

ON THE USE OF COMPLEMENTISERS IN ISTRO-ROMANIAN

RAMONA CĂTĂLINA CORBEANU¹, IONUȚ GEANĂ²

Article history: Received 27 September 2021; Revised 29 September 2021; Accepted 11 October 2021; Available online 31 March 2022; Available print 31 March 2022.

©2022 Studia UBB Philologia. Published by Babeş-Bolyai University.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

ABSTRACT. *On the Use of Complementisers in Istro-Romanian.*³ This article deals with the description of certain aspects of the complementiser system in Istro-Romanian (hereinafter IR), a severely endangered Romance variety. The prototypical IR complementisers are *ke* ('that'), *neca* (subjunctive marker), and in rarer occurrences *se* ('that/if'). Their main features are their high degree of heterogeneity, as well as their occurrence in various syntactic configurations that either makes IR pattern with Daco-Romanian (its closest sister), or sets IR apart across Romance. Our analysis is carried out on a corpus made of: Traian Cantemir's *Texte istroromâne* (data collected during 1932-1933), Sextil Pușcariu's *Studii istroromâne. Texte I* (1906-1926), Sârbu, R., V. Frățilă's *Dialectol istroromân* (1982-1996). Among the situations at which we will take a closer look, we should mention the occurrence of the complementiser *ke* 'that' in places where Daco-Romanian and other Romance varieties would not use it or would use it differently.

Keywords: *Istro-Romanian syntax, (Eastern) Romance dialectology, IR complementisers, word order*

REZUMAT. *Observații privind complementizatorii din istroromână.* Articolul de față își propune să descrie anumite aspecte privitoare la sistemul complementizatorilor din istroromână (numită în continuare IR), o varietate

¹ **Ramona Cătălina CORBEANU** is Researcher at the Romanian Academy's "Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics and a Junior Lecturer at the Centre for Romanian Studies, Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest. Her current main research interests are the syntax and the morphology of old Romanian and of modern Romanian, Romanian as a second language, lexicology, lexicography and Romanian derivational morphology, and the syntax of Istro-Romanian. Email: catalina.corbeanu@unibuc.ro.

² **Ionuț GEANĂ** is Researcher at the Romanian Academy's "Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics and Associate Professor at the Centre for Romanian Studies of the University of Bucharest. His research interests focus on language variation in such fields as Romance and Romanian morphosyntax, phonetics and phonology, dialectology, and Romanian as a foreign language. Email: ionut.geana@litere.unibuc.ro.

³ This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P1-1.1-TE-2019-0832, within PNCDI III.

romanică orientală pe cale de dispariție. Complementizatorii prototipici din istroromână sunt *ke 'că'*, *neca 'să'*, și – mai rar – *se 'să'*. Principalele caracteristici ale acestora privesc gradul ridicat de eterogenitate, precum și prezența în configurații sintactice dintre cele mai variate, care fie le apropie de uzul din dacoromână („sora” cea mai apropiată), fie le izolează în contextul romanic mai larg. Analiza noastră se bazează pe un corpus alcătuit din: *Texte istroromâne* de Traian Cantemir (date culese între 1932-1933), *Studii istroromâne. Texte I* de Sextil Pușcariu (1906-1926), *Dialectul istroromân* de R. Sârbu și V. Frățilă (date culese între 1982-1996). Printre situațiile asupra cărora ne vom apleca în mod deosebit, menționăm apariția complementizatorului *ke 'că'*, în contexte în care dacoromâna sau alte limbi romanice nu l-ar folosi sau l-ar întrebuița diferit.

Cuvinte-cheie: *sintaxa istroromânei, dialectologie romanică (orientală), complementizatori în IR, topică*

1. Introduction

This article is part of a larger project, *Istro-Romanian and Istro-Romanians. Legacy and Heritage*, whose overall goal is to give a descriptive account of Istro-Romanian (IR), a severely endangered Romance variety, as spoken today in Croatia and by the diaspora, and the people who speak this language, focusing on the following dimensions: linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, language contact, and multiculturalism. Specific objectives include: a new collection of texts/data, an updated Istro-Romanian vocabulary, a descriptive account of word order in Istro-Romanian, and drafting linguistic questionnaires for various morphosyntactic (and less lexical) issues.

