

# A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ROMANIAN AND SOUTHERN ITALIAN UNTENSED FINITE CLAUSES

ANNA CARDINALETTI, GIULIANA GIUSTI<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** The paper compares the Balkan phenomenon known as “infinitival loss” in two varieties of Romance that have not been in direct contact, i.e., Romanian and some southern Italian dialects. The aim is to investigate how the Romance clausal structure realizes a phenomenon that does not generally appear in Romance. We focus on two main properties: the fine structure of the complementizer field, with left-dislocated elements sandwiched between two overt complementizers, and that of the inflectional field, in which clitic pronouns and clausal negation adjoin to Tense and Mood, respectively. The differences between the two varieties of Romance are reduced to the different first-merge positions of the particles characterizing untensed finite clauses. Comparison with Romanian permits a better understanding of the southern Italian dialects, which show micro-variation and optionality in the position of complementizers and particles and the realization of negation.

**Keywords:** Romanian, southern Italian dialects, infinitival loss, mood, complementizer, negation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It is well-known that some Italian dialects spoken in southern Calabria, north-eastern Sicily, and Apulia display a finite complement clause in contexts in which the other Italian varieties present an infinitive. The phenomenon is often referred to as “infinitival loss” or better “unpopularity of the infinitive” (cf. Rohlfs 1969: 102–106), since these varieties do display infinitival clauses in other contexts or sometimes even in the same contexts (Manzini and Savoia 2005: 650–652, Ledgeway, this volume). “Infinitival loss” is a well-known property that defines Balkan languages (Joseph 1983, Tomić 2006), such as Greek, the Tosk varieties of Albanian, Bulgarian and Romanian, the latter being a Romance language that unlike other Balkan languages, but similar to the southern Italian varieties, also displays infinitives (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Hill and Alboiu 2016). Despite these similarities with Romanian, southern Italian dialects are traditionally compared to Greek, which was a prestige language in ancient times and is still present in the area. This line of research, stemming from extended work by Rohlfs, focuses on diachronic issues arising

---

<sup>1</sup> Ca’ Foscari University of Venice, cardin@unive.it, giusti@unive.it. Although this paper has been written with four hands, to comply with criteria imposed by our department on the evaluation of research, A. Cardinaletti is responsible for the abstract and sections 2, 3, and 6, G. Giusti is responsible for sections 1,4,5,7 and the references.

from contact (cf. Ledgeway 1998, 2013, De Angelis 2017a,b, among many others). The contact between some Calabrian dialects and Arbëresh has also been investigated (Manzini and Savoia 1999, 2005). To our knowledge, an explicit comparative analysis of southern Italian dialects and Romanian has not been entertained beyond and above the contact issue. Comparative observations about the particles introducing the finite complements are found only *in passim* (e.g. Ledgeway 2003 [2004]: 25, 26, 44 n. 58; 2005: 366; 2013: 22; 2016: 1023–1027). This short paper aims at filling this gap, focusing on the similarities and differences arising in the distribution of the mood particles Rom. *să* vs. s.It. *mu/mi/ma* and their variants with respect to the subject, the clitic pronouns, and the clausal negation. We refine a previous proposal by Cardinaletti and Giusti (2020), which argued for the clausal status of the finite complement clause (as opposed to pseudo-coordinations which also appear in some of these varieties), and suggest a more articulated structure of such clausal complements in cartographic terms. In this paper, we focus on the dialects spoken in southern Calabria and north-eastern Sicily.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. THE PARALLEL DATA

In Romanian, both control (1a) and non-control (1b) complement clauses to verbs like “want” are finite and contain a subjunctive verb introduced by the particle *să*.

- (1) a. Voia    *să*        ia    o carte.  
 want-3sg-past-ind                                      PRT     take-3sg-pres-subj                                      a book  
 ‘S/he wanted to take a book.’
- b. Voia    ca Ion     *să*        ia    o carte.  
 want-3sg-past-ind                                      CA Ion PRT     take-3sg-pres-subj a book  
 ‘S/he wanted Ion to take a book.’ (Hill 2002: 226)

In the southern Italian dialects where this construction is present, the embedded verb does not display tense distinctions, on a par with Romanian; but unlike Romanian, it is in the indicative Mood.<sup>3</sup> The examples in (2a) and (3a) are presented compared with their

---

<sup>2</sup> This work is part of the VariOpInTA project (Variation and Optionality in Italo-Romance) developed in the framework of the Department of Excellence project <https://www.unive.it/pag/40760> awarded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research to the Department of Linguistics and Comparative Cultural Studies of Ca’ Foscari University of Venice (2018-2022).

