BRILL

Changing alignments in the Greek of southern Italy

Adam Ledgeway
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
anl21@cam.ac.uk

Norma Schifano
University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
N.Schifano@bham.ac.uk

Giuseppina Silvestri
University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA
g.silvestri@ucla.edu

Abstract

This article investigates a peculiar pattern of subject case-marking in the Greek of southern Italy. Recent fieldwork with native speakers, coupled with the consultation of some written sources, reveals that, alongside prototypical nominative subjects, Italo-Greek also licenses accusative subjects, despite displaying a predominantly nominative-accusative alignment. Far from being random replacements within a highly attrited grammar, the distribution of these accusative subjects obeys specific structural principles, revealing similarities with historical attestations of the so-called "extended accusative" in early Indo-European. On the basis of these data, Italo-Greek is argued to be undergoing a progressive shift towards an active-stative alignment, a claim supported by additional evidence from auxiliary selection, adverb agreement and sentential word order.

Keywords

Greko – Griko – extended accusative – subjects – active-stative alignment

1   Introduction[1]

Greek has been spoken as an indigenous language in southern Italy since ancient times (Falcone 1973: 12–38; Horrocks 1997: 304–306; Manolessou 2005a: 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 8th century BCE with the establishment of numerous Greek colonies along the coasts of southern Italy. The opposing—and now widely accepted—view, argued most vehemently by Battisti (1927; cf. also Morosi 1870, Parlangèli 1953), sees the Greek of southern Italy as a more recent import dating from the Byzantine period of domination between the 6th and 11th centuries. However, as argued by Fanciullo (1996, 2001, 2007), these two apparently opposing views can be reconciled if we accept that Italo-Greek is largely a Byzantine import preserving some ancient Doric features, a view further supported by Ralli (2006: 134) who argues that "[Italo-Greek] preserves some traces of an ancient Doric substratum, which could point to the continuous uninterrupted presence of Greek speakers in South Italy" (cf. also Squillaci 2017: 7–9; Ralli forthcoming). Whatever the correct view, it is clear that by the beginning of the 2nd millennium CE, Greek was still widely spoken as a native language in north-western Sicily, Calabria and Apulia. Indeed, as late as the 14th 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 Bovesìa and Grecìa Salentina (cf. Schifano & Silvestri 2017). In Bovesìa, where the local variety of Greek is known as *Greko*, the language is today confined to five remote villages of the Aspromonte mountains (namely, Bova (Marina), Chorìo di Rochudi, Condofuri (Marina), Gallicianò and Roghudi (Nuovo)),[2] where it is reported, according to some of the most generous estimates (cf. Katsoyannou 1995: 27–31, 2001: 8–9), to be spoken by around 500 speakers (see also Spano 1965; Martino 1980: 308–313; Stamuli 2007: 16–19; Remberger 2011: 126 f.; 2018:

---

1   Glossing used in examples follows the Leipzig Glossing Rules (see https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf).

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) due to the forced evacuations of their villages following natural disasters such as landslides and earthquakes.

138 f.; Squillaci 2017: 14 f.). In Grecìa Salentina, on the other hand, the language, locally known as *Griko*, has fared somewhat better, in that it continues to be spoken in a pocket of eight villages of the Otranto peninsula (Calimera, Castrignano de' Greci, Corigliano d'Otranto, Martano, Martignano, Soleto,[3] Sternatia, Zollino) by as many as 20,000 speakers according to the most optimistic estimates (Comi 1989; Sobrero & Miglietta 2005; Manolessou 2005a: 105; Marra 2008: 52 f.; Romano 2008).

In what follows we shall focus on one feature of the syntax of Italo-Greek which has to date gone unnoticed in the literature and which we believe is otherwise unattested in other modern dialects and varieties of Greek outside of Italy. The phenomenon in question concerns the possibility of marking a subset of surface subjects with accusative case.[4] A careful analysis of such attestations reveals that accusative-marked subjects cannot be disregarded as random replacements within a highly attrited grammar but, rather, they obey regular structural principles that underlie an ongoing progressive shift towards an active-stative syntactic alignment. It is our contestation that this change in the alignment of Italo-Greek is the result of contact with Romance where reflexes of an active-stative alignment are otherwise abundantly attested.

This article is organized as follows. After providing a brief introduction to some basic concepts in the general description of morphosyntactic alignments (Section 2), we briefly consider the distribution of case-marking and formal splits in the verb system of Standard Modern Greek (Section 3) and their differing characterizations in terms of alignment. This is followed by an examination of the fundamental properties and distribution of the so-called "extended accusative" in early Indo-European (Section 4), which we subsequently compare with the distribution of accusative subjects in the Italo-Greek varieties of Griko (Section 5.1) and Greko (Section 5.2), which are shown to follow an emerging active-stative alignment.[5] In support of this analysis, the following sections (Section 6.1–6.3) review further evidence from Italo-Greek

---

3 Griko is widely reported to have been abandoned in the village of Soleto during the second half of the previous century (Rohlfs 1977: 69; Sobrero 1980: 399; Aprile et al. 2002: 680; see also Pellegrino 2016: 141, fn. 3). However, during our fieldwork in 2016, we were able to find one speaker from Soleto whose data are reported below.

4 Instances of accusative subjects in Italo-Greek were already identified by Rohlfs (1977: 69) and Katsoyannou (1999), who either discarded them as random speech errors and/or incorrectly interpreted them as the consequence of a collapsing morphological case system. For a comparative discussion of non-nominative subjects in non-personal constructions across the Balkans, see Friedman & Joseph (2018).

5 Unless otherwise indicated, all the data reported in this study come from our fieldwork with native speakers *in loco* during 2016.

for the emergence of morphosyntactic reflexes of an active-stative alignment. The final section (Section 7) summarizes the results and offers some general conclusions and remarks about the nature and role of Romance-Greek contact in shaping the grammars of Italo-Greek in southern Italy.

2   Alignments: some preliminary observations

Before looking at the details of accusative subjects in the Greek of southern Italy, we must first review some basic concepts and distinctions about morphosyntactic alignments which will prove essential in our discussion of Italo-Greek below. Following a widely-accepted typological distinction (Dixon 1994: 6–8; see also Comrie 1989: 110–116), we can distinguish three core sentential participants labelled A and O (1a), the subject and object, respectively, of a transitive construction, and S (1b–c), the subject of an intransitive construction:

(1)   a. **John** (A) was smoking **a cigarette** (O).
       b. **John** (S) was smoking.
       c. **The gun** (S) was smoking.

In a number of areas of their grammars, many languages make a further distinction between two types of intransitive S(ubject): (i) an S with an agentive interpretation (1b) and hence, to all intents and purposes, identical to A(gent), bar the presence of an O(bject); and (ii) an S with an UNDERGOER interpretation (1c) and hence, to all intents and purposes, identical to O(bject), bar the presence of an A(gent). The former we may call S_A and the latter S_O.

To varying degrees, languages make available the means to encode these three core participants through nominal marking systems (case, adpositions), verb marking systems (agreement, auxiliaries, voice distinctions), and through sentential word order. Together these three mechanisms of argument marking variously place the three nuclear sentential participants into one of the following three typological organizations (cf. La Fauci 1997: 12; Ledgeway 2012: ch. 7):

(2)   a. A is formally distinguished from O and, in turn, shares the same formal
          marking as $S_{A/O}$;
       b. O is formally distinguished from A, and, in turn, shares the same formal
          marking as $S_{A/O}$;
       c. A is formally distinguished from O, but the formal marking of S is split
          between A ($= S_A$) and O ($= S_O$);

The arrangement described in (2a) is traditionally termed a nominative-accusative alignment, while the arrangement described in (2b) yields an ergative-absolutive alignment. The third and final active-stative alignment in (2c) represents a compromise between the two preceding alignments, in that S is formally aligned in part with A and in part with O. It is doubtful, however, that the full grammatical apparatus of any language can be consistently described in terms of just one of these three alignments, although it is often possible to associate particular languages with one predominant orientation. For example, below we shall see that Italo-Greek combines an inherited nominative-accusative orientation with an emerging active-stative orientation in certain areas of the nominal and verbal systems, as well as at the level of the sentence where we shall review evidence for an active-stative orientation in the patterns of sentential word order.

3 Standard Modern Greek

The nominal system of Standard Modern Greek can unequivocally be described in terms of a nominative-accusative alignment. By way of illustration, consider the three sentences in (3a–c):

(3) a. *O   Janis   ðiavazi*
        the.MSG.NOM Janis.MSG.NOM read.ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG
        tin   efimeriða.   (SMG)
        the.FSG.ACC newspaper.FSG.NOM-ACC
        'Janis reads the newspaper'.

     b. *O   Janis   ðiavazi.*   (SMG)
        the.MSG.NOM Janis.MSG.NOM read.ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG
        'Janis reads'.

     c. *Peϑeni   o   Janis.*   (SMG)
        die.ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM Janis.MSG.NOM
        'Janis is dying'.

Whether the grammatical subject corresponds to the A of a transitive predicate (3a), the S_A of an (intransitive) unergative predicate (3b), or the S_O of an (intransitive) unaccusative predicate (3c), it invariably surfaces in the nominative. This is indicated by the nominative, masculine singular definite article *o* and the final inflexion *-s* borne by the nominal *Jani-* in the examples

above. By contrast, the grammatical O(bject) of a transitive verb surfaces in the accusative form marked in (3a) above by the distinctive accusative form of the feminine singular definite article *tin* (cf. nominative form *i*). It follows that the nominal system of Standard Modern Greek formally contrasts A and $S_{(A/O)}$ (marked nominative) with O (marked accusative) to yield a canonical nominative-accusative orientation which proves totally insensitive to the semantic characterization (AGENT vs UNDERGOER) of the subject.

By contrast, the verb system is less consistent in its morphosyntactic orientation. As the examples in (3a–c) already clearly illustrate, in the active voice the verb system also operates according to a nominative-accusative alignment, in that the finite verb invariably agrees in person and number with the nominative subject (witness the final 3SG inflexion *-i* in all three examples above), and not with the accusative object when present. However, Greek also presents a non-active (often referred to as "medio-passive") voice, which formally brings together intransitive UNDERGOER subjects variously drawn from the passive (4a) and unaccusative structures including some deponents, anticausatives, inherent reflexives and reflexive constructions (4b), which all share a distinct set of non-active morphological forms (cf. final 3SG inflexion in *-te*):

(4)   a. *I*   *efimeriða*
         the.FSG.NOM newspaper.FSG.NOM-ACC
         ðiavazete   *apo   ton   Jani.*   (SMG)
         read.NON-ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG from the.MSG.ACC Janis.MSG.ACC
         'The newspaper is being read by Janis'.

      b. *Erxete*   *o*   *Janis.*   (SMG)
         come.NON-ACT.IPFV.NON-PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM Janis.MSG.NOM
         'Janis is coming'.

As the active-passive contrast between (3a) and (4a) reveals, the surface passive subject in the latter is underlyingly an O, hence its S_O status. Analogously, the overwhelming majority of non-active forms that are not passives are unaccusative predicates (cf. 4b), whose surface subject is analysed in many current formal frameworks as a derived subject moved from or related to the verb's complement position, hence its UNDERGOER interpretation and S_O status. We thus see that Standard Modern Greek combines a nominative-accusative formal distinction in the nominal system, inasmuch as all surface subjects (be they A, S_A or S_O) are systematically marked nominative, with a mixed alignment in the verb system: syntactically the person and number agreement of the finite verb is invariably controlled by a nominative-marked argument in accordance

with a nominative-accusative alignment, but, morphologically, the finite verb predominantly displays an active-stative alignment with distinct morphological paradigms for verbs with active subjects (A/S_A) on the one hand and stative subjects (S_O) on the other (cf. 3SG -*i* vs -*te* in (3) vs. (4) above).[6]

4   Extended accusative in early Indo-European

The label "extended accusative" is traditionally used to refer to the extension of accusative case to mark the subjects of a subclass of (intransitive) verbs, a phenomenon commonly attested in many ancient Indo-European languages (Moravcsik 1978; Plank 1985) including, among others, Avestan (Lazzeroni 2002: 311–313; Danesi 2014), Old Persian (Kent 1946), Gothic (Delbrück 1900), early Germanic (Barðdal 2011), Ancient Greek (Lazzeroni 2013) and Latin.[7] In some cases such attestations have been dismissed as cases of textual corruption, morphological conflation or anacolutha (Ledgeway 2012: 329; Adams 2013: ch. 13, §6.3). Although there is no doubt some truth to some of these claims in a small number of cases, overall their number is too great and their structural distribution too regular for them to be entirely dismissed as such. The question therefore arises as to whether those attestations which are recognised as genuine outputs of the grammars under investigation should be analysed as constructions simply inherited from a common proto-stage of Indo-European, or as independent developments that arose in individual members of the family (see, for example, Danesi 2014).[8] For the sake of the present discussion, it will suffice to observe that, despite individual differences, the distribution of the extended accusative shares some common features across early Indo-European. These include: (i) the greater frequency of the extended accusative in lower-register texts; (ii) the optionality of the extended accusative, insofar as it continues to occur alongside nominative subjects in the same contexts; and (iii) the class of subjects involved, which is generally lim-

---

6 Cf. Mackridge (1987: 96–99), Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2004), Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton (2004: ch. 6).

7 Regarding the distribution of the extended accusative in Latin, see Löfstedt (1933: 329–334), Norberg (1944: 21–32), Gerola (1949–1950), Bastardas Parera (1953: 16–20), Westerbergh (1956: 235 f.), Herman (1966, 1987: 102, 1995: 72–75), Durante (1981: 41), Pensado (1986), Väänänen (1982: 203 f.), Helttula (1987), La Fauci (1988: 54 f., 1997), Zamboni (1998: 131 f.), Pieroni (1999), Cennamo (2001a, 2001b, 2009, 2011), Lazzeroni (2002: 310–312), Rovai (2005, 2007, 2012, 2014); Ledgeway (2011a: 459–461, 2012: §7.3.2.1); Adams (2013: ch. 12, §6.3); Bentley (2016: 821 f.).