As there is no monograph dedicated to IR complementisers (but see a general description of IR in Kovačec 1984 or Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, a.o.), our goal is to answer the following questions:

1. What are the prototypical complementisers in IR? What are their main morphosyntactic and semantic functions?
2. Are IR complementisers similar to Daco-Romanian or other Romance varieties? How similar/different?
3. Does the system of IR complementisers prove to be novel across (Eastern) Romance?

First off, in our view, a complementiser is a structurally homogeneous subclass of conjunctions which link a matrix to its complement clauses. They are subordinating conjunctions with no semantics of their own (Stan 2007), and we consider complement clauses those clauses where the core arguments are encoded in the same way as in a main clause (following Dixon 2006). In answering the above established questions, our aims are to see the class of

canonical complementisers and their semantic-syntactic properties (to establish the contexts and the matrix for every complementiser), to analyse the constructions where IR admits the simultaneous occurrence of two complementisers or the occurrence of a *Wh*-phrase and a complementiser, and to compare the IR data with data from other Romance varieties, especially with Romanian.

Our corpus includes texts collected after 1900: *Texte istroromâne*, by Traian Cantemir, collected between 1932-1933, *Studii istroromâne. Texte I*, by Sextil Pușcariu (1906-1926), *Dialectul istroromân*, by R. Sârbu, V. Frățilă, collected between 1982-1996 (from north and from south), alongside *O călătorie în satele românești din Istria*, by Teodor Burada, from 1896.

2. Looking at the data – IR complementisers

Che ‘that’ (sometimes spelled *ke*, but with essentially a consistent phonology), *se* ‘that/if’ (may be reduced to *s-*), *neca* ‘that/if’ (sometimes spelled as *neka*) are the prototypical complementisers in Istro-Romanian. Of the three, *se* seems to be the least used one (as a complementiser, being though used with its etymological meaning ‘if’ in conditional sentences). Similar to Daco-Romanian, their main features regard their high degree of abstractness, as well as occurrence in various syntactic configurations (Pană Dindelegan 2013, 466). The IR complementisers are not specialized for the clausal expression of particular positions.

Etymologically, *ke* comes from Latin *quod* ‘that’ (where it already was a prototypical complementiser), while *se* comes from Latin *si*, with conditional meaning and a subordination marker. The complementiser *neca* is borrowed from Croatian *neka* where the main value is ‘in order to, so that’ (Vrzić and Doričić 2014, 110), but see the examples in (10). In IR, *neca* has the morphological value of a conjunction (see TC, 172; Dianich, 132) and is mostly followed by the indicative; *neca* is at the beginning of the process of the grammaticalization (Corbeanu 2020), in the sense that it has switched its uses from an adverbial marker (to mark an adjunct purpose clause, as its use in the source language, i.e. Croatian) to a complementiser (to head the subject/object CPs)⁴.

With respect to the uses of *che*, it introduces declarative complements (standardly marked with the indicative):

- (1)
- | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| a. <i>A</i> | <i>zis</i> | <i>che</i> | <i>țire</i> | <i>nu-i</i> |
| has.AUX | tell.PPLE | that | who.NOM | NEG=IS |
| <i>pre se</i> , | <i>neca</i> | <i>męre</i> | <i>chiá</i> | |
| for self | SUBJ | go | away | |
- “He said that who is not for themselves should go away” TC, 102

⁴ For the purposes of this article, we have glossed *che*, *neca*, *se* as such when they were used as complementisers, whereas for *neca* and *se*, whenever they are markers of adverbial clauses (condition or purpose usually), we glossed them as *so that/in order to*, and *if* respectively.

b. <i>Știu</i>	<i>ke</i>	<i>acmo-av</i>	<i>proveruit</i>	<i>ke</i>	<i>vor</i>
I.know	that	now=has.AUX	check.PPLE	that	FUT
<i>obnovi</i>	<i>ačă</i>				
rehearse	that.F				
"I know they convinced then they would rehearse that" SF, 48					
c. <i>Iă vede che</i>	<i>vire</i>				
she sees that	come.PRES.3.SG				
"She sees that he is coming" SI, 135					