The paper is dedicated to Virginia Hill, an old friend of ours since our early research stay at the University of Geneva in the late 80s and an inspiring colleague ever since.

We thank Alessandro De Angelis and Adam Ledgeway for having thoroughly commented a previous version of the paper and the editors for their helpful improvements. All remaining errors are of course our own.

<sup>3</sup> The dialects analysed here do not have the present subjunctive mood and do not oppose subjunctive to indicative (Rohlf 1969: 61-62, Manzini and Savoia 2005: 653). In the construction under consideration, the same verbal form is used as in other finite complements, namely indicative.



- b. Speram ca, la examen, nimănuî să nu  
 hope-1sg-past-ind CA in exam nobody-dat PRT not  
 i se ceară legitimația (Hill, Alboiu 2016: 264)  
 him-dat=refl=ask-3sg-pres-subj ID  
 ‘I was hoping that, at the exam, nobody would be asked for their ID.’

- (5) ForceP TopicP FocusP FinP NegP ...  
 ca/să să

In (4) we observe that Force can (4a) or must (4b) be realized by *ca* when the left periphery is activated. This also happens with preverbal subjects. As we have seen in (1b), when *să* is preceded by the subject, the complementizer *ca* must be present (at least in some registers and for some speakers and obligatorily so in the standard). If *ca* is absent, the subject must occur postverbally.

- (6) Speram (?\*Victor) să sosească  
 hope-1sg-past-ind (Victor) PRT arrive-3sg-pres-subj  
 (Victor) mâine (Hill, Alboiu 2016: 264)  
 (Victor) tomorrow  
 ‘I hope Victor will arrive tomorrow.’

According to Hill and Alboiu (2016), the subject preceding *să* in (1b) is in a left-peripheral position, either Focus or Topic. When the left periphery is activated, Force is preferably realized, thus the marginality or ungrammaticality of the preverbal subject in (6). This proposal is cast in the generally shared analysis that VSO is the unmarked order in Romanian (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin 1994) as well as in the whole Balkan area (cf. Rivero 1994, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998). VSO is derived by V-to-T movement across the VP-internal subject.

Examples like (3a), in which the subject precedes the particle *mu* but no complementizer appears, may at first sight suggest that the only difference between southern Italian dialects and Romanian is that Force may not be realized in these dialects. However, a more detailed analysis is needed which takes into account the fact that in these dialects, a preverbal subject is not necessarily left-dislocated and the unmarked order is SVO, as in Italian.

Following Cardinaletti (2004), we take preverbal overt subjects to occur in a dedicated position, SpecSubjP. This position is the highest of the inflectional field, thus lower than FinP, which functions as the hinge between the complementizer and the inflectional field (Rizzi 1997). If this assumption is correct, the particle that follows a non-dislocated subject must necessarily be located in a position different from Fin and belonging to the inflectional field. We take it to be a Mood position, as in Rivero’s (1994) and Hill’s (2002) previous analyses of Romanian *să* (see Damonte 2011; also see Ledgeway 1998 for the proposal that *mu* fills the same [–T] head as the infinitival marker). This proposal captures the fact that Mood is a property of the clausal inflection. This proposal, which is illustrated in the cartography in (7), is a refinement of the simplified structure presented in Cardinaletti and Giusti (2020: 127).

- (7) ForceP TopicP FocusP TopicP FinP SubjP MoodP TP VP

The combination of Hill and Alboiu's (2016) hypothesis in (5) and our proposal in (7) implies that two positions are available for mood particles, Fin and Mood. This is consistent with Rizzi's (1997) seminal proposal of having a finiteness head in the complementizer field that shares the values of the features of the inflectional field.

