   krɛ
        I.think that he.comes tomorrow
        'I think he comes tomorrow'   *Guglionesi*

The generalizations that Manzini and Savoia (2005, 2011) draw from Italian varieties, are confirmed by Aromanian down to a considerable level of detail. First, there is evidence that Topic/Focus material can follow both complementizers; thus *kə* is followed by a wh-phrase in (1c'), while sentences where *tsi* is followed by left peripheral material include (2a), (3a-b); at the same time, left peripheral material is not necessary to the lexicalization of either complementizer. Second, in some varieties (Fier, Libofshë, Diviakë) there is lexical coincidence between the complementizer and the wh-pronouns system; if so, it is the complementizer that co-occurs with the subjunctive particle *tsi* that coincides with a wh-pronoun. The importance of this generalization is that it makes it unlikely that the coincidence of wh- pronouns and complementizers is an external accident; rather, it appears to be rule-governed, and hence to warrant an internal explanation.

In recent years, the indicative/subjunctive distinction in Romance languages has been clarified by the work of Giorgi (2009), according to whom it signals whether a representation of the Speaker is present within the embedded sentence (indicative) or not (subjunctive), leading to independent T anchoring in the indicative, but not in the subjunctive. In some languages, like standard Italian or Sardinian, the morphological subjunctive encodes this distinction. However in other languages like Abruzzese or Central/Southern Italian varieties the morphological subjunctive appears to be restricted to irrealis readings proper, as in (14b). This however does not mean that the relevant interpretive contrast between Speaker/T anchored contexts and non-anchored contexts is not observed in this second set of languages – which means in turn that it could be relevant for the choice of complementizers after all.

Suppose we keep to the conclusion that (12) represents the structure of a *tsi* sentence in Aromanian. Based on Giorgi (2009), one may want to propose that Romance languages like Aromanian (but also Abruzzese etc.) have a second complementizer, i.e. again a wh- operator, which is restricted by sentential contents that are Tense- and Speaker- anchored ('indicatives'). In other words the alternation between *kə* and *tsi* in Aromanian (*ka* and *kə* in Abruzzese) etc. is rather like the alternation between 'who' and 'what' in English – namely an alternation between two wh-operators with different restrictions. To be more precise, it is normally accepted that English 'who' has a [human] restriction, while 'what' is unrestricted (answers to 'what' include animate and inanimate individuals as well as events/situations). Similarly, for Aromanian, we can keep *tsi* as the unrestricted complementizer and restrict *kə*, as just proposed, to Speaker/T anchored propositions.

A differentiation of two-complementizer systems according to their selection properties is appealing for its simplicity. Morphological subjunctive properties do not appear to be involved – since they seem to differ in their extension in Romance languages, while complementizer systems are essentially stable. However abstract properties of Speaker/T anchoring – corresponding to morphological indicative in a subset of languages – can adequately describe the selectional restrictions of complementizers, as schematized for Aromanian in (20).

(20) a. *tsi*: wh-
     b. *kə*: wh-, Speaker/T anchored proposition

We are now in a position to answer the question why lexical coincidence of complementizers and wh- pronouns is always restricted to subjunctive complementizers. The question turns out to be the converse to another one, namely why among wh- pronouns it is generally 'what' that lexically overlaps with complementizer. The obvious answer is that 'what' lacking selectional restrictions is compatible with propositional content whereas 'who' is not. Similarly a wh- element with the propositional restriction in (20b) could not turn up with an individual variable interpretation. Recall lastly that in one of the Aromanian varieties we considered namely Këllez, there is a complementizer *kə* with the properties in (20b) – but no complementizer *tsi*, while the distribution of *tsi* appears to be covered by a non-wh- element namely *ta*. Nevertheless there is no reason why we couldn't extend the wh- property to *ta*, and associate it with a propositional restriction, that excludes it from introducing individual variables. We shall return to the status of *ta* at the end of section 2.

1.3   Summary

Summarizing so far, Romance finite complementation involves turning sentences into free relatives, headed by a wh- pronoun. The latter may be specialized for the task, but more often overlaps with some wh- pronoun introducing individual variables – which provides the most obvious empirical pointer to its nature. There are also Romance languages with two complementizers; we have proposed in (20) that their distribution is governed by presence/absence of a restriction to Speaker/T anchoring (Giorgi 2009). Only the unrestricted complementizer can overlap with a wh- pronoun introducing an individual variable.

Several questions are raised by these proposals. The most important one is why finite sentences in Romance would involve relativization. The answer seems to be the one originally proposed by Rosenbaum (1967), namely that (finite, declarative) sentences are in fact not embeddable and their nominalization is a strategy to circumvent this prohibition. Still one may want to ask why exactly sentential contents are not embeddable – and how exactly the relativization strategy used by finite embedding compares to other embedding strategies for instance in Romance. We shall return to these question in section 3, after reviewing two further types of Aromanian sentential complements, namely sentences introduced just by subjunctive particles and non-finite (infinitival, participial) sentences.

2.   Subjunctive particles and control

2.1   The distribution of subjunctive particles

The process whereby Romanian progressively came to restrict the distribution of the (pan-Romance) infinitive in favour of clauses introduced by the subjunctive particle *s* is normally interpreted as an instance of the pan-Balkan phenomenon of the loss of infinitive (Joseph 1983). Note however that, as we will see in section 3, in standard Romanian infinitival complements are present in the form of the short infinitive – and Aromanian has infinitival complements with–*re* inflected infinitives (so-called long infinitives). In other words, there is no necessary connection between Prt sentences and loss of infinitive.

Theoretical matters debated in connection with standard Romanian *s* concern notably its status as a complementizer or as a Mood marker. For Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) *s* is generated in C,

thus accounting for its C-like characteristics, but I incorporates with C, thus accounting for the I-like properties of *s* as well. Hill (2013a, 2013b) works in a different framework, including the split CP analysis of Rizzi (1997), and has at her disposal two different C positions, namely Rizzi's Fin and Force. For her, the subjunctive particle *s* merges in the lower C position, i.e. Fin, while the *ca* and *c* complementizers merge in Force. This means that Topic and Focus material precedes *s* and follows *ca/c*. On the basis of the same data, Jordan (2009) reaches a different conclusion, namely that *s* is an I/M element, following in essence Rivero's (1994) proposal that subjunctive particles occupy a dedicated projection MoodP.

Importantly, the presence of Prt makes the control reading of the embedded complement possible. With obligatory control verbs (OC), *s* clauses display obligatory coreference of the embedded subject with a matrix argument; *s* complements of non-obligatory control verbs, on the other hand, can either display control or disjoint reference (Jordan 2009). Even when a non-control reading is available, and a nominative subject can therefore be lexicalized, the latter can only appear in peripheral position. Thus it can be postverbal or it can be topicalized between *ca* and *s*, but it cannot intervene between the particle and the verb.

Aromanian examples where the *s* particle co-occurs with the *tsi/ta* complementizer have already been provided in section 1.1. The presence of the particle allows the control reading – though it is equally compatible with the presence of a disjoint subject. The two readings are independent of the presence of *tsi/ta*, since analogous data can be found with sentences introduced only by *s*. This latter configuration is illustrated in some detail in (21)-(24).

