

Patterns of infinitival and finite complementation in Griko and Salentino

Abstract: Griko and Salentino show various degrees of diachronic and diatopic microvariation in the retreat and loss of the infinitive, whilst displaying at the same time a high degree of overall structural uniformity in their parallel preservation of the infinitive in: (1) restructuring contexts; (2) infinitival relatives; and (3) negative imperatives. On the surface, there is nothing *a priori* to suggest that these three contexts should be connected in any way. Yet this article demonstrates how these three uses can be reduced to a single structural explanation which views the infinitive as a reduced clausal constituent (viz. *v*-VP) generated in a monoclausal structure selected in all cases by a modal, temporal or aspectual auxiliary which is phonologically overt in (1), but oscillates between overt and covert phonological realizations in (2) and (3) in accordance with crosslinguistic variation. The result is a unified analysis which allows us to capture the distribution of infinitival complementation in all the relevant varieties quite simply in terms of a so-called restructuring configuration in which the infinitive invariably instantiates a monoclausal structure selected by a T-related auxiliary. At the same time, this analysis also offers us a highly natural explanation of the distribution of finite and infinitival complementation in Salentino after causative MAKE. The former is aligned with the *faire-infinitif* type, in which the subject is pragmatically foregrounded and structurally projected, and the latter with the *faire-par* type, in which the subject is pragmatically backgrounded and not structurally projected, hence the selection of the infinitive which is the typical morphosyntactic expression of reduced clausal constituents. By contrast, the exceptional behaviour of Griko on the one hand, which exclusively employs finite complementation, and the Salentino dialects of the province of Brindisi on the other, which exclusively employ infinitival complementation, simply represent cases of idiosyncratic lexical variation in the distribution of finite and infinitival complementation which is subject to considerable nanovariation across the Greek and Romance varieties of Salento.

Key-words: Griko, Salentino, infinitive, finite complementation, auxiliary, restructuring, causative.

Titolo: La distribuzione della complementazione infinitivale e finita in griko e in salentino

Riassunto: Anche se caratterizzati da diversi gradi di microvariazione diacronica e diatopica relativa al progressivo declino e all'eventuale perdita dell'infinito, il griko e il salentino mostrano, in generale, un alto grado di uniformità strutturale nella conservazione dell'infinito nei contesti a ristrutturazione (1), nelle relative infinitivali (2) e nell'imperativo negativo (3). Superficialmente, non c'è *a priori* nessun motivo per cui dovremmo aspettarci la distribuzione dell'infinito proprio in questi tre contesti strutturali. Tuttavia, il presente articolo mette in evidenza come questi tre usi dell'infinito possano essere ricondotti ad una singola spiegazione strutturale. Secondo tale interpretazione, l'infinito costituirebbe un complemento proposizionale ridotto (ovvero un *v*-VP) generato all'interno di una struttura monofrasale e selezionato

* Università degli Studi di Bergamo; email: adam.ledgeway@unibg.it

** University of Birmingham; email: N.Schifano@bham.ac.uk

*** University of California, Los Angeles; email: g.silvestri@ucla.edu

in tutti i casi da un ausiliare di tipo modale, temporale o aspettuale, fonologicamente esplicito in (1), ma soggetto a oscillazione tra realizzazioni fonologiche esplicite ed implicite in (2)-(3), in funzione della variazione interlinguistica. Ne consegue un'analisi unitaria che tiene conto della distribuzione della complementazione infinitivale in entrambe le varietà, ora interpretabile come un chiaro esempio di una configurazione detta a ristrutturazione. Allo stesso modo tale analisi ci offre anche un'evidente spiegazione della distribuzione della complementazione finita e infinitivale nei dialetti salentini con il predicato causativo FARE. Il primo tipo di complementazione codifica il tipo causativo detto *faire-infinitif*, in cui il soggetto viene messo in primo piano a livello pragmatico e viene perciò strutturalmente proiettato, mentre la complementazione infinitivale realizza il tipo causativo detto *faire-par*, in cui il soggetto passa in secondo piano e non viene strutturalmente proiettato, spiegando così la selezione dell'infinito, in quanto tipica espressione morfosintattica dei costituenti proposizionali ridotti. D'altro canto, il comportamento eccezionale del griko, il quale impiega esclusivamente la complementazione finita, e dei dialetti salentini della provincia di Brindisi, i quali impiegano esclusivamente la complementazione infinitivale, rappresenta un caso di variazione lessicale idiosincratICA nella distribuzione della complementazione finita e infinitivale, chiaramente soggetta a notevole nanovariazione nelle diverse varietà greche e romanze del Salento.

Parole chiave: griko, salentino, infinito, complementazione finita, ausiliare, ristrutturazione, costruzione causativa.

1. *Introduction*

The competition between infinitival and finite subjunctive subordination represents one of the key features of the Balkan Sprachbund (Joseph 1983; Mišeska Tomić 2004, p. 31). In some languages (e.g. Macedonian) this has led to the loss of the infinitive, whereas in others (e.g. Romanian) it has given rise to a very restricted use of the infinitive. In Salento, where Greek has been spoken since ancient times (Rohlf 1924, 1974), though not necessarily uninterruptedly (Battisti 1927; Parlangeli 1953; Fanciullo 1997), the infinitive has not been lost in Griko as in other modern Greek varieties (though see Mackridge 1987 and Sitaridou 2014 for Pontic), but continues to the present day, albeit with a restricted distribution. Under the influence of centuries-old contact with Griko, the surrounding Romance varieties show an almost identical development with the infinitive replaced in most contexts by a finite strategy (Ledgeway 2013a). While these basic facts regarding the convergence between Griko and Salentino in their preference for finite over infinitival subordination are well known (cf. Loporcaro 2021, pp. 194-198), our understanding of the structural factors which determine the otherwise exceptional survival of the infinitive in a specific set of configurations remains poorly understood, as does the seemingly free alternation between infinitival and finite complementation in causatives.

