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1 Greek in Southern Italy: Italo-Greek

As is well known, Greek has been spoken as an indigenous language in southern Italy since ancient times (Falcone, 1973: 12-38; Horrocks, 1997: 304-306; Manolessou, 2005: 112-121; Ralli, 2006: 133). According to one, albeit now unpopular, view championed most notably by Rohlfs (1924; 1933; 1974; 1977), the Greek spoken in southern Italy, henceforth Italo-Greek, is to be considered a direct descendant of the ancient (mainly Doric) Greek varieties which were imported into Magna Graecia as early as the eighth century BC with the establishment of numerous Greek colonies along the coasts of southern Italy.\(^1\) The opposing – and now widely accepted – view, argued most vehemently by Battisti (1924; cf. also Morosi, 1870; Parlangèli, 1953), sees the Greek of southern Italy as a more recent import dating from the Byzantine period of dominion between the sixth and eleventh centuries (though see Fanciullo, 2007, for a conciliatory approach to these apparently two opposing views). Whatever the correct view, it is in any case clear that by the beginning of the second millennium AD Greek was still widely spoken as a native language in north-western Sicily, Calabria and Apulia. Indeed, as late as the fourteenth century Petrarch is reported to have advised those wishing to study Greek to go to Calabria.

Today, by contrast, Italo-Greek survives precariously only in a handful of villages of southern Calabria and Salento in the respective areas of Bovesia and Grecia Salentina. In Bovesia, where the local variety of Greek is known as greko (though usually known as grecanico in Italian; henceforth abbreviated as gc), the language is today confined to five remote villages of the Aspromonte mountains (namely, Bova (Marina), Chorio di Rochudi, Condofuri (Marina), Gallicianò and Roghudi (Nuovo)),\(^2\) where it is reputed, according to some of the most generous estimates (Spano, 1965; Martino, 1980: 308-313; Stamuli, 2007: 16-19; Remberger, 2011: 126-127), to be spoken by around 500 speakers (cf. however Katsoyannou, 1992: 27-31; 2001: 8-9). In Grecia Salentina, on the other hand, the language, locally known as griko (henceforth abbreviated as gk),\(^3\) appears to have fared somewhat better, in that it continues to be spoken in a pocket of seven villages of the Otranto peninsula (Calimera, Castrignano dei Greci, Corigliano d’Otranto, Martano, Martignano, Sternatia, Zollino) by as many as 20,000 speakers according to the most optimistic estimates (Comi, 1989; Sobrero and Miglietta, 2005; Manolessou, 2005: 105; Marra, 2008: 52-53; Romano, 2008).

Now, although Greek was extensively spoken in southern Italy for centuries, following the gradual expansion first of Latin and then what were to become the local Romance varieties in this same area, Greek and Romance came to be used alongside of each other in a complex situation of diglossia with expanding bilingualism. As a consequence, the Romance dialects of these two areas, namely Calabrese and Salentino, display huge structural influences from Italo-Greek, since they first emerged among speakers whose mother tongue was Greek (the ‘substrate’) and continued to develop and expand to the present day in the shadow of the surrounding, albeit shrinking, Italo-Greek dialects (the ‘adstrate’). To a lesser extent, these latter

\(^1\) Cf. ‘These Greeks must be considered the last direct descendants of the Greek population of Magna Graecia’ (Rohlfs, 1997b: 233).

\(^2\) To these villages one can also add the small diaspora of speakers now dispersed across Melito di Porto Salvo and across the city of Reggio Calabria (e.g. in the district of San Giorgio Extra) following the forced evacuations of their villages following natural disasters such as landslides and earthquakes. In what follows, all unreferenced Greko examples are taken from Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi (1959).

\(^3\) In what follows all unreferenced Griko example are taken from Morosi (1870).
varieties also show some structural influences from the local Romance dialects (cf. for example note 23 below); in more recent times, regional (/standard) Italian has also been thrown into the mix, at least among younger members of the speech community, although its influence on Italo-Greek is negligible if not inexistent given the age of most Italo-Greek speakers. Greek and Romance contact in diachrony and synchrony can be summarized as in Figure 1 (cf. also Martino, 1980: 338; Profili, 1985; Marra, 2008; Romano, 2008).

![Diagram of Greek – Romance contact in diachrony and synchrony]

Consequently, the influence of Greek on the Romance dialects of southern Italy is generally considered to offer us one of the most spectacular, and least controversial, cases of language contact within Romance. One has only to think of the many articles and monographs written by Rohlfs on this topic (cf. Rohlfs, 1924; 1933; 1964; 1967; 1997a, b, c, d, e, f; 1974) that variously highlight the supposed influence of Italo-Greek on the lexical, morphological and syntactic structures of these Romance dialects. Among the numerous lexical examples in common use throughout large parts of the South, it will suffice here to recall such widespread Hellenisms as χίμαρος > zīmmaru ‘billy-goat’, νάχη > naca ‘cot’, ἁπάλος > āpilu ‘soft, without shell’, γάστρα > (g/c)rasta ‘vase, pot’, λαγάνα > làgana ‘long thin pasta strip’.

In the area of morphology, some of the most striking examples include the widespread absence of the adverbial manner suffix -mente ‘-ly’, whose functions are typically covered by the simple bare adjective (1a–b), the generalized use of the passato remoto ‘aorist’ in large parts of the Extreme South as the sole perfective tense (2a–b), and the use of the so-called dativo greco ‘Greek-style dative’ in large parts of southern Calabria where, on a par with the merger of dative and genitive cases during the Middle Greek period (Joseph, 1990: 160), the genitive preposition di ‘of’ has extended its functions, at least under specific conditions, to include the marking of dative arguments (3a–b).

---

4 Greek influence on the phonology of these dialects, in contrast, is less conspicuous. However, one oft-cited case of possible Greek phonological interference concerns the pentavocalic stressed vowel system of the dialects of the Extreme South (cf. Rohlfs, 1977: 1–2).
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(1) a. *nu te l’eri llovati filu boni* (Scorrano, LE)
   not you= it=you.were washed not good
   ‘in any case you hadn’t washed them well’

b. *o ascìàdi mu pai calò* (gk)
   the hat.NSG me= goes good.NSG
   ‘the hat suits me’

(2) a. *tutti ‘ssi cosi ormai diventàru normali* (Catanzaro)
   all these things now became normal
   ‘all these things have now become normal’

b. *Aen efáni o yóssu?* (Roccaforte (gc))
   not appeared the son=your
   ‘Has your son not turned up?’

(3) a. *Nci dissì di lu figghiòlu ’u si ndi vacì* (Bovese, RC)
   to.him= I.said of the boy that self= therefrom goes
   ‘I told the boy to go’

b. *ordìnëtse tu Ğósëppi ná ‘ne meðëto* (Bova (gc))
   he.ordered of the Giuseppe that he.be with.them
   ‘he ordered Giuseppe to stay with them’

Also in the area of syntax the dialects of southern Italy display numerous structural calques with the surrounding Italo-Greek dialects. Without doubt the most notable and most widely-studied of these relates to sentential complementation where, following the Greek pattern, finite clauses are generally employed at the expense of the infinitive. Naturally, this finite pattern of subordination brings with it the use of a dual complementizer system which broadly distinguishes between irrealis clauses headed by *mu/ma/mi* (Calabria) or *cu* (Salento) on the one hand and realis clauses introduced by *ca* on the other.⁹

(4) a. *Àiu mu vàiù mu vijù duv’ àiu mu vàiù òja* (Sant’Andrea, CZ)
   I.have that I.go that I.see where I.have that I.go today
   ‘I have to go and see where I have to go today’

a’. *tus ambitéspai ya na pàusi sto bastiménto na divertëftusi,*
   them= they.invited for that they.go.to.the ship that they.enjoy
   *na kámusi mian gali šalàta* (Roccaforte (gc))
   that they.do a good party

'they invited them to come aboard to enjoy themselves and to make merry with
them'
b. *ti cuntanu ca su’ stanchi morti* (Catanzaro)
you= they.tell that they.are tired dead
‘they tell you that they’re dead tired’
b'. léyete *ti o δýávolo éfiye ánda peðía* (Rochudi (gc))
say.PASS.3SG that the devil left from the children
‘it is said that the devil fled from the children’

Also indicative of Greek contact is the widespread use of: (i) paratactic structures (5a-b);10 the imperfect indicative in the protasis and apodosis of unreal hypothetical clauses (6a-b);11 and (iii) the definite article in conjunction with first names, both male and female, in Salentino dialects (7a-b), though not in Calabrese despite the use of the article in this context in Greko.12

(5) a. *Crammatina lu scia’ ccattamu* (Lecce)
tomorrow.morning it= we.go we.buy
‘we’ll go and buy it tomorrow’
b. *pame ce drome* (Soleto (gc))
we.go and we.eat
‘we’re going to eat’

(6) a. *iva si non chivía* (Melito di Porto Salvo, RC)
I.went if not it.rained
‘I would go if it were not raining’
b. *An išera pu m’ épie tim búḍḍa, san gáḍaro ton éðenna áše*
if I.knew who me= took the hen like ass him= I.tied to
stable
‘If I knew who stole my hen, I would tie them to the stable like an ass’

(7) a. *Quistu dev’ essere lu Pascali* (Scorrano, LE)
this must to.be the Pasquale
‘This must be Pasquale’
b. *efònase to pedi to mea ce puru ton Antonài* (Martano (gc))
he.called the son the big and also the Antonuccio
‘he called to him his eldest son as well as Antonuccio’


In light of structural parallels such as those briefly reviewed in (1)-(7), it has become commonplace in the literature to claim that once extensive Greek-Romance bilingualism throughout the Extreme South of Italy has given rise to an exceptional Hellenization of the local Romance dialects or, as Rohlfs aptly put it, a case of spirito greco, materia romanza (‘Greek soul, Romance (lexical) material’). While accepting Rohlfs’ general thesis that the Romance dialects of this area superficially appear to be nothing more than Greek disguised as Romance (or to put it another way, Greek in Romance clothing), such broad-brush generalizations obscure many subtle differences between Italo-Greek and the local Romance varieties which have hitherto gone unnoticed. In what follows we shall therefore reconsider a number of case studies of apparent Greek-Romance contact to highlight a number of such differences with the aim of exploring how such contact phenomena may be modelled in terms of parameter hierarchies. In particular, we shall examine to what extent it is possible to reinterpret morphosyntactic convergence and divergence in this area of southern Italy in terms of a scalar parameter theory.