(21) a.   mini   **voj**   **z**   in   **D**
           I   want   Prt   I.come
           'I want to come'

      b.   ts   am   **dz s**   **s**   (nu)   ti   ɣajə
           to.you I.have said   Prt   (not)   you   you.wash
           'I told you to wash up'

      c.   esti   **ɟini**   **s**   u   vədəm
           is   well   Prt   it   we.see
           'It is good that we see it'

      d.   mini   u   **snekw**   **z**   dɔrm
           I   Fut   I.go   Prt   I.sleep
           'I will go to sleep'

(22) a.   nu   **voi**   **s**   ti   ved   **L**
           not   I.want   Prt   you   I.see
           'I don't want to see you'

      b.   ma   tsə   **dzɛk**   **s**   o   fats
           Progr to.you I.say   Prt   it   you.make
           'I am telling you to do it'

      c.   ɲ   ɛr seʃti   **(tsi)**   **s**   o   ved
           to.me it.likes   that   Prt   him   I.see
           'I like to see him'

      d.   mini   **fug**   **nu**   **s**   vədə   eu
           I   go.away   not   Prt   I.see   him
           'I go not to see him'

(23) a.   mini   **vrɛm**   **s**   o   vədɛm   **F**
           I   wanted   Prt   him   I.saw
           'I wanted to see him'

      b.   mini **m nduɛsk**   **s**   u   vɛd   eu
           I   think   Prt   him   I.see   him
           'I think I see him'

     c.   mini filli   **(tsi)**   **s**   lədzɛsk   un libər
          I   began that   Prt   I.read   a book
          'I began reading a book'

     d.   eu   (nu)   **pɔt**   **z**   in
          he   not   can   Prt   he.comes
          'He can't come'

     e.   nu   tə   **ɣas**   **s**   o   fats
          not   you   I.let   Prt   it   you.do
          'I don't let you do it'

(24) a.   **vrɛu**   **(ta)**   **s**   u   məkə   **K**
          I.wanted   that   Prt   it   he.eats
          'I wanted him to eat it'

     b.   ts   **dzɛʃ**   **(ta)**   **s**   u   fats
          to.you I.said that   Prt   it   you.make
          'I told you to do it'

     c.   buna **esti**   **s**   durɲim
          good   is   Prt   we.sleep
          'It is good that we sleep/ to sleep'

     d.   **nɛg**   **(ta)**   **s**   u   vɛd
          I.go   that   Prt   him   I.see
          'I go to see him'

     e.   u   **fets**   **s**   dɔʁmə
          him   I.made Prt   he.sleeps
          'I made him sleep'

The *si* particle occurs lower than the complementizer *tsi/ta* and lower than left dislocated material (Topic, Focus), as illustrated in section 1.1 – 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 Diviakë, the order is normally *si nu*, for instance in (21b). In Libofshë we also find a preference for the order *si nu*, for instance in (22d), though the examples in (25) show that the alternative order *nu si* is allowed in the same context. 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* and *s nu s* are equally possible orders, as in (26b-c). The doubling of *s* is also systematic in Këllez, yielding *s nu s* as in (27). Finally, though rare, the doubling of *si* in the absence of the negation is also attested, for instance in Fier in (26d).

(25) a.   ɲ   ar   dzɛs **tsi** **s**   **nu/**   **nu**   **s**   dɔrm   **L**
          to.me they.have said   that   Prt   not/   not   Prt   I.sleep
          'They told me not to sleep'

     b.   ma   tsə   dzɛk atsea **tsi**   **nu s/ s**   **nu** o bei
          Progr to.you I.say   to.you that   not Prt/Prt   not it you.drink
          'I am telling you not to drink it'

(26) a.   mini mənduɛsk   **tsi**   **s**   **nu** u   vɛd   **F**
          I   think   that   Prt   not him I.see
          'I think I don't see him'

     b.   mini vɔi   **tsi** tini **si**   **s**   **nu** dɔrɲ
          I   want   that you Prt   Prt   not sleep
          'I want you not to sleep'

     c.   tsə   dzəʃ **tsi**   **s**   **nu**   **s**   o   fats
          to.you I.said that   Prt   not   Prt   it   you.do
          'I told you not to do it'

     d.   eu   agərʃɛ **(tsi)** **si**   **z**   ɣa   kəmɛʃa

	he	forgot	that	Prt	Prt	he.wash	the.shirt

'He forgot to wash the shirt'

(27) ar   fudzitə   **ta**   **s**   **nu**   (s)   məkə   **K**

they.have   gone   that   Prt   not   Prt   they.eat

'They have gone out not to eat'

Current accounts of Prt consider macro data such as the position of Prt with respect to the finite complementizer and Topic/Focus material, but are not finely articulated enough to account for subtler variation such as (25)-(27). 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 (28b). On the contrary, the Greek particle moves from Mood to C/Op, as in (28a), and this accounts for its complementary distribution with the complementizer *oti* and presumably for the fact that it precedes Neg.

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

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

On the basis of (28a), one may surmise that double occurrences of the Aromanian Prt *si* in (25)-(27) 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/ta* (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* or follow both of them; more than one Neg position must be involved. In fact, variation similar to that of Aromanian characterizes Calabrian and Sicilian varieties; the examples in (29)-(30) show the basic contrast between the Neg-Prt order in (29) and the Prt-Neg order in (30).

(29)   a.   vɔnu   (pɛ)   **nɔ**   **mu**   u hattsu

             they.want   for   not   Prt   it I.do

             'They don't want me to do it'   *Gizzeria*

         b.   vuɐʝʝu pɛ   **nnɔ**   **mmu**   mi cama

             I. want for   not   Prt   me he.calls

             'I don't want him to call me'   *S.Pietro a Maida*

(30)   a.   tɛ ðiku   **mu**   **um**   biəni

             you I.tell   Prt   not   you.come

             'I am telling you not to come'   *Conflenti*

         b.   tʃ   aju ðittu   **mu**   **un**   mɛ camanu

             them   I.have told   Prt   not   me they.call

             'I told them not to call me'   *Platania*

Next, in some varieties, Prt is systematically doubled on either side of the negation, as in (31). Other instances of doubling crop up when there are Topics or Foci, for instance in (32) – independently of whether the basic order is Prt-Neg or Neg-Prt.

(31)   a.   vɔʝʝu pɛ   **mmi**   **nɔ**   **mi**   vɛni

             I. want for   Prt   not   Prt   he.comes

             'I don't want him to come'

         b.   tʃi ðissi   pɛ   **mmi**   **nɔ**   **mi**   mi cama

             him I.told   for   Prt   not   Prt   me he.calls

             'I told him not to call me'   *Seminara*

(32) a. vɔʎʎu   **nɔ**   **mu**   **tu**   **mu**   vɛni
          I.want   not   Prt   you   not   come
          'I don't want you to come'   *Gizzeria*

  b. suɲɲu kuntiəntu   **mu**   **frati-tta**   **(mu)**   **um**   bɛna
          I.am glad   Prt   brother-yours   Prt   not   come
          'I am glad that your brother is not coming'   *Conflenti*

According to Manzini and Savoia (2005), who present these data, doubling of Prt indicates the availability of two different positions for it. The lower position is a C position, understood as we do here, namely as a verb-related position. The higher Prt is a complementizer, understood again as we do here, i.e. a Q(P) operator; they account for its co-occurrence with other complementizers by invoking the iterability of complementizers (comparable to that of wh- operators). In addition, Neg takes at least three different positions – one superordinate to the higher *mu/mi*, as in (32a), one intermediate between the two copies of *mu/mi*, as in (31b), and one lower than the lowest copy of *mu/mi*, as in (32b). In other words, they propose the ordering in (33a) – on which one must further impose the condition (33b), that only one copy of Neg is externalized at any given time.[2]

(33) a.   [Neg nɔ [QP mu [Neg nɔ [C mu   [Neg nɔ
  b.   Condition: only one *nɔ* externalized

Apart from the fact that (33) provides a mere encoding of the data rather than an explanation for them, we note that it is unclear why the same element *mu* would turn up once with the categorial signature C of a verb-related, modal category and once as a complementizer, which in their terms (as in ours) is an operator over propositional content. Nevertheless, the data observed are indeed strictly comparable to those of Aromanian. Aromanian is only slightly more restrictive than Calabrian, in disallowing the sequencing of negation before a doubled Prt, as schematized in (34).

(34) a.   [si   [Neg nu [si   [Neg nu
  b.   Condition: only one *nu* externalized

To a lesser extent, our empirical conclusions are confirmed by Albanian and Arbëresh (Italo-Albanian) varieties, analysed by Manzini and Savoia (2007). In Albanian the subjunctive Prt is *t* (standard spelling *të*), which combines with the negation *mɔs,* specialized for modal environments (imperatives, subjunctives, etc.). In the mainland variety of Gjirokastër, the orders *mɔs t* and *t mɔs* are both attested, as in (35). In Arbëresh, the order is *mɔs t* for instance in Vena di Maida in (36a) but *t mɔs* in Ginestra in (37a). In Vena di Maida, furthermore, *mɔs/mɔh* can be in complementary distribution with *t* , as in (36b). Finally the particle *t* can appear both to the right and to the left of *mɔs*, as in (37b). In the variety of Barile in (38), the doubling of Prt does not depend on the presence of the negation.