The feature sharing between Fin and Mood captures the fact that in some Calabrian dialects, two particles can appear in one and the same clause, one preceding and the other following the subject, as shown in examples (8a) and (8b).<sup>5</sup>

- (8) a. *vʊɛʎʎu*                      *mu*      *iɖɖu*      (*mu*) *'vɛna*  
 want-1sg-pres-ind              PRT      he      (PRT) come-3sg-pres-ind  
 (Conflenti, CZ, M&S 663)
- b. *'vɔʎʎu*                      *mu*      *'hratti-ta*              *mu 'vɛna*  
 want-1sg-pres-ind              PRT      brother-your              PRT come-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I want him/your brother to come.'  
 (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)

Recall that *să* doubling is also found in Romanian (4a). While in Romanian, the higher *să* is in Force, it is less straightforward to decide where the doubled segments are placed in (8). Given that in Manzini and Savoia's (2005) corpus, only the subject appears sandwiched between them, and given that we see no compelling reason to assume that the subject is left-peripheral in all cases, we suggest that the two instances of *mu* occur in Fin and Mood, respectively. In (8a), the occurrence in Fin makes the lower copy in Mood optionally silent. If this is the case, the parallel with Romanian is that the particle which is realized is the one in Fin, while the copy (higher in Romanian, lower in Italian) is optional. The data from Gizzeria however show that either particle can be silent (fn. 5).

*Mu* can also occur in a higher position. Clear evidence for *mu* in Force is provided by (9), where *mu* precedes left-dislocated objects.<sup>6</sup>

- (9) a. *'vɔʎʎu*                      *mu*      *a 'pasta* *s a 'mɔɖʒanu*  
 want-1sg-pres-ind              PRT      the pasta refl=it=eat-3pl-pres-ind  
 'I want them to eat pasta.'  
 (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)
- b. *tʃaju*                      *'ðittu mu*              *a 'karne un*  
 him-dat=have-1sg-pres-ind told PRT              the meat NEG  
*s a 'mɔɖʒa*  
 refl=it=eat-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I told him not to eat meat.'  
 (Platania, CZ, M&S 664)

Consider now the examples in (10), where *mu* follows the left-dislocated object and builds minimal pairs with the examples in (9).

- (10) a. *'vɔʎʎu*                      *a 'pasta mu*              *s a 'mɔɖʒanu*  
 want-1sg-pres-ind              the pasta PRT              refl=it=eat-3pl-pres-ind  
 'I want them to eat pasta.'  
 (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)

<sup>5</sup> While (8a) is given by Manzini and Savoia with the lower particle in parentheses, (8b) is given with two other alternatives, where either particle is not realized.

<sup>6</sup> Adam Ledgeway p.c. notes that Gizzeria, Platania and Conflenti (cf. ex. (11a) below) are on the infinitive vs *mu/ma/mi* border in Calabria in which *mu* can be found in Force alongside with *ca*.

- b. tʃaju                      'ðittu a 'karne mu                      un  
 him-dat=have-1sg-pres-ind told the meat PRT                      NEG  
 s a 'maɲdʒa  
 refl=it=eat-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I told him not to eat meat.'                      (Platania, CZ, M&S 664)

These data show that in these dialects, the presence of left-dislocated constituents does not necessarily require the realization of Force, differently from what we have seen in Romanian. Interestingly, in the dialects in which the double realization of *mu* is possible, such as Gizzeria, particle-doubling is only found with the subject (see (8b)), but not with a left-dislocated constituent. If it turns out that this is not an accidental gap in Manzini and Savoia's corpus, it can be taken to show that particle doubling only occurs in Fin and Mood.

Of course, we do not exclude the possibility that the subject is left-dislocated. In fact, the subject may be just preceded or just followed by *mu* in the variants in (8b), parallel to what we found with unequivocally dislocated objects in (9)–(10).

In some southern Calabrian dialects, the high *mu* in Force covaries with the complementizer *ka*, as in the examples in (11), providing a further parallel with the Romanian example (4a).