In what follows, we undertake a comparative investigation of infinitival and finite complementation in the Greek and Romance dialects of Salento. At a macro level, we show that the three apparently unrelated contexts in which the infinitive continues to be licensed can all be reduced to a single structural environment, thereby providing unprecedented theoretical insight into the phenomenon of infinitive loss. At the same time, we shall also examine a particular case of divergence between Griko and Salentino in the causative construction, highlighting how our structural conclusions about the distribution of the infinitive allow us to make immediate sense of the alternation between infinitival and finite complementation. The Griko and Salentino data to be discussed come from a combination of existing published sources and from our own fieldwork carried out *in loco* as part of the Leverhulme-funded project *Fading Voices in Southern Italy* (<https://greekromanceproject.wordpress.com>).

2. *Survival of the infinitive*

Although the use of the infinitive in Griko and Salentino is today greatly reduced, it is still productively employed in restructuring contexts (1), infinitival relatives (2) and the negative imperative (3), as illustrated in the following Salentino examples.

- 1) Ce putemu **fare?** (Lecce)
 what can.1PL do.INF
 ‘What can we do?’ (Garrisi 1991, p. 36)
- 2) Nu nc’ è cce **ffare!** (Lecce)
 NEG there= be.3SG what do.INF
 ‘There’s nothing to be done!’ (Protopapa 1991, p. 18)
- 3) No llu **gridari** a fflita! (Presicce)
 NEG him= shout.INF DOM son=your.2SG
 ‘Don’t shout at your son!’

On the surface, it is not clear what, if anything, these three contexts have in common and why infinitival complementation should survive in just these three contexts. Below we shall see that the common retention of the infinitive in these contexts in Griko and Salentino can be captured by a unified structural analysis which extends the analysis of (1) to the contexts in (2)-(3).

2.1. Restructuring

Though showing some lexical variation across dialects and even between speakers, the infinitive is still employed, to varying degrees and often alongside competing finite subjunctive complements, with a class of high frequency restructuring predicates in a monoclausal structure (Rizzi 1976, 1982; Cinque 2004, 2006). However, as a full clausal complement (viz. CP), the infinitive is not found but is systematically replaced by a finite clause introduced by one of two finite complementizers, namely Griko/Salentino *ka/ca* and *na/cu* (4). Consequently, the distribution of the infinitive is restricted to the complement of a small number of functional predicates in monoclausal contexts where it invariably instantiates a reduced (viz. v-VP) clausal type (Ledgeway 2013a, 2013b, n. 6, 2015, p. 157, 2016, p. 1024; Groothuis 2022), although even here the infinitive is also frequently rivalled by a finite subjunctive complement. For instance, the infinitive after CAN represents an option in both Griko and Salentino (5), although not the sole option in Griko where a subjunctive complement is also available (Rohlf's 1977, p. 191; Tommasi 1998, p. 185).

- 4) a. Mi ppermettetti [_{CP} **na** **pi** [_{CP} **ka**
IRR.NEG permit.SBJV.2SG IRR.PRT say.SBJV.2SG that
ikhe sbagliezzonta!]] (Sternatia Griko)
have.PST.3SG err.N-FIN
- b. Nu tte permettere [_{CP} **cu** **ddici** [_{CP} **ca**
NEG you= permit-INF IRR.PRT say.2SG that
ia sbagliatu]]! (Ugento)
have.PST.IPFV.3SG err.N-FIN
'Don't you dare say that he had made a mistake!'
- 5) a. 'e sozo [_{vP} **erti**] / 'en isoze makà [_{vP}
NEG can.1SG come-INF NEG can.PST.PFV.3SG at.all
na pratisi] (Calimera Griko)
IRR.PRT walk.SBJV.3SG
'I can't come / (s)he couldn't walk' (Tommasi 1998, pp. XLV/XLIX)
- b. Nun iame pututu [_{vP} **scire** **cu** **llu**
NEG have.PST.IPFV.1PL be.able.PTCP go-INF IRR.PRT him=
truvamu]. (Ugento)
find.1PL
'We wouldn't have been able to go and visit him.'

We thus observe in Griko and Salentino considerable diatopic and idiolectal variation in the progressive diachronic retreat of the infinitive (for an overview, see Manzini, Savoia 2005, II, § 3.11; Ledgeway 2013b, pp. 196-206; Loporcaro 2021, pp. 194-198; Ledgeway, Schifano, Silvestri in prep., ch. 6) such that synchronic patterns of variation are not uncommon. One of the most striking of these concerns the differing behaviour of aspectual predicates and the modal *MUST*, which in Griko both invariably align with finite complementation (6a-b), while in Salentino aspectuals alternate between infinitival and finite complementation (7a) and *MUST*, which is instantiated by the periphrasis (*a(v)ire/-i* ‘have’ + *a* ‘to’ and may also indicate futurity, requires infinitival complementation (7b).

- 6) a. i gùscia nsìgnase **na** **pràtisi** (Griko)
the goat begin.PST.PFV.3SG IRR.PRT walk.SBJV.3SG
'the goat began to walk'
(*Rize Grike*, <https://www.rizegrike.com/esegue.php?tipo=135>)
- b. t' ixa **na** **kamo?** (Calimera Griko)
what have.PST.1SG IRR.PRT do.SBJV.1SG
'what was I supposed to do?'
(*Kinita* 1976, p. 6)
- 7) a. Non spiccia **di** **fumare** / **cu** **fuma.** (Otranto)
NEG finish.3SG of smoke.INF IRR.PRT smoke.3SG
'he won't stop smoking.'
(*AsiCa* 27)
- b. M' ha' **scusari.** (Mesagne)
me= have.2SG excuse.INF
'You have to forgive me.'
(Aresta, Dipietrangelo n.d., p. 17)

In short, one of the last bastions of infinitival complementation in Griko and Salentino is in restructuring contexts following functional predicates, typically *CAN*, but also, in accordance with diachronic and diatopic variation, various other functional predicates summarized in Table 1 adapted from Ledgeway, Schifano, Silvestri (in prep., ch. 7).

Table 1: Griko and Salentino infinitival and finite complementation.