(35) a.   **t**   **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*
(36) a.   ɐ   mə   mirə   **mɔs**   **t**   ɛ   ʃɔrə

---

[2] Furthermore copies of *mu/mi* are never adjacent. It seems reasonable to see this latter constraint as an instantiation of a more general morphological haplology constraint (Neeleman and van de Koot 2006, van Riemsdjik 2008, Yip 1998) – hence irrelevant for the present discussion.

| | | it.is | more | good | not | Prt | him | he.see |
'It is better that he doesn't call him'

b. ɐ mə mirə **mɔh** ɛ ʃɔrə
it.is more good not him he.see
'It is better that he doesn't call him' *Vena di Maida*

(37) a. tə θɛjə **t** **mɔs** a θratʃə
to.you I.said Prt not him you.call
'I told you not to call him'

b. iʃ mə mir **t** **mɔs** **t** a bətʃ
it.is more good Prt not Prt it you.do
'It is better for you not to do it' *Ginestra*

(38) jamən kundɛnt **t** **(mɔs)** **t** a ʃɔ
I.am happy Prt not Prt him I.see
I am glad not to see him' *Barile*

For independent reasons, Manzini and Savoia (2007) conclude that the negation is specialized for the C domain, as suggested by the label NegC. This imposes rather more restrictions on the position of the negation than in Romance, so that when there are two copies of Prt it is constrained to appear between them, as in (38). The string in (38) also accounts for the fact that occurrences of a single Prt yield either the sequence Prt-NegC (when the higher occurrence of Prt is chosen) or else NegC-Prt.

(38) [tə [NegC mɔs [tə

Despite the simplification introduced by (38) with respect to (33), 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, nor do analyses of complementizers as wh- pronouns help in this respect (Manzini and Savoia 2005). Needless to say, we may enrich the models, to make them compatible with the facts; for instance we may internally articulate Fin into several positions as proposed by Hill (2013a, b) in relation to infinitival complements (see section 3). Nevertheless, some evidence concerning specifically Albanian *t* suggest 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. We turn to this evidence next, which involves considering the crucial interpretive property of Prt sentences, namely that of allowing control.

2.2 Prts and the theory of control

There is more than one reason to conclude that control is involved in Prt sentences in Aromanian, as well as in other Romance languages (e.g. Calabrian, Romanian) and Balkan languages (Albanian). To begin with, several examples including the *si* particle in section 1.1. and 2.1, have matrix verbs that require coreference between their subject and the embedded subject. Relevant examples involve aspectual verbs, e.g. 'begin' in Libofshë's (3c) and the motion verbs 'come' and 'go' in an aspectual interpretation in Këllez's (9c) and (24d), or in Diviakë's (21d). At least one example, namely Fier's (23d) involves a modal, namely 'can'. Despite the fact that these verbs embed finite complements, a disjoint reference reading of the embedded subject is not possible, exactly as it isn't in the infinitival sentences that they select in French/Italian/Spanish or in English. In other words, whatever syntactico-semantic mechanism is involved in Obligatory Control, it applies irrespective of the finite morphosyntax of the complement sentence.

A particular point of interest of Aromanian is that it preserves the common Romance

infinitive in –*re* (-*ri* in Aromanian), introduced by the preposition *di/ti* (cf. French/Spanish *de*, Italian *di*). In several of the Obligatory Control environments (complements of 'begin', complements of motion verbs), informants offered both a finite and an infinitival rendering, as illustrated in (39), (40), (41). The same is true for environments that in principle allow both control and disjoint reference, for instance verbs of command, as in (41). In (41), the infinitival complement of Aromanian, exactly like the infinitival complements of French/Italian/Spanish or English, is compatible only with the control construal, part of which is the distinctive *de se* (or here *de te*, Landau 2015) reading. Evidently, the finite Prt constructs that are systematically offered as an alternative by our informants, are interpreted in the same way.

(39) am   agrəʃətə   **tsi**   **s**   mək/   **ti**   məkari   **D**
      I.have   forgotten   that   Prt   I.eat/ for   to.eat
      'I forgot to eat'

(40) a.   o cisiə   **tsi**   **s**   o   fak   mini/   **di**   fətsɛri   **L**
           it I.started that   Prt   it   do   I/   for   to.do
           'I began to do it'

      b.   ɲi   nɛsi   minta   **tsi** nu **s**   o fak/   **di**   nu   fatsɛri
           to.me came   the.mind   that not Prt   it I.do/ for   not   to.do
           'I remembered not to do it'

      c.   am   vənit   **tsi** **s**   ti vəd/   **di** vədɛri (tini)
           I.have   come   that   Prt   you I.see/ for   to.see you
           'I came to see you'

(41) tsə   dzəʃ   **si**   **s**   o   fats   /**di**   fətsɛri aist   **F**
      to.you I.say   Prt   Prt   it   you.do/ for   to.do   this
      'I tell you to do this'

(42) a.   am   buʁitə   **ta**   **s**   u   vɛd   **K**
           I.have   started   that   Prt   it   I.see
           'I began to see it'

      a'. mini   mbuˈʁi **di**   gʁɛʁin
           I   started for   to.speak
           'I began to speak'

      b.   ei   ar   vinitə **ta**   **s**   mi vjadɛ/   **ti**   vidɛʁi mini
           they have   come   that   Prt   me they.see/ for   to.see me
           'They came to see me'

    Generative discussion about the nature of control spans several decades. In the early 80s, Williams (1981) proposes that control involves the embedding of a predicative expression (not a proposition), which is closed by the matrix subject. At the same time, Chomsky (1981) characterizes the subject of control sentences as an empty category PRO, which has a binding relation to some matrix argument. Within the minimalist framework, PRO is championed in particular by Landau (2004, 2006, 2013), who proposes that control depends on Agree between a matrix functional category (I for subject control, v for object control), which acts as the probe, and an embedded PRO, which acts as the goal. The distribution of PRO is governed by an algorithm, whereby only finite tensed clauses (+Agr, +T) are incapable of being controlled. The presence of a –Agr clause or of a –Tns one licences PRO, hence control. Infinitival sentences are a typical example of –Agr control, while finite complements in Balkan languages allow control in virtue of their –Tns properties.

    The main alternative to PRO within the minimalist framework is the movement theory of control proposed by Hornstein (1999). Boeckx and Hornstein (2006) also consider control into finite sentences. Normally, movement (hence control) is disallowed out of embedded sentences because of the presence of a C phase, blocking it. However defective C phases do allow A-

movement. In order to get control into finite complements it is sufficient for them to be defective phases. As for which sentential complements are and are not phases, Boeckx and Hornstein adopt Landau's idea that tenselessness is crucially involved. Finally, Manzini and Roussou (2000) are normally considered within the bracket of movement theories of control, because they propose that the same structure underlies both control and raising, but theirs is in reality an attempt at reviving predication theories of control, in which control amounts to the closure of an open variable in the embedded complement (a predicate rather than a sentence). Manzini and Roussou however have nothing to say on control into finite sentences.

Here we are not interested directly in control, but rather in sentential introducers, hence in subjunctive Prts. In the approaches of Landau (2004, 2006) or Boeckx and Hornstein (2006), the contribution made by the so-called subjunctive particle to control syntax is not made explicit. Given the requirements of Landau's theory, or of the movement theory of control, one could propose that the so-called subjunctive particle in reality is a –Tns morpheme – though it can equally introduce +Tns (non-control) contexts. Yet if the particle really only contributes Tns/Mood properties, why wouldn't Romance languages like Italian or French or Spanish endowed with inflectional subjunctives also licence control into their subjunctive sentences?