8 On the issue of the origins of other instances of non-nominative subjects in non-personal constructions across the Balkans, see also Friedman & Joseph (2018).

TABLE 1   Extension of accusative: syntactic and semantic criteria[a]

Syntactic criterion

unaccusatives → unergatives → transitives

S_O S_A

Semantic criterion

inactive inanimate → active inanimate → active animate

---

a   See Cennamo (2009: 341) for a third, pragmatic, criterion, namely
    accusative extension to constituents originally denoting the topic.

ited to inactive or involuntary intransitive subjects that exert minimal or no
control over the relevant event or situation (Moravcsik 1978: 254; Plank 1985).
Only rarely and in later chronological periods is the extended accusative found
with dynamic intransitive subjects and, even much more rarely, with transitive
agentive subjects.[9] The syntactic and semantic criteria governing the exten-
sion of accusative-marking to subjects cross-linguistically are summarized in
Table 1.

A good case in point is represented by (late) Latin, where the extended
accusative is mainly attested in low transitivity domains, in the sense of Hopper
& Thompson (1980: 252; cf. also Sorace 2000; Rovai 2005: 63), in that the appear-
ance of the accusative reflects the underlying semantic case of the UNDER-
GOER subject formally aligning it with the class of O(bjects).[10] It therefore typ-
ically surfaces with S_O-type subjects in middle constructions with deponents
(5a), anticausatives (5b), passives (5c), impersonal passives (5d), and existen-
tials (5e), as well as in active syntax in conjunction with unaccusatives (5f) and,
in particular, the verb ESSE 'be' (5g).

(5)   a. *nascitur*   *ei*   *genuorum*
         born.PASS.PRS.IND.3SG him.MSG.DAT knees.NPL.GEN
         contractionem   *aut* ***claudicationem***   (Lat., *Mul. Ch.* 516)
         contraction.FSG.ACC or   limp.FSG.ACC
         'his knees are developing a contraction or a limp'

---

9   See, for example, Plank (1985: 290), Rovai (2005: 62 f.), Cennamo (2009: 324–326) and
      Ledgeway (2012: 331) on Latin. Cf., however, also Adams (2013: 247–249).
10   See Lazzeroni (2002: 310–312), Cennamo (2009, 2011), Ledgeway (2012: 328 ff.), Bentley
      (2016: 822). Cf. also Danesi (2014) for similar contexts in Avestan.

b. ***multos***   ***languores***   *sanantur*   *in*
   many.MPL.ACC weaknesses.MPL.ACC heal.PASS.PRS.IND.3PL in
   ipsis   *locis*   (Lat., *Ant. Plac. Itin.* 165.16)
   same.PL.ABL places.MPL.ABL
   'many weaknesses are healed in these places'

c. ***ipsas***   ***portas***   *aperiuntur*
   sames.FPL.ACC gates.FPL.ACC open.PASS.PRS.IND.3PL
                                               (Lat., *Itin. Hier.* 11.1)
   'the(se) gates are opened'

d. *et   sic   fit*   ***orationem***   *pro omnibus*
   and thus to.be.done.PRS.IND.3SG prayer.FSG.ACC for all.NPL.ABL
                                               (Lat., *Per. Aeth.* 25.3)
   'and thus the prayer is made for everyone'

e. *habebat*   *de   ciuitate*   *forsitan* ***mille***
   have.IPFV.PST.IND.3SG from city.FSG.ABL perhaps thousand
   quingentos   ***passus***   (Lat., *Per. Aeth.* 23.2)
   five.hundred.MPL.ACC steps.M.ACC
   'it was perhaps 1500 paces from the city'

f. *ut   **sanguinem**   exeat*   ***copiosum***
   so.that blood.MSG.ACC exit.PRS.SBJV.3SG copious.MSG.ACC
                                               (Lat., *Mul. Ch.* 618)
   'so that plentiful amounts of blood may run out'

g. *si sine   uulnere   erit,*   ***totam***
   if without wound.NSG.ABL be.FUT.IND.3SG all.FSG.ACC
   curationem   *haec*   *est*   (Lat., *Mul. Ch.* 526)
   healing.FSG.ACC this.FSG.NOM be.PRS.IND.3SG
   'if he is unwounded, this is all part of the healing process'

Cross-linguistically, instances of the extended accusative also tend to occur in varieties whose case systems are undergoing considerable weakening, a feature also readily observable in late Latin (but cf. Old Persian, Danesi 2014: 251, fn. 71). Arguably, this "extended" use of the accusative which increases greatly in frequency in later Latin texts can be construed as a gradual alignment shift in the nominal system, whereby non-active subjects come increasingly to be formally marked on a par with transitive objects. In particular, nominative is reserved for

A/S$_A$ subjects and accusative for O(bjects) and S$_O$ subjects in accordance with an emerging active-stative alignment and, more rarely in later periods, also for S$_A$ subjects in accordance with an ergative-absolutive alignment (La Fauci 1997: 57 ff.; Zamboni 1998: 131 ff.; Ledgeway 2012: 332; Bentley 2016: 822).

5   Extended accusative in Italo-Greek

5.1   *A note on case-marking in Italo-Greek*
Just like Standard Modern Greek, Italo-Greek determiners and nominals show morphological case-marking for nominative, accusative and genitive-dative across three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter) and two numbers (singular vs. plural). However, the morphophonological reduction of several of its nominal inflexional markers has led to many instances of apparent syncretism. Although in some cases there arise genuine instances of neutralization, in most cases the apparent syncretisms are crucially resolved by means of an additional phonosyntactic strategy whereby, following an original sandhi assimilation, an erstwhile final inflexional consonant today surfaces in the consonantal lengthening of the initial consonant of the following word. For example, when preceded by the definite article (cf. Table 2), the nominative vs accusative distinction in masculine and feminine nouns in Griko may be marked by lengthening of their initial consonant (e.g. (*t*)*on liko* 'the.MSG.ACC wolf.MSG.NOM-ACC' > (*t*)*o lliko* 'the.MSG.ACC wolf.MSG.ACC' vs *o liko* 'the.MSG.NOM wolf.MSG.NOM'), a phenomenon for which we borrow the Romance label *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* 'phonosyntactic doubling' (henceforth RF).[11]

By way of illustration, consider the Griko examples in (6)–(7) where the nominative vs. accusative case distinction is marked solely by the absence vs. presence of RF, respectively:[12]

---

11   The alternance between *t*-forms and vowel forms in the accusative (e.g. *to* vs *o*) is optional. For a more detailed discussion, see Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (in prep.: ch. 2). See also Morosi (1870: 118 ff.) and Rohlfs (1977: 66 ff.).

12   In citing Romance data from our fieldwork in Calabria and Salento, we use a very broad orthographic representation largely based on Italo-Romance orthographic practices. The following points should therefore be noted: (i) *ch*/*gh* = /k/g/; (ii) *c*+*i*/*e* = /(t)ʃ/, (*g*)*g*+*i*/*e* = /dʒ:/, *sci* = /ʃ(:)/, *gli* = /ʎ:, j:/, *z* = /ts, dz/ (long intervocalically), -*ddh*- = /ɖ(ʐ)(:)/; (iii) all orthographically double consonants are realized long. For the transliteration and transcription of Italo-Greek forms for which there is no established norm (cf. Iannàccaro and Dell'Aquila 2011:39 f.), we adopt here, with some modifications, the relatively simple system used in Papageogiadis (n.d.) in his adaptation of Karanastasis' (1997) grammar of Italo-Greek dialects. In particular, for the transcription of consonantal phonemes broadly

TABLE 2   Griko definite articles

	Masculine		Feminine	
	Singular	**Plural**	**Singular**	**Plural**
Nom	o	i, e	i, eᵃ	i, e
Acc	(t)on + V / some Cᵇ to[+RF] o [+RF]	tos, (t)us tu[+RF] u[+RF]	(t)in + V / some C ti[(+RF)] i[+RF,c]	(t)es + V / some C te[+RF] eᵈ

a   The feminine singular and plural form *e* is limited to the Griko spoken in Calimera.
b   The consonants affected are velars and labials (Morosi 1870: 118), although assimilation may also occur, e.g. *tom Betro* 'the.MSG.ACC Petro.MSG.ACC' (Rohlfs 1977: 181).
c   RF may be absent in conjunction with the accusative feminine singular only in Calimera, where there is no ambiguity with the nominative (viz. *e*).
d   Despite appearances, in Calimera this *e* does not give rise to ambiguity with the feminine nominative singular since the nouns are inflexionally distinct, e.g. *e kiante*.FPL.ACC vs *e kianta*.FSG.NOM 'the plant(s)'.

(6)   a.   ***O   Pietro   ttseri   na***
            the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM know.PRS.3SG IRR.PRT
            milisi   o   Griko.   (Calimera)
            speak.SBJV.3SG the.NSG Griko.NSG
            'Pietro can speak Griko'.

      b.   *Ena attà   filìa   mu pu   Luppìu teli   na*
            one from.the friend.NPL =my from Lecce   want.PRS.3SG IRR.PRT
            di   o   ssìndako.   (Calimera)
            see.SBJV.3SG the.MSG.ACC mayor.MSG.ACC
            'One of my friends from Lecce wants to meet the mayor'.

---

equivalent to those of Italian we use the relevant (di-/tri)graphs from the Romance alphabet, e.g. *p* = /p/, *f* = /f/, *gli* = /ʎʎ/, *gg(i)* / *(c)c(i)* / *sc(i)* + *i/e* = /dʒ: / tʃ(:) / ʃ(:)/. At the same time, we augment these with the following graphemes: *j* + V [+ant.] = Greko /j/, Griko /ʝ/; *g* + V [−ant.] = Greko /ɣ/, Griko /g/; (*δ*)*δ* = /(δ)δ/ (Greko only); (*t*)*th* = /θ(:)/ (Greko only); (*k*)*kh* = / x(:)/; (*z*)*z* = Greko /z/, Griko /dz/; *-ddh-* = / ɖ(ʐ):/; (*k*)*k* = /k(:)/ (for further details see Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri in prep.: §1.2.1). In the representation of both Romance and Italo-Greek, word stress is marked through an orthographic grave accent only on non-paroxytonic words, including monosyllables, as well as on the weak vowel of a diphthong. All examples taken from published sources are, of course, reproduced in their original orthographic form.

(7) a. *Motte èstasa   essu   mu, i*
        when arrive.PFV.PST.1SG at.home =my the.FSG.NOM
        Marìa   ikhe   fanta.[13]   (Sternatia)
        Maria.FSG.NOM have.PASS.IPFV.3SG eat.NON-FIN
        'When I arrived home, Maria had eaten'.

     b. *Ida   i   **Mmarìa**   defore attì*
        see.PFV.PST.1SG the.FSG.ACC Maria.FSG.ACC outside from.the
        porteddha   keccia   tis
        door.FSG.NOM-ACC small.FSG.NOM-ACC the.FSG.GEN
        aglisìa.[14]   (Calimera)
        church.FSG.NOM-ACC-GEN
        'I saw Maria outside the little door of the church'.

As we shall see, it is precisely the presence or otherwise of RF that will allow us
in many cases to discriminate between nominative and accusative marking on
many of the subjects discussed below.

5.2   *Accusative subjects in Griko*

On a par with Standard Modern Greek (cf. Section 3), Griko apparently presents
a core nominative-accusative alignment, formally contrasting subjects and
objects. Thus, we see in (8) that subjects of transitives (A; 8a), unergatives (S$_A$;
8b) and unaccusatives (S$_O$; 8c) are treated uniformly in that they are all marked
nominative, in contrast to transitive O(bject)s which are systematically marked
accusative (cf. *us piattu* in 8a):

---

13   Given their historical evolution (Manolessou 2005b), in the literature (Italo-)Greek verb
      forms in *-onta/-onda* such as *fanta* 'eaten, eating' have been variously referred to as partici-
      ples (e.g. Rohlfs 1977: 109 f., 200 f.; Mackridge 1987; Manolessou 2005a) and gerunds (e.g.
      Katsoyannou 1995; Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 2012). Without taking a
      firm position, for ease of exposition here we simply gloss them as NON-FIN. The same
      gloss is applied to non-finite forms in *-meno/-a*.
14   Non-proparoxytone feminine singular nouns ending in *-a* are always formally ambiguous
      between nominative, accusative and genitive (unless marked accusative through RF). In
      what follows we shall gloss them as NOM-ACC-GEN only when the context clarifies that the
      noun is genitive. In contexts where the noun may only be either nominative or accusative,
      the formal ambiguity with genitive will not be indicated.

(8) a. *E   Marìa   pleni   kalà us*
         the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM wash.PRS.3SG well the.MPL.ACC
         piattu.   (Calimera)
         dishes.MPL.ACC
         'Maria washes the dishes well'.

     b. *O   Pietro   kantalì   fiakka.*   (Calimera)
         the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM sing.PRS.3SG badly
         'Pietro sings badly'.

     c. *Ekhi   tossu   khronu   ka   e*
         have.PRS.3SG many.MPL.ACC years.MPL.ACC that the.FSG.NOM
         aglisìa   èpese.   (Calimera)
         church.FSG.NOM-ACC fall.PFV.PST.3SG
         'It's been many years since the church fell'.

