**Less finite = less structure?**

**Evidence from irrealis clauses in Romanian, Salentino and Southern Calabrian**

Finiteness is a commonly used but poorly understood notion within linguistics. In my dissertation, I studied Romance verb forms which do not fit the traditional binary opposition between finite and non-finite forms, such as inflected and personal infinitives (cf. e.g. Raposo 1987; Ledgeway 2000: Chapter 4; Mensching 2000; Ambar & Jiménez-Fernández 2017), and Balkan-style subjunctives (cf. Calabrese 1992; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Ledgeway 1998, a.o.). I argue that finiteness needs to be understood as the result of two anchoring mechanisms, namely of tense and person (Bianchi 2003; Ritter & Wiltschko 2014). Allowing these to operate separately, we can account for different degrees of finiteness.

During this talk, I will focus specifically on the relation between the level of finiteness of a complement and its structural size. Irrealis clauses in Romanian, Southern Calabrian and Salentino prove an interesting case study. These languages feature a double complementiser system, with a dedicated irrealis complementiser: *să* in Romanian, *cu* in Salentino and *mu/mi/ma* in Southern Calabrian. Apart from being used as subjunctives, these clauses also replace the use of the canonical Romance infinitive, on a par with Balkan languages (Joseph 1983). It will be shown that the various uses instantiate different levels of finiteness, i.e. different types of tense and person anchoring.

The question arises whether these levels of finiteness are reflected in the clause size. With series of tests, I demonstrate that this is not the case. We can thus conclude that there is no one-to-one correspondence between levels of finiteness and clause size in Romance.
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