Manzini and Savoia (2007), Manzini (2009) seek both to develop Manzini and Roussou's ideas about control as a variable saturation operation (essentially a predication) – and to reinterpret the Albanian particle *të* as being connected to the expression of the EPP as such a variable. A fundamental piece of evidence tying particle *të* to the pronominal system is its occurrence in Linker contexts (Campos 2008, Campos and Stavrou 2005, Franco et al. 2015). As a Lkr, *të* appears in front of adjectives both as adnominal modifiers in (43a), and in predicative position in (43b). It equally appears in front of genitives, as in (44), whether as adnominal modifiers or as predicates. There is also a type of relative clause that appears to involve *të* as a Lkr, as exemplified with standard Albanian in (45) (cf. Kallulli 2008).[3]

(43) a. ɛrðə   kriatura-tə   tə   mbiðɛɲ-a
          came   boys-nom.def Lkr   big-pl
          'The big boys came'
      b. jan   tə   traʃ-a
          they.are   Lkr   fat-pl
          'They are fat'   *Vena di Maida*
(44) a. ɲə/ ajɔ   kɐmb tə   matʃə-sə
          a/that   leg   Lkr   cat-gen
          'a/ that leg of the cat'
      b. kjɔ   ɐʃt   tə   ɲəriu-tə
          this   is   Lkr   man-gen
          'This is of the man's'   *Vena di Maida*
(45) a. burri të   cilit   i   ke   dhënë   librin
          the.man Lkr to.which to.him you.have given the.book
          'the man to whom you have given the book'
      b. ?Burri   të   cilin   e   thirre
          the.man   Lkr   which   him   you.called
          'the man whom you called'

One may want to consider the occurrences of *të* in (43)-(45) in adnominal modification/predication contexts as merely homophonous with the occurrence of *të* as subjunctive particle. However a strong interpretive connection can be established between Lkr and Prt

---

[3] Incidentally, *-t( )* also plays a role in the system of definite postnominal inflections of Albanian, realizing for instance the masculine oblique singular in (44b); we disregard this fact here which is discussed in the references quoted.

occurrence, if we consider that a stream of formal studies takes control to be an instance of predication (Williams 1981, Chierchia 1984). Similarly, we may take it that Lkr contexts establish a predication between the phrase introduced by the Lkr (adjective, oblique, relative clause) and some other DP (the head of the relative, the subject of the copular sentence etc.).

Some potential difficulties with the identification of Lkr *të* and Prt *të* are morphological. As shown by the literature, Albanian preadjectival and pregenitival Lkrs vary according to the phi-features, Case and definiteness of the head noun. Thus *t* in the nominative plural in (43) alternates with *i* in the masculine nominative singular, *e* in the feminine nominative singular (Campos 2008). By contrast, Prt *të* is invariable. Now, crosslinguistic comparison shows that Lkr element may be inflected (such as the Albanian article) or not inflected (such as the Persian ezafe). In languages in which the Lkr can be inflected, the extent of which it is may vary depending on the context of insertion (e.g. pre-adjectival or pre-genitival, cf. Franco et al. 2015). In fact, in (45) the relative clause Lkr has an invariable *të* shape. Therefore the lack of an inflectional paradigm associated with Prt *të* does not seem to represent an unsurmountable obstacle to its unification with Lkr *të*.

Importantly, occurrences of *të* as sentential introducer are not limited to finite subjunctive complements. Rather in Tosk Albanian, including standard Albanian, non-finite purpose clauses and non-finite relative clauses expressed by participial structures are introduced by (*për) të*, as in (46). In contexts like (46), it appears that we can keep glossing *të* as Prt only to the extent that we separate the Prt category from subjunctive modality.

(46)   a.   aɾðtʃ   pəɾ   t   a/i   vɛʃur
            I.came for   Prt   him/them   dressed
            'I came (in order) to dress him/them'
       b.   ɲə   kəmiʃ pəɾ   t   (u)   laɾə
            a   shirt for   Prt   Passiv washed
            'a shirt to be washed/to wash'   *Gjirokastër*

In the Arbëresh dialect of *Civita*, the aspectual verb 'finish' takes a non-inflected participial complement preceded by *t* , as in (47a), though the variant where 'finish' embeds a finite 'subjunctive' verb also exists as in (47b). Continuity between (47a) and (47b) may lead us to conclude that the same fundamental Prt element is involved; but note once again that Prt does not appear to have anything to do with the expression of subjunctive Mood.

(47)   a.   fiɾɔva   tə   diɛvasuɾ   ʎibɾin
            I.finished   Prt   read   book-the
            'I finished reading the book'
       b.   fiɾɔva   t   ɛ   diɛvasja
            I.finished   Prt   it   I.read
            'I finished reading it'   *Civita*

The generative literature does not agree in its entirety on the predicative status of Lkr structures. Thus Larson and Yamakido (2008) construe Lkrs as case assigners, while Richards (2010) argues that they are means for identity avoidance at the PF interface. Yet generative works treating Lkr structures as predication include den Dikken and Singhapreecha (2004), Campos and Stavrou (2005) who argue that the Lkr is a copula. In a different take on the same general idea, Lekakou and Szendroi 2012, Franco et al (2015) argue that the Lkr is a D, as implied by its traditional label of article, and hence plays the role of subject of the predication.

Let us consider how this characterization of the Lkr element works in the simple example in (43a). The structure of (43a) is an in (48); the Lkr projects a DP functional layer above the AP, providing a lexicalization for the argument slot of the predicate 'big'. Following Higginbotham (1985), we assume that the interpretation of the DP 'the big children' requires identification of the

argument slots (theta-roles) of the adjective and the noun, which are ultimately satisfied by the Determiner of the noun, represented in (48) by the postnominal article/definite inflection. In the schema in (48), therefore, the Lkr D is a bound variable of the higher D closing off the DP (see Lekakou and Szendroi 2012 on Greek, Franco et al. 2015 on Albanian for slightly different implementations).

(48)   [kriatura [$_D$ tə]]   [$_{DP}$ tə   [$_{AP}$ mbiðɛɲa]]

The characterization that Manzini and Savoia (2007) propose for Prt *të* is in essence the same just reviewed for Lkr *të*. Specifically, "*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".

When applied to the minimal pair in (47), this complex of ideas leads Manzini and Savoia (2007), Manzini (2009) to propose a novel 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. Since they keep the conventional assumption that whatever Prt does it does at the CP level, the proposed structure for (47) is as in (49). In (49) 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.

(49)   a.   firnɔva   [$_{CP}$ [$_D$ tə]   C   [$_{IP}$ ɛ diɛvasja
        b.   firnɔva   [$_{CP}$ [$_D$ tə]   C   [$_{IP}$ diɛvasur ʎibrin

Though this account differs both from the movement theory of control and from Landau's (2013) PRO algorithm, in a more recent development, Landau (2015) himself proposes a predicational take on control that seems compatible with (49). In discussing English predicates which obligatorily take control complements, for instance (50a), Landau argues in favour of the structure in (50b). 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 (following Rizzi 1997, presumably) 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 to take place.

(50)   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. What Manzini and Savoia (2007) add to this general picture is the specific proposal that in subjunctive Prt languages of the Balkan type, the Prt is connected to the expression of the EPP as a variable. This raises the important question of how Prt is to be construed in contexts that are compatible with a control reading but do not necessitate it – or in contexts which display disjoint reference between the matrix and the embedded subject. We return to this question in the next section.

