

## Salentino *cu* and Southern Calabrian *mu*: implications for the notion of finiteness

Kim A. Groothuis, University of Cambridge

The Italo-Romance varieties spoken in Salento, southern Calabria, and northeastern Sicily, which have historically been in close contact with Greek, present a dual complementiser system marking irrealis and realis complements differently, where the irrealis subordinating particle replaces the canonical Romance infinitive to a large extent. In fact, these varieties present a restricted use of the infinitive (cf. Rohlfs 1969, *la perdita dell'infinito*). Examples are given in (1) and (2):

(1) *Lu Karlu ole ku bbene krai*

The Karlu wants CU come tomorrow

(Campi Salentina (LE), Calabrese 1993: 28)

(2) *Voɛɟɟu mu lu 'vijju*

I.want MU him I.see

(San Pietro a Maida (CZ), Manzini & Savoia 2005: 656)

The clauses introduced by *cu* and *mu* are problematic for a traditional definition of finiteness, according to which it is a binary morphological property of verbs. The clauses introduced by *cu* and *mu* contain verbs which are morphologically finite, bearing TAM and agreement marking; however, on a syntactic level, they pattern with non-finite clauses, in that they do not have deictic (or absolute) tense. Instead, like infinitives, their tense has to be simultaneous with that of the matrix verb in certain cases (3a) or be interpreted as irrealis/future with respect to the matrix tense, as in (3b) (Stowell 1982; Bošković 1997; Landau 2000):

(3) a. *Ncumencianu/finiscinu mi (u) mbivinu*

(it=) they.start/finish MU it=they.drink

'They start/finish drinking it.'

b. *Voliva megghiu m'eranu venutu oji.*

I.wanted better MU they.were arrived today

'I would have preferred if they had arrived today.'

(Bovese, Squillaci 2016: 106, 142)

Furthermore, the subject of a Salentino and Southern Calabrese subjunctive can be controlled by an argument in the matrix clause (4) on a par with the null subjects of infinitival clauses in other Romance languages:

(4) *Rina<sub>i</sub> si=mentù PRO<sub>i</sub>/\*pro<sub>j</sub>/'Ntoniu m'i=lava*

Rina REFL=put.3.SG PRO<sub>i</sub>/pro<sub>j</sub>/ Antonio mu=them=washes

'Rina began to wash them.'

(Southern Calabrese, Ledgeway 2007: n. 20)

This paper will investigate the degree of finiteness of these clauses. It will be assumed that finiteness is related to *anchoring* of the event to the speech act (cfr. Groothuis in prep). (Groothuis in prep) Anchoring needs to take place for tense, which can be free, restricted (with future infinitives and subjunctives) or anaphoric (as with simultaneous infinitives), as well as for person; also the person of the subject can be free, restricted (as with obviation or non-obligatory and partial control) or anaphoric (exhaustive obligatory control). The combination of degrees of anchoring for both person and tense lead to a scalar reinterpretation of finiteness.

On this view, it will be shown that *cu* and *mu* can head different positions along the clausal spine: they occupy a position within the verbal domain (vP), the inflectional domain (IP) or the complementiser domain (CP), depending on the matrix verb that selects them (Ledgeway 2012; 2013: n. 6; 2015: 157; Taylor 2014; Squillaci 2016: 160–2). This makes them comparable to the infinitival complementisers *a/à* and *di/de* in Italian and French respectively (cf. Kayne 1999; Cinque 2004: 165; Tortora 2014). Whenever the subjunctive is selected by a functional verb, the complement is reduced and less finite in terms of Tense and Person anchoring. However, based on comparative evidence from Romanian, it will also be argued that there is no cross-linguistic correlation between clause size and finiteness.

In brief, this talk will show that i) finiteness is not a grammatical primitive; ii) *cu* and *mu* can head different positions along the clausal spine iii) these differently-sized complement correlate partly with anchoring of Tense and Person, although this correlation does not hold cross-linguistically.

## References

- Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 1993. The sentential complementation of Salentino: a study of a language without infinitival clauses. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, 28–98. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. Restructuring and functional structure. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and beyond*. (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 3), 132–191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Groothuis, Kim A. in prep. *Reflexes of finiteness in Romance*. University of Cambridge PhD.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1999. Prepositional Complementizers as Attractors. *Probus* 11(1). 39–73.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2007. Diachrony and finiteness: subordination in the dialects of Southern Italy. In Irina A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, 335–365. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. Contatto e mutamento: Complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento. (Ed.) Marina Benedetti. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 41(3). 459–480.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2013. Greek disguised as Romance? The case of Southern Italy. In Mark Janse, Brian D Joseph, Angela Ralli & Metin Bagriacik (eds.), *MGDLT5. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 184–227. Patras: Laboratory of Greek dialects, University of Patras.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2015. Reconstructing Complementiser-drop in the Dialects of the Salento: A Syntactic or Phonological Phenomenon? In Mary Theresa Biberauer & George Walkenden (eds.), *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-structural Interactions*, 146–62. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Maria Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: morfosintassi generativa*. 3 vols. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Squillaci, Maria-Olimpia. 2016. *When Greek meets Romance: a morphosyntactic analysis of language contact in Aspromonte*. University of Cambridge PhD thesis.
- Stowell, Tim. 1982. The tense of infinitives. *Linguistic inquiry* 13(3). 561–570.
- Taylor, Cameron. 2014. *Aspects of clause structure in Nicotrese. A descriptive account*. University of Cambridge PhD.
- Tortora, Christina. 2014. *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford: Oxford University Press.