2 Parameter hierarchies

Since the conception in early Government and Binding Theory of Universal Grammar in terms of a small set of abstract parametrized options, much work over recent decades has radically departed from this view with a focus on predominantly surface-oriented variation (cf. Borer, 1984). This has led to the proliferation of a remarkable number of local, low-level parameters interpreted as the (PF-)lexicalization of specific formal feature values of individual functional heads (including φ, Case, movement-triggers (EPP, Edge)) in accordance with the so-called Borer-Chomsky Conjecture (Baker, 2008b: 353). While this approach may prove descriptively adequate in that it predicts what precisely may vary (cf. Kayne, 2000; 2005a,b; Manzini and Savoia, 2005), it suffers considerably from explanatory inadequacy. Among other things, it necessarily assumes such microparameters to be highly local and independent of one another. This assumption seriously increments the acquisitional task of the child who has to set each value in isolation of the next on the basis of the primary linguistic data alone, and at the same time exponentially multiplies the number of parametric systems and, in turn, the number of possible grammars predicted by UG (cf. Kayne, 2005b: 11-15; Roberts, to appear). By way of illustration, consider the following patterns of past participle agreement observed across Romance (cf. Smith, 1999; Loporcaro, 1998; D’Alessandro and Roberts, 2010; Ledgeway, 2012: 317-318):

(8) a. La manzana, la había [vP [Spec la] comida] la (Sp.)
   ‘I had eaten the apple’
   b pro, some [AgrOF [Spec pro] magnite] lu biscotte / pro, so [vP [Spec ___]
   pro are.1PL eaten.MPL the.MSG biscuit.MSG/ pro am magnite] li ______ biscotte (Arl.)
   ‘We have eaten the biscuit / I have eaten the biscuits’
   c avetzi [vP [Spec ___] presas] de fotos? (Occ.)
   ‘Did you take any photos?’
   d La clé que j’ai [vP [Spec la-clé] prise] la-clé (Fr.)
the.key.FSG that I have taken.FSG
‘the key which I took’

e  Li/Ci hanno [vP [Spec li/iei] visti] li/iei ieri (It.)
them.M/us=they have
‘They saw us yesterday’

f  Los/Nos as [vP [Spec los/nos] vistos/vistu] los/nos (Lula, Srd.)
them.M/us=you have
‘You have seen them/us’

g  Els/Les he [vP [Spec els/les] llegit/llegides] els/les (Brc. Cat.)
them.M/F I have
‘I’ve read them’

Assuming participle agreement to be the surface reflex of an underlying Agree relation for φ-features between, say, the functional head v_P and a given nominal, we are forced to recognize at least seven different microparametric specifications for v_P. The simplest and least constrained system is exemplified by Ibero-Romance varieties such as Spanish (8a), where v_P never displays any agreement, failing to enter into an Agree relation with any DP. Its mirror image is the pattern of participial agreement found in the eastern Abruzzese dialect of Arielli (8b), where the participle, and hence v_P, simply agrees with any plural DP, be it the internal or external argument. Slightly more constrained, though still liberal by general Romance standards, is the pattern found in Occitan varieties (8c) where the participle agrees with all types of DP object, a pattern further constrained in modern standard French (8d) by the additional requirement that the object DP be overtly fronted (either under object-to-subject fronting as with unaccusative structures, or under relativization and wh-fronting). In this respect, modern Italian (8e) proves even more restrictive in that, in addition to A-moved superficial subjects of unaccusatives and passives, v_P only agrees with fronted nominals when they are represented by pronominal clitics, an option taken a stage further in Sardinian dialects (8f) where there is a further requirement that the pronominal clitic also be 3rd person. Finally, there are varieties such as standard Barcelona Catalan (8g), where v_P is further restricted to agreeing only with feminine 3rd person pronominal clitics. The overall picture reflects an unmistakable tension between the demands of detailed empirical description on the one hand, which forces us to assume as many as seven distinct featural (viz. microparametric) instantiations of v_P across Romance, and the desire to provide a principled explanation within the limits of a maximally constrained theory of UG on the other.

One way to avoid the proliferation of grammatical systems that such a microparametric approach predicts, while still accommodating morphosyntactic variation like that witnessed for the Romance participle in (8a-g), is to assume a theory that combines some notion of macroparameters alongside microparameters (Baker, 1996; 2008a, b). Following ideas first proposed by Kayne (2005b: 10) and further developed by Holmberg and Roberts (2010) and Roberts (2012), progress in this direction has recently been made by the Rethinking Comparative Syntax (ReCoS) research group based in Cambridge;13 their central idea is that macroparameters should be construed as the surface effect of aggregates of microparameters acting in unison, ultimately as some sort of composite single parameter. On this view, macroparametric effects

13 The ReCoS project (www.mml.cam.ac.uk/dtal/research/recos/index.html) is based within the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics of the University of Cambridge. Recent publications of the ReCoS group include: Biberauer, Holmberg, Roberts and Sheehan (2012), Biberauer and Roberts (2012; in press), Roberts (2012).
obtain whenever all individual functional heads behave in concert, namely are set identically for the same feature value (e.g. in a consistently head-final language such as Japanese *all* heads will bear a roll-up movement feature or some other kind of feature guaranteeing uniform head-finality which invariably places complements to the left of their heads), whereas microparametric variation arises when different subsets of functional heads present distinct featural specifications (e.g. in mixed languages such as German where verbal heads bear the relevant roll-up feature, but nominal heads do not). Conceived in this way, parametric variation can be interpreted in a scalar fashion and modelled in terms of parametric hierarchies. Macroparameters, the simplest and least marked options that uniformly apply to all functional heads, are placed at the very top of the hierarchy, but, as we move downwards, variation becomes progressively less ‘macro’ and, at the same time, more restricted with choices becoming progressively more limited to smaller and smaller proper subsets of features (namely, no F(p) > all F(p) > some F(p), for F a feature and p some grammatical behaviour). More specifically, functional heads increasingly display a disparate behaviour in relation to particular feature values which may, for example, characterize: (i) a naturally definable class of functional heads (e.g. [+N], [+finite]), a case of mesoparametric variation; (ii) a small, lexically definable subclass of functional heads (e.g. pronominals, auxiliaries), a case of microparametric variation proper; and (iii) one or more individual lexical items, a case of nanoparametric variation.

In light of these assumptions, we may now reinterpret the distribution of Romance participial agreement in (8a-g) in terms of a small-scale parametric hierarchy along the lines of (9), ultimately part of a larger hierarchy related to differential object marking (for discussion, see Sheehan 2013).

(9) Does \( \nu_{\text{PP}} \) probe \( \phi \)-features of DP?

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{No: Spanish (8a) Yes} \\
\quad \text{All argument DPs?} \\
\quad \quad \text{Yes: Ariellese (8b) No} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{All DPs}_{\text{acc}}? \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Yes: Occitan (8c) No} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{All fronted DPs?} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Yes: French (8d) No} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{All pronominals?} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Yes: Italian (8e) No} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{All 3rd person?} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Yes: Sardinian (8f) No} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{All feminine?} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Yes: Catalan (8g) \checkmark} \\
\end{array}
\]

\( \Rightarrow \text{MESO} \)

\( \Rightarrow \text{MICRO} \)

\( \Rightarrow \text{NANO} \)
The gradual cascading effect produced by the options presented in (9) highlights how variation in relation to the ability of $v_{PnP}$ to probe the $q$-features of specific nominals is not uniform but, rather, licenses differing degrees of surface variation in accordance with the growing markedness conditions that accompany the available parametric options as one moves down the hierarchy. In this respect, we can note that Spanish and Ariellese represent rather simple and relatively unmarked options, in that $v_{PnP}$ in these varieties either indiscriminately fails to probe all DP arguments or, on the contrary, systematically probes all (plural) DP arguments. Occitan varieties, on the other hand, are slightly more constrained in that $v_{PnP}$ only probes a subset of DP arguments, namely those marked [+ACC], whereas in French there is the further proviso that the DP$_{acc}$ must have also undergone A- or A'-movement. In all four cases, however, we are dealing with a case of mesoparametric variation, in that the four options can be subsumed within a naturally definable class insofar as they exclusively make reference to a single functional head [D], in turn further specified for the feature [+ACC] in Occitan and French (presumably un(der)specified in the case of Spanish and Ariellese) and the relevant A/A'-movement feature in French. We observe however a shift from meso- to microparametric variation as we move down the hierarchy to Italian, insofar as the relevant class of triggers for participial agreement is no longer represented tout court by a naturally definable class of functional heads (viz. [D]), but now also makes reference to a small and lexically definable subclass of Ds, namely pronominals. Arguably, in the case of Sardinian and Barcelona Catalan where this lexically definable subclass is further broken down into the ever more marked pronominal categories of 3rd person and, in turn, feminine, we are now entering nanoparametric territory where the relevant generalizations hold of just a handful of individual lexical items, namely Sardinian lu (MSG), la (FSG), los (MPL) and las (MSG) and Barcelona Catalan la (FSG) and les (FPL).

Armed with these assumptions about parametric variation, let us now revisit a number of structural cases of Greek-Romance contact to see how these maybe modelled in terms of the parameter hierarchies outlined above.

3 Greek – Romance parallels revisited

3.1 *Dativo greco* (‘Greek-style dative’)

Above we saw how it has often been reported that the Romance dialects of Calabria have, following an original Greek pattern now widespread within the Balkan Sprachbund (Pompeo 2013), extended the distribution of the genitive preposition *di* ‘of’ to include many of the traditional uses of the dative, the so-called *dativo greco* (cf. 3a-b). Although there is undoubtedly some truth to these traditional descriptions, they nonetheless conceal some non-trivial differences between *Greko* and *Calabrese*. Firstly, Greek-style genitive marking of indirect objects is not obligatory in *Calabrese*, with RECIPIENT arguments more frequently

---

14 No such use of the genitive has to date been recorded for the Romance dialects of the Salento.

15 I am grateful to M.O. Squillaci and T. Squillaci for providing the following Romance Bovese data. See also Trumper (2003: 232-233).
surfacing in the dative marked by the preposition *a* ‘to’ in accordance with the typical Romance pattern, witness (10a) which forms a minimal pair with (3a) repeated here as (10b).