2.3   Analysis of Aromanian

As a preliminary to the discussion of Aromanian, it is important to note that Aromanian like Albanian has linker structures (Campos 2005, Franco et al. 2015). However unlike Albanian, Aromanian lexically differentiates the subjunctive Prt, namely *si*, from pre-adjectival and pre-genitival Lkrs. In fact the pre-adjectival Lkr, *atseu* etc. as in (51), differs from the pre-genitival linker, which takes the form *o/ali*, also occurring in front of datives, as in (52).[4]

(51)   fitʃor-u   **(a)tse-u**   mar-u
        boy-msg   Lkr-msg   big-msg
        'the big boy'

(52)   a.   libr-a   **o** fitʃor-u/   **ali** fet-i
              book-the   Lkr boy-msg/   Lkr girl-obl.fsg
              'the book of the boy/girl'

        b.   i   o am   datə   **o** fitʃor-u/   **ali**   fet-i
              him   it I.have given   Lkr boy-msg/   Lkr girl-obl.fsg
              'I gave it to the boy/girl'

In section 2.2, the evidence connecting Albanian *të* to Lkr *të* provided us with independent grounds for uncoupling the so-called subjunctive Prts from the I-C (Tense/Mood) system of the sentence – and connecting it to the expression of the variable structure necessary for control. However in Aromanian (as in many other languages, including Romanian or Greek) there is no lexical overlapping between Lkrs and Prts. In fact, nothing that we have said predicts the necessity of this coincidence, merely its possibility. As we have just seen, Pre-adjectival Lkrs differ lexically from pre-genitival ones in Aromanian, though their lexical coincidence is the prevalent attested pattern crosslinguistically. Following Albanian (48), we propose structure (53a) for the preadjectival Lkr in (51) and structure (53b) for the pre-genitival Lkr. On the basis of the structures in (53), the preadjectival and pre-genitival Lkr can be differentiated simply in terms of the structure they select, namely AP and DP respectively.[5]

(53)   a.   [fitʃor [$_D$ u]]   [$_{DP}$ atseu   [$_{AP}$ maru]]
        b.   [libr [$_D$ a]]   [$_{DP}$ o   [$_{DP}$ fitʃoru]]

Let us then consider finite control structures embedding the Prt *si*, for instance (23c), reproduced in (54a) for ease of reference. If we apply point by point the analysis of Albanian (49b) to it, we obtain the structure in (54b), where *si* is assigned the status of D specialized for the context CP/IP. In (54b) the finite verb inflection has a phi-features content sufficient to establish reference to 1st person singular, i.e. the speaker; however the variable structures created by the presence of Prt *si* (here a D element) requires to be satisfied by a matrix argument. The wellformedness of the sentence depends on the features of the matrix argument matching those independently introduced by the embedded finite inflection.

(54)   a.   mini   filli   **s**   lədzɛsk   un libər
              I   began   Prt   I.read   a book

---

[4] Incidentally, the preadjectival Lkr is not present in Romanian; the pre-genitival Lkr is present but with different characteristics. In particular, it does not precede dative complements, and it agrees not with the genitive DP but with the head Noun (as is normal in pre-genitival Lkr structures, cf. also Albanian).

[5] Other factors may play a role, such as the agreement of pre-genitival *o/ali* with the embedded genitive itself, cf. fn. 4.

'I began reading a book'
b.   **í**   filli   [$_{CP}$ [$_D$ si]   C   [$_{IP}$ lədzɛsk un libər

We must now consider the long-delayed question of what happens with Prt complements that can equally receive a control or a non-control reading, or only the latter. Landau (2015) offers the generalization that such complements are selected by propositional attitude verbs, as exemplified in (55a) for English. Even when selecting control complements, propositional attitude verbs have a more complex structure than the control verbs considered so far. This increased complexity is determined by the fact that the left periphery of the sentence hosts a logophoric centre, including crucially a representation of Author (the matrix subject, to whom the propositional content is imputed) and/or Addressee. At the same time, the inner core of the embedded sentence has the same structure as for predication control. Control involves binding of the D_{Author} variable by the matrix Author; the D_{Author} argument can then satisfy the embedded predicate. The *de se* reading effectively corresponds to Author control.

(55)   a.   John intends to visit Athens
        b.   … intends   [$_{CP}$ D_{Author} C   [$_{Fin/RelP}$ D   [Fin/Rel   [$_{TP}$ ~~D~~ to visit…

Landau argues that if the embedded inflection is finite, the type of control seen in (55b), i. e. logophoric control, is impossible – contrary to what happens in predication control. For control to go through, the embedded control structure should be predicated of D_{Author} and the latter bound by the matrix subject – but this is impossible because D_{Author} is already assigned a value by the embedded finite I. Yet, as anticipated in presenting the Aromanian data, the syntactic and interpretive evidence favours the conclusion that control extends to finite complements of attitude verbs – which are in free alternation with infinitival clauses and, as far as we can tell, display the same *de se* interpretation. Therefore, we keep to the fairly standard assumption that control alternates with lack thereof in Prt complements of attitude verbs.

Let us pursue the idea that control complements of attitude verbs, for instance (23a), repeated as (56a) for ease of reference, involve the same structure as we have already seen in (54) above, for control complements of non-attitude verbs. We would like to suggest that predication control is sufficient to establish the *de se* reading, when combined with the intrinsic properties of the subject of attitude verbs, i.e. of representing the holder of the embedded propositional content.

(56)   a.   mini   vrɛm   **s**   o   vədɛm
               I   wanted   Prt   him   I.saw
            'I wanted to see him'
        b.   … vrɛm   [$_{CP}$ [$_D$ s]   C   [$_{IP}$ o vədɛm

The question now is how non-control readings are equally allowed for Prt complements of attitude verbs, as for instance in (24a), reproduced below in (57a); by contrast, any attempt at introducing a non-control reading would result in ungrammaticality with non-attitude main verbs, for instance (54). In both examples, the finite embedded verb inflection is capable of transmitting its full set of phi-features (person, number) to the subject of predication – yet only in (57) does this succeed in establishing reference independently of a matrix argument. Taking Landau's suggestion, we may assume that this has to do with the presence of a referential anchoring centre in the embedded sentence, which we provisionally represent via the category Author in (57b). In the picture we are offering therefore predication control and establishment of a logophoric center are two alternative ways for satisfying the requirements of attitude verbs. In any event, we should stress that we are offering this proposal simply for the sake of completeness. Exactly which properties of the matrix verb (and/or which selected properties of the embedded complement) determine the possibility of disjoint reference in (57) but its impossibility in (54) is largely outside the purview of

the present study, which concerns the contribution make to structural and interpretive properties by sentential introducers of various kinds (complementizers, Prts, etc.).

(57) a. vrɛu   s   u   məkə
        I.wanted   Prt   it   he.eats
        'I wanted him to eat it'
     b. … vrɛu   [D_Author]   [CP [D s]   C   [IP u məkə

From a structural point of view it is important to note that if there is a lexical subject is realized in the embedded sentence, it takes either a left peripheral position, as for instance in (3a) reproduced below in (58a), or a right peripheral position as in (4c), reproduced in (58b). These examples are reproduced in (58) for ease of reference. On the contrary it is impossible for the subject to be positioned between the Prt and the verb. This is hard to explain if the subjunctive Prt is construed as a manifestation of Fin or Mood. On the other hand, it follows under the assumption that the subjunctive Prt introduces an EPP variable, since this excludes that the Spec, IP position could have lexical content. Incidentally, the generalization concerning the position of the lexical subject holds not only in Aromanian, but also in the other languages discussed here (Albanian, Calabrian).

(58) a. vɔi   tsi   tini   z   iɲ   məni
        I.want that you   Prt   come tomorrow
        'I want you to come tomorrow'
     b. eu   vini   dənint tsi   s   vənɛm   mini
        he   came   before that Prt   came   I
        'He came before I came'

In the light of the discussion of control, we may also come back to structures involving the doubling of Prt, as schematized for instance in (34) for Aromanian. The structures in (54), (56)-(57) commit us to identifying at least one of the positions of the subjunctive Prt with the D position available for predication/control. It is natural to assume that the other Prt position is also a D position. Consider for instance example (26d), repeated below as (59a). If the higher copy of *si* instantiates D position within the C domain, the lower copy may simply represent the IP-internal position of the EPP argument, as in (59b).

(59) a. eu   agərʃɛ   **(tsi)**   **si**   **z**   ɣa   kəmɛʃa
        he   forgot   that   Prt   Prt   he.wash   the.shirt
        'He forgot to wash the shirt'
     b. … agərʃɛ   [CP [D si] C   [IP [D z] ɣa kəmɛʃa

In other words, under the account in (59b), the doubling of subjunctive Prts is to be equated to the doubling of subject clitics found in modal environments (e.g. questions), where both the IP-internal clitic positions and the CP-internal clitic positions are realized (see Manzini and Savoia 2005 for examples involving Northern Italian varieties). Under these conditions the negation clitic can also vary between an IP-internal lexicalization and a CP-internal one, as schematized in (60a) for example (26b) and in (60b) for example (26c).