Neca, on the other hand, introduces *irrealis* complements (marked either with the subjunctive for the verb *fi* 'be' (2a) – considering that in IR only the verb *fi* 'be' has specific suppletive forms for the subjunctive – or the indicative (2a'), and the indicative for the rest of the verbs (2b–d):

- (2) a. *Asă ie vrut-a neca fiie si*
 so he want.PPLE=have.AUX.3SG NECA be.SUBJ.3.SG also
lui cășe
 he.GEN house
 "This is how he wanted his house to be as well" SI, 23
- a'. *Neca sām mușkile și neca⁵*
 if be.PRES.1.SG man.DEF and if
sām măi tîrara SF, 105
 be.PRES.1.SG more young.F
 "If I were a man and I were younger [I could become a police officer]"
- b. *Iăle zis-a neca șede*
 they.F tell.PPLE=have.AUX.3SG NECA sit
 "They said they should have a seat" TC, 6
- c. *Ie-m ganę neca io meg cl'emă*
 she=me.CL.DAT told NECA I go.PRES.1.SG call.INF
o sârte (ali silițę) fâre
 INDEF seamstress or dressmaker outside
 "She told me to go call a seamstress (or dressmaker) outside" TC, 48
- d. *Lui a fost vol'a neca*
 he.DAT has.AUX be.PPLE wish NECA
ănsură-se
 marry.INF=REFL.3.SG
 "He wanted to get married" TC, 60

Getting to the third complementiser, *se* – it selects the indicative (3a), the conditional (3b), or the subjunctive (3c), and, of the three complementisers, it is the least represented in the corpus.

⁵ Although here it marks a conditional sentence, the example is very interesting, as it is a sign that the conditional modality is given by *neca* alone, as the indicative is unmarked.

- (3) a. *le* *âv* *ântrebât* *de* *noşna*
 he has.AUX ask.PPLE of traditional.costume
se avem *noi*
 if have.PRES.1.PL we
 “He asked about the traditional costume, if we have [any]” SF, 273
- b. *N-âm* *avzît* *se* *rę* *ieşi*
 NEG=have.AUX.1.SG hear.PPLE if COND release
ke io rę cumparâ
 that I COND buy
 “I haven’t heard if it was released, or I would buy it” SF, 54
- c. *Trebe* *se* *segav* *fîie!*
 must.3.SG SE smart.M be.SUBJ.3.SG
 “He has to be smart” SI, 44

3. Semantic-syntactic properties of complementisers in IR

The general function of markers is the illocutionary dependency (Fagard, Pietrandrea, Glikman 2016). With respect to modality, we have taken into account two theoretical approaches as found in the literature: i) According to Frajzyngier (1995) the focal function of complementisers is a modal one, claiming that all complementisers are modal. ii) In contrast, Boye, van Lier & Brink (2015) found, in a survey of complementisers carried out for 89 languages, that not all complementisers are modal, but rather may only have a complementising function (i.e. the function of identifying complements as complements) or have a complementising function plus a non-modal function.

Different languages show different strategies of modality marking, which are mainly shared between the matrix verb, the complementiser and the embedded verb (Colasanti 2018, 73).

In Romance, the contrast between the indicative and the subjunctive is linked to different kinds of modality. Following Noonan (2007), while declarative and factive verbs usually select a sentential complement which contains indicative morphology, volition verbs usually embed complements with subjunctive morphology. Indicative and subjunctive forms are said to differ in mood. Indicative-subjunctive distinctions in complementation are attested in a number of language families. For instance, in standard Romanian, both the mood of the embedded clause (viz. indicative vs. subjunctive) and the complementiser (viz. *că* and *să*) can differ.

The selection of complementisers is determined at semantic and syntactical level, by the class of verbs in the matrix clause.

To convey a general table on the use of the three complementisers in IR, we will use Givón’s (2001, 40-1) complementation hierarchy: modality verbs (‘want’, ‘begin’, ‘finish’, ‘try’), manipulation verbs (‘make’, ‘tell to’, ‘order’, ‘ask’)⁶, perception-cognition utterance verbs (‘see’, ‘think’, ‘say’).

⁶ Identified in Ammann, van der Auwera (2004, 341) as “volitional mood”.