(10) a. Nci dissi a lu figghiòlu ‘u si ndi vaci (Bovese, RC)
   to.him=I.said to the boy that self= therefrom goes
   ‘I told the boy to go’

b. Nci dissi di lu figghiòlu ‘u si ndi vaci (Bovese, RC)
   to.him=I.said of the boy that self= therefrom goes
   ‘I told the boy to go’

Secondly, in so-called genitive structures such as (10b) the genitive-marked indirect object DP is always obligatorily doubled by a dative clitic (e.g. nci), witness further the structures in (11a-c).

(11) a. *(Si) dissi d’u figghiòlu ‘u si ndi vaci (S. Ilario, RC)
   to.him=I.said of the boy that self= therefrom= goes
   ‘I told the boy to go’

b. *(Nci) lu scrissi di mè fratì (Bagaladi, RC)
   to.him=it=I.wrote of my brother
   ‘I wrote it to my brother’

c. *(Nci) lu vindia di Don Pippinu (Bagaladi, RC)
   to.him=it=I.sold of Don Peppino
   ‘I was selling it to Don Peppino

We are not therefore dealing with an autonomous genitive structure, as is the case in Greek, but with a hybrid structure in which the indirect object is referenced in part through dative marking on the verbal head and in part through genitive marking on the nominal dependent. This observation is even more striking when we consider that the same dialects have an independent genitive clitic (INDE >) *ndi* ‘of it; thereof/from’ which, despite providing a perfect match for the genitive case of the nominal dependent, cannot double the indirect object in such examples:

(12) a. *Ndi dissi d’u figghiòlu ‘u si ndi vaci (S. Ilario, RC)
   of.him=I.said of the boy that self= therefrom= goes

b. *Ndi lu scrissì di mè fratì (Bagaladi, RC)
   of.him=it=I.wrote of my brother

c. *Ndi lu vindia di Don Pippinu (Bagaladi, RC)
   to.him=it=I.sold of Don Peppino

Finally, the use of the so-called dativo greco is not indiscriminate, but carries a marked pragmatic interpretation. Thus, despite appearances, (10a-b) are not entirely synonymous. By way of comparison, consider the English minimal pair in (13a-b), where the indirect object of the first example (to someone) has undergone so-called dative shift in the second example where it now appears without the dative marker to and comes to precede the underlying direct object.

(13) a. I promised to rent every apartment in the building to someone

b. I promised to rent someone every apartment in the building
As is well known, one of the pragmático-semantic consequences of dative shift in English is to force a known or given interpretation of the recipient argument, as can be clearly seen in (13a-b):

whereas the quantifier to someone in (13a) typically refers to an unknown individual or group of individuals (e.g. whoever I can find who is willing to pay the rent), dative-shifted someone in (13b) typically, though not necessarily unambiguously for all speakers, refers to a particular individual already known to the speaker (e.g. my father’s best friend), but whom the speaker simply chooses not to name in this particular utterance (for discussion, see Aoun and Li, 1993). By the same token, it is this same presuppositional reading of the recipient that is licensed by the dativo greco in Calabrese, witness the implied specific reading of the ‘student’ in (14b) when marked by the genitive in contrast to its non-specific reading in (14a) when it surfaces in the dative; similarly, the identity of ‘the boy’ in (10b) is assumed to be known to the addressee.

(14) a La machina, nci la vindu a nu studenti (Bovese, RC)
the car to.him= it=I.sell to a student
‘I’ll sell the car to a student (=not known to me, any gullible student I can find)’

b La machina, nci la vindu di nu studenti (Bovese, RC)
the car to.him= it=I.sell of a student
‘I’m selling a student the car (= specific student known to me)’

Integrating these observations with the results of Manolessou and Beis’ (2006) investigation of indirect object marking across Greek dialects (cf. also Joseph, 1990: 160; Horrocks, 1997: 125-126, 216; 2010: 628-629; Ralli, 2006: 140-141), we can construct a partial parameter hierarchy based on the marking of indirect objects (IOs) along the lines of (15) with representative examples in (16a-d), ultimately to be understood as part of a larger hierarchy related to argument marking and alignments (cf. Sheehan 2013).

(15) Are all internal arguments Case-marked accusative?
Yes: nth. Gk dialects No
Asia Minor Are all IOs Case-marked dative?
Tsak., Dodec. (16a)
Yes: AG, Sal. (16b) No
Are all IOs Case-marked genitive?
Yes: SMG, sth. dialects No
Italo-Gk (16c) Are a subset of IOs Case-marked genitive (= hybrid Case)?
Yes: Calabrese (16d)
[+presup. ⇒ dative-genitive]

16 For full discussion, see Larson (1988, 1990), Jackendoff (1990), Torrego (1998) and references cited there.
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(16) a. ἐπέτετε τὸν ὄνε (Tsakonian, Manolessou & Beis, 2006)
    he.said the.ACC donkey.ACC
    ‘he said to the donkey’

b. ὑπηρετῶ τοῖς θεοῖς (AG, Xenophon, Cyropaedia 8.2.22)
    I.serve the.DAT.PL gods.DAT
    ‘I am a servant to the gods’

c. Ce t’ adreffiatu tū ‘pane (Martano (gk))
    and the brothers=his him.GEN said
    ‘And his brothers said to him’

d. Si dissî d’u figghiòlu ‘u si ndi vaci (S. Ilario, RC)
    to.him= I.said of.the boy that self= therefrom= he.go
    ‘I told the boy to go’

Our first option in (15) represents the least marked question that we can ask about the marking of indirect objects, namely whether they are formally distinguished at all from other internal arguments. The negative reply to this question thus isolates a group of northern Greek dialects, Asia Minor dialects, Tsakonian and Dodecanese which, in contrast to all other Greek varieties, fail to mark a formal distinction between direct and indirect objects, witness the accusative-marking of the RECIPIENT in (16a). We are thus dealing with a case of mesoparametric variation, in that in these varieties accusative, arguably the core object Case crosslinguistically and licensed by v, hence situated at the top of our hierarchy, indiscriminately marks all DP objects, a naturally definable class (namely, [-NOM] Ds). The next option is that exhibited by varieties such as ancient Greek and Salentino which, by contrast, unambiguously distinguish indirect objects by marking them dative (16b), in contrast to varieties such as standard modern Greek, southern Greek dialects and Italo-Greek which are situated further down the hierarchy in that they conflate this category with the genitive (16c). The greater and increasing markedness of these latter two options follows from the observation that crosslinguistically dative, generally taken to be licensed by an Appl(iative) functional head, represents the least marked distinctive Case for indirect objects, whereas genitive, at least in those languages with rich case systems, typically displays all the hallmarks of an inherent Case whose distribution is largely defined by not entirely predictable lexical factors, hence taken here to be assigned by a lexical V head. These two options reflect, respectively, micro- and nanoparametric variation, in that dative serves in the former case to uniquely mark a small, lexically definable subclass of functional heads, namely all Ds bearing the RECIPIENT feature (for arguments in favour of treating theta roles as formal features, see Hornstein, 1999), whereas in the latter case genitive is associated with a class of predicates whose membership can only be established on purely lexical grounds, inasmuch as the RECIPIENT feature is just one of many semantic roles associated with genitive marking.

Our final option in (15) is represented by the dativo greco in Calabrese (16d), clearly the most marked option of all, insofar as the marking of RECIPIENT arguments in this variety is strictly context-sensitive, with the dativo greco serving to narrowly delimit individual RECIPIENT arguments in accordance with their [±presuppositional] reading. This more complex and non-uniform behaviour is further reflected in the surface form of the so-called dativo greco which, we have observed, involves a composite Case structure combining dative clitic marking on the verbal head with genitive prepositional marking on the nominal dependent, presumably reflecting the simultaneous intervention of Appl\textsubscript{DAT} and V\textsubscript{GEN} heads in the licensing of such indirect objects. These facts which require greater cross-dialectal exploration to ascertain their
extent and significance for typological and theoretical issues about argument structure, including the mapping between morphological marking and syntactic configurations, the availability of object raising and the behaviour of ditransitive structures, highlight how convergence through grammars in contact does not necessarily lead to simple borrowing, but frequently yields new hybrid structures born of reanalysis.

3.2 Complementation

We observed in relation to examples (4a-b) above that both Italo-Greek and the local Romance dialects show a marked tendency to avoid the infinitive in favour of a system of finite complementation. However, contrary to all other Greek dialects, with the notable exception of Pontic (Mackridge, 1987), the infinitive is not by any means defunct, but exceptionally survives to the present day in Italo-Greek where it is still employed, to varying degrees and often alongside competing finite na-clauses, in conjunction with a class of restructuring predicates (Cinque, 2004; 2006). Below we provide some representative examples of infinitival clauses together with competing finite na-clauses from Griko (17a-c) and Greko (18a-c):

(17) a. Oria se sozo pi / e ssozo na tramo (Zollino / Sternatia)
   beautiful you= I.can to.say / not I.can that I.run
   ‘I can call you beautiful / I cannot run’
   b. Cústi o caddo cantalisi / a cusi na simànun ‘e
   heard.PASS the cockerel to.sing if you.heard that ring the
   campane (Martano)
   ‘The cockerel could be heard crowing / If you hear the bells ringing’
   c. A teli piachi o rodo / n’ acapisi (Corigliano)
   if you.want to.take the rose / that you.love
   ‘If you want to take the rose / to love’

(18) a. se kánno δéi / tis to kánnise na to fái (Roccaforte)
   you= I.make to.bind/ to.her=it=you.make that it=she.eat
   ‘I’ll have you tied up / You’ll make her eat it’

17 The use of a na-clause following sozo ‘can’ in Griko is unusual: the Sternatia example is the only recorded example in our corpus, where its use is licensed in this piece of verse by the requirements of the rhyme (cf. Morosi, 1870: 137). Baldissera (2012; this volume), by contrast, notes an interpretative difference between the use of infinitival and finite complements, with the latter apparently marking ability readings, witness her translation of (i). It is not inconceivable that such a reading might also be at play in the selection of a finite complement in (17a).