(60) a. …   [CP [D si]   C   [IP [D s] [neg nu]   …
     b. …   [CP [D s] [neg nu]   C   [IP [D s]   …

Recall finally that in section 1 we analysed the *tsi* complementizer of Aromanian as a wh-pronoun, compatible both with a sentential restriction and an individual one. At the same time, we

left the matter open of the form that seems to substitute for *tsi* in the variety of Këllez, namely *ta*. 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, but rather a complementizer, namely an operator introducing a propositional variable. Vice versa, the subjunctive Prts *si* of Aromanian and *s* of Romanian are connected by external evidence to the Latin and Romance *si/se* 'if' element, i.e. the polarity complementizer (Adger and Quer 2001). 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.[6]

2.4   Conclusions

In section 1, we argued that the so-called Romance complementizer, or C_{Force} in the split CP framework of Rizzi (1997), is in reality a wh-pronoun which turns the propositional content into a free relative. There is no sense therefore in which the sentential introducer is the highest functional projection in the sentence. The highest functional projection is the highest position of V, for which we keep the conventional label C (the phase head). In this section, we have seen that subjunctive Prts, which have been argued to represent lower complementizer positions, i.e. C_{Fin} in Rizzi's (1997) schema, are better reanalysed as linker (D) elements connected to the lexicalization of the subject of the sentence. Therefore, the overall picture of sentential organization that we propose is closer to the IP-CP structure of Chomsky (1995) than to more articulated 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 more conservative solutions.

3.   Non-finite complements and Prepositional introducers

3.1   The evidence

In standard Romanian there are two types of non-finite complement sentences, which involve either the so-called short infinitive or the supine. Morphologically, the short infinitive corresponds to the pure verb base, i.e. to the root followed by thematic vowel, while the 'long' infinitive in *–re* has become a de-verbal Noun. The short infinitive can be bare, or it can be preceded by the sentential introducer *a*. Interestingly, Early Romanian had a larger repertory of infinitival structures, since it also admitted of long, i.e. *–re* inflected, infinitives. Furthermore the *de* Preposition could precede *a*+infinitive sequences. In recent literature influenced by Rizzi's (1997) model of the left periphery, the elements *a* and *de* are identified with Fin; where the two co-occur it is assumed that the Fin position splits into two, with the higher Fin taken by *de* and the lower Fin taken by *a* (Hill 2013b).

The second type of non-finite sentential complement in standard Romanian involves the so-called supine. Morphologically, the supine is the perfect participle form, which takes the label supine in that it has an active construal rather than a passive/unaccusative one. In Early Romanian, according to Hill (2013b) "the supine starts in non-finite relatives, expands to predicative BE structures, and displays timid distribution as sentential complement to verbs by the end of the 18th century". Relatives, copular contexts and complements to certain verbs are the three main context

---

[6] Something very similar happens with Ancient Greek *hina* vs. Modern Greek *na* (Roberts and Roussou 2003). The place of the polarity complementizer in Aromanian hypotheticals appears to be taken by *ma*, which is further attested as progressive particle. The English equivalent would be if one expressed hypotheticals by gerunds, e.g. 'you coming, I will wait for you'. In standard Romanian are introduced by a complex form *dac* .

for the supine in standard Romanian as well. All three are introduced by the preposition *de*, which for Hill (2013a), again occupies the Fin position.

    The Aromanian evidence matches Early Romanian more closely than the standard in several respects, for instance in the use of infinitives presenting the pan-Romance infinitival inflection *–r(e)* (so-called long infinitives). In externalist terms, this is particularly notable, in that Aromanian is spoken in contact with languages (Tosk Albanian) that have fully undergone the shift to infinitival-less status. At the same time, Aromanian therefore is far from atypical in the Romance panorama. For instance, the Calabrian varieties with *mu/mi* Prt complements, preserve the morphological infinitive *–re*, typically under modals, and sometimes extended to other obligatory control contexts..

    In Aromanian the long infinitive occurs in many of the contexts which present it in more familiar Romance languages, including complement control clauses of the kind exemplified in (39)-(42) above, where the infinitive alternates with the subjunctive Prt construction. All examples of infinitives display control, either by an antecedent, or so-called arbitrary control (i.e. generic, quantificational reference of the control variable), except for causative embeddings, for instance (62e), (63d). Control environments include complements of aspectual, modal and attitude verbs, as in (39)-(42), (62a-c) and (63a-b), as well as infinitival relatives. In the latter context, the infinitive alternates with the subjunctive Prt construction, as in (61b), (64a). In all instances, the long infinitive is preceded by the Preposition *ti/di*, obviously related to pan-Romance genitive Preposition *di/de* 'of'; in Aromanian, where genitive is a case, the basic meaning of *ti/di* appears to be close to English 'for', as in (61a).

(61) a.   esti   libra   **ti**   tʃələməɲ   **D**
                 is   the.book   for   children
                 'It is the book for children'

      b.   esti pənə   **ti** məkari/**tsi** **s**   məˈkəm
                 is bread   for to.eat/ that Prt   we.eat
                 'there is some bread to eat'

      c.   aist jinu   **esti**   **ti**   vəndɛri
                 that wine   is   for   to.sell
                 'That wine is for selling'

      d.   **vin**   **ti**   vədɛri (atseu)
                 I.came for   to.see   (him)
                 'I came to see him'

(62) a.   **mbari**   **ti**   məkari   **L**
                 I.stopped   for   to.eat
                 'I stopped eating'

      b.   ɲ   ɛr seʃti   **di/ ti**   vədɛri
                 to.me it.likes   for   to.see
                 'I like seeing him'

      c.   ma   tsə   **dzɛk** **di**   fətsɛri
                 Progr to.you I.say   for   to.do
                 'I am telling you to do it'

      d.   esti   unə   kəmiʃa   **di**   ɣari
                 is   a   shirt   for   to.wash
                 'It is a shirt to be washed'

      e.   i-o   fɛtʃ   kəmiʃa   otsui   **di**   ɣari
                 to.him-it   I.made   the.shirt   to.that.one   for   to.wash
                 'I made him wash the shirt'

(63) a.   mini   **viɲ**   **di**   vədɛri (tini)   **F**
                 I   came   for   to.see you
                 'I came to see you'

	b.	eu	**mbari di**	(u) lədzɛri libru					
		he	stopped for	it to.read the.book					
		'He finished reading the book'							
	c.	aist kəmɛʃ	esti	**di**	ɣari				
		this shirt	is	**for**	to.wash				
		'This shirt is to be washed'							
	d.	mini	u	**fak**	**d**	ardɛri			
		I	him	make	for	to.laugh			
		'I made him laugh'							

(64) a. aistə esti jin **ti** (ni) bɛʁi/ **ta** s nu s u bɛm **K**
this is wine for not to.drink/ that Prt not Prt it we.drink
'This is wine not to be drunk'

b. aistə libʁə **esti ti** (ni) kəntaʁi
this book is for not to.read
'This book is not to be read'

The other major non-finite construction of Aromanian employs the perfect participle with active interpretation, i.e. what in Romanian linguistics is known as the supine. This has a much more limited distribution than in standard Romanian, since it is limited to adjuncts introduced by *ni* 'without'. Note that control is not obligatory, as one may expect to be the case in adjuncts, cf. (66a) and Mensching (2000) for cross-Romance comparison. The embedded verbs in (65)-(67) all have the *ót( )* morphology which characterizes the Latin and Romance perfect participle.

(65) a. mini am inʃətə **ni** məkatə **D**
I have gone.out without eaten
'I went out without eating'

b. atseu fudzi **ni** vədzutə (pi mini)
he went without seen (to me)
'He left without seeing me'

(66) a. am fudzit **ni** vənit tini **L**
I.have gone not come you
'I left without you coming'

b. ɲisai **ni** vədzut tini
I.went.out without seen you
'I went out without seeing you'

(67) a. mini iʃɛjə **ni** ti vidzut (tini) **F**
I went.out without you seen (you)
'I went out without seeing you'

b. mini fudzi **ni** məkat (pəni)
I went without eaten (the.bread)
'I left without eating the bread'

(68) a. am iʃatə **ni** durɲit / məkatə pɛna **K**
I.have gone.out not slept / eaten the.bread
'I went out without sleeping/eting the bread'

b. ei fudzire **ni** gʁitə a ɲia
they went without called to me
'They left without calling me'

A close comparison can be run between the Aromanian supine and Tosk Albanian (the language in contact), where the preposition *pa* 'without' also introduces a perfect participle (inflected by –*r* in Albanian), as in (69).

