

**Greek and Romance in contact: when finite becomes non-finite**

Adam Ledgeway (anl21@cam.ac.uk), Norma Schifano (ns513@cam.ac.uk), Giuseppina Silvestri (gs486@cam.ac.uk) (University of Cambridge)

**The problem.** Within the traditional typology of causative structures (Comrie 1985), the Romance languages are known to exhibit an infinitival construction which is intermediate between the analytic and the morphological type, as shown by the presence of two independent predicates (analytic feature) and the tight cohesion between the causative and the lexical verb (morphological feature) (cf. Kayne 1975; Guasti 1993; Sheehan 2016). The aim of our presentation is to discuss novel empirical evidence from causatives in the present-day Romance (Calabrese) and Italo-Greek (Grecanico) dialects of southern Italy which have been in continuous contact for centuries, leading to the emergence of two innovative patterns which are neither wholly Romance nor Greek, but can, at best, be defined as hybrid structures exhibiting a mixture of Romance monoclausal infinitival syntax with Greek-style biclausal finite syntax. The evidence discussed proves particularly interesting in that it both enriches the existing typology of causative constructions and sheds new light on contact-induced change and, in particular, the nature and development of the category of finiteness.

**The data.** Both Calabrese and Grecanico exhibit Balkan-style complementation, whereby the infinitive has largely been replaced by finite complementation, with the exception of a small class of functional predicates where the infinitival still (optionally) survives (cf. Rohlfs 1969, 1977; Joseph 1983; Lombardi 1997; Katsoyannou 2001; Ledgeway 2004, 2013; Manzini & Savoia 2005; Squillaci 2016). Within this scenario, the traditional pattern for causative constructions is summarised in Table 1, where an infinitival intransitive (Type 1) / transitive (Type 2) type alternates with a finite intransitive (Type 3) / transitive (Type 4) variant:

Table 1: Distribution of infinitival and finite causatives (Traditional Pattern)

	Infinitival Construction		Finite Construction	
	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
	<i>I.make sing.INF Giorgio<sub>ACC</sub></i>	<i>I.make sing.INF the song to Giorgio<sub>DAT</sub></i>	<i>I.make that sings Giorgio<sub>NOM</sub></i>	<i>I.make that sings the song Giorgio<sub>NOM</sub></i>
Gr.	(+)(not common)	+	+	?+(not common)
Cal.	?+(not common)	+	+	?+(not common)

Recent fieldwork, however, has brought to light two new innovative finite patterns (cf. Table 2) where, following the increased use of finite complementation at the expense of the infinitive and arguably under the influence of Italian, the syntax of the original infinitival construction has been implanted into the finite construction. This has given rise to a structure where the Recipient of the causation is marked accusative in the intransitive construction (Type 3\*) (cf. Recipient in Type 1) and dative in the transitive one (Type 4\*) (cf. Type 2):

Table 2: Distribution of infinitival and finite causatives (Innovative Pattern)

	Infinitival Construction		Finite Construction	
	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3*	Type 4*
	<i>I.make sing.INF Giorgio<sub>ACC</sub></i>	<i>I.make sing.INF the song to Giorgio<sub>DAT</sub></i>	<i>I.make that sings Giorgio<sub>ACC</sub></i>	<i>I.make that sings the song Giorgio<sub>DAT</sub></i>
Gr.	(+)(not common)	+	+	+
Cal.	?+(not common)	+	+	+

**The analysis.** While the infinitival construction (cf. Types 1/2) involves a monoclausal structure with a single complex predicate ([<sub>CP</sub> make+infinitive]) and a single argument structure (cf. accusative/dative embedded subject), the traditional finite construction (cf. Types 3/4) is biclausal, with two finite verbal predicates ([<sub>CP</sub> make [<sub>CP</sub> V<sub>Finite</sub> ]]) and two

independent argument structures (cf. nominative embedded subject). In the innovative patterns (cf. Types \*3/\*4), the syntax of the infinitival construction is grafted onto the new finite construction, i.e. Type 3\* = blend of Type 1 + Type 3 and Type 4\* = blend of Type 2 + Type 4. As the new finite construction takes on the syntax of the infinitival construction, there is a change from biclausality to monoclausality (1), as supported by a number of syntactic tests such as climbing of clitics to the matrix predicate:

- (1) a [make V<sub>Infinitival</sub>] (Types 1, 2)  
 b [make [that V<sub>Finite</sub>]] (Types 3, 4)  
 c [make that V<sub>Finite</sub>] (Types 3\*, 4\*; cf. Cinque 2003; Ledgeway 2015)

The outcome is therefore a hybrid structure, which is apparently biclausal (cf. Greek-style) on the surface, but which exhibits a Romance-style monoclausal argument structure with canonical transparency effects. A spectacular result of this change is the emergence of accusative- and dative-marked subjects (cf. 2b), such that Types 3\*/4\* appear morphologically finite, but display a non-finite syntax failing to license nominative:

- (2) a [<sub>CP</sub> make [<sub>CP</sub> that T-V OBJ SUBJ<sub>NOM</sub> ]] (Type 4)  
 b [<sub>CP</sub> make [<sub>VP</sub> that V-v OBJ SUBJ<sub>ACC/DAT</sub> ]] (Type 4\*; cf. Cinque 2003)

In order to capture the attested mixture of (Romance) infinitival syntax with (Greek-style) finite syntax in the contact-induced innovative patterns 3\* and 4\*, we argue for a structure in which the interaction between a null argument and a lower Applicative head accounts for the apparent emergence of accusative- and dative-marked subjects in conjunction with an irrealis embedded verb form which functions today to all intents and purposes as an inflected infinitive, and no longer as a full-fledged nominative-assigning finite verb.

### Selected references

- Cinque, G. (2003). 'The Interaction of Passive, Causative, and "Restructuring" in Romance', in C. Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. New York: OUP, 50-66.
- Comrie, B. (1985). 'Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology', in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge: CUP, 309-48.
- Guasti, M.T. (1993). *Causative and perception verbs*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Joseph, B. (1983) *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan infinitive*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Katsoyannou, M. (2001) 'Le parler grec de Calabre', *LALIES* 21: 7-59.
- Kayne, R. (1975). *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ledgeway, A. (2004). 'Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: La doppia serie di complementatori', *Rivista italiana di dialettologia* 27: 89-147.
- Ledgeway, A. (2013). 'Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy', in M. Janse, B. Joseph, A. Ralli and M. Bagriacik (eds), *Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, Patras, 184-228.
- Ledgeway, A. (2015). 'Reconstructing Complementiser-drop in the Dialects of the Salento,' in T. Biberauer & G. Walkden (eds), *Syntax Over Time*. Oxford: OUP, 146-62.
- Lombardi, A. (1997). *The grammar of complementation in the dialects of Calabria*. Doctoral thesis, University of Manchester.
- Manzini, M.R. & Savoia, L. (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romanci*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Rohlf, G. (1969) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. III. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Turin: Einaudi.
- Rohlf, G. (1977). *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento)*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbunchnhandlung.
- Sheehan, M. (2016). 'Complex predicates', in A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 981-93.
- Squillaci, M.O. (2016). *When Greek meets Romance. A morphosyntactic analysis of language contact in Aspromonte*. University of Cambridge: unpublished doctoral thesis.