(i) en sozo na pao (gk)
   not I.can that I.go
   ‘I am not able to go’

It is also notable that the overwhelming majority of examples of the infinitive after sozo recorded in the literature involve negation of sozo. This might be taken to indicate that negation is is in some way involved in licensing the infinitive, a conclusion also supported by the observation that another context in which the infinitive exceptionally survives is in negated indirect interrogatives of the type den éxo pu päi (lit. not I.have where to.go) ‘I have nowhere to go’ (Rohlfs, 1977: 191; Katsoyannou, 2001: 47).
b. E ssu sónno aníši / den ésonne na ta’ gwálise óšu (Roccaforte)
not you= I.can to.open / not he.could that them= he.pull out
‘I cannot open the door to you / he could not pull them out’

c. Egò tus ácua platètti / na platèttsusi (Bova)
I them= I.heard to.talk / that they.talked
‘I heard them talking’

In a similar fashion the infinitive survives, again to varying degrees and often alongside of competing finite clauses (Manzini and Savoia, 2005, I: 650-654), also in the neighbouring Romance dialects of Salento (19a-c) and Calabria (20a-c):

(19) a. cce ppozzu fare? (Lecce)
what I.can to.do
‘What can I do?’

b. Facìtime ssettare / te facia cu llaba’ ccunti a ssirda (Lecce)
make.IMP=me to.sit.down you= I’d.make that it=FUT you.tell to sister=your
‘Let me sit down! / I’d make you go and tell your sister’

c. Sàccite cumpurtäre cumu nna vera recina (Lecce)
know.IMP=you to.behave like a real queen’
‘Learn to behave like a true queen!’

(20) a. u pozzu fari (Seminara, RC)
it= I.can to.do
‘I can do it’

b. l’ annu a cchiamari / pe mmi u chiamanu (Seminara, RC)
him= they.have to to.call / for that him= they.call
‘they must call him’

c. u fazzu dòrmiri / mi dormi (Seminara, RC)
him= I.make to.sleep / that he.sleeps
‘I’ll make him sleep’

If we now examine in greater detail the distribution of the infinitive across these Greek and Romance dialects of southern Italy, it soon becomes apparent that there has been a gradual diachronic retreat of the infinitive, which is characterized at the same time by a considerable amount of diatopic and idiolectal variation. We illustrate this for Italo-Greek by way of Table 1. Although our written records only go back as far as the latter half of the nineteenth century, the texts and sources listed in the first column are arranged in chronological order and can thus broadly be read diachronically, allowing us to track the changing patterns of Italo-Greek complementation over approximately the last century and a half. These are to be read in conjunction with the implicational scalar arrangement of predicates on the horizontal axis,

---

which, although not necessarily systematically reported on in each study (hence the blanks in Table 1), are ordered according to their growing susceptibility to infinitival complementation (towards the left of the scale) and finite (na-clause) complementation (towards the right of the scale). Now a number of observations immediately emerge from Table 1, which provide us with some important empirical generalizations about sentential complementation in Italo-Greek.

Firstly, the retreat of the infinitive to the advantage of finite complementation has progressed far more quickly in Griko than in Greko, as superficially revealed by a cursory examination of the dwindling number of ‘(Infinitival)’ tokens contained in the Griko section of Table 1. This same conclusion is further supported by the results of Rohlf’s (1977) and (1997e) comparative studies of complementation in both areas, originally published in (1950) and (1972), respectively. In his earlier 1950 investigation, Rohlf reports the use of infinitival complementation, albeit alongside finite strategies, with all predicates on the scale between hear and come in both Griko and Greko. Twenty years later, however, in his 1972 study Rohlf finds that the infinitive has now been eliminated with this same range of predicates in Griko, but not in Greko where the infinitive, although no longer an option with let and want (and presumably neither with come, for which he does not unfortunately provide any information), now represents the preferred complementation pattern with hear, know and make. Even earlier, a similar tendency is observable in a comparison of the (largely) nineteenth-century sources, where Morosi (1870) reports the optional extension of finite complementation to make and hear in Griko (cf. also Cassoni, ([1937] 1990: 85), whereas in Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi (1950) they still predominantly occur with the infinitive (viz. make: 25/7 (I/F), hear: 3/1 (I/F)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Griko</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Na-complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morosi (1870)</td>
<td>I (I/F)</td>
<td>I (I/F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassoni ([1937] 1990)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohlf ([1950] 1977)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohlf ([1972] 1997e)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italia &amp; Lambro. (2001)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotardo ([1975] 2010)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frassanito (2010)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldissera (2012)</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greko</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>Na-complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.T. &amp; Caracausi (1959)</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohlf ([1950] 1977)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohlf ([1972] 1997e)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsoy. (1992: 2001)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violi (2004)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remberger (2011)</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovese</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 These data are based on my reading of the mainly prose texts contained in Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi (1958: 10-128, 269-278, 281-306, 394-486), which are principally representative of Greko from the second half of the nineteenth century, but which also include some texts from the twentieth century (up until 1958).

20 Although Katsoyannou (1992: 334, 356-359; 2001: 47) claims the infinitive to be restricted to complements of sònno ‘can’ in the modern Greco of Gallicianó, her own corpus (Katsoyannou, 1992: 328, 464) offers examples following know (en iperam blatéssi taliáno lit. ‘not I.knew to.speak Italian’) and make (kanum bajéssin garo lit. ‘they.make to.pay dear’).
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Table 1. Variation in use of infinitival & finite complements in Griko and Greko

Secondly, the retreat of the infinitive appears more advanced in Griko than in Greko. By way of illustration, consider the sources for the modern period where we observe that in Griko (Baldissera, 2012; this volume) the infinitive is now restricted to can, whereas in Greko the infinitive, albeit subject to some idiolectal variation, is reported to still constitute at least an option after hear, know and make (and somewhat implausibly even after come according to Violi, 2004: 144) in addition to can.

Finally, the evidence reported in Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi (1958) allows us to conclude that in Italo-Greek causative make is potentially more susceptible to the extension of finite complementation than modal know (hence the ordering know > make in Table 1 above), since, unlike the latter, make is occasionally followed by a finite complement (21a-c). Similarly, in

---

21 I am grateful to M.O. Squillaci (Bova) for providing these data.
22 Note that in Table 1 (i) hear is a cover term for all verbs of perception (including see, watch, feel); (ii) know refers to the modal ‘know how’, and not the epistemic ‘know that’; and (iii) must in these varieties refers to a ‘have to/that’ periphrasis.
23 Baldissera (2012; this volume) reports that in modern Griko the infinitive (i.a) is also an option, alongside a finite na-clause (i.b), after the aspectual predicate spicceo ‘finish’:

(i) a. Spiccetsa atse polemisi stes etse (gk)
    I.finished of to.work at.the seven
b. Spicceetsa na polemiso stes etse (gk)
    I.finished that I.work at.the seven
‘I finished working at seven’

There is however reason to believe that this infinitival strategy represents a recent borrowing from Romance (cf. also Rohlf, 1977: 192) and, in particular, from the local Salentino dialects where the infinitive (alongside finite strategies) is regularly employed after aspectuals (cf. Table 2 below). Observe in this regard that the lexical item itself spicceo is a Romance borrowing (cf. Sal. spicciare/i ‘to finish’ < Fr. dépêcher < *DISPICIARE), hence it is not inconceivable that, in borrowing this particular lexical item from the adstratal Romance dialects, bilingual Griko speakers also borrowed (or, better, transferred) the relevant infinitival complementation pattern. This is further supported by the observation that the infinitive in (i.a) is preceded by the preposition atse ‘of’, a clear calque of the corresponding Romance/Salentino constructions which also require the use of the prepositional complementizer de / te ‘of’ to introduce the infinitive (cf. ii).

(ii) Aggiu spicciatu te fatiare (Lecce)
    I.have finished of to.work

From a comparative and diachronic examination of the data in Table 1, it is also notable that at no other time either in Griko or Greko has the infinitive ever been reported as an option for aspectual predicates which, together with the andative predicate go, represent the functional predicates least susceptible to infinitival complementation. By the same token, the implicational nature of the scalar arrangement of predicates in Table 1 would lead us to expect that all functional predicates to the left of aspectual spicceo should also, at least as an option, permit infinitival complementation in Griko, a prediction clearly not borne out. Rather, the exceptional nature of infinitival complementation in conjunction with spicceo in modern Griko is entirely in line with the borrowing scenario outlined above, which introduces an unexpected structural irregularity into the system tied to a single lexical item in accordance with an unmistakable nanoparametric pattern.
24 More precisely, in our sample of Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi’s anthology we counted 6 sentential complements to know, all in the form of an infinitival clause, and a total of 32 sentential complements to causative make, of which just 7 occur in finite form.
the anthology of *Griko* texts contained in Cassoni ([1937] 1990), causative *make* invariably selects for a finite clause (22a) but *know* selects for an infinitive (22b):

(21) a. *tséri kumbattétsi* (Bovese (gc))

\[
\text{you.know to.fight}
\]

‘you know how to fight’

b. *s’ étame exí túto práma* (Bovese (gc))

\[
\text{you= he.made to.have this thing}
\]

‘he obtained this thing for you’

c. *Káme na peðánu ta δio peðiamu* (Bovese (gc))

\[
\text{make.IMP that die the two children=my}
\]

‘Have both of my children die!’

(22) a. *m’ ècame ’na fao* (Calimera (gk))

\[
\text{me= she.made that I.eat}
\]

‘she made me eat’

b. *o sordo t’ ufsere cratési* (Castrignano (gk))

\[
\text{the money it=he.knew to.save}
\]

‘he knew how to save money’

If we now examine complementation in the Romance dialects of the same areas, as illustrated in Table 2, we immediately see some striking differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salentino</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Hear</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Let</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Come</th>
<th>Go</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rohlfs ([1972] 1997e)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>(I)/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancarella (1988)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindisi</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leccce</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casarano (LE)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternatia (LE)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martignano (LE)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Sal. (Calabrese 1993)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorrano (Musio 1995)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE (Protopapa 1990-92)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calabrese</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Hear</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Let</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Come</th>
<th>Go</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rohlfs ([1972] 1997e)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>(I)/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardi (1998)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrrenian Coast</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Coast</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristofero (1998)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boval. (Remberger 2011)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovese</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>I/F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Variation in use of infinitival and finite complements in *Calabrese* and *Salentino*
Given that in some of the Salentino and Calabrese dialects reported in Table 2 (e.g. Sternatia, Bovese), we are dealing with speakers, and even more so in the recent past, who are also native speakers of their local Italo-Greek variety, we might legitimately expect the patterns of complementation observed in Table 1 above for the two Italo-Greek-speaking areas to be broadly, if not closely, replicated in the neighbouring Romance dialects reported in Table 2. However, these expectations are not borne out. Firstly, we note that the retreat of the infinitive has been quicker in Calabrese than in Salentino, with finite complements now representing an option with all predicates in Calabrese, whereas in Salentino the sole selection of the infinitive still represents a more productive and versatile option with a larger range of predicates (e.g. can...make). This distribution is the opposite of that seen in Table 1 for Italo-Greek, where it was noted that the retreat of the infinitive had progressed most rapidly in Griko.