	Infinitive $\leftarrow$ $\rightarrow$ Finite						
Griko	CAN	KNOW	HEAR	LET	MAKE	WANT, MUST	GO, COME, PHASAL, TRY
Salentino	CAN	MUST	HEAR	MAKE, LET	KNOW, PHASAL	WANT, COME, GO, TRY	

We therefore take infinitival configurations to instantiate a monoclausal structure in which the infinitive represents a reduced *v*-VP complement (cf. Trumper, Rizzi 1985) selected by a functional predicate generated directly in the sentential core (IP), as informally sketched in (8):

- 8) [_{IP} V_{FUNCTIONAL} [_{*v*-VP} V_{INF}]]

2.2. Infinitival relatives

Infinitival relatives are structures in which the infinitive is preceded by a *wh*-relative which is the complement of an existential predicate (9a-b), typically HAVE or BE, or, less frequently, a so-called dynamic predicate denoting coming into being or view, or availability (Grosu 2004, p. 406; Šimík 2011, § 2.2; Caponigro 2021, p. 11).

- 9) a. En iha pleo pu siri (Griko)
 NEG have.PST.1SG more where pull.INF
 ‘I no longer had anywhere to go’ (Morosi 1870, p. 137)
 b. Nu’ sta bbiti ca mo’ tenimu cce ffare? (Lecce)
 NEG PROG see.2SG that now have.1PL what do.INF
 ‘Can you not see that we’ve got things to do?’ (Protopapa 1990, p. 25)

Infinitival relatives can broadly be described as existentials in which the fronted *wh*-phrase (or quantifier) has the semantic force of a narrow-scope indefinite and the infinitive is marked by the inclusion of a possibility/ability modal operator (Izvorksi 1998, p. 160; Grosu 2004, p. 402; Šimík 2008, p. 127), as witnessed by the use of modal CAN in the English paraphrases of (9a-b), namely ‘...where I **could** go/nothing that **can** be done’. Caponigro (2003, p. 99), by contrast, argues that the modal flavour of these constructions is ambiguous between possibility and necessity readings (cf. also Cinque 2020, p. 197), with the result that examples such (9a-b) can also be readily paraphrased in English with an overt deontic necessity modal operator, namely ‘...where I **should** go/nothing that **needs** doing’. This modal operator is typically made visible by irrealis marking on the verb, variously encoded by infinitival or subjunctive morphology in accordance with cross-linguistic variation. Both options are found in Griko and Salentino (Rohlf 1969, p. 105, 1977, p. 191), as the following contrasting pairs highlight.

- 10) a. 'en ei tipo ti **kami** (Calimera Griko)
 NEG have.3SG nothing what make.INF
 'there's nothing to be done' (Tommasi 2001, p. 62)
- b. 'en ichamo tipo **na su**
 NEG have.PST.1PL nothing IRR.PRT you.SG=
dòkome (Calimera Griko)
 give.SBJV.1PL
 'We didn't have anything to give you' (Tommasi 1998, p. XII)
- 11) a. Nu nc' è nnienzi **te fare** (Lecce)
 NEG there= be.3SG nothing of do.INF
 'There's nothing to be done' (Protopapa 1991, p. 102)
- b. nu nc' ete nienti **cu tte erguegni** (Lecce)
 NEG there= be.3SG nothing IRR.PRT you= shame.2SG
 'there's nothing for you to be ashamed about' (Garrisi 1991, p. 32)

Also included here are indirect interrogative structures which again fluctuate between the infinitive (12a-b) – albeit at best marginal in Griko with just a handful of examples in our corpus – and a finite irrealis clause (12c).

- 12) a. i pondichì en izzèrane ti **cài** (Griko)
 the mice NEG know.PST.IPFV.3PL what make.INF
 'the mice didn't know what to do' (*I Spitta* 12, 4)
- b. nu ssapianu cce **fare** (Lecce)
 NEG know.PST.IPFV.3PL what make.INF
 'they didn't know what to do' (Garrisi 1991, p. 11)
- c. en issere pu **na stasi** (Martano Griko)
 NEG know.PST.IPFV.3SG where IRR.PRT stand.SBJV.3SG
 'he didn't know where to stay'
 (Lekakou, Baldissera, Anastasopoulos 2013, p. 33)

On a par with infinitival relatives, indirect interrogatives are also argued to license a modal operator, typically linked to deontic necessity, hence the use of **MUST/SHOULD** in the paraphrases of (12a-c), e.g. ...what they **should** do/...where he **should** stay, although the non-deontic possibility/availability reading is not entirely ruled out either (i.e. ...what they **could** do/...where he **could** stay).

Drawing these facts together, the observed possibility (and necessity) reading of infinitival relatives (and indirect interrogatives) can be interpreted as evidence for the presence of a null modal auxiliary (henceforth represented as **AUX**), in most cases a phonologically unrealized variant of **CAN**

but also *MUST* in some instances as we have just seen, which selects for an infinitival complement along the lines of (13). Indeed, further direct evidence for this view comes from the observation (cf. Manzini, Savoia 2005, I, p. 662) that in many Salentino dialects the modal auxiliary *CAN* (14a) or *MUST* (14b) be overtly spelt out.

13) ..._{[CP} *wh*-_{[IP} *Aux*_{CAN(/MUST)} [_{VP} *V*_{INF}]]]

- 14 a. Nu ssippe cce **ddice** / nu
 NEG know.PST.PFV.3SG what say.INF NEG
 sapia cchiù cce ia **dicere.** (Lecce)
 know.PST.IPFV.3SG more what have.PST.IPFV.3SG say.INF
 'He didn't know (anymore) what to say.' (Garrisi 1991, pp. 37/80)
- b. un s'satfju du 'addzu **ffire** (Taviano)
 NEG know.1SG where have.1SG go.INF
 'I don't know where to go.' (Manzini, Savoia 2005, I, p. 662)

Our analysis based on the availability of null modal auxiliaries not only provides a unified analysis of infinitival complements to restructuring predicates and in infinitival relatives, reducing the latter to a variant of the former, but it also explains the observed difference in the distribution of the infinitive in indirect interrogatives. While in Salentino the infinitive in indirect interrogatives proves productive (cf. 12b, 14), we noted that in modern Griko its use in the same contexts proves, at best, marginal today (cf. 12a). This difference follows from our previous observation about the distribution of the infinitive after *MUST*: while Salentino requires infinitival complementation following *MUST* (cf. 7b), and by implication also after silent *MUST* in indirect interrogatives (cf. 12b), Griko today employs a finite subjunctive complement after *MUST* (cf. 6b), hence its general avoidance of the infinitive in indirect interrogatives after silent *MUST*. Those rare examples of the infinitive such as (10a) represent therefore residues of a former stage of Griko when *MUST* could still license an infinitival complement (cf. Ledgeway 2013b, pp. 197-200), or a reading in which the modal operator is lexicalized by a silent version of *CAN* rather than *MUST*.