Che is selected by:

- perception-cognition utterance verbs (*vede* ‘see’, *zice* ‘say’, *misli* ‘believe’, *obeți* ‘promise’):

- (4) a. *Iă vede che vire*
 she sees CHE come.PRES.3.SG
 “She sees him coming” TC, 135
- b. a. *le av zis che ăalt trei*
 he has.AUX tell.PPLE CHE other three
miseș che neca ămnu
 months CHE NECA go.pres.3.sg
 “He said he would go in three months’ time” TC, 27
- c. *Pac ău mislît iel’ ke čia partizâni*
 then have.AUX believe.PPL they.M CHE those partisans
dormu
 sleep.PRES.3.PL
 “So they thought those partisans were sleeping” SI, 72
- d. *le mișe obeșit-a ke se*
 he me.DAT promise.PPLE=has.AUX CHE REFL.3.SG.
va-nsurâ dupa mire
 FUT=marry after me
 “He promised me he would get married after me” SI, 162

- modality verbs (*vrę* ‘want’, *nadi* ‘hope’) or adverbs (*scodeș* ‘pitifully’):

- (5) a. *Vrut-am spure ke iuva io*
 want.PPLE-have.AUX.1.SG tell.INF CHE where I
lucru
 work.PRES.1.SG
 “I wanted to say where I worked” SF, 120
- b. *Io me nades ke nu măi vișe ii colę*
 I REFL.1.SG hope CHE NEG more go.INF there
 “I hope I won’t go there any longer” SF, 83
- c. *Scodeș che te cu mire*
 pitifully CHE CL.REFL.ACC.2SG with me
preșzi
 lose
 “It’s a pity you waste your time with me” SI, 138

- manipulation verbs (*a dă urdin* ‘order’):

- (6) *Dăt-a podestātu urdinu che saca*
 give.PPLE=has.AUX mayor.DEF order.DEF CHE each
ribę, ce se cașare și poidire, che

fish which	REFL	fish.COND.3.SG	and	eat.COND.3.SG	CHE
<i>vo</i>	<i>Ûäre</i>	<i>poderi, che</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>flå</i>
F.CL.ACC	COND	clean CHE	REFL	FUT	find
<i>cl'ucïu</i>	<i>ån</i>	<i>vreo ribe</i>			
key.DEF	in	any fish			

"The mayor ordered that each fish that will be caught and eaten, that it will be cleaned, that it will be found a key in every fish" TC, 61⁷

Neca is selected by:

- perception-cognition utterance verbs (*ziçe, ganę* 'say', *åntrebå* 'ask'):

- (7) a. *L'-Ûãm* *zis* *neca-m*
he.CL.ACC=have.AUX.1.SG tell.PPLE NECA=I.CL.DAT
låsu *samo* *saca* *do* *hruşve* *e*
leave.PRES.3.SG only each two pears and
n-av *ni ura*
NEG-has.AUX no one.F
"I told him if he would leave me only two pears each but he wouldn't [leave me] any" TC, 47
- b. *Stara* *ren* *åntrebå* *plåche,*
old.F.DEF COND.1.PL ask payment
neca *ne* *gospodåru* *platę*
NECA we.CL.DAT man.DEF pay.PS.3.SG
"We would ask the old one about the payment, if the man paid us" TC, 47

- manipulation verbs (*zaproşi* 'require', *rogå* 'ask', *recomandå* 'advise'):

- (8) a. *Iel'i* *måi vişe* *a* *nostrę* *jeiånske* *cånte*
they.M more GEN our of.Żejane songs
zahtevuis *neca* *noi* *cåntåm*
ask.PRES.3.PL NECA we sing.PRES.1.PL
"They ask more that we sang our local songs" SF 301
- b. *Rogata* *donche* *fruniga* *neca* *jegl*
pray.PPLE.have.AUX.3SG so ant.DEF NECA he.CL.DAT
daje *salec* *munca*
give.PRES.3.SG something eat.INF
"He was thus asking the ant to give him something to eat" TB, 118
- c. *Gospodåru* *recomandęit-a* *chiåro* *bire* *lu*
man.DEF recommend.PPLE-has.AUX very well DAT
orålu *neca* *cåvte* *bire*
eagle.DEF NECA search well

"The man strongly recommended the eagle to search well" TC, 29

⁷ Do note in this example that the conditional is formed with its two attested morphologies: synthetic *caţåre* and *poidire*, but *Ûäre poderi*.