However, alongside such prototypically marked arguments, viz. nominative subjects and accusative objects, our corpus also includes attestations of subjects marked with accusative case.[15] These were produced by both proficient (p.) and semi-speakers (s-s.) from all eight villages and belong to the spoken informal register of the language.[16] As for their syntactic distribution, they can occur in root (9), embedded (10) and adverbial (11) clauses, and both in pre- and postverbal positions (cf. 9a vs. 9b):[17]

---

15   Neuter subjects are not taken into account here as nominative and accusative are syncretic in the neuter gender; indeed in glossing neuter forms below we do not indicate case, unless genitive. Note, furthermore, that we do not distinguish in what follows between (abstract) Case and (morphological) case, but simply use the spelling "case" throughout.

16   By semi-speaker, we mean speakers belonging to one of the following three subcategories: (i) L1 speakers whose once full competence has been eroded as a consequence of a lack of use of the language for a more or less extended period of time; (ii) L1 speakers who have naturally acquired Griko from their families, but only partially; and (iii) local L2 speakers who have decided to learn Griko later in life, but who have never reached full native-like competence (Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri 2018a: 13); see also Dorian (1980, 1981) and, for Italo-Greek, Stamuli (2007: 65–67) and Guardiano & Stavrou (2019: 5–6).

17   A different type of accusative subject is also found in a subset of embedded clauses, for which see Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (2018c) and Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (in prep.).

(9) a. ***O***   ***ppatera***   *ìbbie*   *vòtonta*
          the.MSG.ACC priest.MSG.ACC go.IPFV.PST.3SG go.around.NON-FIN
          spiti   *spiti.*[18]   (Martano, p.)
          house.NSG house.NSG
          'The priest used to go around visiting all the houses'.

     b. *Ipao*   *na*   *piao*   *ta*   *treffia*   *mu*
          go.PRS.1SG IRR.PRT take.SBJV.1SG the.NPL brothers.NPL =my
          na   *tos*   *po*   *possen apètane*
          IRR.PRT them.DAT= say.SBJV.1SG how   die.PFV.PST.3SG
          to   *sciddho.*   (Sternatia, p.)
          the.MSG.ACC dog.MSG.NOM-ACC
          'I'll go and fetch my brothers to tell them how their dog died'.

     c. ***Ti***   ***kkiatera***   *tu*   *Petru*
           the.FSG.ACC daughter.FSG.ACC the.MSG.GEN Petro.MSG.GEN
          ìffie.   (Corigliano, s-s.)
          run.PFV.PST.3SG
          'Petro's daughter ran away'.

     d. ***Tes***   *kiante*   *tus*   *pomudoru*
          the.FPL.ACC plants.FPL.NOM-ACC the.MPL.GEN tomato.MSG.GEN
          ikàisa.   (Corigliano, s-s.)
          burn.PFV.PST.3PL
          'The tomato plants burnt'.

(10) *Mu*   *fènato*   *ka*   *'tto*   *pornò*
      me.DAT= seem.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG that at.the.NSG morning.NSG
      i   ***Mmarìa***   *epplìnite*   *kalà.*[19]
      the.FSG.ACC Maria.FSG.ACC NEG=clean.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG   well
                                                                (Corigliano, s-s.)
      'It seemed to me that Maria didn't use to wash properly in the morning'.

---

18 Note that in examples such as (9a) we gloss the masculine singular article *o* as distinctively accusative, and not as ambiguously nominative-accusative (cf. nominative *o* vs accusative *(t)o(n)*), since it produces RF on the following nominal. Clearly, what is relevant in such examples is the determiner's ability to license RF and not just its surface form.

19 In this and similar examples produced by semi-speakers it is not uncommon to find surface irregularities in all domains, such as *epplìnite* instead of *epplènato*.

(11) *Motte* **to**   *Ppetro*   *ce* **ti**   *Rrita*
      when the.MSG.ACC Petro.MSG.ACC and the.FSG.ACC Rita.FSG.ACC
      estàsane   *essu,*   *ìpane*   *na*   *pane*
      arrive.PFV.PST.3PL at.home tell.PFV.PST.3PL IRR.PRT go.SBJV.3PL
      ison   ospitali.   (Corigliano, s-s.)
      to.the hospital.MSG.ACC
      'When Pietro and Rita arrived home, they were told to go to the hospital'.

Given the highly attrited status of the language now spoken in a rapidly-shrinking speech community which is today in constant contact with the dominant neighbouring Romance varieties that lack a formal case system (viz. Salentino and (regional) Italian),[20] it is tempting to disregard examples such as (9)–(11) as random replacements produced by speakers whose competence has been drastically eroded (Rohlfs 1977: 69; cf. also Rossi Taibbi & Carcausi 1959: liiif., lix and Katsoyannou 1999 for Greko). However, a careful investigation of the syntactic distribution of accusative subjects in our corpus reveals a number of interesting affinities with historical attestations of the so-called extended accusative, suggesting that they should be interpreted as the authentic output of a changing grammar rather than performance errors of an increasingly less native grammar.

Indeed, overall instances of accusative subjects in our corpus of Griko are less controversial than many attestations from early Indo-European languages reviewed above, inasmuch as they have been systematically produced by native speakers who have also confirmed their grammaticality. Moreover, they share a number of common features with the historical instances of extended accusative reviewed above. First, Griko accusative subjects are also optional: for all the examples including an accusative subject there are speakers who produced the same sentences with a regular nominative subject (12a–b). At the same time, speakers who produced accusative subjects also produced regular nominative subjects, both in the (near-)identical sentences (13)–(15) and in different ones (16)–(17).

(12) a. *Avri*   **o**   *Giorgio*   *enna pai*
        tomorrow the.MSG.NOM Giorgio.MSG.NOM must go.SBJV.3SG
        ssi   *Ggina.*   (Sternatia, p.)
        to.the.FSG.ACC Gina.FSG.ACC

---

b. *Avri*   ***to***   *Iorgi*   *enna pai*
tomorrow the.MSG.ACC Iorgi.MSG.NOM-ACC must go.SBJV.3SG
ssi   *Ggina.*   (Soleto, p.)
to.the.FSG.ACC Gina.FSG.ACC
'Tomorrow Giorgio has to go to Gina's'.

(13) a. *O*   *ijo*   *mbiche.*   (Sternatia, p.)
the.MSG.NOM sun.MSG.NOM-ACC set.PFV.PST.3SG
b. ***Ton***   *ijo*   *mbiche.*
the.MSG.ACC sun.MSG.NOM-ACC set.PFV.PST.3SG
                             (Sternatia, same speaker)
'The sun set'.

(14) a. ***I***   ***antròpi***   *ìpane*   *is*   *kampagna,*
the.MPL.NOM men.MPL.NOM go.PRS.3PL to.the field.FSG.NOM-ACC
i   *jineke*   *istène*   *essu.*
the.FPL.NOM women.FPL.NOM-ACC stay.PRS.3PL at.home
                              (Corigliano, p.)
'The men go to the fields, the women stay home'.

b. *Imì*   ***antròpu***   *ìpame*   *is*   *kampagna,*
we.NOM men.MPL.ACC go.PRS.1PL to.the field.FSG.NOM-ACC
esì   *jineke*   *stete*   *essu.*
you.2PL.NOM women.FPL.NOM-ACC stay.PRS.2PL at.home
                          (Corigliano, same speaker)
'We men go to the fields, you women, stay home'.

(15) a. ***O***   ***kossubrino***   *mu*   *itàrattse.*
the.MSG.NOM cousin.MSG.NOM =my leave.PFV.PST.3SG
                              (Corigliano, s-s.)
'My cousin left'.

b. ***Olu***   ***tus***   *attsaderfò*   *mmu*
all.MPL.ACC the.MPL.ACC cousin.MSG.NOM-ACC =my
taràttsane.
leave.PFV.PST.3PL
                              (Corigliano, same speaker)
'All my cousins left'.

(16) a. *O*   *ciuri*   *mu* *en* *ìttsere*   *na*
the.MSG.NOM father.MSG.NOM =my NEG= know.PRS.3SG IRR.PRT
vali   *tus*   *kiodu*   *na*   *stiasi*
use.SBJV.3SG the.MPL.ACC nails.MPL.ACC IRR.PRT fix.SBJV.3SG
ti   *pporta.*   (Sternatia, p.)
the.FSG.ACC door.FSG.ACC
'My father doesn't know how to use the nails to fix the door'.

b. *Ekhi*   *kappossus* *khronu*   *ka* *i*
have.PRS.3SG many   years.MPL.ACC that the.FSG.NOM-ACC
aglisìa   *antika*   *èpese*   *motte*
church.FSG.NOM-ACC ancient.FSG.NOM-ACC fall.PFV.PST.3SG when
kame   *to*   *tterremoto*
do.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC earthquake.MSG.ACC
poddhì.[21]   (Sternatia, same speaker)
much
'It's been many years since the church fell when there was a strong earthquake'.

(17) a. *O*   *patera*   *ipai*   *spiti*   *spiti.*
the.MSG.NOM priest.MSG.NOM go.PRS.3SG house.NSG house.NSG
(Corigliano, s-s.)
'The priest is going to every house'.

b. *Ti*   *inglisìa*   *èpese*   *ja*
the.FSG.ACC church.FSG.NOM-ACC fall.PFV.PST.3SG for
na   *terremoto*
an.MSG.NOM-ACC earthquake.MSG.NOM-ACC
dinatò.   (Corigliano, same speaker)
powerful.MSG.NOM-ACC
'The church fell because of a powerful earthquake'.

Second, although we are dealing with a predominantly spoken code, accusative subjects in Griko appear to belong predominantly to the spoken and most informal registers of the language. This is confirmed by a preliminary investigation of early and contemporary written sources which has brought to light some

---

21   Note that although *kame* in (16b) is glossed as 'make', its actual meaning here is unaccusative 'happen'.

examples of accusative subjects, nearly all of which are restricted to early writ-
ten records (cf. Morosi 1870) of originally orally recounted tales and stories (18)
and contemporary informal texts such as those exemplified in (19) taken from
a selection of personal testimonies about life in the past published in the local
magazine *I Spitta*:[22]

(18) a. *Eguìch'*   *ènan*   *afse cinu.*[23]
          go.out.PFV.PST.3SG one.MSG.ACC of   them.MPL.ACC
                                                           (Martano, Morosi 1870: 5)
          'One of them [= Roman soldiers] came forward'.

      b. *Nifta*   *jùrise*   *ittin*
          night.FSG.NOM-ACC come.back.PFV.PST.3SG that.FSG.ACC
          emèra.   (Martano, Morosi 1870: 5)
          day.FSG.NOM-ACC
          'That day turned again into night'.

      c. *Pesti*   *ti   e   diavimmèno*
          say.IMP.2SG=her.GEN-DAT that be.PRS.3SG pass.NON-FIN.MSG
          to   cerò.   (Corigliano, Morosi 1870: 52)
          the.MSG.ACC time.MSG.NOM-ACC
          'Tell her that the time has passed'.

      d. *Pos istèghi   to   cosmo   ce*
          how stay.PRS.3SG the.MSG.ACC world.MSG.NOM-ACC and
          t'   àjera?   (Soleto, Morosi 1870: 64)
          the.FSG.ACC sky.FSG.NOM-ACC
          'How are the world and the sky?'

---

22 The translations below are based on the Italian translations provided in the magazine,
     accessible at http://www.rizegrike.com/spitta.php.

23 Note however that the final *-n* of the masculine singular article *ena(n)* may have also been
     triggered by the prevocalic phonological context, rather than just being the etymological
     -n of the accusative (cf. Rohlfs 1977: 68f. on neuter *to(n)* and masculine/neuter *ena(n)*).
     The same applies to (18b) (but see 20d for the lack of *-n* on the same noun in the nomina-
     tive). See also fn. 37 below.

(19) a. *Tutta   travùdia   mas   avisùne   na   noìsume*
these.NPL songs.NPL us.ACC help.PRS.3PL IRR.PRT know.SBJV.1PL
*ti   ìsane   ce   ti   ene   **tin***
what be.IPFV.PST.3SG and what be.PRS.3SG the.FSG.ACC
emigraziùna   ja   to   gheno   atto
emigration.FSG.NOM-ACC for the.NSG people.NSG from.the
choma   dikòmma.   (*I Spitta 11*)
land.NSG ours
'These songs help us understand what emigration is and what it was for the people from our land'.

b. *Motte glinnàne   **tes**   scole,*
when close.IPFV.PST.3PL the.FPL.ACC schools.FPL.NOM-ACC
i   mànamu   mas   èbbianne   ole
the.FSG.NOM mother.FSG.NOM=my us=ACC take.IPFV.PST.3SG all
ce trì ce mas   èperne,   manìchitti, me   to
and three and us.ACC= take.IPFV.PST.3SG alone   with the
papùni, si Svizzera   so   ciùrimu,   ce
train   to.the Switzerland to.the father.MSG.NOM-ACC=my and
stèamo   fìnca en   anìane   matapàle
stay.IPFV.PST.1PL until NEG= open.IPFV.PST.3PL again
tes   *scole.*   (*I Spitta 11*)
the.FPL.ACC schools.FPL.NOM-ACC
'When the schools closed, my mother would take all three of us and would take us alone by train to Switzerland to my father's, and we would stay there until the schools opened again'.

Note that optionality extends to written sources too, insomuch as nominative subjects are also regularly attested, witness the following examples, where all the subjects are marked as nominative despite their occurrence with an unaccusative verb (20a–c) and the copula BE (20d):

(20) a. *Motti epèsane   **o**   **Cristò.***
when die.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM Christ.MSG.NOM
                                        (Martano, Morosi 1870: 5)
'When Christ died'.

b. *Dè　e　　　　　　mane　　　　　　　dè　e*
NEG the.FPL.NOM mothers.FPL.NOM-ACC NEG the.MPL.NOM
ciuri　　　　　　jurìsane.
fathers.MPL.NOM-ACC come.back.PFV.PST.3PL
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Martano, Morosi 1870: 12)
'Neither the mothers nor the fathers came back'.

c. *Ìrte　　　　　　o　　　　　ànemo.*
come.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM wind.MSG.NOM-ACC
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Martano, Morosi 1870: 15)
'The wind came'.

d. *Motti　e　　　　　emèra　　　　　en*
when the.FSG.NOM day.FSG.NOM-ACC be.PRS.3SG
afsilì.　　　　　　　　　　　(Martano, Morosi 1870: 10)
high.FSG.NOM-ACC
'When the day is high'.