2.3. *Negative Imperative*

The final context in which the infinitive continues to be productively used in Salento is in the 2sg negative imperative (15), a usage widely attested

across Italo-Romance varieties (Rohlf 1968, p. 356; Manzini, Savoia 2005, III, pp. 388-390; Parry 2013, § 3.6; Ledgeway, Schifano, Silvestri 2021, § 4)¹, as well as in old French, Romansh and Romanian.

- 15) a. nu critare comu li pacci (Scorrano)
 NEG shout.INF as the mad
 ‘don’t shout like a mad man!’ (Musio 1995, p. 14)
- b. Nu’ te riscurdare (Matino)
 NEG you= forget.INF
 ‘Don’t forget!’ (Fiorentino 1998, p. 30)

This suppletive use of the infinitive alternates once again with a finite irrealis structure (Rohlf 1968, pp. 355f.; Ledgeway 1998, pp. 47f.; Ledgeway, Schifano, Silvestri 2021, § 4):

- 16) a. cu nu’ mme llurdi intru casa (Lecce)
 IRR.PRT NEG me= dirty.2SG in house
 ‘don’t make a mess of the inside of my house!’ (Protopapa 1990, p. 21)
- b. cu nno cati (Lecce)
 IRR.PRT NEG fall.2SG
 ‘don’t fall down!’ (Rohlf 1968, p. 355)

In order to understand the otherwise exceptional distribution of the infinitive in the Salentino negative imperative, we propose on the strength of what we have already seen for restructuring predicates (§ 2.1) and infinitival relatives (§ 2.2) that the use of the infinitive in the negative imperative is not a genuine case of suppletion but, rather, represents a core case of reduced infinitival complementation selected by a null functional predicate in a restructuring context. Direct proof of this analysis can be seen in numerous Italian dialects where, in contrast to the positive imperative, the Infl head is exceptionally lexicalized in the negative imperative through an overt auxiliary (presumably with modal force) selecting an infinitival complement (Zanuttini 1994, 1997, pp. 150-154; Manzini, Savoia 2005, III, § 7.2; Ledgeway 2020). As illustrated in the following representative examples taken from Manzini and Savoia’s (2005, III, pp. 453-461) wide-ranging survey, this auxiliary may in accordance with dialect variation surface as a reflex of

¹ Griko lacks this use of the infinitive since the infinitive has never been an option in this context (Ledgeway, Schifano, Silvestri 2021, § 3), insofar as this use of the infinitive in the negative imperative represents a late Latin development (Parry 2013, p. 100).

STARE ‘stand’ (17a) or, in the dialects of southern Italy, a reflex of IRE ‘go’ (17b) or ESSE(*RE) ‘be’ (17c) which, in contrast to reflexes of STARE, select for a gerund rather than an infinitival complement.

- 17) a. $\begin{bmatrix}_{\text{IP}} & \text{ni} & \text{stɛ/stum/stɛ} & & \begin{bmatrix}_{\text{v-VP}} & \text{l(e)} & \text{ʧa'mɛ}\end{bmatrix}\end{bmatrix}$ (Sassello)
 NEG STAND.2SG/1PL/2PL him= call.INF
- b. $\begin{bmatrix}_{\text{IP}} & \text{nɔ} & \text{lu} & \text{ʃi/ʃəmə/ʃətə} & \begin{bmatrix}_{\text{v-VP}} & \text{ca'mannə}\end{bmatrix}\end{bmatrix}$ (Acerenza)
 NEG him= GO.2SG/1PL/2PL call.GER
- c. $\begin{bmatrix}_{\text{IP}} & \text{nɔ} & \text{ɔ} & \text{si/ simmə/ seitə} & \begin{bmatrix}_{\text{v-VP}} & \text{ca'mannə}\end{bmatrix}\end{bmatrix}$ (Minervino Murge)
 NEG him= BE.2SG/1PL/2PL call.GER
 ‘Don’t/Let’s not call him!’

These examples are reminiscent of the cases of overt auxiliary realization seen for infinitival relatives and indirect interrogatives which alternate with a null variant of the same modal auxiliary. It is logical therefore to assume that so-called suppletive cases of the simple infinitive found in the negative imperative such as (15a-b) instantiate covert examples of the structures in (17a-c) hosting a silent modal auxiliary (cf. Kayne 1992; Zanuttini 1994, 1997, pp. 118-126) along the lines of the structural representations in (18).

- 18) a. $\begin{bmatrix}_{\text{IP}} & \text{NEG} & \text{AUX}_{\text{STAND}(/GO/BE)} & & \begin{bmatrix}_{\text{v-VP}} & \text{V}_{\text{INF}(/GER)}\end{bmatrix}\end{bmatrix}$
 b. $\begin{bmatrix}_{\text{IP}} & \text{NEG} & \text{STAND}(/GO/BE) & & \begin{bmatrix}_{\text{v-VP}} & \text{V}_{\text{INF}(/GER)}\end{bmatrix}\end{bmatrix}$

This analysis consequently provides an elegant solution to the otherwise puzzling distribution of the infinitive in the negative imperative, reducing it to another case of infinitival complementation embedded under a (null) functional predicate in a restructuring context in line with the other cases examined in §§ 2.1-2.