- (11) a. 'suɲɲu                      kun'tiəntu                      ka                      frat-tta                      (mu)  
 be-1sg-pres-ind happy                      KA                      brother-your                      (PRT)  
 um 'bena  
 NEG come.3sg-pres-ind  
 'I'm happy that your brother is not coming.'                      (Conflenti, CZ, M&S 663)
- b. ε 'miəllu                      (ka)                      il|i                      mu                      u                      llju 'hanu  
 be-3sg-pres-ind (KA) they                      PRT                      NEG                      it=have-3pl-pres-ind  
 'It's better that they don't have it.'                      (Platania, CZ, M&S 661)

In conclusion, both Romanian and these southern Calabrian dialects display untensed finite complements. Two differences emerge, a morphological one (subjunctive vs. indicative) and a syntactic one (the partially different position of the particles). We have observed that these particles realize heads of the functional spine and can appear in three positions, Force, Fin, and Mood, that is, the higher and the lower functional heads of the complementizer system and the highest head of the verbal inflection. This is because these positions share the [-T] features that characterize this clause type. The variation and optionality in the realization of the particles are therefore expected as the result of micro-parameters. This is in fact the point of the extended work on the parametric change in the complementizer system from old to modern Romanian carried out by Hill and Alboiu (2016).

In what follows, we check our hypothesis on the syntactic position of the particle taking into consideration the distribution of clitic pronouns and clausal negation in section 4 and section 5, respectively.

#### 4. THE POSITION OF CLITIC PRONOUNS

A strong similarity between Romanian and southern Italian dialects is that the clitic pronouns occur in the same position as they do in tensed clauses, namely before the finite verb.<sup>7</sup> Clitics thus appear between the mood particle and the finite verb. We provide the relevant examples in (12a) for Romanian and in (12b) for the Calabrian dialect of San Pietro a Maida (this order is also shown by the examples (9), (10), and (11b) above).

- (12) a. Nu ştiu                                cui                                să-i  
 not know 1sg-pres-ind    whom-dat                                PRT=him-dat  
 trimit                                scrisorile.  
 send-1sg-pres-ind letters-the  
 ‘I don’t know who to send the letters to.’ (adapted from Hill and Tomić 2009:201)
- b. ‘vuɛjju                                mu                                lu ‘vijju  
 want-1sg-pres-ind                                PRT    him=see-1sg-pres-ind  
 ‘I want to see him.’    (San Pietro a Maida, CZ, M&S 653)

In both Romanian and the southern Italian dialects, we take clitic pronouns to be adjoined to the finite verb in T. Independently of the position occupied by the mood particles (in either Fin or Mood), they will invariably precede the clitics.

#### 5. THE POSITION OF THE CLAUSAL NEGATION

In Romanian, the clausal negation follows the particle *să* (13a) and precedes clitic pronouns (13b), as in all finite contexts.

- (13) a. Zicea                                ca Ion    să                                nu                                mai                                plece                                la câmp.  
 say-3sg-past-ind    CA Ion    PRT    NEG    more    go-3sg-pres-subj to field  
 ‘S/he said that Ion should not go in the field.’    (Hill 2002: 229)
- b. Zicea                                ca (pe Maria)    să                                n-o mai                                invite.  
 say-3sg-past-ind    CA (ACC Maria)    PRT    NEG her=more    invite-3sg-pres-subj  
 ‘S/he said that s/he should not invite Maria any more.’ (adapted from Hill 2002: 230)

In the Italian dialects, the position of the clausal negation with respect to the mood particle is instead subject to variation. Some southern Calabrian and north-eastern Sicilian dialects display the same pattern as Romanian, namely the order ‘*mi/mu* - neg’. This order is found with both null subjects (14a) and overt subjects (14b).

- (14) a. t’aiu    dittu mu                                un                                me chiamano  
 you-dat=have-1sg-pres-ind said PRT                                NEG    me=call-3pl-pres-ind  
 ‘I told you they shouldn’t call me.’    (Platania, CZ, M&S 660)

---

<sup>7</sup> We abstract away from the intricate variation that is found with different verb forms and different clitics in Romanian.

- b. [bbas'tja:nɔ      'vɔ:li                      ma'ri:ɑ mi nɔn  
 Bastiano              want-3sg-pres-ind              Maria PRT NEG  
 si ma'ri:ta]  
 refl=marry-3sg-pres-ind  
 'Bastiano doesn't want Maria to get married' (Messina, De Angelis 2017b: 147)

Other southern Calabrian and north-eastern Sicilian dialects display the opposite pattern 'neg - *mi/mu*', as shown in examples (15). We provide examples with a null subject in (15a) and an overt subject in (15b).