Finally, Griko accusative subjects crucially present the same syntactico-se-
mantic restrictions outlined above for the extended accusative in early Indo-
European. In particular, the extended accusative targets intransitive subjects
which are relatively inactive and inert, in short UNDERGOERS. As a conse-
quence, in our corpus accusative subjects in Griko are principally attested with
middle syntax, including deponents with reflexive interpretation (21a; cf. also
10), unaccusatives (21b; cf. also 9a–d, 11, 12b, 13b, 14b, 15b, 16b, 17b, 18a–b), anti-
causatives (cf. 19b), and the copula BE (21c; cf. also 18c).

(21) a. *Mu　　fènato　　　　　　　ka　'tto*
me.DAT= seem.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG that at.the.NSG
pornò　　　i　　　Mmarìa
morning.NSG the.FSG.ACC Maria.FSG.ACC
epplìnite　　　　　　　　　kalà.　　　　　(Corigliano, s-s.)
NEG=clean.NON-ACT.IPFV.PST.3SG well
'It seemed to me that Maria didn't use to wash properly in the morning'.

b. *O　　　ppatera　　ibbie　　　vòtonta*
the.MSG.ACC priest.MSG.ACC go.IPFV.PST.3SG go.around.NON-FIN
spiti　　spiti.　　　　　　　　　　(Martano, p.)
house.NSG house.NSG
'The priest used to go around visiting all the houses'.

c. *Diu mèdeku   i   kkalì,   o*
two doctors.MPL.ACC be.PRS.3PL good.MPL.NOM the.MSG.NOM
addhu   e   mmu   piace   poddhì.
other.MSG.NOM-ACC NEG= me.DAT= like.PRS.3SG much
(Calimera, p.)
'Two doctors are good, as for the other I don't like him very much'.[24]

To this we can also add low transitivity domains such as example (22) involving a stative predicate with a surface subject characterized by minimal control. Indeed, in accordance with Hopper & Thompson's (1980: 252) interpretation of 'low transitivity', we note that example (22) involves just one participant, an A low in potency, and denotes a non-action (viz. state) which is atelic, non-punctual and negated.

(22) *I   Mmarìa   en   ìttsere   a ssottsi*
the.FSG.ACC Maria.FSG.ACC NEG= know.PRS.3SG if can.PRS.3SG
erti   na   fai   ma mà.   (Calimera, s-s.)
come.INF IRR.PRT eat.SBJV.3SG with= us.ACC
'Maria doesn't know if she can come and eat with us'.

Conversely, the vast majority of animate and/or active subjects with transitive verbs included in our corpus bear the expected nominative marking. The very few instances of accusative marking in these contexts such as (23a) were only produced by semi-speakers (cf. fn. 16). This suggests that such rare examples should be interpreted either as genuine performance errors or as a separate case of reanalysis within a drastically more attrited grammar not shared by proficient native speakers (23b).

---

24   Interestingly, in this example the referential predicative adjectival complement *kkalì* of the accusative subject (*Diu*) *mèdecu* is inflected nominative (cf. accusative (*k*)*kalù*), showing a mixed pattern of case-marking. We also find the opposite pattern where the subject surfaces in the nominative and its predicative complement in the accusative, witness the following Greko example from the now defunct variety spoken in Roccaforte:
(i) *Egó   aḍḍiventégwo   mian   galì   mula.*
    I.NOM become.PRS.1SG a.FSG.ACC beautiful.FSG.NOM-ACC mule.FSG.NOM-ACC
    'I'll transform into a beautiful mule'. (Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959:131)

(23) a. ***Ton***   *aderfò*   *mmu ikhe*
      the.MSG.ACC brother.MSG.NOM-ACC =my have.IPFV.PST.3SG
      plìnonta   *oli to*   *spiti.*[25]   (Corigliano, s-s.)
      clean.NON-FIN all the.NSG house.NSG

   b. ***O***   *aderfò*   *mmu ikhe*
      the.MSG.NOM brother.MSG.NOM-ACC =my have.IPFV.PST.3SG
      plìnonta   *olo*   *to*   *spiti.*
      clean.NON-FIN all.NSG the.NSG house.NSG

                                                           (Calimera, p.)

     'My brother had cleaned the whole house'.

By way of summary, we list below in Table 3 all the classes of verb which are attested in our spoken and written corpus of Griko with an accusative subject.

From the overview in Table 3, it is clear that the extension of the accusative to subjects in Griko follows a regular structural distribution targeting unaccusative syntax according to a pattern analogous in all relevant respects to that observed for early Indo-European (cf. Section 4). In particular, the extension of the accusative serves to draw a formal distinction on the one hand between S_O (together with O) marked accusative and A and S_A marked nominative on the other. We thus see the emergence of a competing active-stative alignment in the nominal domain which, although now well advanced in Griko, has not (yet) replaced the erstwhile nominative-accusative alignment with S_O subjects still optionally occurring in the nominative. Indeed, in some cases nominative marking is still obligatory today. More specifically, while the extension of the accusative can target nominals which are high in the animacy scale (Silverstein 1976; cf. also Lazzeroni 2002: 309; Rovai 2005: 64) such as proper nouns and kinship terms, it is never found with pronouns. This undoubtedly reflects the fact that case distinctions are typically most robustly retained with pronouns (Spencer 2009: 195), as evidenced by all modern Romance varieties (with the exception of Romanian) where case distinctions have been lost on full DPs but retained to differing degrees in pronouns (Blake 2004: 178 f.; Sornicola 2011; Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016: 913–916). Revealing in this respect is the example in (14b), repeated here as (24), where we see that the first-person plural subject

---

25   Note the incorrect inflexion on the quantifier, which should be *olo* as in (23b).

TABLE 3   All attestations of accusative subject in Griko

Attested verb	Category
break (itself)	Deponents
burn (itself)	
look at oneself	
wash oneself	
close (itself)	
open (itself)	
arrive	Unaccusatives
die	
fall	
go	
leave	
go out	
return	
pass	
run	
go down, set	
happen	
be	Copular BE
stand	
lexical HAVE[a]	Low transitivity contexts
not be able	
not want	
not let	
not know	
buy	Transitives (only s-s.)
cook	
clean	
want	

a   We include lexical 'have' here as it is stative, non-telic
    and takes a non-Agentive subject (viz. locative).

(24) *Imì* **antròpu** *ipame* *is* *kampagna,*
we.NOM men.MPL.ACC go.PRS.1PL to.the field.FSG.NOM-ACC
esì *jineke* *stete* *essu.*
you.NOM.2PL women.FPL.NOM-ACC stand.PRS.2PL at.home
(Corigliano, p.)

'We men go to the fields, you women stay at home'.

imì occurs in the nominative (cf. accusative *(e)mà(s)*), but its accompanying (appositional) nominal modifier *antròpu* (cf. nominative *àntropo*) occurs in the distinctive accusative form.

5.3 *Accusative subjects in Greko*

Having ascertained above the presence of accusative subjects in the Italo-Greek variety of Griko spoken in Salento, it is instructive as a point of comparison to consider now Greko spoken in southern Calabria. The results of our fieldwork in southern Calabria show a situation very similar to that reviewed above for Griko. Indeed, already in an article from (1999), Katsoyannou had noted a small number of instances of accusative subjects in her data from Gallicianò collected in 1984 (cf. also Rossi Taibbi & Carcausi 1959: liiif., lix; Rohlfs 1977: 69), some examples of which are reported in (25).[26]

(25) a. *mu* *po'ni* **tin** *tʃi'lia.*
me.GEN= hurt.IPFV.N-PST.3SG the.FSG.ACC stomach.FSG.NOM-ACC
(Gallicianò, Katsoyannou 1999)
'I've got a stomach ache'.

b. *'pasesse* **ton** *ke'ro.*
pass.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC time.MSG.NOM-ACC
(Gallicianò, ibid.)
'the time passed by'.

---

26 For the sake of the present discussion, it is sufficient to observe that the morpho-phonological shape of definite articles in Greko largely coincides with that of articles in Griko, as outlined in Table 2. The reader is referred to Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (in prep.: ch. 2) for further details.

c. *san   'erketo   **ton**   'mina   tu*
   when   come.IPFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC month.MSG.ACC the.GEN
   'ʤuniu.   (Gallicianò, ibid.)
   June.GEN
   'when the month of June would come around'.

On a par with our previous observations about early Indo-European and Griko, the extension of accusative proves once again optional in Greko, as the following minimal pair produced by the same speaker highlights.

(26) a. ***o***   ***po'stino***   *pu   eɣi'ae   s   to   Vu'ni*
     the.MSG.NOM postman.NOM who go.PFV.PST.3SG to the Bova
     ‖ *tu   'ipe*   (Gallicianò, Katsoyannou 1999)
       him.GEN-DAT = say.PFV.PST.3SG
     'the postman who went to Bova said to him […].'

b. ***ton***   *po'stino*   *pu   'epie   ɣ   Vu'ni*
   the.MSG.ACC postman.NOM-ACC who go.PFV.PST.3SG to Bova
   'eperren   tin   'posta.   (Gallicianò, ibid.)
   take.IPFV.PST.3SG the.FSG.ACC post.NOM-ACC
   'the postman who used to go to Bova would collect the post.'

Ultimately, Katsoyannou fails to see any regularity in such examples, writing them off as examples of "morphological confusion between the nominative and accusative" (1999: 243) brought about by the apparent weakening of the Greko case system. However, even a cursory examination of the examples in (25) and (26b) reveals an inescapable structural regularity to the extension of the accusative in that it invariably targets unaccusative syntax (namely, S$_O$ subjects).[27]

    Further substantial confirmation of this emergent active-stative pattern also comes from a consideration of late 19th- and early 20th-century written texts. Once again the instances of accusative subjects are quite numerous in collections of originally orally-recounted tales and stories, witness the following examples taken from Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi (1959):

---

27   Significantly, Greko is also reported by Katsoyannou (1999: 243 f.) to employ the accusative form of nominals in a-syntactic uses (e.g. lists, citation forms), a feature also reported for the extended accusative in late Latin (see Ledgeway 2012: 304 f.).

(27) a. *Će   irte   passéonda éna   χχristyanò.*[28]
     and   come.PFV.PST.3SG pass.GER   a.MSG.ACC christian.MSG.ACC
                                                    (Roccaforte 31)

     'And a man passed by'.

  b. *Arrívegwe   to   kafè.*   (Roccaforte 67)
     arrive.IPFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC coffee.MSG.ACC
     'The coffee used to arrive'.

  c. *Epasséspai   ennéa minu.*   (Roccaforte 36)
     pass.PFV.PST.3PL nine   months.MPL.ACC
     'Nine months passed by'.

  d. *Ti   efáni   ambróndu énan*
     him.GEN= appear.PST.PFV.3SG in.front   a.MSG.ACC
     aϑropúni.   (Bova 480)
     man.AUG.MSG.NOM-ACC
     'A large man appeared before him'.

  e. *Anévenne   ándom   milo   énan*
     ascend.IPFV.PST.3SG from.the mill.MSG.NOM-ACC a.MSG.ACC
     áϑropo.   (Bova 403)
     man.MSG.NOM-ACC
     'A man was coming up from the mill'.

  f. *Ećóssu ekáϑenne   'nam   véččo.*
     inside sit.IPFV.PST.3SG a.MSG.ACC old.man.MSG.NOM-ACC
                                                    (Bova 481)
     'There inside was sitting an old man'.

  g. *San   etéloe   ton   ǵeró.*
     when finish.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC time.MSG.NOM-ACC
                                                    (Roghudi 303)
     'When the time finished'.

As these illustrative examples reveal, accusative subjects consistently occur
with core unaccusatives, including verbs of motion and position. However, we

---

28   Observe the RF effect produced by the masculine singular indefinite article *ena* (< *enan*)
     in this example.

also find once again, and indeed more frequently in these late 19th- and early 20th-century texts, nominative subjects in the same contexts, as the following representative unaccusative examples demonstrate.

(28) a. *Irte   mia   máňi*
       come.PVF.PST.3SG a.FSG.NOM beautiful.FSG.NOM-ACC
       miććéḍḍa.   (Roccaforte 49)
       girl.FSG.NOM-ACC
       'A beautiful girl came by'.

     b. *Ektevi   i   kammaréra.*   (Roccaforte 53)
        descend.PVF.PST.3SG the.FSG.NOM maid.FSG.NOM
        'The maid came down'.

     c. *Arrívespe   mia   pálla.*   (Roccaforte 76)
        arrive.PFV.PST.3SG a.FSG.NOM ball.FSG.NOM
        'A ball came over'.

     d. *Poi   eχoristi   o   liko.*
        then leave.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM wolf.MSG.NOM
                                                       (Roccaforte, 31)

        'Then the wolf left'.

     e. *Efórese   i   yinéka.*   (Roccaforte 62)
        dress.PFV.PST.3SG the.FSG.NOM lady.FSG.NOM
        'The lady got dressed'.

     f. *San   ekondófere   o   arćiδyávolo*
        when   return.PVF.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM devil.MSG.NOM-ACC
                                                       (Bova, 483)

        'When the devil came back'

Consistent with our conclusions so far, we have not found in the corpus of texts in Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi (1959) any examples of accusative subjects outside of core unaccusative syntax. Rather, transitives (29a) and unergatives (29b) exclusively license nominative subjects.[29]

---

29   For one exception in Greko arguably determined by surface word order, see the discussion of example (ii) in fn. 35 below.