Secondly, the retreat of the infinitive is more advanced in (some, though not all, varieties of) Calabrese than in Salentino, in that the infinitive no longer represents the sole option with any single predicate, even after can, in most modern Calabrese varieties, whereas in Salentino the infinitive still represents the sole permitted complement type employed after can across all varieties and, in some dialects, also after hear, must, know and make. Yet, the infinitive with these latter four predicates has not been recorded for Griko for some 40 years (cf. Rohlfs, [1950] 1977, in Table 1), highlighting a significant lag in the rate of change affecting the retreat of the infinitive in these two linguistic groups despite ongoing and extensive contact. Similarly, in many Calabrese dialects the infinitive continues to represent an option, together with finite complement clauses, after a wide range of predicates (viz. can...want); yet we saw for Greko that, apart from can, the infinitive is only ever found after hear, and to a lesser extent after know and make.

Finally, a further difference between Salentino and Calabrese concerns the respective susceptibility of the modal and causatives predicates know and make to the extension of finite complementation. Whereas in Salentino there are varieties such as Leccese (cf. 19b-c) where finite complements are found following make, but not know (hence the ordering know > make in Table 2 above), in Calabrese both infinitival and finite complements are found following know but not necessarily after make which, in some varieties at least (cf. Rohlfs, 1997e: 325-332; Cristofaro, 1998), only allows an infinitival complement (hence the ordering make > know in Table 2). This latter distribution contrasts with that noted in Table 1 for Italo-Greek where, on a par with Salentino, the modal predicate know shows a greater resistance to finite complementation.

If we now put the results of Tables 1 and 2 together, the overall picture that emerges is that given in Table 3, where darker shading indicates a correspondingly greater propensity towards the use of finite complementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Hear</th>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Let</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Come</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Aspectuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Griko</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grecanico</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salentino</strong></td>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Must</td>
<td>Know</td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>Let</td>
<td>Aspectuals</td>
<td>Want</td>
<td>Come</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calabrese</strong></td>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Must</td>
<td>Make</td>
<td>Know</td>
<td>Let</td>
<td>Aspectuals</td>
<td>Want</td>
<td>Come</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Greek and Romance infinitival and finite complement selection in southern Italy
Despite centuries of intimate language contact and extensive Greek-Romance bilingualism, Table 3 highlights a number of significant differences between the varieties under discussion. One of the most obvious of these concerns the differing behaviour of aspectual predicates and the modal *must*, which in Italo-Greek both invariably align with finite complementation (23)-(24), while in *Salentino* (25) and *Calabrese* (26) they either freely alternate between infinitival and finite complementation (aspectuals) or favour infinitival complementation (*must*).

   she.began that she.walks
   ‘she began to walk’
   you.have that you.leave of the door
   ‘you must leave through the door’

   he.entered that he.writes
   ‘he was beginning to write’
   b. *Éxo na ta éxo ñikátu* (Gallicianò, Katsoyannou, 1992: 341)
   I.have that them= I.have there
   ‘I must have them there’

(25) a. *ave spicciare cu vene ddescia fastidiu / ieu va spicciu de*
   he.has to.finish that he.comes he.gives bother I FUT I.finish of
   *cunzare a intru lla camera* (Scorrano, LE)
   to.prepare to inside the bedroom
   ‘he has to stop coming here and annoying us / I’m gonna finish preparing the bedroom’
   b. *lu patrunu de casa ave bbivire* (Scorrano, LE)
   the owner of house has to.drink
   ‘the landlord must have a drink’

(26) a. *si misi mi ciangi / si misaru a ballari* (Reggio Calabria)
   self= she.put that she.cries selves= they.put to to.dance
   ‘she began to cry / they began to dance’
   b. *m’ aviti a perdunari* (Reggio Calabria)
   me= you.have to to.forgive
   ‘you must forgive me’

A further disparity concerns the extension of finite complementation to *make*. In Italo-Greek and *Salentino*, *make* patterns more readily with *let*, though still not forming a single class of ‘causatives’ with the latter since in some of these same varieties *let* only licenses finite complementation (cf. (a) examples below), whereas *make* also allows an infinitival complement
(cf. (b)-(c) examples below), hence the order \ldots know \succ [make > let] \succ want\ldots. In Calabrese, by contrast, we have seen in Table 2 that make is more susceptible to infinitival complementation than modal know and hence, in turn, even more detached from causative let (viz. \ldots make \succ know \succ let\ldots) which shows a greater propensity towards finite complementation (30a-b).

(27) a. astu n’ artune (gk, Cassoni, [1937] 1990: 107)
   let.IMP that they.come
   ‘Let them come!’
   
   b. ‘S’ ōcama tossu ’na fai (Climera (gk), Cassoni, [1937] 1990: 152)
   you= I.made so.much that you.eat
   ‘I made you eat so much’
   
   c. Oli cànnome pragalisi (gk, Morosi, 1870: 137)
   all.PL we.make to.pray
   ‘We all make pray’

(28) a. âfì na se filio (gc, Violi, 2004: 118)
   let.IMP that you= I.kiss
   ‘Let me kiss you!’
   
   b. kàme na pettòi apànù (gc, Violi, 2004: 130)
   make.IMP that he.ascends up
   ‘Make him go up!’
   
   c. me kànni pethànì (gc, Violi, 2004: 130)
   me= he.makes to.die
   ‘He’s killing me’

(29) a. Lassa ttrow ddu baccalà te sirda (Lecce)
   let.IMP I.find that cod of sister=you
   ‘Let me find that fool of a sister of yours’
   
   b. fazzu cu te llicchi li musi (Lecce)
   I.make that yourself= you.lick the lips
   ‘I’ll make you lick your lips’
   
   c. te fazzu ccògghiere li tienti te terra (Lecce)
   you= I.make to.ccollect the teeth of earth
   ‘I’ll make you pick your teeth up from the floor’

(30) a. i dassu ’u parranu (Nicotera, VV)
   them= I.let that they.speak
   ‘I let them speak’


(i) ton èkame ce apèthane (gc)
   him= he.made and he.died
   ‘he made him die’

\footnote{On the deletion of the irrealis complementizer cu in this example, see the discussion in §3.2.1 below.}
b. cu chiju chi mi stati facendu passari! (Nicotera, VV)
   with that which me= you.stand making to.pass
   ‘With all you’re putting me through!’

Overall the biggest difference, however, concerns the extent of the spread of finite complementation which has progressed to different degrees in the four dialect groups, reaching its height in Griko where it is now obligatory with all functional predicates other than can (cf. though note 23), followed by Greko where, broadly speaking, it has entirely replaced the infinitive after all predicates except can, hear, know and make, and finally to a much lesser extent in Salentino and Calabrese where today it only proves obligatory with a handful of predicates situated at the rightmost part of the scale (viz. (want >) come > go).

To sum up, diachronically there is extensive and largely unpredictable variation in the distribution of infinitival and finite complementation both across and within individual areas and dialects and, synchronically, even within the same speech community. At the same time, most of these differences can ultimately be reduced to idiosyncratic variation in the selectional properties of individual lexical items in accordance with our definition of nanoparametric variation above. To be sure, as with Biberauer and Roberts’ (in press) discussion of variation in the English auxiliary system, the variation and instability observed in relation to the distribution of infinitival and finite complementation in Magna Graecia does not readily lend itself to an explanation in terms of independent linguistic principles or theories such as Cinque’s (1999; 2004; 2006) highly-articulated theory of clause structure which might lead us to expect, for example, the extension of finite complementation to follow, say bottom-up, the order of functional projections predicted by his rich clausal architecture. On the contrary, the variation witnessed here can be most naturally modelled in terms of the more marked options made available by the lower branches of a complementation parameter hierarchy along the lines of (31):
(31) Can selected functional heads \((C, T, \nu)\) be [+finite]?

No: CG  Yes

Are modal features obligatory on all heads? (= dual complementizer system)

No: st. Romance  Yes

Do they license the obviation effect (= control effects)?

Yes: Latin \((UT, QUOD)\)  No (= Balkan varieties)

Can they be specified [-finite] (= infinitives)?

No: SMG  Yes

Can they be selected by ‘hear’ (=1 or more lexical Vs)?

No: Griko  Yes

Can they be selected by ‘let’?

No: Greko  Yes

Can they be selected by ‘want’?

No: Salentino  Yes: Calabrese…

Our first question in (31) relates to a mesoparametric distinction which allows us to identify languages like Classical Greek, where a naturally definable subclass of selected functional heads \(C, T\) and \(\nu\) (all specified as [+V]) are uniformly specified negatively for the [+finite] feature, thereby capturing the fact that sentential complements invariably surface in non-finite form.²⁷ More marked by comparison is the subsequent question regarding the obligatory marking of \([\pm\text{realis}]\) modal features on all such functional heads, which serves to draw a distinction between those varieties that present dual complementizer systems (e.g. Latin, Balkan varieties) and those that do not (e.g. standard Romance).²⁸ This amounts to a case of microparametric variation in that it isolates a small – indeed, in this particular case, binary –, lexically definable subclass of functional heads (e.g. Ro. \(cā\) vs sā, Cal. ca vs mu).²⁹ Among those varieties that present dual complementizer systems, we can, in turn, further distinguish between those which license the obviation effect (namely, display control effects) such as Latin and those that do not, a contrast


²⁸ On the possibility of (Romance) complementizers variously lexicalizing \(C, T\) and \(\nu\) heads, see Ledgeway (2013; in press a).

²⁹ Of course, in the case of Greek and its dialects the situation proves more complex, in that the complementizer system offers a richer array of lexical forms including, in addition to \(oτί\) and \(nα\) also \(pou\) (cf. Nicholas, 1998; Roussou, 2000; 2010; Roussou and Roberts 2001; Roussou and Tsangalidis, 2010). Nonetheless, the fact remains that the distinction is ultimately a binary one, namely \(oτί / pou\) vs \(nα\), however one wishes ultimately to represent it formally (e.g. \([\pm\text{realis}]\) or \([\pm\text{factive}]\)).
which conveniently singles out the relevant Balkan(-style) varieties of immediate interest to us here. Within this subset of languages the availability of the [-finite] feature, intended here to indicate the availability or otherwise of the infinitive, allows us to make the relevant distinction between standard modern Greek (and indeed all other dialects of Greek except Pontic) on the one hand and Italo-Greek, Salentino and Calabrese on the other.