- (15) a. vu'ria                      nɔ              mi              'mɑntʃunu  
 want-1sg-pres-cond              NEG              PRT              eat-3pl-pres-ind  
 'I would like for them not to eat.' (Mandanici, ME, M&S 660)  
 b. 'vuɛʝju                      'tuni              'nɔ              mmu              'niʒʃʃi  
 want-1sg-pres-cond              you              NEG              PRT              go-out-2sg-pres-ind  
 'I don't want you to go out.' (Arena, VV, M&S 663)

In order to analyse these negative sentences, the projection of the clausal negation is to be added to the cartographic structure provided in (7). Following Hill and Tomić (2009), we suggest that NegP is located between MoodP and TP. The position of the clausal negation above TP is consistent with Hill and Alboiu's (2016) proposal seen in (5) above:

- (16) FinP    SubjP    MoodP    NegP    TP    VP

The configurations in (5) and (16) directly derive the order 'particle – negation' in both Romanian and the dialects represented in (14). In this order, the particle and the clausal negation are independent from one another, as confirmed by the fact that they may appear at different sides of the subject. In both (17a), parallel to (14), and (17b), negation is in the Neg head, while *mu* occurs in different positions, Mood and Fin (or Force), respectively.

- (17) a. vɔ'lera                      'hrati-ta              mu              unn  
 want-1sg-pres-cond              brother-your              PRT              NEG  
 ɛʃʃɛra (Platania, CZ, M&S 664)  
 go-out-3sg-pres-cond  
 b. vɔ'lera                      mu              'hrati-ta              unn  
 want-1sg-pres-cond              PRT              brother-your              NEG  
 ɛʃʃɛra (Platania, CZ, M&S 664)  
 go-out-3sg-pres-cond  
 'I would like for your brother not to go out.'

Example (18), from the same dialect, shows that clitic pronouns (left-adjoined to T) always follow the negation, while *mu* may be higher than the subject, as in (17b).

- (18) ɛ 'miɔʎʎu    mu    iʎʎi    u    ʎʎu 'hanu (Platania, CZ, M&S 664)  
 is better    PRT    they    NEG    it=do-3pl-pres-ind  
 'It's better they don't do it.'



In the dialect of Conflenti, where a high and a low *mu* can co-occur (see example (8a) above), the negation follows the lowest particle.

- (19) *suŋŋu*                      *kun'tiəntu*                      *mu*                      *frati-tta*                      (mu)                      *um*  
 be-1sg-pres-ind                      happy                      PRT                      brother-your                      (PRT)                      NEG  
 'bəna  
 come-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I'm happy that your brother is not coming.'
- (Conflenti, CZ, M&S 663)

We take the opposite order 'neg - particle' to be derived by left-adjunction of the negation to the particle (as suggested by Ledgeway 1998: 27 and Damonte 2008: 91-92, 2011: 233 with different implementations). This is supported by the observation that the negation and the particle form a cluster which may appear in higher syntactic positions than Mood. In addition to the order seen in (15b), in which *nɔ mu* follows the subject (20a), the cluster *nɔ mu* may precede the subject, as in (20b). In (20b), we take *nɔ mu* to have raised to Fin across the overt subject in specSubjP<sup>8</sup>.

- (20) a. 'vɔλλu                      'hratti-ta                      nɔ                      mu  
 want-1sg-pres-ind brother-your                      NEG                      PRT  
 'vena  
 come-3sg-pres-ind  
 (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)
- b. 'vɔλλu                      nɔ                      mu 'hratti-ta  
 want-1sg-pres-ind                      NEG                      PRT brother-your  
 'vena  
 come-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I want your brother not to come.'
- (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)

Our hypotheses predict that the order '*mi/mu* - neg' is never found in a position preceding the subject, as appears to be the case from the data found in the literature. On the one hand, the cartography in (16) setting NegP below Mood predicts that negation follows both the subject and the particle. On the other hand, the proposal that the order 'neg - *mi/mu*' is derived by left-adjointing the negation to the mood particle (reversing the order in the clausal spine) predicts that this cluster is not only found after the subject but also in the higher positions in which a copy of the particle can appear.