(29) a. *I*   *lukandéra*   *tos*   *ékame*
the.FSG.NOM landlady.FSG.NOM them.GEN= make.PFV.PST.3SG
to   *kúnto.*   (Roccaforte 245)
the.MSG.ACC bill.MSG.NOM-ACC
'The landlady prepared their bill'.

   b. *Arrispúndespe*   *o*   *peniténti.*   (Roccaforte 41)
reply.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM penitent.MSG.NOM
'The penitent replied'.

Unsurprisingly, these same results are confirmed entirely by our own recent fieldwork among Greko speakers who also spontaneously produced accusative subjects exclusively with unaccusative syntax (30a–b), albeit alongside nominative subjects in the same contexts, as the (near) minimal pairs in (31)–(32) produced by the same speakers illustrate:

(30) a. *San*   *eghìriespa*   *sto*   *Rikhudi,* *in*
when come.back.PFV.PST.1SG to.the Roghudi the.FSG.ACC
anglisìa   *ito*   *ppèssonda.*[30]
church.FSG.NOM-ACC be.IPFV.PST.3SG fall.GER
                                                  (Chorìo di Roghudi, p.)
'When I went back to Roghudi, the church had fallen down'.

   b. *Ekhi*   *tossu*   *khronu*   *ti*   *tin*
have.PRS.3SG many.MPL.ACC years.MPL.ACC that the.FSG.ACC
anglisìa   *èppe.*   (Roghudi, s-s.)
church.FSG.NOM-ACC fall.PFV.PST.3SG
'It's been many years since the church has fallen down'.

(31) a. *Tuto*   *ene*   *o*   *sciddho*
this.MSG.NOM-ACC be.PRS.3SG the.MSG.NOM dog.MSG.NOM
dikommu.   (Gallicianò, p.)
mine
'This is my dog'.

   b. *Tuto*   *ene*   *to*   *ssciddho*
this.MSG.NOM-ACC be.PRS.3SG the.MSG.ACC dog.MSG.ACC

---

30   For final *-n* on the feminine articles in (30a) and (30b), see fn. 23.

*ddikommu, δen **to**   ddikossu.*[31]
mine   NEG= the.MSG.ACC yours

<div align="right">(Gallicianò, same speaker)</div>

'This is my dog, not yours'.

(32) a. *Egò   ce   o   Petro   δen   esòame*
I.NOM and the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM NEG= can.PFV.PST.1PL
na   gràttsome   poddhè   grafete.
IRR.PRT write.SBJV.1PL many.FPL.NOM-ACC letters.FPL.NOM-ACC

<div align="right">(Bova, p.)</div>

b. *Egò   ce   to   Ppetro   δen   esòsame*
I.NOM and the.MSG.ACC Pietro.MSG.ACC NEG= can.PFV.PST.1PL
na   gràttsome   poddhè   grafete.
IRR.PRT write.SBJV.1PL many.FPL.NOM-ACC letters.FPL.NOM-ACC

<div align="right">(Bova, same speaker)</div>

'Pietro and I couldn't write many letters'.

Particularly interesting are the examples in (32a–b) with coordinated subjects in a context of low transitivity (negated modal): as with the Griko example in (14b, 24), example (32b) shows that accusative-marking of subjects extends to nouns, but not to pronouns which must obligatorily occur in the nominative. Similar evidence can also be found in another corpus of contemporary data (cf. Stamuli 2007), where again accusative subjects are attested with unaccusative verbs (33), the copula BE (34), and with an involuntary subject (cf. 'the scabies' in 35) exerting no control over the event:

(33) a. *'irtɛ   miaŋ   ɣi'nɛka.*
come.PFV.PST.3SG a.FSG.ACC woman.FSG.NOM-ACC

<div align="right">(Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007: 126)</div>

'a woman turned up'.

---

31   In Greko there are two distinct forms for 'dog', namely *o sciddho* (m.) and *to sciddhì* (n.) (M.O. Squillaci, p.c.). Although some speakers mix these two forms, this particular informant in (31) consistently uses the masculine form throughout all the interviews, hence the selection of *to* in this example can only be interpreted as accusative marking, as also confirmed by the fact that it licenses RF here.

b. *e*   *eka'tɛvɛ*   **tin**   *ɔ'ʃia.*
and fall.PFV.PST.3SG the.FSG.ACC mountain.FSG.NOM-ACC
(Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007: 136)
'and the mountain collapsed'.

c. *m:u*   *'irtɛ*   *tɔ*   *'sinaxɔ.*
me.GEN-DAT come.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC cold.MSG.NOM-ACC
(Chorio di Roghudi, Stamuli 2007: 348)
'I caught a cold'.

(34) **tɔ**   *kjɛ'rɔ*   *d:ɛn itɔ*
the.MSG.ACC weather.MSG.NOM-ACC NEG be.IPFV.PST.3SG
ka'lɔ.   (Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007: 136)
good.MSG.NOM-ACC
'the weather wasn't good'.

(35) *raspe*   *a ssu*   *trɔgi*   **ti**
scratch.IMP.2SG if you.GEN-DAT eat.PRS.3SG the.FSG.ACC
rruɲɲa.   (Gallicianò, Stamuli 2007: 552)
scabies.FSG.ACC
'scratch yourself if the scabies itches you'.

5.4   *Interim conclusions*

In summary, we have observed how within the nominal system the Italo-Greek varieties Griko and Greko present increasing evidence for a progressive shift from a traditional nominative-accusative alignment, in which an extended nominative marks all surface subjects (A, S_A, S_O) in contrast to the accusative restricted to marking O(bjects), towards an active-stative alignment in which the accusative is extended beyond O(bject) nominals to now include S_O subjects thereby restricting nominative-marking to just A and S_A subjects. However, the emergence of the so-called extended accusative in Italo-Greek represents just one of several surface reflexes of an original Romance active-stative alignment which, in a process of partial replication, has progressively been extended and adapted in the native grammars of Italo-Greek speakers. In the following sections we shall consider some further evidence for this hypothesis from the verbal and sentential domains where other reflexes of a Romance active-stative syntactic alignment have transparently been replicated in the local Greek varieties, confirming that Italo-Greek is undergoing a partial alignment shift.

6   Other reflexes of an active-stative alignment

6.1   *Auxiliary selection*

Beyond accusative subjects, the effects of an active-stative alignment are also clearly observable in the patterns of perfective auxiliary selection. Historically, all Romance varieties, and still many today (cf. Bentley 2016: 824), exhibit an alternation in the selection of the auxiliaries HAVE and BE in conjunction with the past participle in the formation of various compound verb forms.[32] In Italian, for example, auxiliary HAVE (= *avere*) is selected in conjunction with transitives/unergatives (36a), whereas unaccusatives (36b), including the passive (36c), select auxiliary BE (= *essere*).

(36)   a. *Maria **ha**   cucinato   (la   pasta).*
          Maria have.PRS.IND.3SG cook.PFV.PTCP.MSG the.FSG pasta.FSG
                                                                    (Italian)
          'Maria has been cooking (the pasta)'.

       b. *È   arrivata   Maria.*   (Italian)
          be.PRS.IND.3SG arrive.PFV.PTCP.FSG Maria
          'Maria has arrived'.

       c. *È   **stata**   cucinata   la*
          be.PRS.IND.3SG be.PFV.PTCP.FSG cook.PFV.PTCP.FSG   the.FSG
          pasta.   (Italian)
          pasta.FSG
          'The pasta has been cooked'.

Griko traditional sources (cf. Rohlfs 1977: 198; cf. also Gemma Italia & Lambroyorgu 2001: 109 f.; Tommasi 2001: 188; Baldissera 2013: 42) report the sole use of auxiliary HAVE in conjunction with the invariable non-finite form in *-onta* (cf. fn. 13 above) for the formation of the pluperfect, regardless of the thematic structure of the lexical verb. Thus, in (37) we witness the systematic use of *íxa* 'had' with both the transitive/unergative *gráfsonta* 'written' and the unaccusative *értonta* 'come'.

---

32   See, among others, Perlmutter (1978), Vincent (1982), Burzio (1986), Loporcaro (2007, 2016), and Ledgeway (2012, 2019).

(37) a. *íxa*   *gráfsonta.*   (Griko, Rohlfs 1977: 198)
    have.IPFV.PST.1SG write.NON-FIN
    'I had written'.

  b. *íxa*   *értonta.*   (Griko, Rohlfs 1977: 198)
    have.IPFV.PST.1SG come.NON-FIN
    'I had come'.

Although most of the data in our oral corpus of Griko comply with this picture (cf. 38a–b), some speakers occasionally show signs of an active-stative split of the type exemplified in (39), selecting HAVE with unergative/transitive verbs (39a) and BE with deponent verbs with an UNDERGOER subject (39b) in accordance with an A/S$_A$ vs S$_O$ alignment:[33]

(38) a. *Persi*   *o*   *ànemo*   ***ikhe***
    last.year the.MSG.NOM-ACC wind.MSG.NOM-ACC have.IPVF.PST.3SG
    klàsonta   *i*   *pporta.*   (Calimera, p.)
    break.NON-FIN the.FSG.ACC door.FSG.ACC
    'Last year the wind had broken the door'.

  b. *E*   *Marìa*   ***ikhe***   *skappèttsonta.*
    the.FSG.NOM Maria.FGS.NOM have.IPVF.PST.3SG run.away.NON-FIN
                                (Calimera, p.)
    'Maria had run away'.

(39) a. *Mu*   *'khe*   *kàmonta*   *poddhì piaciri*   *an*
    me.DAT= have.IPVF.PST.3SG do.NON-FIN much   pleasure if
    a   *pedìa*   *mu* ***ikha***   *ssìronta*
    the.NPL children.NPL =my have.IPVF.PST.3PL win.NON-FIN
    olu   *tu*   *ssordu.*   (Calimera, p.)
    all.MPL.ACC the.MPL.ACC money.MPL.ACC
    'How happy I would have been if my children had won all the money'.

  b. *Tis*   *àrtena* *isi*   *bikkieri siciliani* *en*
    the.FSG.GEN-DAT moment these glasses Sicilian NEG=

---

33   Observe that examples like (39) were produced not only by semi-speakers but also by fluent speakers and as such cannot be disregarded.

> ***isa***   ***klastonta.***   (Calimera, same speaker)
> be.IPVF.PST.3PL break.NON-FIN
> 'Until now these Sicilian glasses hadn't broken'.

Unsurprisingly, many local Romance dialects of Salento also display a robust active-stative split in auxiliary selection, at least in the present perfect where once again HAVE surfaces with transitives/unergative (40a) and BE with unaccusatives (40b), though not in the pluperfect where most Salentino dialects generalize BE across all verb classes (41) (Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri in prep.).

(40) a. ***Ave***   ***capitu.***   (Scorrano)
         have.PRS.IND.3SG understand.PFV.PTCP.MSG
         'He's understood'.

    b. ***È***   ***sciuta***   ***puru quista.***   (Scorrano)
         be.PRS.IND.3SG go.PFV.PTCP.FSG also   this.one.FSG
         'She's also gone out'.

(41) a. ***Me   n'   era***   ***ditta***   ***quarche tuna.***
         me= of.it= be.IPFV.PST.3SG say.PFV.PTCP.FSG some   one.FSG
                                                                     (Scorrano)
         'He had told me one or two of them'.

    b. ***Forsi   era***   ***statu***   ***meju.***   (Scorrano)
         perhaps be.IPFV.PST.3SG be.PFV.PTCP.MSG better
         'Perhaps it would have been better'.

Given these facts, it is highly plausible to interpret the novel differential selection of the auxiliaries observed in (39a–b) as part of a larger Romance active-stative alignment which is influencing the morphosyntax of Griko. While it might be objected that in the relevant pluperfect paradigm the local Romance dialects show the generalization of a single auxiliary (cf. 41a–b), and furthermore the opposite auxiliary to that traditionally selected in Griko (cf. 38a–b), the relevance of the more frequent present perfect paradigm (cf. 40a–b) must not be forgotten, nor the influence of (regional) Italian on these Greek speakers, a genuine part of their linguistic repertoire, which, following the pattern in (36a–c), consistently marks the active-stative auxiliary split also in the pluperfect (42).

(42) a. *Maria* **aveva**   *cucinato*   (*la*   *pasta*).
     Maria have.IPFV.PST.3SG cook.PFV.PTCP.MSG the.FSG pasta.FSG
                                                               (Italian)
     'Maria had been cooking (the pasta)'.

   b. **Era**   *arrivata*   *Maria.*   (Italian)
      be.IPFV.PST.3SG arrive.PFV.PTCP.FSG Maria
      'Maria had arrived'.

   c. *Era*   **stata**   *cucinata*   *la*
      be.IPFV.PST.3SG be.PFV.PTCP.FSG cook.PFV.PTCP.FSG the.FSG
      pasta.   (Italian)
      pasta.FSG
      'The pasta had been cooked'.

We note finally that in the Greek of southern Calabria, by contrast, the sole auxiliary consistently employed in the pluperfect is BE (43a), a pattern which is extended to the local Romance dialects of the area (43b) which do not show an active-stative split in the perfective auxiliary (Schifano, Silvestri & Squillaci 2016; Squillaci 2017: §2.7; Remberger 2018; Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri in prep.). In this domain of the grammar, the overt reflexes of an active-stative alignment are therefore more advanced in Griko than in Greko.