- modality verbs (*vre* ‘want’, *treba* ‘must’), for example (2b) taken here as (9a):

- (9) a. *Lui a fost vol'a neca*
 he.DAT has.AUX be.PPLE wish NECA
ănsurâ-se
 marry.INF=REFL.3.SG
 “He wanted to get married” TC, 60
 b. *Ația tréba neca zicu.*
 that.F must NECA say.PRES.1SG
 “I should say that” SF, 131

Neca gets the value of a hedged imperative in a context where the main verb is missing (10). In Daco-Romanian there is a somewhat similar use, where the subjunctive has an imperative value (*Să mergem!* ‘Let’s go!’). But this context from IR can be an influence from Croatian, where *neca* is also an imperative marker.

- (10) a. *Neca ste srečen.*
 IMP be.3.SG happy
 “Let him be happy” SF, 90
 b. *Neca viru doi cel'i boil'i*
 IMP come.3.PL two those hangmen
ce uomiri obisescu și neca-l
 who people hang.PRES.3.PL and IMP=he.CL.ACC
l'ăvu și neca-1 obisescu
 wash.3.PL and IMP=he.CL.ACC hang.3.PL
 “Let the two hangman that hang people come and let them wash him and let them hang him” TC, 64

Aspectual and modal verbs normally select the infinitive; the instances with the subjunctive are rare.

IR is different from Daco-Romanian and certain southern Italian dialects (Pană Dindelegan 2013, 467), but is similar to most other Romance languages (French, Spanish, standard Italian), where mood selection is not associated with a specific complementiser (*neka*, *che* and *se* for indicative).

- (11) a. *Io-m știvot che tu-ști-n*
 I=have.AUX know.PPLE CHE you.SG=are.2.SG=in
râi
 heaven
 “I knew you were in heaven” TC, 67
 b. *Iâle zis-a neca sede*
 they.F say.PPLE=have.AUX NECA sit.PRES.3.SG
 “They told him to sit down” TC, 6

The modal selection associated with *che* or *neca* is determined, as a preference, by the contrast between *assertive/non-assertive* (12a,b), *affirmative/negative* (12c,d) and *interrogative/non-interrogative* (12e,f).

- (12) a. *Zis-a* *ke* *va* *făce* *nușcâre*
 say.PPLE=has.AUX CHE FUT make.INF some
cnige
 books
 "He said he would make some books" SF, 221
- b. *Zis-a* *neca* *pozdrave*
 say.PPLE=has.AUX NECA greet.PRES.3.SG
 "He told him to say hello" TC, 30
- c. *Prevtu* *ganę* *che* *iuva* *l'e*
 priest.DEF say.PS.3.SG CHE where his.CL.DAT-POS=is
pucșa
 gun.DEF
 "The priest said where his gun was" TC, 66
- d. *Io nu voi* *neca* *în-r-a* *vostra* *roba*
 I NEG want.PRES.1.SG NECA in=POS your clothing
moru
 die.1.PRES.SG
 "I don't want to die in your clothes" TC, 132
- e. *Zis-a* *mulăra* *ke*
 say.PPLE=has.AUX woman.DEF CHE
io-st-acăsa?
 I=stay.PRES.1.SG=at.home
 "Did my wife say I was not working?" SF, 57
- f. *Iel'* *se* *rogu* *neca-l'*
 they.M REFL pray.PRES.3.PL NECA=he.CL.ACC
lăse *chiă*
 leave.PRES.3.PL there
 "They also asked to leave him alone" TC, 18

An interim conclusion: dicendi verbs select either *che* or *neca*, but the complementisers provide the modality.

4. Special usages

4.1. Co-occurrence of different complementisers after the same matrix verb is due to particular values/properties of the verb, or to historical coincidence, but also to the particular value each complementiser bears (De Boel 1980, 282).