3. *Causatives*

3.1. *Diatopic variation*

A major difference between Griko and Salentino lies in the distribution of infinitival complementation following causative MAKE: with the exception of one isolated constructed example (19a) in Morosi (1870), Griko has only employed finite irrealis complementation since our earliest records (19b), whereas Salentino displays a degree of variation between finite and infinitival complementation (20a-b).

- 19) a. Oli cànnome **pragalisi.** (Griko)
 all.NOM.PL make.1PL pray.INF
 ‘We all have prayers said.’ (Morosi 1870, p. 137)
- b. camu **na** **cusi** **po** **emi**
 make.1SG IRR.PRT hear.SBJV.2SG how we
etraudizome (Calimera Griko)
 sing.SBJV.1PL
 ‘I’ll make/let you hear how we sing’ (Comparetti 1866, p. 81)
- 20) a. Faccia **cu** **lli** **ggiusta**
 make.PST.IPFV.3SG IRR.PRT them= prepare.3SG
la Rita. (Calimera Salentino)
 the Rita
 ‘She would make Rita get them ready.’
- b. Aggiu fattu **accunzare** **le** **scarpe.** (Lequile)
 have.1SG make.PTCP repair.INF the shoes
 ‘I had the shoes repaired.’

The only exception are the Salentino dialects of the province of Brindisi which are the mirror image of Griko, in that they typically generalize infinitival complementation in causatives on a par with Italian (21a-b).

- 21) a. Ci no’ mmi faci cchiù **rricalari** **lu** **cumputer,**
 if NEG me= make.2SG more give.INF the computer
 ti scannu! (Brindisi)
 you.SG= kill.1SG
 ‘If you no longer let me have a computer, I’ll kill you!’ (De Luca 1998, p. 1)
- b. Maria è ffattu **ggiustà** **tutti** **li** **lietti**
 Maria be.3SG make.PTCP prepare.INF all the beds
a Rita. (Francavilla Fontana)
 to Rita
 ‘Maria made Rita make all the beds.’

3.2. *Pragmatic Distinctions*

Despite appearances, the alternation just seen between finite and infinitival complementation in the Salentino dialects of the province of Lecce is not free but, rather, represents structured variation. In particular, finite complementation obtains whenever the logical subject of the embedded verb is foregrounded and overtly expressed, whether lexically through an overt

nominative subject (22a) or a null subject (*pro*) referenced through the person and number agreement on the embedded verb (22b).

- 22) a. *faccia tte chiete scusa fijuma* (Matino)
 make.PST.IPFV.1SG you.SG= ask.3SG apology son=my
 'I would make my son ask you for forgiveness.' (Fiorentino 1998, p. 34)
- b. *fazzu canusci puru la socra* [*PRO*_{2SG}] (Scorrano)
 make.1SG know.2SG also the mother-in-law
 'I'll get you to meet my mother-in-law too' (Musio 1995, p. 22)

By contrast, infinitival complementation is employed when the logical subject of the embedded verb is backgrounded and left unexpressed. For example, in (23a) we are simply told that the image of Saint Francis will be painted in the church, but not by whom, and similarly in (23b) we are not told who will repair the shoes.

- 23) a. *fàcenu rreppengìre la ficura te San Frangiscu* (Lecce)
 make.3PL paint.INF the figure of Saint Francis
 'they will have the image of Saint Francis painted' (Garrisi 1991, p. 26)
- b. *Aggiu fattu accunzare le scarpe*. (Lequile)
 have.1SG make.PTCP repair.INF the shoes
 'I had the shoes repaired.'

Information structure differences of the type illustrated in (22)-(23) are traditionally known in the Romance literature, following the seminal work of Kayne (1975), by the labels *faire-infinitif* (FI) and *faire-par* (FP), respectively. Consequently, we see through the alternation between (22) and (23) that Salentino (with the exception of many dialects from the province of Brindisi) formally marks this distinction through a formal opposition between finite and infinitival complementation, whereas in standard Romance the distinction is neutralized through the indiscriminate use of the infinitive. By way of illustration, consider the near minimal Salentino pairs in (24).

- 24) a. *famme u te cuntu*
 make.IMP.2SG=me IRR.PRT you.SG= tell.1SG
quista jeu (Calimera Salentino)
 this I
 'make/let me tell you this!' (Kinita 1998, p. 11)
- b. *Fàttela ticere te fràima lu prete* (Lecce)
 make.IMP.2PL say.INF of brother=my the priest
 'Have it told to you by my brother the priest' (Garrisi 1991, p. 65)

The choice of a finite irrealis clause in (24a) yields the *faire-infinitif* interpretation, in which the subject of the embedded verb TELL is explicitly referenced, not only through the inflexional agreement of the embedded verb agreeing with the nominative subject *jeu* 'I', but also through the coreferential object clitic (*-me* 'me') on the causative predicate. By contrast, the infinitive in (24b) licenses the *faire-par* reading, in which the subject of TELL is now backgrounded through the use of a *by*-phrase (cf. *te fràima* 'by my brother'). This correlation between form (finite vs infinitive) and pragmatic-semantic interpretation (*faire-infinitif* vs *faire-par*) is further evidenced by examples such as (25): once again the finite clause in (25a) licenses the *faire-infinitif* reading in which the 2sg embedded subject is fully specified (namely, 'I'll make you wash...'), whereas in the *faire-par* infinitival example in (25b) the subject of PREPARE is not structurally present, hence the generic interpretation of the implicit subject.

- 25) a. Mo fazzu **cu** **llavi** **li** **piatti!** (Presicce)
 now make.1SG IRR.PRT wash.2SG the dishes
 'I'll make you wash the dishes!'
- b. sta fazzu **preparare** nu fac-sìmile (Calimera Salentino)
 PROG make.1SG prepare.INF a facsimile
 'I'm having a duplicate prepared' (Kinita 1974, p. 10)

Consequently, infinitival examples such as (26a) which in a language such as Italian would *a priori* be compatible with both the *faire-infinitif* and the *faire-par* readings (viz. 'we make him dress' and 'we have him dressed') are unambiguous in Salentino where the infinitive exclusively licenses the latter interpretation. Similarly, (26b) can only mean 'he had a very high table prepared for him' and not 'he made him prepare a very high table'.