It is, however, from this point onwards that we move into nanoparametric territory, since the only way to make sense of the observed variation in the selectional properties of different functional predicates is to make explicit reference to individual lexical items in terms of the implicational scales, themselves presented as pure stipulations at this stage rather than derivable from general linguistic principles,30 outlined in Tables 1, 2 and 3. For instance, the exceptional restriction of the infinitive to can in Griko can only be formalized in terms of the rather specific question regarding whether such [-finite] heads (= infinitives) can be selected by the specific lexical item hear. If the answer is negative, then the only other lexical predicate to its left, namely can, must by implication be able to select an infinitival complement, thereby correctly isolating Griko. By a similar process of explicit lexical identification we can isolate the other three broad dialect groups: if the infinitive cannot be selected by let, then this implies that it can only be selected by all functional predicates to its left (viz. can...make), the correct characterization of Greko, and if unavailable to be selected by want, then this further isolates Salentino from Calabrese where only predicates to the left of want license infinitival complementation (viz. can...aspectuals).31 Without doubt, this admittedly somewhat messy characterization of the facts bears all the hallmarks of nanoparametric variation, to the extent that we are dealing with a largely unpredictable and irregular distribution of the infinitive based purely on the idiosyncratic variation of individual lexical items, rather than on naturally definable classes or lexically definable subclasses of functional heads.

3.2.1 C(omplementizer)-drop

Staying with complementation, we can note a further subtle difference between Italo-Greek and southern Italo-Romance in the area of C(omplementizer)-drop. Although we have established that, following the (Italo-)Greek pattern, Romance dialects of this area have developed a dual complementizer system, the relevant facts concerning the distribution of both complementizers is not identical in both dialect groups. Essentially, Calabrese dialects (34a-b) pattern on a par with both Italo-Greek varieties (32)-(33), in that both the realis and irrealis complementizers must invariably be pronounced.

you.think that him= we.find
‘Do you think that we’ll find him?’

30 See, however, Givón (1990: 826, 853) and Cristofaro (1998) for functionalist explanations in terms of greater or lesser semantico-pragmatic integration between the functional predicate and its sentential complement.

31 As Ian Roberts (p.c.) points outs, these nanoparametric options could be more appropriately formalized in terms of θ-role and Case features: perception verbs like hear assign a θ-role to their eventive internal argument, whereas causatives like let assign just Case (cf. Roberts 2013), and volitionals like want, in their modals sense, are just raising triggers, assigning neither θ-role nor Case to their complement. This would reduce the parametric options to θ-role and Case feature bundles of various kinds.
b. Τέλι *(nna) su pó (gk, Rohlfs, 1969)
you.want that you= I.say
‘you want me to tell you’

(33) a. Εγώ tus àcua *(ti) eplatègguai (Bova (gc))
I them= heard that they.spoke
b. Εγώ tus àcua *(na) platèttsusi (Bova (ge))
I them= heard that they.speak
‘I heard them speaking’

(34) a. Ti cuntano *(ca) su’ stanchi morti (Catanzaro)
you= they.tell that they.are tired dead
‘They tell you that they’re dead tired’

b. Ti scialavi *(ma) ’i guardi (Catanzaro)
yourself= you.enjoyed that them= you.watch
‘You enjoyed watching them’

In Salentino dialects, by contrast, the irrealis complementizer cu (35b), but not its realis counterpart ca (35a), is regularly dropped (cf. Rohlfs, 1969: 105; Calabrese, 1993: 81 n. 8; Terzi, 1996), a phenomenon which cannot simply be reduced to a PF phenomenon, at least in the northern dialects of Salento where C-drop licenses significant structural effects (for detailed discussion, see Ledgeway, 2013; in press a);

(35) a. Te l’ia tittu *(ca) è nu bravu vagnone (Cellino San Marco, BR)
you= it=1.had said that he.is a good boy
‘I told you that he’s a good lad’

b. Ce bbuei *(cu) ddici? (Cellino San Marco, BR)
what you.want that you.say
‘What do you want to say?’

In light of these facts, we can now slightly modify our proposed complementation parameter hierarchy in (31) to incorporate this microparametric difference between Salentino on the one hand and Calabrese and Italo-Greek on the other. In (36) we produce the relevant portion of the hierarchy that takes account of this C-drop option:32

---

32 Note that C-drop is also found in a number of standard Romance varieties in marked modal contexts (e.g. in subordinate clauses containing a verb in the subjunctive or the future or conditional), the evidence of which can be used to argue for the existence of a dual complementizer system (albeit with homophonous complementizers) in these same varieties. For further discussion, see Poletto (2001), Ledgeway (2013; in press a), Ledgeway and Lombardi (in press).
(36) Can selected functional heads \((C, T, v)\) be [+finite]?

No: CG          Yes
Are modal features obligatory on all heads? (= dual complementizer system)

No: St. Romance  Yes
Do they license the obviation effect (= control effects)?

Yes: Latin \((UT, QUOD)\)  No (= Balkan varieties)
Are modal features fully specified on all heads?

No: Salentino \(=\)C-drop  Yes: SMG, Griko, Greko, Cal.

3.3 The definite article

We now return to the distribution of the definite article. Above we noted how in Griko (37a) and Greko (37b) the use of the definite article proves obligatory with proper names in accordance with a usage only partially reflected in the surrounding Romance dialects, witness the contrast between Salentino and Calabrese in (38a-b).

(37) a. Allù sessanta irte puru o Steo \(\text{gk, www.glossagrika.it}\)
   at.the sixty came also the Steo
   ‘In 1960s Steo also came over’

   b. I Romi è ppon òria a’ tti Nnàpuli \(\text{Sternatia (gk)}\)
   the Rome is more beautiful than the Naples
   ‘Rome is more beautiful than Naples’

(38) a. Nu’ à nisu lu tescorsu te la Catarina cu llu Saveriu? \(\text{Lecce}\)
   not you have heard the speech of the Catarina with the Saveriu
   ‘Didn’t you hear Catarina’s discussion with Saverio?’

   b. \((\text{La})\) Maria mi fici scriveri tutti i cosi \(\text{Bova}\)\(^{33}\)
   the Maria me= made to.write all the things
   ‘Maria made me write everything down’

The variation witnessed in this area finds an elegant explanation in terms of the parametric approach to the development of the Greek article and the structure of the DP expounded in Guardiano (2006). In particular, she breaks down the observed variation across different diachronic varieties of Greek into four microparametric options (39a–c), which we can, in turn, directly incorporate into a parameter hierarchy along the lines of (40), part of a larger word structure hierarchy (Roberts, 2012; Biberauer and Roberts, in press):

\(^{33}\) Cf., however, the obligatory use of the article in the equivalent Bovese Greko sentence: \((I)\) Maria mu ècame na gràzzo pasa prama.
Our first question in (40) relates to the microparametric option (39a) which serves to distinguish between those languages that lack articles such as ancient Greek and Latin, which fail to grammaticalize definiteness overtly in the syntax through the lexicalization of the D position with a definite article (cf. Bošković, 2005a,b; 2008, in press; Bošković and Gajewski, 2011; Ledgeway, 2012: 43-46), and those that do. Among the latter group we can further isolate through option (39b) those varieties such as Classical Greek which, despite presenting a definite article, fail to grammaticalize the [±count] distinction in the DP and hence lack an indefinite article. Among those that grammaticalize both the definite and indefinite articles we can further distinguish in accordance with (39c) between weak and strong D languages (Guardiano and Longobardi, 2005). Varieties of the former group such as English do not require overt association in the syntax between N and D, hence kind-reference is not explicitly lexicalized on D in these varieties, witness the absence of the article in English sentences such as (*The) grass is green. In strong D languages such as Greek and Romance varieties, by contrast, kind-reference has to be licensed through explicit association of N and D in the syntax, witness the obligatory use of an expletive article in the equivalent French sentence *(L’)herbe est verte.

Crucially, among the strong D varieties that interest here we can finally distinguish on the basis of the parametric option (39d) between those that exhibit N(-to-D)-raising and those that do not. Standard modern Greek squarely falls into the latter category, as is immediately revealed by its strict adherence to the A+N order with definite DPs and the requirement that D be lexicalized with an expletive article in conjunction with proper names (41a-b; cf. Mackridge, 1985: 198; Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton, 1997: 276–278).
3.4 Verb movement

Finally, we turn our attention to the verb to consider what structural parallels Greek-Romance contact has produced on the verbal system. In some respects, the parallels between the two varieties prove quite remarkable (Rohlfs, 1977: 193-203; Katsoyannou, 1992: 301-323; Italia Gemma and Lambroyorgo, 2001: 107-124; Remberger, 2011: 130-43), as was already noted...
above in relation to the distribution of the passato remoto in contexts of present relevance on a par with the use of the Italo-Greek aorist (cf. 2a-b). By way of further illustration, consider the overview of verbal paradigms in Calabrese, Greko and standard modern Greek presented in Table 4 taken from Remberger (2011: 132). While we can standardly recognize eight distinct paradigms for modern standard Greek, this number goes down to just four in Calabrese and Greko which both lack progressive and non-progressive futures, the future perfect and the present perfect, thereby revealing a perfect formal parallelism between the two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calabrese &amp; Greko</th>
<th>SMG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>Simple Past/Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive future</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Overview of verbal paradigms in Calabrese & Greko and SMG

Indeed, the parallels between the Italo-Greek and local Romance verb systems go even further, as revealed by the identical formal development of aspectual periphrases in both dialect groups. Beginning with Greko and Calabrese, we can note that in both varieties progressive (44a-b) and continuative (45a-b) aspects are marked through a grammaticalized periphrasis consisting of ‘stand’ (= steko/starí) and ‘go’ (= pao/iri), respectively, followed by a non-finite verb form (active participle in -onda/gerund in -ndu).