(43) a. *I*   *Maria*   **ito**   *tragudìonda /*
     the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM-ACC be.IPFV.PST.3SG sing.PTCP
     erthonda.   (Bova)
     arrive.PTCP
     'Maria had sung/arrived'.

   b. *Maria* **era**   *parratu /*   *cadutu.*
      Maria be.IPFV.PST.3SG talk.PFV.PTCP.MSG fall.PFV.PTCP.MSG
                                                              (Calabrian, Bova)
      'Maria had spoken/fallen'.

6.2   *Adverb agreement*

Similar conclusions to those seen for auxiliary selection in the verbal domain can be drawn from the sentential domain in relation to the phenomenon of adverb agreement. As demonstrated in detail in Ledgeway (2011b, 2012: ch. 7, 2017) and Ledgeway & Silvestri (2016), dialects of southern Italy show a formal syncretism in the categories of adjective and adverb, with adverbial functions

systematically expressed by the category of adjective. Yet, in contrast to most languages that conflate the functions of adjective and adverb into a single formal class (cf. Romanian, German) in which the adverb assumes an invariable (e.g., default masculine singular nominative) form, in the dialects of southern Italy the adjective in adverbial function may show overt agreement for gender and/or number. Such agreement is not, however, unconstrained but, rather, follows regular and structurally predictable principles which in most dialects can be formalized in terms of an active-stative split. By way of example, consider the following Romance examples from Salento.

(44) a. *Comu sai   asare   **bellu!***   (Salento)
how   know.PRS.IND.2SG kiss.INF beautiful.MSG
'What a wonderful kisser you are!' (female addressee)

b. ***Segretu*** *parlàamu.*   (Salento)
secret.MSG speak.IPFV.PST.1PL
'We were talking secretly'.

(45) a. *Quannu faci   e   cose   **bone**   le*
when   do.PRS.IND.2SG the.FPL things.FPL good.FPL them.FPL=
faci   a metà.[34]   (Salento)
do. PRS.IND.2SG at half
'When you do things well, you don't finish them off'.

b. *Li   cunti   me li   sacciu   fare*
the.MPL accounts.MPL me= them.MPL= know.PRS.IND.1SG do.INF
bueni.   (Salento)
good.MPL
'I can add up well'.

(46) a. *Quiddu   spiccia   **fiaccu.***   (Salento)
that.one.MSG finish.PRS.IND.3SG bad.MSG
'He'll finish badly (= it doesn't bode well for him)'.

b. *Nu   te   senti   **bbona?***   (Salento)
NEG= you.2SG= feel.PRS.IND.2SG good.FSG
'Don't you feel well?' (female addressee)'

---

34   In this and subsequent examples we indicate the agreement controller with underlining.

In the unergative examples in (44), the adjectival adverb invariably occurs in its default masculine singular form irrespective of the number and gender features of the (implied) subject, allowing us to conclude that the S_A subject is unable to control the agreement features of the adverb. In the respective transitive and unaccusative examples in (45) and (46), by contrast, the adjectival adverb now shows full agreement with the O(bject) in the former case and with the S_O subject in the latter case. The relevant agreement patterns can thus be readily framed in terms of a canonical active-stative alignment, inasmuch as there obtains a split between those participants (A, S_A) which do not license adjectival adverb agreement and those (O, S_O) which do.

As already noted in the literature (Rohlfs 1977: 135 f.), Italo-Greek exhibits both non-inflecting deadjectival adverbs in *-a*, as in (47), and adjectival adverbs showing agreement as in (48):

(47) *E   Marìa   kantalì   **kalà.**   (Calimera, p.)
     the.FSG.NOM Maria.FGS.NOM sing.PRS.3SG well
     'Maria sings well'.

(48) ***Kalós/Kalí***   *irte!*   (Griko, Rohlfs 1977: 136)
     good.MSG/FSG come.PFV.PST.2SG
     'Welcome!' (male/female addressee)

The data from written sources and our corpus reveal a similar picture for Griko. In particular, many of our speakers produced, alongside non-agreeing forms of the adjectival adverb, agreeing forms in conjunction with full DP objects (49a), including obligatory agreeing forms with clitic O(bjects) (49b) according to a pattern also found in southern Italo-Romance (cf. Ledgeway 2011a, 2017), as well as with unaccusative S_O subjects (50a–b) (cf. also 50c from Palumbo 1971). Crucially, though, none of our speakers accepted agreeing forms in conjunction with unergative S_A subjects (51a–b), which do not show agreement in written sources either (51c).

(49) a. *E   Marìa   èpline   <u>us</u>
        the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM clean.PFV.PST.3SG the.MPL.ACC
        <u>piattu</u>   kalù /   <u>es</u>   <u>finestre</u>
        dishes.MPL.ACC good.MPL.ACC the.FPL.ACC windows.FPL.NOM-ACC
        kalè.   (Calimera, p.)
        good.FPL.NOM-ACC
        'Maria cleaned the dishes/windows well'.

b. *Isì   Mmarìa,   <u>ti</u>   peleghìsane*
to.the Maria.FSG.ACC her.FSG.ACC= beat.PST.PFV.3PL
***kalì* /   **kalà*.*   (Corigliano, s-s.)
good.FSG.ACC-NOM well
'As for Maria, they gave her a good hiding'.

(50) a. *<u>E</u>   <u>mana</u>   <u>palea</u>   i*
the.FSG.NOM mother.FSG.NOM old.FSG.NOM-ACC the.FSG.GEN
Mmarìa   en   estè   kalì.
Maria.FSG.GEN NEG= stay.PRS.3SG good.FSG.NOM-ACC
                                           (Calimera, p.)
'Maria's grandmother is not feeling well'.

b. *<u>O</u>   <u>pappo</u>   i   Mmarìa*
the.MSG.NOM grandfather.MSG.NOM the.FSG.GEN Maria.FSG.GEN
en   estei   kalò.   (Calimera, p.)
NEG= stay.PRS.3SG good.MSG.NOM-ACC
'Maria's grandfather is not feeling well'.

c. *puru   nârti   kalì   <u>e</u>*
so.that IRR.PRT=come.SBJV.3SG good.FSG.NOM-ACC the.FSG.NOM
<u>fera</u>.   (Palumbo 1971: 146)
fair.FSG.NOM-ACC
'so that the fair goes well'.

(51) a. *<u>O</u>   <u>Pietro</u>   e   kkantalì   kalà /*
the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM NEG= sing.PRS.3SG well
***kalò.*   (Calimera, p.)
good.MSG.NOM-ACC
'Pietro doesn't sing well'.

b. *<u>E</u>   <u>Marìa</u>   kantalì   kalà /*
the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM sing.PRS.3SG well
***kalì.*   (Calimera, p.)
good.FSG.NOM-ACC
'Maria sings well'.

c. *arte   nòisa   kalà*   (Palumbo 1971: 195)
now understand.PRS.1SG well
'now I understand well'

This same active-stative distribution of adjectival adverb agreement is also in evidence in Greko, witness the following representative examples taken from both our fieldwork and written sources.

(52) a. *Ekho   na   katharizzo   **kalò***
        have.PRS.1SG IRR.PRT clean.PRS.1SG good.NSG-MSG.NOM-ACC
        to   *spiti.*   (Gallicianò, s-s.)
        the.NSG.NOM-ACC house.NSG.NOM-ACC
        'I have to clean the house properly'.

   b. *Dóppu pu ton   efórese   **máňo**   će*
      after   that him.ACC= dress.PFV.PST.3SG pretty.MSG.NOM-ACC and
      pulíto.
      appropriate.MSG.NOM-ACC
                                  (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 25)
      'After she had dressed him well and appropriately'.

   c. *An den do   stiréspo   **kaló***
      if NEG= it.NSG= iron.PRS.1SG good.NSG
                              (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 49)
      'If I don't iron it [the item of clothing] well'

   d. *Sa   ddonno   će túndo leunáći će kratitéto*
      you.GEN= give.PRS.1SG and this.NSG lion.NSG and keep=it.NSG
      kalá!   (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 102)
      well
      'I'll also give you this little lion, and take good care of it!'

   e. *Ma esù δiplóeto   **kalá!***
      but you wrap.IMP=him.MSG.ACC well
                              (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 105)
      'But wrap him [= your son] up well!'

(53) a. *I   Marìa   δen   epplèneto*
        the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM NEG= wash.NON-ACT.IPVF.PST.3SG
        *mai **kalì.***   (Chorìo di Roghudi, p.)
        never good.FSG.NOM-ACC
        'Maria never washed herself properly'.

b. *Petro   en   epplèneto   mai*
Pietro.MSG.NOM-ACC NEG= wash.NON-ACT.IPVF.PST.3SG never
kalò.   (Chorìo di Roghudi, same speaker)
good.MSG.NOM-ACC
'Pietro never washed himself properly'.

c. *Íto   kalì   jatremméni.*
come.PFV.PST.3SG good.FSG.NOM-ACC cure.NON-FIN
                                        (Bova, Rohlfs 1977: 136)
'She arrived greatly cured'.

(54) a. *O   Petro   tragudassi   kalà.*
the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM sing.PRS.3SG well
                                        (Chorio di Roghudi, p.)
'Pietro sings well'.

b. *Ciola e   Marìa   tragudassi   kalà /*
also   the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM sing.PRS.3SG well
*kalì.   (Chorio di Roghudi, same speaker)
good.FSG.NOM-ACC
'Maria too sings well'.

c. *Ma e   fforéggo   kalá.*
but NEG= dance.PRS.1SG well
                                        (Bova, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 409 f.)
'But I don't dance well'. (subject = feminine singular)

The examples in (52)–(53) show agreement of the adjectival adverb which is variously controlled either by an O(bject) (cf. 52a–c) or by an S_O unaccusative subject (cf. 53). However, once again we observe that such agreement is optional, witness the use of the non-agreeing adverbial form *kalá* in (52d–e), and indeed impossible with unergative S_A subjects (54).

In summary, the evidence reviewed in this section reveals an additional reflex of an emerging, though not yet fully stabilized, active-stative alignment in the distribution of adjectival adverb agreement which proves sensitive to the A/S_A vs O/S_O split.

6.3   *Sentential word order*

One final piece of evidence in favour of an ongoing shift towards an active-stative alignment comes from sentential word order. With the exception of

some modern Gallo-Romance varieties, Romance languages have broadly converged towards an unmarked SVO word order. However, this SVO order masks in most modern varieties an active-stative alignment where S and O are to be understood more broadly as A/S_A and O/S_O, respectively (cf. Bentley 2006: 364–368; Ledgeway 2012: 334 f.). This explains why in the unmarked case (answering the question: *What happened?*) transitive (55a) and unergative (55b) subjects occur preverbally, whereas unaccusative subjects (55c) occur in a postverbal position corresponding to that occupied by the complement in transitive constructions (cf. *la finestra* in 55a):

(55) a. ***Marco*** *ha*   *rotto*   (*#Marco*) *la   finestra*
        Marco have.PRS.IND.3SG break.PFV.PTCP   the window
        (*#Marco*).   (Italian)
        'Marco has broken the window'.

    b. ***Maria*** *ha*   *cantato*   (*#Maria*).   (Italian)
        Maria have.PRS.IND.3SG sing.PFV.PTCP
        'Maria has been singing'.

    c. (***#Gianni***) *è*   *arrivato*   ***Gianni.***   (Italian)
        Gianni   be.PRS.IND.3SG arrived.PFV.PTCP Gianni
        'Gianni has arrived'.

Now, in contrast to Standard Modern Greek where sentential word order is notoriously very liberal (Philippaki-Warburton 1985; Mackridge 1987: 234–239; Tsimpli 1990; Horrocks 1994; Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 2004: 229–232; Roussou & Tsimpli 2004; Anagnostopoulou 2013: 13, 20–22), the word order of Italo-Greek is considerably more constrained, excluding, for example, VSO orders in root clauses. Rather, on a par with what has just been seen for Italian in (55), the neutral word order of Griko follows an unmistakable active-stative split. Consequently, transitive (56a) and unergative (56b) subjects occur in preverbal position in the unmarked case, whereas unaccusatives subjects (57a) occur in postverbal position on a par with transitive objects (57b).

(56) a. *E*   *Marìa*   *mas*   *fònase*   *na*
        the.FSG.NOM Maria.FSG.NOM us.ACC= call.PFV.PST.3SG IRR.PRT
        fame   *nomeni.*   (Calimera, p.)
        eat.SBJV.1PL together
        'Maria called us to go and eat together'.

b. ***O   Pietro   e   kkantalì   kalà.***
the.MSG.NOM Pietro.MSG.NOM NEG= sing.PRS.3SG well

(Calimera, p.)

'Pietro doesn't sing well'.

(57) a. *Pèsane   o   sciddho   mu.*   (Calimera, p.)
die.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.NOM dog.MSG.NOM =my
'My dog died'.

b. *Ida   diu sciddhu   mavru.*   (Calimera, p.)
see.PFV.PST.1SG two dogs.MPL.ACC black.MPL.ACC
'I saw two black dogs'.

An identical active-stative distribution is found in Greko (M.O. Squillaci p.c.), as the following examples of rhematic clauses clearly demonstrate: both transitive (58a) and unergative (58b) subjects (A/S$_A$) occur preverbally, whereas unaccusative subjects (S$_O$) occur in the immediate postverbal position (59a) on par with transitive O(bjects) (59b).

(58) a. *Mian   iméra o   ćúristi   éspase*
one.ACC day   the.MSG.NOM father.MSG.NOM=her kill.PFV.PST.3SG
énam budḍí.   (Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 36)
a.NSG bird.NSG
'One day her father killed a bird'.

b. ***Tút' i   δio   ediskurréai.***
these the.MPL.NOM two.M-F.NOM chat.IPFV.PST.3PL

(Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 78)

'These two were chatting'.