We know that the co-occurrence of complementisers with other subordination markers is a marginal phenomenon in Romance languages (French *quand que*, Italian *quando che*, Portuguese *quando que*, Spanish *cuando che*) (Fagard, Pietrandrea, Glikman 2016, 87-88). Similar contexts are found in Daco-Romanian (Pană Dindelegan 2013, 470). Hill (2002, 231) notes that “data from different historical stages of Romanian show co-occurrence of *wh*-phrases and *că*”:

- (13) *I-a spus cum că*
 CL.DAT.3.SG=has.AUX tell.PPLE how that
și-ar fi cumpărat o mașină
 REFL.DAT.3.SG=COND be.INF buy.PPLE INDEF car
 “He told her that he had bought a car”

In colloquial/substandard Romanian the combination of two complementisers is possible:

- (14) *Mi-a zis că să*
 me.CL.DAT=has.AUX tell.PPLE that SUBJ
mă duc
 REFL.ACC.1.SG go.SUBJ.1.SG
 “S/he told me to go away”

4.1.1. Co-occurrence of *che* and *neca*

Not both complementisers are semantically bleached. *Neca* by itself marks the subjective thinking (typically obtained through the subjunctive in other Romance varieties). Interesting are the contexts with the co-occurrence of both complementisers (15). Similar to colloquial Romanian, the most contexts are with *che neca* (15 a-c), but we have found one occurrence with the order *neca che* (15d):

- (15) a. *Ie-l' ganę che neca-l'*
 he_i.NOM=he_j.CL.DAT tell.PS CHE NECA=he_i.CL.DAT
dăie corner lir
 give.PRES.3SG forty pounds
 “He_i told him_j to give him_i forty pounds” TC, 84
- b. *Ti-ăm zis che neca-l*
 you.CL.DAT=have.AUX tell.PPLE CHE NECA=CL.M.ACC
l'ei cela mai mărșăvu ce-i ăn
 take.PRES.2.SG that more weak which=is in
stăle
 stable
 “I told you to take the weakest one from the stable” TC, 41

c. *Gospodaru mñ-a dât urdin*
 landlord.DEF me.CL.DAT=has.AUX give.PPLE order
ke neca tot din căşe punş
 CHE NECA all from house put.PRES.1.SG
pre baladur
 on stoop

“The landlord ordered I should put everything in the house on the stoop”
 SI, 19

d. *Ziçe neca che din pod căde*
 says NECA CHE from attic fall.PRES.3.SG
ca sã-ş spârşga piçior
 so that=his.CL.DAT.POS break leg

“He said that he may fall from the attic and break his leg” SF, 47

We found one instance of *se+che* in the corpus:

- (15') *Verit-a rumunu ca şi voi*
 come.PPLE=has.AUX Romanian.M.DEF like too you.PL
şi zis-a se che va ii cu ie
 and tell.PPLE=has.AUX SE CHE FUT go with him
 “There came this Romanian guy just like you and said he would go with
 him” SF, 63

4.1.2. Co-occurrence of *che* and *wh*-phrases

Such constructions seem to suggest that, in some cases, the complementiser *che* has grammaticalized to the point of being void of semantics, and an obligatory marker of subordination (Fagard, Pietrandrea, Glikman 2016, 88).

- (16) a. *Ăntrebât-ũãm che cum l'-a pure*
 ask.PPLE=have.AUX CHE how he.CL.ACC=COND put
lumele
 name.DEF
 “I asked what they would name him” TC, 93
 b. *Voi ăţ zis dende ke*
 you.PL have.AUX.2PL tell.PPLE wherefrom CHE
ştiu
 know.PRES.1SG
 “You said where from I knew” SF, 48

4.1.3. Co-occurrence of *neca* and *wh*-phrases

- (17) *A lui zapisęit, neca çe-m*
 DAT him.DAT wrote NECA what=me.CL.DAT
dă
 give.PRES.2SG
 “He wrote to him what you would give to me” TC, 143

4.2. In IR aspectual and modal verbs select the infinitive, rarely the subjunctive (Corbeanu 2020). Even if one of the generally accepted Balkanisms is the regression of the infinitive (Ammann, van der Auwera 2004, 351), IR favours the infinitive over the subjunctive (while also retaining that IR is not itself a Balkan variety *per se*). Also this is different from Daco-Romanian too, where infinitives in such contexts are heavily underrepresented.