(44) a. tri’ animágga, pu estékai mirýázonda to kréa (Roccaforte (gc))
three animals which stood sharing the meat
‘three animals, which were sharing the meat’

Note that in Italo-Greek théló never grammaticalized as a future marker which is expressed by the simple present (i.a; Morosi, 1870: 145; Rohlf’s, 1977: 193-194; Violi, 2004: 67, 73), and that the periphrasis consisting of èxó ‘have’ + perfect passive participle (in -mena) carries only a resultative meaning (i.b; Morosi, 1870: 142; Rohlf’s, 1977: 196-197), and not a temporal perfective interpretation as in standard modern Greek which is expressed instead by the aorist (i.c):

(i) a Avri èrcome evò (gk) / sas tes iftyázo egó (Roccaforte (gc))
tomorrow come.PRES.1SG I you= them repair.PRES.1SG I
‘I’ll come tomorrow / I’ll repair them for you’

b Èxó faména (gk) / Ton èxó krimméno (Roccaforte (gc))
I have eaten / it= I have hidden
‘I’ve finished eating (and am now full up) / I’ve got it hidden away’

c Éfa (gk) / egó ōn ákua mai mentuvéspi èttiündom mágo (Roccaforte)
I late I not heard never to.mention that wizard
‘I’ve eaten / I’ve never heard mention of that wizard’

34 Note that in Italo-Greek théló never grammaticalized as a future marker which is expressed by the simple present (i.a; Morosi, 1870: 145; Rohlf’s, 1977: 193-194; Violi, 2004: 67, 73), and that the periphrasis consisting of èxó ‘have’ + perfect passive participle (in -mena) carries only a resultative meaning (i.b; Morosi, 1870: 142; Rohlf’s, 1977: 196-197), and not a temporal perfective interpretation as in standard modern Greek which is expressed instead by the aorist (i.c):

(i) a Avri èrcome evò (gk) / sas tes iftyázo egó (Roccaforte (gc))
tomorrow come.PRES.1SG I you= them repair.PRES.1SG I
‘I’ll come tomorrow / I’ll repair them for you’

b Èxó faména (gk) / Ton èxó krimméno (Roccaforte (gc))
I have eaten / it= I have hidden
‘I’ve finished eating (and am now full up) / I’ve got it hidden away’

c Éfa (gk) / egó ōn ákua mai mentuvéspi èttiündom mágo (Roccaforte)
I late I not heard never to.mention that wizard
‘I’ve eaten / I’ve never heard mention of that wizard’

b. **Staju vinendu i Missina** (Reggio Calabria)
   I stand coming from Messina
   ‘I’m on my way from Messina’

(45) a. énan áthropo ton ivre ti ípiye parpatónda ya ta χoráfya (Bova)
   a man him= found that he went walking for the fields
   ‘a man found him who was (continuously) walking through the fields’

b. **Ddhu poviredhhu va girandu casi casi** (Reggio Calabria)
   that poor.DIM goes turning houses houses
   ‘That poor man is going around from house to house’

A very similar situation is found in **Griko** and **Salentino**, where progressive aspect (46a-b) is expressed by a hypotactic structure ‘stand and’ (= stéo cé/sto a) followed by the finite verb, where ‘stand’ shows varying degrees of inflectional attrition (Ledgeway 2008), including the non-agreeing forms (st)é (gk) and sta (Sal.). Both varieties also employ an analogous hypotactic structure for the expression of prospective aspect, namely ‘go (and)’ (= pao (cé) / ire (a)) followed by the finite verb (47a-b).

(46) a. **sté(o) ĉe tró / ĉe vréχi** (Zollino / Martignano)
   I stand and I eat STAND and it rains
   ‘I’m eating / It is raining’

b. **Cce sta ffaciti a dda intru? / Sta cuntamu cose** (Lecce / Matino)
   what STAND you do to there inside STAND we recount things
   ‘What are you doing in there? / We’re discussing things’

(47) a. **pao wrisco tipo** (Calimera (gk), Cassoni [1937] 1990: 164)
   I go I find something
   ‘I’ll go and fetch something’

b. **Se nu’ ppachi li cinquecentu miglioni bba’ ccite marituta** (Lecce)
   if not you pay the 500 millions go he kills husband=your
   ‘Unless you pay 500 million lire, he’s gonna kill your husband’

Despite these remarkable parallels in the verbal systems of Italo-Greek and the local Romance dialects, a major and unexpected difference emerges in relation to the different extent of verb movement in both varieties. By way of example, consider first the contrast in the unmarked position of the finite verb witnessed in the English and French examples in (48a-b):

(48) a. **John** [T Ø [v-VP often cleans his car]] (Eng.)
   b. **Jean** [T nettoie [v-VP souvent nettoie sa voiture]] (Fr.)

Exploiting the fixed positions of VP-adverbs like ‘always’ as a diagnostic indicator of the left edge of the v-VP complex, it is possible to distinguish between overt verb-raising languages like French, where the finite verb raises to the T position to the left of VP-adverbs, and languages like English, where the verb remains *in situ* to the right of such VP-adverbs and the T position is not overtly lexicalized in the syntax. This difference is traditionally retraced to the respective
richness of verbal inflection in the two languages (Emonds, 1978; Pollock, 1989; Belletti, 1990: 44-45; Cinque, 1999: 152; Biberauer and Roberts 2008).

Nonetheless, recent research has revealed a much more nuanced interpretation of Romance verb movement than these familiar broad-brush treatments which classify Romance tout court as having overt verb movement. Following the seminal work of Cinque (1999), Infl/T is now commonly interpreted as a general label for the rich inflectional area of the clause (the Infl/T-domain) made up of a series of distinct functional projections dedicated to marking various temporal, aspectual, modal and voice distinctions ranging over the lexical verb, its arguments, and possible adjuncts which can also be identified by the semantically corresponding adverbial modifiers they host (cf. also Cinque, 2002; 2006; Belletti, 2004; Rizzi, 2004). Armed with these assumptions about a universal fixed hierarchy of adverb positions and corresponding functional projections, it is therefore possible to provide a more fine-grained comparative analysis of verb movement. In this respect, it has been shown that the dialects of southern Italy present low V-movement (Ledgeway and Lombardi, 2005:103-106; in press; Schifano, 2011; in prep.; Ledgeway, 2012: §4.3.2; in press b), as revealed by the following representative Calabrese (49a) and Salentino (49b) examples where the verb does not raise above Cinque’s (1999) pre-VP aspectual adverbs (including not even, already, still, always, hardly, almost):

(49) a. Gianni mancu / sempi / amalappena [v-VP fumava] (Cal.)
   John not.even always hardly smoked
   ‘John didn’t even smoke / John always/hardly smoked’

   b. l’Anna già / ncora / quasi [v-VP u sapia] (Sal.)
   the.Anna already still almost it=knew
   ‘Anna already / still / almost knew’

Nonetheless, it is not possible to conclude that the verb in southern Italian dialects does not raise at all, inasmuch as it must occur to the left of Cinque’s lowest pre-VP adverbs such as ‘well’ and ‘everything’, as illustrated by the following examples:

(50) a. Rosina [T… [AspField sempi cucina bbonu [v-VP cucina]]] (Cal.)
   Rosina always cooks good
   ‘Rosina always cooks well’

   b. iddru [T… [AspField sempre sente tuttu bonu [v-VP sente forchè de l’ urtima parola]]] (Sal.)
   he always hears all well except of the last word
   ‘he always hears everything perfectly except for the last word’

We are led to assume therefore that in the dialects of southern Italy the verb raises to a medial position within Cinque’s pre-VP aspectual adverb field.

Now, given the unmistakable parallels between the verb system of Calabrese/Salentino and Italo-Greek observed so far, it is natural to expect the extent of V-movement in Italo-Greek to be similarly quite low. However, the results of a preliminary examination reveal that this prediction is not borne out. Rather, V-movement in Italo-Greek would appear to pattern identically with standard modern Greek, which is standardly reported to display high V-movement to T (Rivero,
1994; Rivero and Terzi, 1995; Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1998), a position from where it precedes all pre-VP adverbs. Below in (51)-(52) we report some representative examples from Greko and Griko, respectively, which illustrate the higher position of the verb in Italo-Greek.

(51) a. δεν éfaga akomí (Roccaforte (gc))
    not I.ate yet
    ‘I haven’t eaten yet’
b. ečíní ston ĝipo e ppánda (Roccaforte (gc))
    she in.the garden is always
    ‘she is always in the garden’
c. e ssónno porpatim bléo (Condofuri (gc))
    not I.can to.walk anymore
    ‘I can’t walk anymore’
d. i anaráða eyávi sırma ĉ’ ékraš’ ečinda yinêka (Rochudi (gc))
    the anarada went early and called that lady
    ‘the anarada [= hooved-lady!!] didn’t delay in calling that lady’
e. t’ alévvi tos sáabbo en étell’onnem mái (Bova (gc))
    the flour of.the sack not finished never
    ‘the flour from the sack never ran out’

(52) a. ja mia kuindicina ĝkatto panta e missionari (gk, www.glossagrika.it)
    for a fortnight came always the missionaries
    ‘the missionaries would always come for a fortnight’
b. e’ penzean pleo (gk, www.glossagrika.it)
    not they.thought anymore
    ‘they were no longer thinking’
c. En ermáztte mái (gk, www.glossagrika.it)
    not they.marry never
    ‘They’ll never get married’
d. Ekhi già dio (gk, www.glossagrika.it)
    he.has already two
    ‘He’ll already be two years old’
e. E’ ráttu mánu (gk, www.glossagrika.it)
    not they.sow not.even
    ‘They don’t even sew’

Interestingly, however, there is one context in which V-movement patterns identically both in Italo-Greek and in the local Romance dialects. As argued in Ledgeway (2009; 2012b), D’Alessandro and Ledgeway (2010: 2053-2056) and Ledgeway and Lombardi (in press), the finite lexical verb in the dialects of southern Italy exceptionally undergoes high movement to T in irrealis clauses where, as in Italo-Greek and Greek more generally, nothing can intervene between the irrealis complementizer/particle (mu, ma, mí, cu) and the finite verb other than clitic elements (e.g. pronouns, negation; cf. Ledgeway, 1998). The dialects of southern Italy thus display a significant asymmetry between irrealis and non-irrealis clauses (see also Schifano, in

36 For a more nuanced interpretation of the modern Greek facts, see however Mavrogorgios (2010: 182-185).
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prep., for similar data from other Romance varieties): whereas the verb raises to a low position in the lower pre-VP aspectual field in both root and realis complement clauses (53a), in irrealis clauses the verb exceptionally targets the highest available position within the T-domain (53b).