(59) a. *Ćе eχáδi   i   alapúδa.*
and disappear.PFV.PST.3SG the.FSG.NOM fox.FSG.NOM-ACC

(Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 27)

'And the fox disappeared'.

b. *O   Franćéskoe   ékame   **to***
the.MSG.NOM Francesco.MSG.NOM-ACC make.PFV.PST.3SG the.NSG
síňo   tu   ayu   stavrú.
sign.NSG the.NSG.GEN holy.NSG.GEN cross.NSG.GEN

(Roccaforte, Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: 44)

'Francesco made the sign of the holy cross'.

Once again, evidence from word order points to an active-stative orientation at the level of the sentence to parallel the identical alignment pattern examined above for adjectival adverbs, as well as those in the verbal domain (auxiliary selection) and nominal domain (restricted nominative for A/S$_A$ and extended accusative for O/S$_O$).

7   Conclusion

Above we have reviewed considerable evidence from the nominal, verbal and sentential domains of Griko and Greko which highlight an ongoing shift from an original nominative-accusative alignment towards an active-stative alignment. In the nominal domain we have seen how this alignment shift results in a redistribution of nominative and accusative case-marking according to underlying semantic roles, rather than surface syntactic relations. Accordingly, active subjects (A/S$_A$) of transitives and unergatives are case-marked nominative, whereas stative subjects (S$_O$) of unaccusatives are increasingly marked accusative on a par with canonical O(bjects).[35] In this way, the Italo-Greek

---

35   It is also striking that, in contrast to Griko, all examples of accusative subjects in Greko noted in Rossi Taibbi and Caracausi (1959), as well as those in Katsoyannou (1999) and in our corpus (with the exceptions of the relative example in (26b), the coordination example in (32b), and the example with copula BE in (34)), occur in the typical postverbal O(bject) position; whenever inactive subjects (S$_O$) occur in preverbal position, the unmarked position of active subjects (A/S$_A$), they invariably surface in the nominative. Particularly revealing in this respect is the minimal pair reported by Katsoyannou (1999: 242) in (i.a-b) produced by the same speaker, where the pre- and postverbal positions correlate with nominative and accusative case-marking, respectively (we assume, despite appearances, that the meteorological predicate *'ekamen* (*tin*) *kia'ria* is not a true transitive verb, but a compound unaccusative with cognate surface object and a stative (viz. S$_O$) subject *xri'sto*):

(i) a. **_o_**   *xri'sto*   *'ekamen*   *kia'ria.*
        the.MSG.NOM christ.MSG.NOM-ACC do.PFV.PST.3SG fine.weather.FSG.NOM-ACC
                                                                            (Gallicianò)

    b. *'ekamen*   **_to_**   *xri'sto*   *tin*
        do.PFV.PST.3SG the.MSG.ACC christ.MSG.NOM-ACC the.FSG.ACC
        kia'ria.   (Gallicianò)
        fine.weather.FSG.NOM-ACC
        'The weather was fine'.

    We leave it to future work to establish to what extent accusative-marking of inactive subjects, at least in Greko, is also structurally tied to their surface position. If our interpretation of the facts is correct, then this would suggest that Greko represents a more conservative variety than Griko, inasmuch as accusative-marking has not yet been (fully) extended to the preverbal position as in Griko. Presumably, this tendency also explains

TABLE 4   Correlations between active and non-active morphology and case-marking

A/S$_A$ [+Nom] ⟵────────────────────⟶ S$_O$ [+Nom/Acc]

	Active		Non-active
		Present Imperfective	
Griko	Greko	Griko	Greko
plen-o	*plen-o*	*plèn-ome*	*plèn-ome*
plen-i(s)	*plen-i(s)*	*plèn-ese(s)*	*plèn-ese*
plen-i	*plen-i*	*plèn-ete*	*plèn-ete*
plèn-ome	*plèn-ome*	*plen-òmesta*	*plen-òmesta*
plèn-ete	*plèn-ite*	*plen-èsesta*	*plèn-este*
plènune	*plèn-usi*	*plèn-utte*	*plèn-onde*
		Past Imperfective	
èplen-a	*èplen-a*	*plèn-amo*	*eplèn-ommo*
èplen-e(s)	*èplen-e(s)*	*plèn-aso*	*eplèn-esso*
èplen-e	*èplen-e*	*plèn-ato*	*eplèn-eto*
plèn-amo	*eplèn-ame*	*plen-àmosto*	*eplen-òmesta*
plèn-ato	*eplèn-ete*	*plen-àsosto*	*eplèn-este*
plèn-ane	*eplèn-asi*	*plèn-atto*	*eplèn-ondo*

nominal system comes to mirror the formal split already visible in the verb
system where, on a par with Standard Modern Greek (cf. Section 3), the mor-
phological paradigms of the active and non-active (viz. medio-passive) largely
correlate with the distribution of A/S$_A$ and S$_O$ subjects, respectively, as schema-
tized in Table 4 for the present and past imperfective of *plen-* 'wash' (cf. Rohlfs
1977: 110–113, 199 f.).

---

the sole example in our Greko written corpus of the otherwise exceptional accusative-
marking of a transitive subject (cf. ii) ostensibly determined by its postverbal position (but
note also the reduced transitivity of the clause given the non-dynamic, habitual interpre-
tation of the predicate):

(ii) *ti   γlitʃia   'kannusi   <u>te</u>   γi'neke?*
     what cakes.NPL make.PRS.3PL the.FPL.ACC women.FPL.NOM-ACC

                                              (Gallicianò, Katsoyannou 1999: 242)

     'What type of cakes do the women make?'

It is thus legitimate to ask why in other varieties of Greek, such as Standard Modern Greek, a similar active-stative alignment has not arisen in the nominal case system. One possible answer would be to invoke endogenous factors present in Italo-Greek, but not in other varieties of Greek. This is essentially the line taken by Katsoyannou (1999: 239 f.) in her analysis of accusative subjects in Greko, which she interprets as the surface effect of a case system in an irreparable state of collapse in a highly endangered language which is rapidly being abandoned by a bilingual community with greater native competence in a Romance variety without a case system. Yet, Katsoyannou's view represents a misconception of the Italo-Greek case system which, despite some apparent superficial neutralizations (cf. Table 2), still constitutes a robust system with a high functional load, consistent with Dimmendal's (1998: 87) claim based on Dorian's (1978: 608) original observation that 'an obsolescent language often dies "with its morphological boots on"' (on the reduction of the morphological structure of the case system in Italo-Greek, see also Guardiano & Stavrou 2019). This is clearly demonstrated by the representative Italo-Greek nominal paradigms with accompanying definite article in Table 5 (based on Rohlfs 1977: 66 f.).[36]

However, it is true that nominals introduced by the indefinite article do introduce some limited ambiguity into the system, as Table 6 illustrates (cf. Rohlfs 1977: 68 f.).

In particular, we see that in masculine and neuter nouns the core distinction between nominative and accusative is neutralized. With neuter forms this is unsurprising in that nominative and accusative are syncretic in the neuter in other Greek varieties too (and in Indo-European more generally; cf. also Table 5), but this has never led to a generalization of accusative-marking of subjects in these varieties. However, the neutralization witnessed in masculine indefinites in Griko where, for example, underlying nominative and accusative forms such as *èna(n) liko* and *èna lliko*, could *a priori* be argued to provide the original impetus for a progressive, but still optional, extension of accusative-marking to the subject relation.[37] Tempting though this superficial morphophonological explanation

---

36   For further detailed description of the morphological case system of Italo-Greek nouns, see Rohlfs (1977: 69–82) and Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri (in prep.: ch. 2).

37   Prevocalic contexts where, for apparently euphonic reasons, non-etymological -*n* surfaces most robustly on the nominative indefinite article (i.a), including in Greko (example i.b; cf. Rossi Taibbi & Caracausi 1959: lviii), also give rise to (apparent) cases of surface neutralization of nominative and accusative in masculine (and of course neuter) noun phrases (cf. Rohlfs 1977: 69).

TABLE 5   Italo-Greek definite nominal paradigms

	Greko				Griko			
Masculine (*lik-* 'wolf', *min-* 'month')								
	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
Nom	*o liko*	*i liki*	*o mina*	*i mini*	*o liko*	*i/e liki*	*o mina*	*i/e mini*
Acc	*to lliko*	*tu lliku*	*to mmina*	*tu mminu*	*(t)o lliko*	*(t)u lliku*	*(t)o mmina*	*(t)u mminu*
Gen	*tu liku*	*to lliko*	*tu minu/-a*	*to mmino*	*(t)u liku*	*(t)o lliko*	*(t)u minu/-a*	*(t)o mminò/ mmino*
Feminine (*alé-* 'olive', *man-* 'mother')								
	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
Nom	*i alèa*	*i alè*	*i mana*	*i mane*	*e alèa*	*i alè*	*i mana*	*i mane*
Acc	*tin alèa*	*tes alè*	*tim mana*	*te mmane*	*(t)in alèa*	*(t)es alè*	*(t)i mmana*	*(t)es mane/ (t)e mmane*
Gen	*tis alèa*	*tos alèo*	*ti mmanò*	*to mmanò/ mmano*	*(t)is alèa*	*(t)os alèo*	*(t)is mana/ (t)i mmana*	*(t)os manò/ mano/ (t)o mmanò/ mmano*
Neuter (*krea*(-) 'meat', *peδ-* 'child')								
	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
Nom / Acc	*to krea*	*ta krèata*	*to peδì*	*ta peδì*	*(t)o krea*	*(t)a krèata*	*(t)o peδì*	*(t)a peδìa*
Gen	*tu kreatu*	*to kkrèato*	*tu peδìu*	*tos peδìo*	*(t)u kreatu*	*(t)os krèato/ (t)o kkrèatu*	*(t)u peδìu*	*(t)u peδìo*

might appear (cf. also fn. 23), it must be immediately dismissed since it incorrectly predicts an indiscriminate extension of accusative-marking to all surface subjects. Yet, we have seen that accusative-marking of subjects is specifically limited to stative subjects (S$_O$), incontrovertibly showing that what lies behind

---

(i) a. *Irte*   *an*   *ántrepo.*   (Griko)
     b. Irte   nan   áθropo.   (Greko)
         come.PFV.PST.3SG a.(NOM-)ACC man.NOM-ACC
         'A man came'.

Observe, however, that Rohlfs' examples in (i.a-b) crucially involve postverbal subjects of unaccusative predicates.

TABLE 6   Italo-Greek indefinite nominal paradigms

	Greko			Griko		
	M	**F**	**N**	**M**	**F**	**N**
Nom	*(è)na(s) liko*	*m(i)a mana*	*((è)na(n) peδì/)* *(è)na ppeδì*	*((è)na(n) liko/)* *(è)na lliko*	*mìa mana*	*((è)na(n) peδì/)* *(è)na ppeδì*
Acc	*((è)nan liko/)* *(è)na lliko*	*(m(i)an mana/)* *mia mmana*		*((è)nan liko/)* *(è)na lliko*	*(mìan mana/)* *mia mmana*	
Gen	*enù liku*	*(mias manò/)* *mia mmanò*	*(è)nù peδìo*	*anù liku*	*(anìs mana/)* *anì mmana*	*anù peδìu*

the extension of the accusative is of a structural nature replicating a distribution independently observed in early Indo-European. Instead, we argue that the emergence of accusative subjects in Italo-Greek is due to exogenous factors and, in particular, to language contact with Romance. This immediately explains why the extended accusative is only found in those Greek varieties that have been in contact with Romance, but not, for example, in Standard Modern Greek. Moreover, although Griko and Greko are not, and never have been, in contact with one another (Profili 1983; Katsoyannou 1995; Manolessou 2005a; Squillaci 2017: 2), they have each independently developed the extended accusative precisely because they have each individually been in intense contact for centuries with Romance varieties where the evidence for an active-stative alignment is robustly attested in various areas of the grammar (for an overview, see Ledgeway 2012: ch. 7). As a consequence, the speakers of Italo-Greek are also native speakers of local Romance varieties, and in most cases more natively competent in Romance than Greek today. Hence, after many centuries of Greek influencing local Romance varieties, a case of so-called *spirito greco, materia romanza* 'Greek spirit, Romance material' (cf. Ledgeway 2006; Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri forthcoming), their local Greek varieties today often display many Romance features, a case of *spirito romanzo, materia greca* 'Romance spirit, Greek material' (cf. Ledgeway 2013; Ledgeway, Schifano & Silvestri 2018b). It is therefore our contention that the emergence of the so-called extended accusative in Italo-Greek represents just one of several surface reflexes of an original Romance active-stative alignment which, in a process of partial replication, has progressively been extended and adapted in the native grammars of Italo-Greek speakers. It is for this reason that we have been at pains to show above that the extension of the accusative should not be considered an isolated phenomenon within the grammars of Italo-Greek, but must,

rather, be interpreted as part of a larger gradual and ongoing shift towards an active-stative alignment which surfaces in various areas of the nominal, verbal and sentential domains.

Within this context, it is significant to note that, while the surface reflexes of this active-stative alignment observed in the verbal (auxiliary selection) and sentential (adjectival adverb agreement, subject placement) domains of Italo-Greek find an immediate structural parallel in Romance, ultimately the result of a process of PAT(tern) replication (Matras & Sakel 2007; cf. also Heine & Kuteva 2006), accusative-marking of stative subjects represents a Greek innovation since the relevant Romance contact varieties do not have a (nominal) case system. What we therefore see is an expansion of a Romance alignment PAT(tern) which, once embedded in the replicating Greek varieties through the increasing establishment of active-stative-driven auxiliary splits, adjectival adverb agreement and differential subject placement, is further reinforced by the extension of the alignment to new areas of the grammar using Greek MAT(erial) amenable to this same split. At the same time, we must not underestimate the complementary role of the Italo-Greek verb system where the inherited formal opposition between active and non-active verb forms (cf. Table 4) readily maps onto the semantico-syntactic distribution of nominative and accusative subjects, respectively, whilst further strengthening the emerging active-stative patterns in the auxiliary system, adjectival adverb agreement and subject placement.[38] We are therefore led to conclude that the role of contact-induced change in the emergence of accusative-marking of subjects is only indirect (cf. Willis 2017: §26.3): the motivation for the change clearly requires a language-internal, endogenous account in terms of spontaneous innovation (namely, expansion of active-stative syntax to the nominal domain), but the original catalyst for the introduction of the syntactic alignment PAT(ern) that it extends is the result of language-external, exogenous factors, namely contact with Romance.