In Aromanian, there is barely any infinitive left, not even after ‘can’, a verb after which Daco-Romanian has kept the use of the infinitive (in competition with the subjunctive). In IR, infinitives occur after modal verbs, in contexts as 18a–c:

- (18) a. *Vreți un cafe cuhei?*
 want.PRES.2PL INDEF coffee make.INF
 “Should I make you some coffee?” SF, 201
- b. *Ăv ujëit pure-n lăpte clăgu*
 have.AUX.3PL must.PPLE put.INF=in milk clot.DEF
 “They had to put the curd in milk” SF, 197
- c. *Acmo morëim merindă*
 now must.PRES.1.PL eat.INF
 “Now we have to eat” SF, 227

4.3. Among the specific uses of *che* in Istro-Romanian, in places where Daco-Romanian and other Romance varieties would not use it or would use it differently, we found instances of coordination (19a) and co-occurrence with *neca* (19b)

- (19) a. *Mes-av a treile și che*
 walk.PPLE=have.AUX.3SG the third and that
l-av dât
 CL.3.SG.M=has.AUX give.PPLE
 “The third one [brother] went and gave him” TC, 127
- b. *Che neca duce iuva se călu*
 that SUBJ go.PRES.3SG where REFL horse.DEF
fermëre
 stop
 “So that he should go where the horse stops” TC, 127

Che can be repeated, a phenomenon different from the doubling complementisers found in Italian (Paoli 2003) or Slovenian (Plesničar 2017), where only a small nominal group can be intercalated. The Slovenian complementiser doubling data strongly suggests that the syntactic analysis of such constructions is possible only under the assumption that the complementiser field is split into several functional projections, as was first proposed by Rizzi (1997). Here is (6) rebranded as (20):

- (20) *Dât-a* *podestâtu* *urdinu* *che* *saca*
 give.PPLE=has.AUX mayor.DEF order.DEF CHE each
ribę, ce *se* *cațâre* *și* *poidire,* *che*
 fish which REFL fish.COND.3.SG and eat.COND.3.SG CHE
vo *ũare* *poderi, che* *se* *va* *flâ*
 CL.F.ACC COND clean CHE REFL FUT find
cl'uciu *ãn* *vreo* *ribę*
 key.DEF in any fish
 "The mayor ordered that each fish that will be caught and eaten, that it will be cleaned, that it will be found a key in every fish" TC, 61

4.4. *Neca* allows the dislocation of the subject or of an argument/complement. We believe that its syntactic independency favours the dislocation. Various constituents (noun phrases, adverbs, clitics) can be intercalated (Corbeanu 2020).

- (21) a. *Iâ* *vrut-a* *neca* *dupa* *ie* *zaino*
 she want.PPLE=has.AUX NECA after him fast
maritâ-se
 marry.INF=REFL
 "She wanted to marry him fast" TC, 90
 b. *Neca* *đamaręta* *vire*
 IMP morning.DEF come.PRES.3.SG
 "Let the morning come" TC, 14
 c. *Io* *reș* *dopisei* *și* *neca* *globa*
 I COND prescribe also NECA fine
platei
 pay.PRES.3.SG
 "I would prescribe him also to pay for a fine" SF, 208

5. Conclusions

In answering the questions set in the introductory section to this article, the data from the corpus and our analysis show that: 1. There are three complementisers in Istro-Romanian. The complementisers in IR usually follow a matrix verb, and they function to code the matrix clause for its modal property/hypothetical mood.

2. Similar to Daco-Romanian, IR has more than one complementiser, while other Romance languages/varieties have one complementiser. Nevertheless, IR is different from Daco-Romanian, because mood selection is not associated with a specific complementiser: *se* is the least marked, and it is more used with its etymological meaning 'if' and mostly used with the indicative or the conditional,

che is semantically void, and seems to have a general (Romance) “obligatory” complementising nature, and then there is *neca*, which is at the beginning of the process of grammaticalisation (adverbial marker > complementiser); the conditional modality can be given by *neca* alone; *neca* is used with the value of an imperative (sentence) marker; *neca* allows dislocations.

3. IR data provides a lot of different types of co-occurrences (combination of two complementisers – *che neca*, combination of *wh*-phrases and complementisers), which – rather than being novel – shows that the grammaticalisation process is still ongoing, given the historical and cultural development of Istro-Romanian.