- 26) a. comu facimu **èstere** **lu** **Santu** [...] (Lecce)
 how make.1PL dress.INF the saint
 'how shall we have the Saint dressed [...]?' (Garrisi 1991, p. 26)
- b. ni fice **ccunzare** **nnà** **banca**
 DAT.3= make.PST.PFV.3SG prepare.INF a table
àuta àuta (Lecce)
 tall tall
 'he had a very high table prepared for him' (Garrisi 1991, p. 100)

By the same token, the selection of a finite irrealis clause excludes the *faire-par* reading, such that (27a) can only mean 'Let me understand' and

not ‘Let me be understood’, and similarly (27b) ‘you make them help you’ and not ‘you have yourself helped by them’.

- 27) a. Famme **ccapiscu** (Matino)
 make.IMP.2SG=me understand.1SG
 ‘Let me understand!’ (Fiorentino 1998, p. 22)
- b. faci **cu** **tte** **ssistene** (Scorrano)
 make.2SG IRR.PRT you.SG= assist.3PL
 ‘you make them help you.’ (Musio 1995, p. 95)

In Griko, by contrast, which lacks infinitival complementation with causative MAKE, the distinction between direct and indirect causation has to be marked by employing, for example, a third-person plural verb with generic reference. For example, in (28a) the interpretation is that of *faire-infinitif* in which the second-person singular subject of the embedded verb HEAR is foregrounded and explicitly marked through the inflexional agreement on the embedded verb. In (28b), on the other hand, the third-person plural embedded verb HEAR receives a generic interpretation yielding the *faire-par* reading. Conversely, in the Salentino dialects of the province of Brindisi which make exclusive use of the infinitive the distinction is marked, just as in Italian, through the overt expression of the causee or otherwise, as illustrated in (29a-b).

- 28) a. Arte kànnu **na** **kùsi** (Griko)
 now make.1SG IRR.PRT hear.SBJV.2SG
 ‘Now I’ll make you hear’
 (Rize Griko, <https://www.rizegrike.com/esegue.php?tipo=74>)
- b. mi kkami **na** **se**
 IRR.NEG make.SBJV.2SG IRR.PRT you.SG=
 kùsune (Calimera Griko)
 hear.SBJV.3PL
 ‘don’t have yourself heard / don’t let them hear you!’ (Tommasi 2001, p. 30)
- 29) a. A ffatti **cunzari** **li** **lietti**
 have.3SG make.PTCP prepare.INF the beds
 alla Rita. (Cellino S. Marco)
 to.the Rita
 ‘She made Rita make up the beds.’
- b. Aggiu fattu **ggiustare** **le** **scarpe**. (Cellino S. Marco)
 have.1SG make.PTCP repair.INF the shoes
 ‘I had the shoes repaired.’

3.3. Putting syntax and pragmatics together

In summary, we have seen that, with the exception of Griko and Brindisino dialects, the presence vs absence of a structural subject in the embedded clause correlates with the distribution of finite and infinitival complementation. Formally, this finds a straightforward explanation in terms of our previous assumptions about infinitival complementation: in § 2 it was shown that the distribution of the infinitive is limited to restructuring contexts in which the infinitive instantiates a reduced clausal constituent (cf. 5a-b), but never occurs as the complement of predicates which select for a full clausal constituent (cf. 4a-b). It is logical therefore to assume that cases of the *faire-infinitif* construction invariably involve a full clausal constituent (viz. CP) including a position for the embedded subject (here represented by ‘pro’), thereby ruling out the infinitive in favour of a finite irrealis complement (30a). By contrast, the *faire-par* construction involves a reduced clause, presumably a lexical VP that projects just below the *vP* layer in which the subject is canonically inserted (cf. Sheehan, Cyrino 2018; Sheehan 2020), thereby explaining the impossibility of an overt subject and the obligatory selection of the infinitive (30b)².

- 30) a. Faciti(me)_i [_{CP} **cu** _{pro_i} **ddicu**
 make.IMP.2PL(=me) IRR.PRT _{pro} say.1SG
lu veru!] (Scorrano)
 the truth
 ‘Make/Let me tell the truth!’
- b. Facitime [_{VP} **dire** **lu veru!**] (Scorrano)
 make.IMP.2PL=me say.INF the truth
 ‘Have the truth told to me!’

Significantly, this analysis of the facts makes two predictions borne out by our data. The first is that unergatives under causative MAKE should occur only in the finite *faire-infinitif* construction (31), since they project an external argument and hence are incompatible with the bare VP structure of the infinitival *faire-par* construction which only projects positions for the verb, its internal argument(s) and any adjuncts.

² Cf. Trumper and Rizzi’s (1985) analysis of finite and infinitival complementation following verbs of perception in Calabrese. Also not too dissimilar is the analysis of *faire-infinitif* and *faire-par* in terms of *vP* and VP, respectively, in Folli, Harley (2007). Indeed, while we assume here for simplicity that the finite *faire-infinitif* construction involves a full CP complement, we do not exclude the possibility that it may involve a smaller clausal constituent (e.g. TP or *vP*), but in any case larger than the lexical VP to include a structural position for the external argument.

- 31) a. Fici **cu** **ccanta** **lu** **Ggiorgi**. (Martano Salentino)
 make.PST.PFV.1SG IRR.PRT sing.3SG the Giorgio
 ‘I made Giorgio sing.’
 b. Fazzu spicci **te** **mangiare** **pane** (Lecce)
 make.1SG finish.2SG of eat.INF bread
 ‘I’ll make you stop eating bread’ (Protopapa 1991, p. 49)

The second concerns the behaviour of unaccusatives. Given standard analyses (Perlmutter 1978; Burzio 1986) according to which the subject is generated as an UNDERGOER in the verb’s object position optionally raising to the vacant canonical preverbal subject position, unaccusatives should be compatible both with the reduced infinitival complement of the *faire-par* construction if the subject remains in its base position and with the full finite complement of the *faire-infinitif* construction if the UNDERGOER argument raises to the canonical subject position. This prediction is indeed borne out, witness the infinitival and finite unaccusative examples in (32)-(33), respectively.