(69)   dɔla   **pa**   ɛ   lar
        I.went.out   without   it   wash
        'I went out without without washing it'   *Gjirokastër*

The data of Geg Albanian (varieties of Northern Albania and the Kosovo) are also worth reporting in this connection. Geg Albanian differs from Tosk Albanian in that perfect participles, embedded under 'have' or 'be' in the perfect tenses, do not present an −*r* inflection, but rather consist of bare verb bases, as in (70). The same form of the verb shows up under the preposition *mɛ* ‑with', in what is traditionally known as *paskajore* 'infinitive', in Albanian linguistics. In essence, the *paskajore* is found under obligatory control and attitude verbs, allowing both control readings, as in (71a-b), and non-control readings, as in (71c). Unsurprisingly, the *paskajore* can be embedded under the preposition *pa* 'without', yielding the equivalent of Tosk Albanian (69a), as in (71d).

(70) a.   ɛ   kan   mlu
            him   they.have   covered
            'They have covered him'
      b.   ɛ   kam   lɒ
            him   I.have washed
            'I have washed him'
(71) a.   i   kam   ɒ̃:n   m   u   mlu
            to.him   I.have said   to   MP   cover
            'I told him to cover himself'
      b.   **du**   **mɛ** ɛ   lɒ
            I.want   to   him/her   wash
            'I want to wash him/her'
      c.   **doin**   (tʃi)   **mɛ**   ɒ:ɾð   ata
            they.want   that   to   come   they
            'They want to come'
      d.   dɔla   **pɒ**   u   la:
            I.went.out without   MP   wash
            'I went out without washing myself'   *Shkodër*

In short, the varied repertory of non-finite embedding that we have now reviewed involve participial forms, infinitival forms and bare verb bases; despite the differences they share the property of being introduced by Prepositions. These include in particular *di/ti* 'of' in front of the long infinitive in Aromanian, and *ni* 'without' in front of the perfect participle (supine).

3.2   *Prepositions as sentential introducers*

Rizzi (1997) for Italian proposes that Prepositional introducers should be identified with complementizers, and specifically C_Fin. A similar proposal is elaborated by Hill (2013) for Romanian, who argues that Fin should be split into two positions to account for sequences *de a* in Early Romanian. This solution is natural within a cartographic account of the left periphery, but once we reduce finite complementizers to wh- pronouns (section 1) and subjunctive Prts to D linker-like elements (section 2), it would be strange if we had to revert to C for the sentential introducers that most obviously belong to a different category than C, namely P. If on simplicity grounds we reject the conclusion that elements like Aromanian *ti/di* bear the double categorization P and C (Fin), then we are faced with the question why certain Prepositions can and must embed non-finite complements.

In order to answer this question, we must go back to the proposal of section 1, that so-called complementizers are in reality wh- pronouns. What we have failed to address 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 format 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 verbal 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 from Indo-Aryan or from Turkish (Kornfilt 1997). Similarly, in the perspective of section 1, 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; the same is true of Manzini and Savoia's (2011) approach where the embedded complement is effectively a free relative.

The question then arises why nominalization would be necessary for propositional embedding. The standard minimalist theory of argument embedding provides a fairly intuitive answer to this question – which, as we will see, also yields an insight into why Prepositions should be found as sentential introducers. 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, licencing accusative Case– the external argument agrees with I licencing 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 – on the 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, as in (72).

(72)   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.

This does not yet tell us anything about the Prepositional introducers that are obligatory in order to embed infinitival sentences in Romance. The last decade of studies on the internal structure of complex PPs (Svenonius 2006) has clarified the different roles of lexical elements generically classified as Ps within such structures. The P elements that we have seen to introduce infinitival and participial clauses in Romance and Albanian are all oblique Case markers – belonging to what is sometimes notated as a K category. Now, note that the standard minimalist Case licencing via Agree only applies to direct cases; oblique cases (genitive, dative, instrumental) are not covered by this mechanism. In other words, oblique embedding does not fall under (72). Therefore we propose that in the Romance languages (in Geg Albanian etc.) one way to get around the impossibility of licencing sentential constituents via Agree is to turn sentences, specifically non-finite (infinitival, participial) sentence into obliques – by introducing them with Prepositions 'of' (genitive), 'to' (dative), 'with' (instrumental).

Though the matter was left implicit in section 1, it appears that complementation via a wh-propositional pronoun, i.e. via relativization, is restricted to finite sentences. However there is no necessary connection between the obliquization strategy, i.e. P introducers, and non-finite complements – it is just a preferential route (for Romance).[7] A case in point is Early Romanian, as

---

[7] The cropping up of oblique Prepositions in front of the infinitive reminds us of the fact that external evidence connects Indo-European infinitival morphology to the oblique forms of a verbal noun (e.g. Szemerényi 1999: 324-325).

illustrated by Hill (2013b), where the *de* preposition could also precede finite complements, as in (73). As noted by Hill (2013) in Early Romanian *de* "heads possessives, complements of origin, 'by' phrases, complements of location", establishing its bona fide P categorization (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin et al. 2013 on standard Romanian).

(73)   au poruncitŭ   de au fǎcut   un sicreiu
        has ordered   of have made a coffin
        'He has ordered them to make a coffin'   (Hill 2013b)

Sardinian varieties (Jones 1993) provide an interesting example of complement sentences which can equally be introduced by a *k-* complementizer or by a preposition, namely so-called inflected infinitives, as illustrated in (74).

(74)   l an   fattu innantis dɛ/ki ɛnnɛrɛ-çɛ
        it they.have   done before   of/that come-2sg
        'They did it before you came'   *Dorgali* (Sardinia)

Let us then provisionally conclude that the apparent complementary distribution of *k-* and Prepositional introducers in finite and non-finite sentence is the product of external factors, rather than of internal necessity. Other problems arise for the proposal that Prepositional introducers really belong to the category P – and more specifically that they are enlisted as oblique case assigners. For instance, we may expect *di/de* or *a* sentential complements in Romance to be resumed in the same way as ordinary *di/de-DP* or *a*-DP expressions. Indeed *di/de*-CP and *di/de*-DPs can be resumed by accusative clitics, as exemplified by Italian (75) – though resumption by partitive/genitive *ne* is only possible in for *di/de*-DPs. In (76) an *a*-CP complement can be resumed by a locative clitic, as an inanimate *a*-DP object – though it is not clear why the latter is more easily resumed by a dative.

(75)   a.   Ne/la troverò,   dell'acqua
              of.it/it I.will.find   of.the water
              'I will find water'
        c.   *Ne/lo penso, di essere malato
              of.it/it I.think of to.be sick
              'I think I am sick'
(76)   a.   Ce/?*glie   l'   ho   costretto, ad andarci
              to.it   him   I.have forced to   go-there
              'I forced him to go there'
        b.   Ci/?gli ho   dato   una stirata alla camicia
              to.it   I.have given   an ironing to.the shirt
              'I gave an ironing to the shirt'

Another potential source of problems has to do with subject sentences. To the extent that they can surface bare in languages like Italian (77a) we must perhaps invoke their Topic status. Vice versa, we do expect subject sentences to be able to appear preceded by oblique case-markers to the extent that they may be construed as quirky subjects. This is likely to be what happens in the impersonal passive in (77b).

(77)   a.   Mangiare bene è importante
              to.eat well   is important
              'It is important to eat well'
        b.   *(Di) aver parlato   è stato confessato   solo da Paolo
              of   to.have talked has been confessed   only by P

'Only Paolo confessed speaking'

In other words, it seems to us that there no obvious grounds for dismissing the idea that Prepositions introducing non-finite sentences in Romance are anything other than the genitive, dative, etc. case markers that also appear in front of DPs. In the present account, the bases for such a construct are posed by the Agree Resistance principle in (72), which can be circumvented either by nominalizing complement sentences – or else by rendering them as obliques. In any event, in evaluating the proposal that Prepositional introducers do belong to the category P and specifically contribute oblique case (genitive, dative, instrumental) to the embedded sentence, we should also consider what the available alternatives are. As mentioned in introducing the data, the leading alternative is that elements such *de/di, a* lexicalize C positions, perhaps Fin in an articulated left periphery of the type proposed by Rizzi (1997). This is equivalent to saying that these elements systematically belong to two categories, namely C and P. The question then is why this is so. Asking why certain lexical elements (always case assigners) can be merged as both P and C amounts to seeking what properties P and C may have in common. In other words, even in a grammaticalization perspective one must eventually propose why P properties make our introducers likely candidates for Fin. As far as we can tell, the literature treating Ps as complementizers provides no answer.