In a similar vein to the explanation above, namely that the grammaticalisation process is still ongoing, we would like to end our article with a topic for further research, namely that use of *ke* (and the *wh*-element, which Zegrean 2012 labels as question marker) in such examples as:

- (22) a. *Če ke n-âi mes văčile čere?*
 Q CHE NEG=have.AUX.2SG go.PPLE COWS.DEF request.INF
 “Didn’t you go ask for those cows?” SF, 87
- b. *Če ke lucrâm?*
 Q CHE work.PRES.1.PL
 “What are we working?” SF, 105

WORKS CITED

Primary sources

- SF = Richard Sârbu, Vasile Frătilă, 1998, *Dialectul istroromân. Texte și glosar*, Timișoara, Editura Amarcord.
- TC = Traian Cantemir, 1959, *Texte istroromâne*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
- SI = Sextil Pușcariu, 1906, *Studii istroromâne. Texte I*, București, Institutul de Arte Grafice “Carol Göbl”.
- TB = Teodor Burada, 1896, *O călătorie în satele românești din Istria*, Iași, Tipografia Națională.

Secondary sources

- Ammann, Andreas, Van der Auwera, Johan. 2004. “Complementiser-Headed Main Clauses for Volitional Moods in the Languages of South-Eastern Europe: A Balkanism?” *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, edited by Olga Mišeska Tomić, 293-314. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Boye, Kasper, Van Lier, Eva, Brink T., Eva. 2015. “Epistemic Complementisers: A Crosslinguistic Survey.” *Language Sciences*, 51(5), 1-17.

- Cantemir, Traian. 1959. *Texte istroromâne*. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2018. *Romance morphosyntactic microvariation in complementizer and auxiliary systems*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Corbeanu, Ramona-Cătălina. 2020. „Conjunctivul în istroromână. Statutul lui *neca*.” at the workshop *Tradition and Innovation in the Study and Preservation of Istro-Romanian* (within The 20th International Conference of the Department of Linguistics: Romanian Language – Modernity and Continuity in Linguistics Research), 21 November.
- De Boel, Gunnar. 1980. “Towards a theory of the meaning of complementisers in classical Attic.” *Lingua*, 52(3-4), 285-304.
- Dianich, Antonio. 2010. *Vocabolario istroromeno-italiano. La varietà istroromena di Briani ('Bërščina)*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2006. “Complement clauses and complementation strategies in typological perspective.” *Complementation: A cross-linguistic typology*, edited by Robert M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, 1-48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An introduction, vol. II*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fagard, Benjamin, Pietrandrea, Paola, Glikman, Julie. 2016. “Syntactic and semantic aspects of Romance complementisers.” *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*, edited by Kasper Boye, Petar Kehayov, 75-130. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1995. “A Functional Theory of Complementisers.” *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, edited by Joan L. Bybee, Suzanne Fleischman, 473-502. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hill, Virginia. 2002. “Complementiser phrases (CP) in Romanian.” *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 14(2), 223-48.
- Kovačec, August. 1984. “Istroromâna.” *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, edited by Valeriu Rusu, 550-91. Craiova: Editura Scrisul Românesc.
- Maiden, Martin. 2016. “Romanian, Istro-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Aromanian.” *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, edited by Adam Ledgeway, Martin Maiden, 91-125. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noonan, M. 2007. “Complementation.” *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 2nd Edition, vol. 2 (*Complex constructions*), edited by T. Shopen, 52-150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.). 2013. *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Plesničar, Vesna. 2017. “Complementiser doubling in Slovenian subordinate clauses.” *Advances in formal Slavic linguistics*, edited by Franc Marušič, Petra Mišmaš, Rok Žaucer, 233-55. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. “The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery.” *Elements of Grammar*, edited by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Springer Verlag.
- Sârbu, Richard, Frătilă, Vasile. 1998. *Dialectul istroromân. Texte și glosar*. Timișoara: Editura Amarcord.
- Stan, Camelia. 2007. “Notă gramaticală: conjuncția *ca (...)* să.” *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, 58(2), 451-58.

- Vrzić, Zvezdana, Doričić, Robert. 2014. "Language contact and stability of basic vocabulary: Croatian loanwords for body parts in Vlashki/Zheyanski (Istro-Romanian)." *Fluminensia*, 26(2), 105-22.
- Zegrean, Iulia-Georgiana. 2012. *Balkan Romance: Aspects of the Syntax of Istro-Romanian*. PhD Thesis, Università Ca'Foscari Venezia.