- 32) a. La fazzu **enire** **cquai?** (Lecce)
 her= make.1SG come.INF here
 ‘Shall I make/have her come here?’ (Protopapa 1990, p. 38)
 b. me faci **stare** **sempre** **cu** **otamentu**
 me= make.2SG stay.INF always with turning
 de **stommicu**. (Scorrano)
 of stomach
 ‘you make my stomach churn.’ (Musio 1995, p. 20)
- 33) a. Facitime prima **mme** **ssettu**. (Matino)
 make.IMP.2PL=me first me= seat.1SG
 ‘First let me sit down!’ (Fiorentino 1998, p. 63)
 b. ài fare **cu** **nu** **bene** **cchiui** (Scorrano)
 have.2SG do.INF IRR.PRT NEG come.3SG more
 ‘you must ensure that he no longer comes’ (Musio 1995, p. 20)

4. Conclusion

Griko and Salentino show various degrees of diachronic and diatopic microvariation in the loss and retreat of the infinitive, but at the same time display a high degree of overall structural uniformity in their parallel preservation of the infinitive in restructuring contexts, in infinitival relatives

and, albeit with some internal variation, indirect interrogatives, and in the negative imperative in the case of Salentino. On the surface, there is nothing *a priori* to suggest that these three contexts should be connected. Yet the discussion above has demonstrated how these three uses can be reduced to a single structural explanation which views the infinitive as a reduced clausal constituent (viz. *v*-VP) generated in a monoclausal structure selected in all cases by a functional predicate which is phonologically overt in the first case (34a), but oscillates between overt and covert phonological realizations in the second (34b) and third (34c) cases in accordance with crosslinguistic variation. The result is a unified analysis which allows us to capture the distribution of infinitival complementation in all the relevant varieties quite simply in terms of a so-called restructuring configuration in which the infinitive instantiates a monoclausal structure selected by an Infl-related auxiliary.

- 34) a. $[_{IP} \text{ CAN (HEAR/MUST/KNOW/MAKE/START)} \quad [_{v\text{-VP}} \text{ V}_{INF}]]$
 (restructuring)
 b. $[_{IP} \text{ CAN/MUST / AUX}_{CAN/MUST} \quad [_{v\text{-VP}} \text{ V}_{INF}]]$
 (infinitival relative)
 c. $[_{IP} \text{ STAND(/GO/BE) / AUX}_{STAND(/GO/BE)} \quad [_{v\text{-VP}} \text{ V}_{INF(/GER)}]]$
 (negative imperative)

At the same time, this analysis also offers us a highly natural explanation of the distribution of finite and infinitival complementation in Salentino after causative MAKE. The former is aligned with the *faire-infinitif* type, in which the subject is pragmatically foregrounded and structurally projected, and the latter with the *faire-par* type, in which the subject is pragmatically backgrounded and not structurally projected, hence the selection of the infinitive which, as we have just seen, is the typical morphosyntactic expression of reduced clausal constituents (cf. 34a). By contrast, the exceptional behaviour of Griko on the one hand, which exclusively employs finite complementation, and the Salentino dialects of the province of Brindisi on the other, which exclusively employ infinitival complementation, simply represent cases of idiosyncratic lexical variation in the distribution of finite and infinitival complementation which, we have seen (cf. Table 1), is subject to considerable nanovariation across the Greek and Romance varieties of Salento³.

³ While in the case of Griko the selection of finite complementation can freely equate with a reduced or full(er) clause (e.g., *v*-VP vs CP-TP), hence compatible with *faire-par* and *faire-infinitif*, in the case of the Romance dialects from the province of Brindisi we must assume, as in Italian, that infinitives following causative MAKE fluctuate between VP (FP) and *v*-VP (FI).

Sources

- Aresta, R., E. Dipietrangelo, n.d.: *Lu fantasma ti lu povuru Pieru*, <http://www.vittici.it/teatrocomicoitaliano/index_sito.html>
- AsiCa: Atlante sintattico della Calabria (AsiCa)*, Ludwig-Maxmilians Universität München, <<https://www.asica2.gwi.uni-muenchen.de>>
- De Luca, D., 1998: *Li uaj ti 'na famiglia 'nguajata*, <<https://xoomer.virgilio.it/ke-marto/li%20uaj.htm>>
- Fiorentino, F., 1998: *Vernacolo Salentino. Commedie*, Galatina, Congedo.
- Garrisi, A., 1991: *Li cunti te papa Caliazzu a llingua noscia te Lecce*, Cavallone di Lecce, Capone.
- (*La*) *Kinita*: Calimera annual newspaper published by the Centro Studi Fernando Santi (1968-2019), <<http://www.kinita-calimera.it/home.htm>>
- Lekakou M., V. Baldissera, A. Anastasopoulos, 2013: *Documentation and Analysis of an Endangered Language: Aspects of the Grammar of Griko*, University of Ioannina, <<http://griko.project.uoi.gr/>>
- Musio, C., 1995: *Il Salento in vernacolo*, Galatina, Congedo.
- Protopapa, R., 1990-91: *Teatro dialettale leccese. Volume secondo. Volume terzo*, Cavallino di Lecce, Capone.
- Rize griche*: Griko-language stories and fables, <https://www.rizegrike.com/cerca_brani.php>
- I Spitta*: Griko-language periodical (2007-19), <<https://rizegrike.com/spitta.php>>
- Tommasi, S., 1998: *Io' mia forà... Fiabe e racconti della Grecia salentina dai quaderni (1883-1912) di Vito Domenico Palumbo*, Calimera, Ghetonà.
- Tommasi, S., 2001: *Katalisti o kosmo. Tra passato e presente. Lingua, tradizione e folklore nella Grecia salentina. Materiali per un seminario sul griko 1995-1996*, Calimera, Ghetonà.

References

- Battisti, C., 1927: "Appunti sulla storia e sulla diffusione dell'ellenismo nell'Italia meridionale (avec 3 cartes)", *Revue de linguistique romane* 3, pp. 1-97.