Note that the difference in the first-merge position of the particles in Romanian vs. the southern Italian dialects considered here predicts that the particle *să* cannot cluster with the clausal negation. Being in the complementizer field, the particle in Fin cannot be a target for cliticization. The order 'negation - *să*' is indeed not attested.

Finally, consider (21), where the cluster *nɔ mu* appears in a position preceding the subject, as in (20b), and co-occurs with a copy of the particle in Mood with no negation.

- (21) 'vɔλλu                      nɔ                      mu                      'tu mu                      veni (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)  
 want-1sg-pres-ind                      NEG                      PRT                      you PRT                      come-2sg-pres-ind  
 'I want you not to come.'

<sup>8</sup> Given what we said in section 3, the cluster *nɔ mu* may also have raised to Force. This is irrelevant to the point made here. In section 6, we present some evidence which supports further movement of the cluster to Force.

We discard the otherwise unmotivated hypothesis that a Neg head can be merged above Fin. We suggest that the cluster *no mu* raises to a position preceding the subject (Fin or Force), as in (20b), leaving a copy in Mood. The two copies of the particle can both be realized, as already seen in (19). What is left to be motivated is the lack of the negation in the copy in Mood. Given that the realization of the same bundle of features in two positions is at odds with general principles of economy, we propose that in (21), the lower copy of the cluster is realized in a defective way and in fact can also be silent, as in (20b).<sup>9</sup>

In conclusion, there is a crucial difference between the two orders ‘particle – negation’ and ‘negation – particle’ found in southern Italian dialects. In the former order, the particle can precede the subject by itself while the negation always follows the subject. In the latter order, the two elements may either precede or follow the subject as a cluster. We take the latter order to be derived by adjoining the clausal negation to the Mood particle. The cluster may be raised higher to the Fin head. The order ‘negation – particle’ may not arise in Romanian because the clausal negation cannot adjoin to the particle in Fin.

## 6. THE PARTICLE *pε*

In some southern Calabrian dialects, the mood particle *mi/mu* can optionally co-occur with another particle, *pε*, as in (22a), which may also alternate with a copy of the mood particle, either identical (22b), or reduced (22c).

- (22) a. 'vɔnu                    (pε)      mu u 'hattsu                    (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 653)  
           want-3pl-pres-ind (PE)    PRT it=do-1sg-pres-ind  
           ‘They want me to do it.’
- b. 'vɔli                        mi/pε mmi                    'cɔvi                    (Seminara, RC, M&S 654)  
           want.3sg-pres-ind PRT/PE PRT    rain.3sg-pres-ind  
           ‘It wants to rain.’
- c. 'era                         kun'tentu                    pε/u      mmu                    (Gerace, RC, M&S 654)  
           be-1sg-past-ind    happy                    PE/PRT PRT  
           ti'viju  
           you=see-1sg-pres-ind  
           ‘I was happy to see you.’

The form directly reminds of the prepositional complementizer that can appear in purpose clauses (Rohlf's 1969: 193). Purpose clauses are infinitival in Italian, as in (23a), and finite in the dialects, as in (23b).

- (23) a. uscirono                a/per      lavare      i vestiti  
           go-3pl-pst-ind      A/PER    wash-inf the clothes

---

<sup>9</sup> Adam Ledgeway p.c. however tells us that duplication of the whole cluster ‘neg – *mu*’ sandwiching the subject is found in many southern Calabrian dialects.

- b. 'nɛʃʃɛnu 'pɛ mma 'lavani  
 go-3pl-past-ind PE PRT wash-3pl-pres-ind  
 ɛ r'robbɛ (Sorbo San Basile, CZ, M&S 654)  
 the clothes  
 'They went out to wash their clothes.'

In the dialects, however, *pɛ* also appears in contexts in which the purpose semantics is excluded, as in (22b), which displays a weather predicate, and in many of the examples below, in which *pɛ* introduces the complement clause of “want”. We therefore assume that *pɛ* is a complementizer occurring in either Force or Fin (also see Roberts and Roussou 2003 and Damonte 2008, 2011). Note that Romanian *ca*, which introduces subjunctive clauses (see (1b) and (4) above), may also occur in purpose clauses (Hill 2002: 245, note 2). This is another parallelism between Romanian and Calabrian dialects.

