**The size of complements and the height of finiteness:**
**an analysis based on Torlakian Serbo-Croatian complementizer-less construction**

*Boban Arsenijević, University of Graz*

Todorović & Wurmbrand (2020) and Wurmbrand et al. (2020) argue that there are three types finite complements, characterized by different structural sizes, which also determine three respective types of verbs that select them (see also Progovac 1994 and Stjepanović 2004 for a two-types analysis). Each of the three types of complements is empirically identified among the spectrum of Serbo-Croatian finite complements introduced by *da*. The largest complements match the CP (as in (1a), where the matrix and the embedded verb can have different subjects and the embedded clause can have any tense, but cannot be substituted by an infinitive clause), the intermediate match the TP (as in (1b), where the subject must be same and only the present and the future tense are possible, with infinitival substitution available) and the smallest the VP (as in (1c), where even the future is out, but the rest is the same). The last, smallest type forces the authors to counter the standard view that finiteness emerges at the level of TP, and argue that it is spread across the structure.

(1) a. Petar je tvrdio [da je Marija otišla] / *[(Marija) otići]. *SC*
P AUX claimed *da* AUX M left M leave.INF
'Petar claimed that Mary had left.'

b. Petar je odlučio [da ode] / otići / [da će otići].
P AUX decided *da* leaves leave.INF *da* will leave.INF
'Petar decided to leave / that he will leave.'

c. Petar je pokušao [da ode] / otići / *[da će otići].
P AUX tried *da* leaves leave.INF *da* will leave.INF
'Petar decided to leave.'

Arsenijević (2009) analyzes *da* as a relativizer over situations. This implies that *da* can sit no lower than the lowest projection relating a set of situations to another argument, which is AspP, the projection of the viewpoint aspect, where the described situation is related to the topic situation in the sense of Klein 1994. Klein, as well as Tatevosov (2011), argue that the establishing of the viewpoint aspectual relation is closely tied to finiteness. Both Arsenijević's and Klein's / Tatevosov's argument conflict with Wurmbrand and colleagues' view that *da* can introduce VP-level complements.

I provide novel empirical arguments that a) indeed, there are the three different sizes of finite complements in SC, but b) all *da*-clauses are structurally AspPs or larger. This also saves the standard view of structurally high finiteness. I propose a syntactic and semantic analysis for all three types of complements, each with a different mechanism for finiteness.

Core empirical arguments come from the Torlakian dialect of SC. This dialect lacks infinitives, but in addition to the full set of *da*-complements that are available in the standard, it also displays finite complements with the verb in the present tense which lack the complementizer (Sobolev 2004), as in (2), adding a fourth member to the taxonomy.

(2) a. Petar pokušao ode. *Torlakian*
P tried leaves
'Petar tried to leave.'

A range of properties, some of which are summarized in the table below, identify these complements as smaller than the smallest *da*-complements (i.e. those in (1c)), and crucially as smaller than AspP. If there are structures smaller than the smallest *da*-complements, and VP is the smallest struture containing a verb, then *da*-complements cannot be VPs.

| the complement | infinitive | *da*+present | present, no *da* |
|---|---|---|---|
| can include clitics | + | + | / |
| has independent argum. structure | + | + | / |
| possible interveners between verbs | + | + | / |
| is a separate prosodic unit | + | + | / |
| is a separate syntactic constituent | + | + | / |
| can have own temporal specification | + | + | / |

I propose an analysis on which *da* abstracts an ordering source for a set of situations denoted by its complement, and can be generated in any of the projections which otherwise provide such ordering sources, in particular AspP, EpistP, EvidP and ForceP. The embedded clause then acts as a modifier of the ordering source expressed by the selecting verb. When *da* is derived in AspP, the complement must have the verb in the present – the form analyzed as the absence of form-specification, and cannot have an own subject, because both verb-form specification and the subject are specified in AspP or higher. On this view, *da* cannot be generated lower than AspP, as no ordering source is supplied there. In other respects, the analysis matches Wurmbrand and colleagues' in postulating CP, TP and VP complements.

The ordering source is temporal in AspP, epistemic in EpistP, evidential in EvidP, or speech-act-related in ForceP. The complement in (1a) then modifies the ordering source expressed by the verb, the claim, as being compatible with Marija having left, and in (1b, c) the decision and intention, respectively, for being compatible with Peter leaving.

The relativizing capacity of *da* is represented in syntax as an uninterpretable finiteness feature. It probes up and agrees with the closest topic situation, which is the one specified in the matrix AspP. I take this to be the same procedure that in some languages yields the sequence of tense (cf. Zagona's 2014 account). Thus, *da* always underlyingly carries (without expression) the finiteness values of the matrix verb – its person, number and gender. When the complement is larger than AspP, its verb has own specification of these features, acquired by agreement with AspP or other projection in which it is specified. When the complement is AspP, the probe instead finds *da* there, and inherits the features of the matrix verb.

Finally, finite complements without the complementizer in Torlakian are too small to be a spell-out domain (a phase). Their verb is local to the matrix functional layer and directly agrees with it just like the matrix verb. As expected for a structure lacking VoiceP and AspP, it cannot realize arguments, be specified for reference time, or host clitics independently of the matrix verb (assuming that clitics target AspP rather than TP, as arguments have been put forth that TP is generally inactive in SC, see Bošković 2012, Arsenijević 2014, Todorović 2016).

**References: Arsenijević**, B. 2009. Clausal complementation as relativization. Lingua 119, 39-50. **Arsenijević,** B. 2013. Vremensko i aspektualno značenje aorista. Srpski jezik 18, 253-261. **Klein**, W. 1994. Time in Language. London: Routledge. **Progovac**, Lj. 1994. Negative and positive polarity: A binding approach. Cambridge: CUP. **Sobolev**, A. 2004. On the areal distribution of syntactic properties in the languages of the Balkans. In O. Tomić (ed.), Balkan Syntax and Semantics. 59-100. Amsterdam: Benjamins. **Stjepanović**, S. 2004. Clitic climbing and restructuring with 'finite clause' and infinitive complements. JSL 12/1–2, 173–212. **Tatevosov** S. 2011. Severing Perfectivity from the Verb. Scando-Slavica 57(2), 216-244. **Todorović** N. 2016. On the Presence/Absence of TP: Syntactic Properties and Temporal Interpretation. PhD diss., UCon. **Todorović**, N./S. Wurmbrand. 2020. Finiteness across domains. In: T. Radeva-Bork/P. Kosta (eds), Current Developments in Slavic Linguistics. Twenty Years After. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 47-66. **Wurmbrand**, S., I. Kovač, M., Lohninger, C., Pajančič, N. Todorović. 2020. Finiteness in South Slavic complement clauses: Evidence for an Implicational Finiteness Universal. Linguistica 60(1). 119-137.