- Burzio, L., 1986: *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*, Dordrecht, Reidel.
- Caponigro, I., 2003: *Free Not to Ask: On the Semantics of Free Relatives and Wh-words Cross-linguistically*, doctoral thesis, University of California Los Angeles.
- , 2021: "Introducing headless relative clauses and the findings from Mesoamerican languages", in I. Caponigro, H. Torrence, R.Z. Maldonado (eds), *Headless Relative Clauses in Mesoamerican Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 1-57.
- Cinque, G., 2004: "'Restructuring' and functional structure", in A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 3*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 132-191.
- , 2006: *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 4*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- , 2020: *The Syntax of Relative Clauses: A Unified Analysis*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Comparetti, D., 1866: *Saggi dei dialetti greci dell'Italia meridionale*, Pisa, Fratelli Nistri.
- Fanciullo, F., 1993: "Latino e greco nel Salento", in B. Vetere (a cura di), *Storia di Lecce. Dai Bizantini agli Aragonesi*, Roma-Bari, Laterza, pp. 421-486.
- , 2007: "Greco e grecismi nel diasistema italo-romanzo. Alcune considerazioni", in M. Aprile (a cura di), *Nuove riflessioni sulla lessicografia. Presente, futuro e dintorni del Lessico etimologico italiano*, Congedo, Galatina, pp. 233-245.
- Folli, R., H. Harley, 2007: "Causation, obligation, and argument structure: On the nature of little v", *Linguistic Inquiry* 38, pp. 197-238.
- Groothuis, K., 2022: "On the relation between finiteness and clause size: Evidence from Romanian and southern Italo-Romance irrealis clauses", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 120, pp. 1-36.
- Grosu, A., 2004: "The syntax-semantics of modal existential wh constructions", in O.M. Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 405-438.
- Izvorksi, R., 1998: "Non-indicative wh-complement of possessive and existential predicates", in P.N. Tamanji, K. Kusumoto (eds), *NELS 28: Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistics Society*, Amherst, MA, GSLA, pp. 159-173.

- Joseph, B., 1983: *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kayne, R., 1975: *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- , 1992: "Italian negative infinitival imperatives and clitic climbing", in L. Tasmowski, A. Zribi-Hertz (eds), *Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet*, Ghent, Communication and Cognition, pp 300-312.
- Ledgeway, A., 1998: "Variation in the Romance infinitive: The case of the southern Calabrian inflected infinitive", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96, pp. 1-61.
- , 2013a: "Greek disguised as Romance? The case of southern Italy", in M. Janse *et alii* (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras, pp. 184-228.
- , 2013b: "Contatto e mutamento: complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento", in M. Benedetti (a cura di), *Lingue e grammatiche. Contatti, divergenze, confronti. Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 41.3, pp. 459-480.
- , 2015: "Reconstructing complementiser-drop in the dialects of the Salento: A syntactic or phonological phenomenon?", in T. Biberauer, G. Walkden (eds), *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-structural Interactions*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 146-162.
- , 2016: "Clausal complementation", in A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 1013-1028.
- , 2020: "The causative construction in the dialects of southern Italy and the phonology-syntax interface", in G. Bellucci *et alii* (eds), *Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation*, Berlin, De Gruyter, pp. 371-400.
- Ledgeway, A., N. Schifano, G. Silvestri, 2021: "The negative imperative in southern Calabria. *Spirito greco, materia romanza* again?", *Journal of Language Contact* 14, pp. 184-220.
- , in prep.: *Greek-Romance Language Contact: Documentation and Theory*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Lopocaro, M., 2021: *La Puglia e il Salento*, Bologna, il Mulino.

- Mackridge, P., 1987: "Greek-speaking Moslems of north-east Turkey: Prolegomena to study of the Ophitic sub-dialect of Pontic", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 11, pp. 115-137.
- Manzini, M.R., L. Savoia, 2005: *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, 3 voll., Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Mišeska Tomić, O., 2004: "The Balkan Sprachbund properties", in O. Mišeska Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 1-55.
- Morosi, G., 1870: *Studi sui dialetti greci della terra d'Otranto*, Lecce, Editrice Salentina.
- Parlangeli, O., 1953: *Sui dialetti romanzi e romaici del Salento*, Hoepli, Milano.
- Parry, M., 2013: "Negation in the history of Italo-Romance", in D. Willis *et alii* (eds), *The History of the Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*, vol. 1: *Case Studies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 77-118.
- Perlmutter, D., 1978: "Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis", *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4, pp. 157-189.
- Rizzi, L., 1976: 'Ristrutturazione', *Rivista di linguistica generativa* 1, pp. 1-54.
- , 1982: *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Rohlf, G., 1924: *Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien*, Olschki, Geneva.
- , 1968-69: *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. II: *Morfologia*; vol. III: *Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Turin, Einaudi.
- , 1974: *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*, Congedo, Galatina.
- , 1977: *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento)*, Munich, C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Sheehan, M., 2020: "The development of exceptional case marking in Romance with a particular focus on French", *Probus* 32/2, pp. 367-400.
- Sheehan, M., S. Cyrino, 2018: "Why do some ECM verbs resist passivisation? A phase-based explanation", in S. Hucklebridge, M. Nelson (eds), *Proceedings of NELS* 48/3, pp. 81-90.
- Šimík, R., 2008: "Czech modal existential *wh*-constructions as vP-level free relatives", *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 2008, pp. 121-132.
- , 2011: *Modal Existential Wh-constructions*, doctoral thesis, University of Groningen.

- Sitaridou, I., 2014: "The Romeyka infinitive: Continuity, contact and change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus", *Diachronica* 31, pp. 23-73.
- Trumper, J., L. Rizzi, 1985: "Il problema di *ca/mu* nei dialetti calabresi mediani", *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica, Università della Calabria* 1, pp. 63-76.
- Zanuttini, R., 1994: "Speculations on negative imperatives", *Rivista di linguistica* 6, pp. 67-89.
- , 1997: *Negation and Clausal Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.