We now turn to the distribution of *pɛ*. Consider (24), where *pɛ* occurs with two instances of *mi*. In this case, *pɛ* precedes the higher one, while the clausal negation adjoins to the lower one. Our working hypothesis is that *pɛ* is in Force, the higher copy of *mi* is in Fin, and the lower instance of *mi* clustered with the clausal negation is in Mood. This is an instance of *mi*-doubling similar to what we have seen in (8) and (21) above.

- (24) 'vɔʃʃu pɛ mmi nɔ mi 'vɛni (Seminara, RC, M&S 660)  
 want-1sg-pres-ind PE PRT NEG PRT come-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I don't want him to come.'

In (25), *pɛ* occupies a lower position because it follows the subject. Since it is not in Mood, which is occupied by *mu* or *nnɔ mmu*, the only head available is Fin (see also Damonte 2008, 2011). The subject must therefore be left-dislocated in these cases.

- (25) a. 'vuɔʃʃu 'idɖu pɛ mmu 'vɛnɛ (San Pietro a Maida, CZ, M&S 663)  
 want-1sg-pres-ind he PE PRT come-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I want him to come.'
- b. tu 'vɛɛ lu hiʝ 'ʃuɛlu pɛ nnɔ  
 you want-2sg-pres-ind the boy PE NEG  
 mmu nɛʃʃɛ (Jacurso, CZ, M&S 662)  
 PRT go-out-3sg-pres-ind  
 'You want the boy not to go out.'

In (26a), we find the sequence *pɛ nɔ mu* in a position preceding the subject. This is expected if *pɛ* is in Force and the cluster *nɔ mu* is in Fin (as in (20b) or (21) above). The sequence *pɛ nɔ mu* can however also precede a left-dislocated object, as in (26b).<sup>10</sup>

- (26) a. 'vɔʃʃu pɛ nɔ mu 'hratti-ta  
 want-1sg-pres-ind PE NEG PRT brother-your

<sup>10</sup> Since the subject may also be left-dislocated, *pɛ nɔ mu* in (26a) can occur in split Force as in (26b).

- tʃɛ 'vena (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)  
 there=come-3sg-pres-ind  
 'I want your brother not to come.'
- b. 'voʎʎu pɛ nɔ mu a 'pasta s a 'maɲdʒanu  
 want-1sg-pres-ind PE NEG PRT the pasta refl=it=eat-3pl-pres-ind  
 'I want for them not to eat pasta.' (Gizzeria, CZ, M&S 664)

This option can be treated by assuming the possibility of a split Force, a phenomenon that is common in the diachrony of the Romanian complementizer field, according to Hill & Alboiu (2016).

In the literature, we do not find examples in which the complementizer *pɛ* co-occurs with *mu* and the clausal negation in the order '*mi/mu neg*' (see Section 5). Our assumptions do not exclude this option. The absence of this combination might simply be due to the lack of intersection between the subset of dialects that display *pɛ* and the subset of dialects that allow for the order '*mi/mu neg*'.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have compared the microvariation found in the untensed finite clauses of two varieties of Romance: Romanian, on the one hand, and southern Calabrian and north-eastern Sicilian dialects on the other. Comparing languages that belong to the same family but have not been in direct contact has allowed us to study a phenomenon that is not present in other Romance languages and varieties. Thus, the similarities can be taken to show how the Romance clausal structure interacts with this "Balkan" phenomenon.

In both varieties of Romance, the feature [-T] is shared across the clausal spine by two heads of the complementizer field (Force and Fin) and a dedicated head of the inflectional field (Mood). Both varieties display dedicated morphemes for the Force function (Romanian *ca*, southern Calabrian *ka* and *pɛ*) and the Fin or Mood function (Romanian *să* and southern Calabrian and north-eastern Sicilian *mu/mi* and their variants), with interesting overlaps: the complementizer *pɛ* can appear in Fin, while the particles that typically realize Fin or Mood can also appear in the higher heads of the clausal spine.