(53) a. \( (tice \ ca) \left[ T \ l' \ Anna \ [Asp \ già \ u \ sape \ [v-VP \ sape]] \right] \) (Sal.)
   ‘(He says that) Anna already knows’

b. \( speru \ cu \left[ T \ u \ sape \ [Asp \ già \ (*u \ sape) \ [v-VP \ sape]] \right] \) (Sal.)
   ‘I hope that he already knows’

In light of these facts, it is tempting to conclude that the higher verb movement observed in irrealis clauses is a consequence of contact with Italo-Greek. Recall from above (§3.2) that, in contrast to other Romance languages and varieties, the Romance dialects of this area make very little use of the infinitive, the functions of which are in most cases replaced by a finite irrealis clause following the distinctive complementation pattern of the surrounding Italo-Greek varieties. It would appear therefore that the dialects of this area borrowed not only the superficial complementation pattern, which left little consequent space for the infinitive and introduced a dual complementizer system, but they also borrowed the syntax (namely, the exceptionally high V-placement) associated with the introduction of an irrealis complementizer. By contrast, root clauses and realis complement clauses, which do not typically replace the infinitive, were left unaffected and continue to display the default low V-placement typical of all Romance dialects of the south of Italy (Ledgeway and Lombardi, in press). The result is a hybrid grammar which combines (local) Romance low V-placement in realis contexts with Greek-style high V-placement in irrealis contexts.

These differences in the extent of V-placement in the two dialect groups can therefore be modelled in terms of the parameter hierarchy in (53), in which the various movement options have been embedded within a larger word structure parameter hierarchy (cf. Roberts, 2012; Biberauer and Roberts, in press). Focusing on the portion of the hierarchy which interests us most here, we note that generalized high V-placement in Italo-Greek constitutes a mesoparametric option, since V-placement does not discriminate among different subtypes of T probe, but simply applies across the board productively raising verbal categories of all kinds to T. Italo-Greek thus contrasts with the more restricted and marked microparametric V-placement options that immediately follow in the hierarchy, where only a specific subclass of T probes trigger movement. In the cases at hand the relevant discriminating feature is informally labelled [modal], which isolates a subclass of modally marked instantiations of T capable of attracting the verb. In the case of Calabrese and Salentino the relevant feature is intended to single out all instantiations of irrealis modality, where \( T_{Modal} \) probes, and hence is lexicalized by, all [+V] categories, be these lexical Vs or auxiliary vs. Modern English, by contrast, assumes a more restrictive version of this option where T only probes modals (\( v_{Aux} \)), but not lexical verbs. Of course, we have seen that not all verbs in Calabrese and Salentino are probed by T, and this falls out directly from the negative specification for the preceding mesoparametric option regarding the ability of T to trigger head-movement. In short, if T does not probe the verb, then the next
least marked option is for the verb to be probed by the next functional head down, namely Asp,\textsuperscript{37} giving rise to the typically low verb movement observed for [-irrealis] verbs in the dialects of southern Italy, including \textit{Calabrese} and \textit{Salentino} (Ledgeway and Lombardi, in press). Even more restricted options are instantiated by modern English, where lexical Vs are limited to raising to $v$, and those languages with serial verb constructions (SVCs) where lexical V does not raise at all.

(53) Do all functional heads trigger head-movement?

Yes: Polysynthesis  
\textit{Mohawk}  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Do [+V] probes?
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Yes: V-mvt  
    \item No: \Rightarrow N-movement subhierarchy…
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Does T? (= [Vb+Asp]-to-T mvt)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Yes  
    \item No
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item All T probes?  
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Yes: high V-mvt  
    \item No: low V-mvt
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item SIDs  
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Does \textit{v}? (= V-to-$\textit{v}$ mvt)
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

4 Discussion and conclusions

The detailed discussion of Italo-Greek and southern Italo-Romance morphosyntax above has shown beyond all doubt how, at least on the surface, the grammars of the these two broad linguistic groups are in many respects very similar, to the extent that the observed structural parallels are far too striking for them to be dismissed as accidental but, rather, must be considered the result of centuries-old structural contact between Greek and Romance, ultimately to be placed towards the upper end of Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) five-point scale of contact intensity. With the sole exception of adjectival positions in Italo-Greek (cf. §3.3), the direction of such contact has consistently been shown to be unidirectional, involving the transfer and extension of original Greek structural features into the surrounding Romance varieties. At the same time, however, we have seen that a detailed examination of these contact phenomena

\textsuperscript{37} Asp is to be interpreted here as one of a series of functional heads within the lower pre-VP aspektual field. We are glossing here over considerable microparametric differences across varieties in terms of which specific instantiations of Asp may probe the verb. For detailed discussion in relation to Romance, see Schifano (in prep.).

\textsuperscript{38} We leave open for future research the various options here, assuming that in some languages V-movement is triggered by more marked instantiations of T including, among others, [-finite] T. This is presumably the correct characterization for Italian, where finite lexical verbs raise to a clause-medial position (immediately above the lower pre-VP field), whereas non-finite verb forms such as the infinitive obligatorily raise to T (Belletti, 1990: 70-76; Cinque, 1999: 143-146; Ledgeway, 2012: 144-145; in press b: §2.1.2.2).
reveals how the finer details of such structural parallels often differ in subtle and unexpected ways once adopted in Romance: this highlights how speakers have not so much borrowed actual Greek forms but, rather, reshaped and reanalysed, often in a process of replication (Heine and Kuteva, 2003; 2005), already existing Romance categories (e.g. dative and genitive marking, finite and infinitival complementation, article usage, and verb movement) to approximate the superficial Greek models and patterns. Indeed, data like these highlight how the varieties in question marry together in still poorly explored and largely little understood ways facets of core Romance and Greek syntax to produce a number of innovative hybrid grammars, the evidence of which can be profitably used to throw light on the nature of parametric variation and the proper formal characterization of convergence and divergence.

In the case of Italo-Greek and southern Italo-Romance, which it must not be forgotten independently share a common Indo-European ancestry that is in large part responsible for their shared macro- and mesoparametric settings (e.g. head-initial, nominative-accusative alignment, pro-drop), observed Greek-biased convergence between the two can typically be reduced to a surface effect of shared microparametric settings. By way of illustration, consider once again the case of sentential complementation. Specifically, we saw that southern Italo-Romance patterns not with standard Romance, but, rather, with Italo-Greek in exhibiting a dual complementizer system, the manifestation of which was argued to be ultimately understood as a case of microparametric variation in terms of the obligatory marking of $±$realis modal features on all selected functional heads. On the other hand, the more subtle nature of divergence between southern Italo-Romance and Italo-Greek can be reduced to the surface effect of different settings in relation to hierarchically ‘deeper’ microparametric options and, above all, in relation to nanoparametric differences. Returning again to sentential complementation, although Italo-Romance and Italo-Greek share the same microparametric settings in relation to $±$realis modal features (= dual complementizer system), licensing of the obviation effect (= lack of control) and non-finiteness (= presence of infinitives), we have seen how only distinct nanoparametric settings can provide the key to understanding why they differ quite radically and in largely unpredictable ways with regard to the individual functional predicates that may or may not select the infinitive. This is another significant aspect where the parameter hierarchies prove particularly enlightening, inasmuch as the ‘relic syntax’ associated with these nanoparametric properties provide us with a valuable window on what must have formerly been productive complementation patterns that our extremely limited textual record does not allow us to observe directly in its entirety (cf. Biberauer and Roberts, in press). Indeed, one of the general predictions of the parameter hierarchies discussed by Biberauer and Roberts (in press) is that the parameters situated higher in the hierarchy (e.g. macro- and mesoparameters) should display greater stability over time than both micro- and nanoparametric options situated in the lower portions of the hierarchy. Although the time depth of our textual records is admittedly rather limited (cf. Tables 1 and 2), we can nonetheless see over the course of approximately 150 years that the rate and extent of change over this period has been quite considerable, not to say catastrophic in particular cases, with the infinitive now restricted in many, though not all, varieties to just one predicate, namely ‘can’. This progressive yet swift diffusion of finite complementation at the expense of the infinitive highlights a process of diachronic regularization of finite complementation in all except the most frequent cases in the primary linguistic data (PLD), namely after ‘can’ (and to a lesser extent after ‘hear’ > ‘know/make’), where the more marked nature of the featural specification associated with the particular lexical items involved is overridden by their prominence in the PLD.
Turning finally to the title of this paper, it is appropriate to ask whether the local Romance varieties of *Magna Graecia* can indeed be regarded as Greek disguised as Romance. The preceding discussion has provided and reviewed abundant evidence to demonstrate that ultimately this interpretation is untenable. Although such a view has traditionally enjoyed a great deal of acceptance, hence Rohlfs’ now classic slogan *spirito greco, materia romanza*, it is based on rather superficial structural similarities deriving from retained macro- and mesoparametric settings and, above all, from shared ‘shallow’ (= hierarchically higher) microparametric settings. However, as soon as one begins to peel back the layers, it soon becomes clear that convergence through grammars in contact does not necessarily lead to simple borrowing and transference through interference, but more frequently gives rise to new hybrid structures born of reanalysis of the original Greek structures within an emergent Romance grammar instantiating ‘deeper’ (= hierarchically lower) microparametric and, above all, nanoparametric options. This observation goes against the general prediction (cf. Biberauer and Roberts, in press) that, all things being equal, syntactic change should proceed ‘upwards’ in the hierarchy as acquirers strip away features in their attempt to postulate the simplest featural analyses compatible with the PLD (Roberts and Roussou, 2003). In the particular cases at hand, however, we are dealing with convergence where speakers are not so much trying to provide the best fit with the PLD, but, rather, are striving to accommodate fully acquired structures from their native L1 in a ‘less’ native L2, frequently introducing competing and additional options within the contact grammar. Within this scenario, one possibility that presents itself to speakers is to simply eradicate such redundancy from the system, as appears to have been the case with the gradual demise of the infinitive where apparent optionality in the choice of complement type has been radically reduced in recent times according to different lexical classes giving rise to the observed nanoparametric variation.39 Another is to reanalyse such optionality as meaningful variation, thereby enriching the contact grammar with new choices and concomitant distinctions. This appears to have been the case with the *dativo greco*, where the introduction of Greek-style genitive marking of *recipient* arguments does not replace dative marking wholesale, but, rather, emerges as a marked context-sensitive option that is specialized in the marking of individual *recipient* arguments in accordance with their [±presuppositional] reading.
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