4.   Conclusions

In what precedes, we considered in some detail the complementation system of Aromanian – which has also led us to review similar facts of other Romance languages and of the language spoken in contact with Aromanian, namely Albanian. As we noted at the end of section 2, the overall picture of sentential organization that we propose is closer to the IP-CP structure of Chomsky (1995) than to more articulated cartographic proposals. In the studies available within the split CP model of the left periphery, the sentential introducers of Aromanian would find a natural collocation either as exponents of C_{Force} (finite complementizers) or as exponents of C_{Fin} (subjunctive Prts, Prepositional introducers), eventually requiring certain refinements in the hierarchy.

We have proposed a different picture, where sentential introducers provide a response to the difficulty of embedding sentential (CP) as opposed to nominal (DP) content in argument position. These responses are of two main type in Romance. In section 1, we argued that the Romance *k*-complementizers are wh-pronouns which turn propositional contents into free relatives, effectively nominalizing them. This allows the relativized sentence to be embedded in ordinary object and subject position, circumventing the Agree Resistance Theorem formulated in (72). In section 3, we have concluded that a different strategy is employed with non-finite complements (infinitive, participles), namely obliquization. The Prepositional introducers of Romance are not only Ps, but in fact case markers, exactly as in their occurrences embedding a DP. Making a sentential content into an oblique is a different way of excluding it from the consequences of the Agree Resistance Theorem.

Finally, in section 2 we considered as set of sentential introducers that characterize Balkan/Romance languages 'without infinitives', or more properly, with control into finite ('subjunctive') sentences. Following Manzini and Savoia (2007) on Albanian, we proposed that in Aromanian as well, Prts are neither a Mood projection of the verb, nor are they complementizers of sort. Rather they should be connected to the linkers system and recognized as D(-related) categories, introducing the EPP argument as a variable and allowing control by a matrix argument.

References

Adger, David, Quer, Joseph. 2001. The syntax and semantics of unselected embedded questions. *Language* 77: 107-133.

Arsenijević, Boban. 2009. Clausal complementation as relativization. *Lingua* 119, 39-50.

Bayer, Josef. 2001. Two grammars in one: Sentential complements and complementizers in Bengali and other South Asian languages. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages: Tokyo Symposium on South Asian Languages - Contact, Convergence and Typology,* P. Bhaskarorao and K. V. Subbarao (eds.), New Delhi: Sage Publications, 11-36.

Besten, Hans den. 1984. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules, in W. Abraham (ed.), *On the formal syntax of West-Germania*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 47-131.

Boeckx, Cedric, Hornstein, Norbert. 2006. The virtues of control as movement. In Davies and Dubinsky (eds.) *Special Issue on Raising and Control. Syntax* 9.2

Bresnan, Joan. 1972. *Theory of complementation in English syntax*. Ph. D. Dissertation, MIT; Cambridge, Mass.

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

Campos, Hector. 2008. Some notes on adjectival articles in Albanian. *Lingua* 119, 1009-1034.

Campos, Hector, Stavrou, Melita, 2005. Polydefinites in Greek and Aromanian. In: Tomić, O. M. (Ed.), *Balkan syntax and semantics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 137–173.

Chierchia Gennaro. 1984. *Topics in the syntax and semantics of infinitives and gerunds*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Dikken, Marcel den, Singhapreecha, P., 2004. Complex Noun Phrases and linkers. *Syntax* 7, 1–54.

Dikken, Marcel den, 2006. *Relators and linkers*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

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

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, Nedelcu, Isabela, Giurgea, Ion. 2013. Genitive DPs and pronominal possessors. In: Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin and Ion Giurgea (Eds) *A Reference Grammar of Romanian: Volume 1: The noun phrase*, pp. 309–354. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Franco, Ludovico, Manzini, M. Rita, Savoia, Leonardo M. 2015. Linkers and agreement. *The Linguistic Review* 32: 277–332

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

Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. The syntax of MCP: Deriving the truncation account. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman, Rachel Nye. *Main Clause Phenomena*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 547-621.

Hill, Virginia 2013a. The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive. *The Linguistic Review* 30: 547–583

Hill, Virginia. 2013b. The emergence of the Romanian supine. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 2

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96

Jordan, Maria 2009. *Loss of infinitival complementation in Romanian diachronic syntax*, Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Florida

Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kallulli, Dalina. 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* 235-264. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Kayne, Richard 1976. French relative "que". *Current Studies in Romance Linguistics*, Fritz Hensey and Marta Luján (eds.), Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 255–299.

Kayne, Richard. 2010. *Comparisons and contrasts*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 190-227.

Kornfilt, Jaklyn.1997. *Turkish*. London: Routledge

Landau Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 811-87

Landau Idan. 2006. Severing the distribution of PRO from Case. In Davies and Dubinsky (eds.) *Special Issue on Raising and Control. Syntax* 9.2

Landau Idan. 2013. *Control in generative grammar. A research companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Landau Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

Larson, Richard, Yamakido, H. 2008. Ezafe and the deep position of nominal modifiers. In: McNally, L., Kennedy, C. (Eds.), *Adjectives and adverbs. Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 43-70.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: La doppia serie di complementatori, *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 27: 89-147.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2005. Moving Through the Left Periphery: The Dual Complementiser System in the Dialects of Southern Italy, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103: 339-96.

Lekakou, Marika, Szendrői, Kriszta. 2012. Polydefinites in Greek: Ellipsis, close apposition and expletive determiners. *Journal of Linguistics* 48, 107-149.

Manzini, M. Rita 2009. 'Pro, pro and NP-trace (raising) are interpretations', in K. Grohmann (ed.), *Phase theory: Features, Arguments, Interpretations*. Amsterdam/Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 131-180.

Manzini M. Rita, Roussou Anna. 2000. A minimalist theory of A-movement and control. *Lingua* 110: 409-447

Manzini, M. R., Savoia. L. M. 2003. The nature of complementizers. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 28, 87–110.

Manzini, M. Rita, Savoia. Leonardo M. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa.* Alessandria: Ed. dell'Orso

Manzini, M. Rita, Savoia. Leonardo M. 2007. *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax. Investigations into Romance and Albanian dialects*. Routledge, London.

Manzini, M. Rita, Savoia. Leonardo M. 2011. *Grammatical Categories*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Mensching, Guido. 2000. *Infinitive Constructions with specified subjects*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Neeleman, Ad, van de Koot, Hans. 2006. Syntactic Haplology. In Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdjik (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax,* Vol. IV. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 684-710.

Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering Trees*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Riemsdijk, Henk van. 2008. Identity Avoidance: OCP-effects in Swiss Relatives. In: Freidin, R., Otero, C. P., Zubizarreta, M. L. (Eds.), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 227-250.

Rivero, Maria-Luisa. 1994. Clause structure and V-Movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 63-120

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery, in L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281-337

Roberts, Ian, Roussou, Anna. 2003. *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenbaum, Peter. 1967. *The grammar of English complement constructions*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press

Santorini, Beatrice. 1989. *The generalization of the Verb-Second Constraint in the History of English*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Svenonius, Peter. 2006. The emergence of axial parts. *Nordlyd* 33. 1–22.

Stowell, Timothy. 1981. *Origins of phrase structure*. Ph. D. Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Szemerényi, Oswald. 1999. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Williams, Edwin. 1981. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203-238

Yip, Moira. 1998. Identity Avoidance in Phonology and Morphology. In: Lapointe S. G., Brentari D. K., Farrell, M. (Eds.), *Morphology and Its Relation to Phonology and Syntax*. CSLI Stanford, CA, pp. 216-246.