We have developed our analysis following the seminal work on the diachrony of Romanian by Virginia Hill and her collaborators, which has shed new light on the syntax of the southern Italian data. This has allowed us to highlight the basic difference in the first-merge position of the particles (Fin in Romanian, Mood in the dialects) and the basic similarity in the possibility for both to appear higher than their first-merge positions, due to the feature sharing that is ultimately a general phenomenon of natural languages. Other similarities concern the distribution of the clitic pronouns with respect to the particles and the first-merge position of the clausal negation. The different first-merge position of the particles explains why clustering with the clausal negation is possible in the southern Italian dialects but not in Romanian. Another striking similarity is the grammaticalization path of the complementizers *ca* and *pɛ* found in purpose clauses. In both varieties of Romance, they may appear as complementizers of untensed finite clauses, first-merged in a position immediately higher than the one occupied by the mood particle: Force in Romanian, Fin in

southern Italian dialects. Like the mood particles, these complementizers may raise higher, to Force. The two varieties of Romance again pattern in a parallel way.

We hope that this contribution will stimulate further comparative work on Romanian and southern Italian dialects. In future work, we also aim at addressing the comparison between Romanian and the Salentino dialects, which might turn out to be more similar to Romanian than the dialects of southern Calabria and north-eastern Sicily analyzed here.

## REFERENCES

- Alexiadou, A., E. Anagnostopoulou, 1998, “Parametrizing AGR: Word order, verb-movement and EPP checking”, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 16, 3, 491–539.
- Cardinaletti, A., 2004, “Toward a cartography of subject positions”, in: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*, New York, Oxford University Press, 115–165.
- Cardinaletti, A., G. Giusti, 2020, “Multiple agreement in southern Italian dialects”, in: L. Franco, P. Lorusso (eds), *Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 125–148.
- Damonte, F., 2008, “Modo e negazione nei dialetti calabresi meridionali”, *Quaderni di lavoro dell’ASIt*, 8, 85–100.
- Damonte, F., 2011, “Matching Moods. Mood Concord between CP and IP in Salentino and Southern Calabrian Subjunctive Complements”, in: P. Benincà, N. Munaro (eds), *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 5*, New York, Oxford University Press, 228–256.
- De Angelis, A., 2017a, “Microvariazione, diacronia e interferenza: due *case-studies* dall’Italia meridionale estrema”, *Archivio glottologico italiano*, CII, I, 40–69.
- De Angelis, A., 2017b, “Between Greek and Romance: Competing Complementation Systems in Southern Italy”, in: P. Molinelli (ed.), *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean Settings*, Berlin, Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 135–155.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C., 1994, *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter.
- Hill, V., 2002, “Complementizer Phrases (CP) in Romanian”, *Rivista di Linguistica*, 14, 2, 223–248.
- Hill, V., G. Alboiu, 2016, *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hill, V., O. M. Tomić, 2009, “A typology of subjunctive complements in Balkan Languages”, *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11, 1, 197–208.
- Joseph, B. D., 1983, *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General and Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ledgeway, A., 1998, “Variation in the Romance infinitive: The case of the southern Calabrian inflected infinitive”, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 96, 1, 1–61.
- Ledgeway, A., 2004, “Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori”, *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia*, 27, 89–147.
- Ledgeway, A., 2005, “Moving to the left periphery: the dual complementizer system in the dialects of southern Italy”, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 103, 3, 339–396.
- Ledgeway, A., 2013, “Greek disguised as Romance? The case of southern Italy”, in: M. Janse, B.D. Joseph, A. Ralli, M. Bagriacik (eds), *Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, Laboratory of Modern Greek dialects, University of Patras, 184–228.
- Ledgeway, A., 2016, “Clausal complementation”, in: A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1013–1028.
- Ledgeway, A., this volume, “The final stronghold of the infinitive: (silent) modals in Romanian and southern Italy”.

- Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 1999, "The syntax of middle-reflexive and object clitics: a case of parametrization in Arbëresh dialects", in: M. Mandalà (ed.), *Studi in onore di Luigi Marlekaj*, Bari, Adriatica, 283–328.
- Manzini, M. R., L. M. Savoia, 2005, *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, vol. 1, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Rivero, M. L., 1994, "Clause Structure and V-Movement in the language of the Balkans", *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 12, 1, 63–120.
- Rizzi, L., 1997, "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in: L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 281–337.
- Roberts, I., A. Roussou, 2003, *Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Rohlf, G., 1969, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Torino, Einaudi.
- Tomić, O. M., 2006, *Balkan Sprachbund Morphosyntactic Features*, Dordrecht, Springer.