In conclusion, our discussion of Italo-Greek and Romance alignments has shown how, at least on the surface, the grammars of these two linguistic groups are in many key respects converging, to the extent that the observed structural parallels are far too striking for them to be dismissed as accidental or the output of heavily attrited grammars. Rather, they must be considered the result of centuries-old intense structural contact between Greek and Romance, ultimately to be placed towards the upper end of the five-point scale of contact

---

38   Relevant here is Guardiano et al.'s (2016) *Resistance Principle* according to which syntactic change under horizontal pressure only takes place if surface evidence that makes such a change structurally possible is already independently available in the language.

intensity proposed by Thomason & Kaufman (1988). Indeed, while it is well known that traditionally the direction of such contact has consistently involved the transfer and extension of original Greek structural features into the surrounding Romance varieties (cf. Ledgeway 2013), large-scale linguistic shifts among recent generations of the southern Italian Greek-speaking communities towards Romance have resulted in a reversal of the direction of contact. Consequently, today we see many examples of transfer of Romance structural features into Italo-Greek. In this respect, the ongoing emergence of an active-stative alignment in the syntax of the nominal, verbal and sentential domains of Italo-Greek represents a prime example of Romance-Greek contact and, in particular, highlights how the role of language contact may genuinely prove pervasive insofar as it is even able to trigger a shift in alignment, arguably involving a change of a macroparametric order (cf. Sheehan 2014).

References

Adams, James N. 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2004. Voice morphology in the causative-inchoative alternation: Evidence for a non-unified structural analysis of unaccusatives. In *The unaccusativity puzzle: Explorations of the syntax-lexicon interface*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou & Martin Everaert, 114–136. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2013. Greek syntax 2012: State-of-the art and perspectives. *Studies in Greek linguistics* 33: 11–57.

Aprile, Marcello, Rosario Coluccia, Franco Fanciullo & Riccardo Gualdo. 2002. La Puglia. In *I dialetti italiani: storia, struttura e uso*, ed. by Manlio Cortelazzo, Carla Marcato, Nicola de Blasi & Gianrenzo Clivio, 679–756. Torino: UTET.

Baldissera, Valeria. 2013. *Il dialetto Griko del Salento: elementi balcanici e contatto linguistico*. Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia, doctoral thesis.

Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2011. The rise of Dative Substitution in the history of Icelandic: A diachronic construction grammar account. *Lingua* 121(1): 60–79.

Bastardas Parera, Juan. 1953. *Particularidades sintácticas del latín medieval*. Barcelona: Escuela de filología.

Battisti, Carlo. 1927. Appunti sulla storia e sulla diffusione dell'ellenismo nell'Italia Meridionale (avec 3 cartes). *Revue de linguistique romane* 3: 1–97.

Bentley, Delia. 2006. *Split Intransitivity in Italian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bentley, Delia. 2016. Split intransitivity. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden, 821–832. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blake, Barry. 2004. *Case*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax: A Government-Binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Cennamo, Michela. 2001a. On the reorganization of voice distinctions and grammatical relations in Late Latin. In *De Lingua Latina novae quaestiones. Actes du X Colloque International de Linguistique Latine*, ed. by Claude Moussy, 51–65. Lowain-Paris: Peeters.

Cennamo, Michela. 2001b. L'*extended accusative* e le nozioni di voce e relazione grammaticale nel latino tardo e medievale. In *Ricerche Linguistiche fra Antico e Moderno*, ed. by Valeria Viparelli, 3–27. Napoli: Liguori.

Cennamo, Michela. 2009. Argument structure and alignment variations and changes in Late Latin. In *The role of semantic, pragmatic, and discourse factors*, ed. by Jóhanna Barðdal & Shobhana Chelliah, 307–346. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cennamo, Michela. 2011. Case marking of Core Arguments and Alignment in Late Latin. In *Grammatical case in the languages of the Middle East and Europe. Acts of the International Colloquium Variations, Concurrence et Evolution des Cas dans divers Domains Linguistiques. Paris, 2–4 April 2007*, ed. by Michèle Fruyt, Michel Mazoyer & Dennis Pardee, 297–314. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Comi, Pasquale. 1989. *Un'indagine sulla vitalità attuale del griko a Castrignano dei Greci (Lecce)*. University of Zurich BA thesis.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Danesi, Serena. 2014. Accusative subjects in Avestan: 'Errors' or non-Canonically marked arguments? *Indo-Iranian journal* 57: 223–260.

Delbrück, Berthold. 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Dimmendal, Gerrit. 1998. Language contraction versus other types of contact-induced change. In *Endangered langugages in Africa*, ed. by Matthias Brenzinger, 71–117. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.

Dixon, Robert. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dorian, Nancy. 1978. The fate of morphological complexity in language death: Evidence from East Sutherland Gaelic. *Language* 54: 590–609.

Dorian, Nancy. 1980. Language shift in community and individual: The phenomenon of the laggard semi-speaker. *International journal of the sociology of language* 25: 85–94.

Dorian, Nancy. 1981. *Language death. The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2016. Case. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden, 911–923. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Durante, Marcello. 1981. *Dal latino all'italiano moderno*. Bologna: Zanichelli.

Falcone, Giuseppe. 1973. *Il dialetto romaico della Bovesia*. Milan: Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardi di Scienze e Lettere.

Fanciullo, Franco. 1996. *Fra oriente e occidente. Per una storia linguistica dell'Italia merdionale*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.

Fanciullo, Franco. 2001. On the origins of Modern Greek in southern Italy. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph & Angela Ralli, 67–77. Patras: University of Patras.

Fanciullo, Franco. 2007. Greco e grecismi nel diasistema italo-romanzo. Alcune considerazioni. In *Nuove riflessioni sulla lessicografia. Presente, futuro e dintorni del Lessico etimologico italiano*, ed. by Marcello Aprile, 233–245. Glatina: Congedo.

Friedman, Victor & Brian Joseph. 2018. Non-nominative and depersonalized subjects in the Balkans: Areality vs. genealogy. In *Non-canonically case-marked subjects: The Reykjavík-Eyjafjallajökull Papers*, ed. by Jóhanna Barðdal, Na'ama Pat-El & Stephen Mark Carey, 23–53. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Gemma Italia, Gemma & Georgia Lambroyorgu. 2001. *Grammatica del dialetto greco di Sternatia (Grecia salentina)*. Galatina: Congedo.

Gerola, Berengario. 1949–1950. Aspetti della sintassi del nominativo e dell'accusativo nel tardo latino. *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di SS.LL.AA* 108: 207–236.

Guardiano, Cristina, Dimitris Michelioudakis, Andrea Ceolin, Monica Irimia, Giuseppe Longobardi, Nina Radkevic, Giuseppina Silvestri & Ioanna Sitaridou. 2016. South by south east. A syntactic approach to Greek and Romance microvariation. *L'Italia dialettale* 77: 96–166.

Guardiano, Cristina & Melita Stavrou. 2019. Adjective-noun combinations in Romance and Greek of southern Italy. Polydefiniteness revisited. *Journal of Greek linguistics* 19: 3–57.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helltula, Anne. 1987. *Studies on the Latin Accusative Absolute*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Herman, József. 1966. Recherches sur l'évolution grammaticale du latin vulgaire: Les emplois "fautifs" du nominatif . *Acta classica universitatis scientiarum Debrecen* 2: 109–112.

Herman, József. 1987. La disparition de *-s* et la morphologie dialectale du latin parlé. In *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif. Actes du Ier colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, 2–5 septembre 1985)*, ed. by József Herman, 97–108. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Herman, József. 1995. Les ardoises wisigothiques et le problème de la différenciation territoriale du latin. In *Latin Vulgaire-Latin Tardif 4*, ed. by Louis Callebat, 63–76. Hildesheim: Olms.

Holton, David, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 2004. *Greek. An essential grammar of the modern language*. London: Routledge.

Holton, David, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 2012. *Greek. A comprehensive grammar*, 2nd edn., rev. by Vassilios Spyropoulos. London: Routledge.

Hopper, Paul & Sandra Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2): 251–299.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1994. Subjects and configurationality: Modern Greek clause structure. *Journal of linguistics* 30: 81–109.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1997. *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers*. London: Longman.

Iannàccaro, Gabriele & Vittorio Dell'Aquila. 2011. Historical Linguistic Minorities: Suggestions for Classification and Typology. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 210: 29–45.

Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1997. *Grammatikí ton Ellinikon Idiomaton tis Kato Italias*. Athens: Academy of Athens.

Katsoyannou, Marianne. 1995. *Le parler gréco de Gallicianò* (*Italie*)*: Description d'une langue en voie de disparition*. Université de Paris VII, doctoral thesis.

Katsoyannou, Marianne. 1999. Implications typologiques d'une évolution morphologique: le cas du sujet explicatif en gréco. *Revue d'ethnolinguistique* 8: 233–246.

Kent, Roland. 1946. The accusative in Old Persian mām kāma. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 66(1): 44–49.

La Fauci, Nunzio. 1988. *Oggetti e soggetti nella formazione della morfosintassi romanza*. Pisa: Giardini.

La Fauci, Nunzio. 1997. *Per una teoria grammaticale del mutamento morfosintattico. Dal Latino verso il Romanzo*. Pisa: ETS.

Lazzeroni, Romano. 2002. Il nome greco del sogno e il neutro indoeuropeo. *Archivio glottologico Italiano* 87(2):145–162.

Lazzeroni, Romano. 2013. Fra ruoli semantici e ruoli pragmatici: il cosiddetto 'schema pindarico' nel greco antico. *Archivio glottologico Italiano* 98: 26–40.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2006. The dual complementiser system in southern Italy: *Spirito greco, materia romanza?* In *Rethinking languages in contact: The case of Italian*, ed. by Anna Laura Lepschy & Arturo Tosi, 112–126. Oxford: Legenda.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2011a. Syntactic and morphosyntactic typology and change. In *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Vol. 1: Structures*, ed. by Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway, 382–471. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2011b. Adverb agreement and split intransitivity: Evidence from southern Italy. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 96: 31–66.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2013. Greek disguised as Romance? The case of southern Italy. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, Angela Ralli & Metin Bağrıaçık, 184–228. Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2017. Patterns in Romance adverb agreement. In *Adjective adverb interfaces in Romance*, ed. by Martin Hummel & Salvador Valera, 47–80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2019. Parameters in the development of Romance perfective auxiliary selection. In *Historical Linguistics 2015. Selected Papers from the 22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Naples, 27–31 July 2015*, ed. by Michela Cennamo & Claudia Fabrizio, 344–384. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2018a. The expression of progressive aspect in Griko: Mapping morphosyntactic isoglosses in an endangered Italo-Greek variety. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 116(2): 1–39.

Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2018b. Il contatto tra il greco e le varietà romanze nella Calabria meridionale. *Lingue antiche e moderne* 75: 95–133.

Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2018c. Accusative subjects in Italo-Greek: Alignment vs ECM. Talk given at *CamCoS 7*, 10–12 May 2018, University of Cambridge.

Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. Forthcoming. The Negative Imperative in Southern Calabria. *Spirito greco, materia romanza* again? *Journal of Language Contact*.

Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano & Giuseppina Silvestri. In prep. *The fading voices of southern Italy: A case study in Greek-Romance language contact in Magna Graecia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2016. L'accordo degli avverbi aggettivali e del participio passato nei dialetti meridionali. In *Atti del IV Convegno internazionale di dialettologia—Progetto A.L.Ba*, ed. by Patrizia Del Puente, 163–185. Venosa: Osanna Edizioni.

Löfstedt, Einar. 1933. *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Zweiter Teil: Syntaktisch-Stilistische Gesichtspunkte und Probleme*. Lund: Gleerup.

Loporcaro, Michele. 2007. On triple auxiliation. *Linguistics* 45: 173–222.

Loporcaro, Michele. 2016. Auxiliary selection and participle agreement. In *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden, 802–818. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackridge, Peter. 1987. *The Modern Greek language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Manolessou, Io. 2005a. The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: An overview. *Kambos: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 13: 103–125.

Manolessou, Io. 2005b. From participles to gerunds. In *Advances in Greek generative syntax*, ed. by Melita Stavrou & Arhonto Terzi, 241–283. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Marra, Piersaverio. 2008. Un'indagine sociolinguistica nella Grecìa Salentina: 'Speculazioni' su una lingua in agonia. In *Il griko nel terzo millennio: 'Speculazioni' su una lingua in agonia*, ed. by Antonio Romano & Piersaverio Marra, 49–100. Lecce: Il Laboratorio.

Martino, Paolo. 1980. L'isola grecanica nell'Aspromonte. Aspetti sociolinguistici. In *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano. Atti dell'XI congresso internazionale di studi. Cagliari 27–30 maggio 1977*, ed. by Federico Albano Leoni, 305–341. Rome: Bulzoni.

Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in language* 31: 829–865.

Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. On the distribution of active and ergative patterns. *Lingua* 45: 233–279.

Morosi, Giuseppe. 1870. *Studi sui dialetti greci della Terra d'Otranto: preceduto da una raccolta di canti, leggende, proverbi e indovinelli nei dialetti medesimi.* Lecce: Tip. Editrice Salentina.

Norberg, Dag. 1944. *Beiträge zur spätlateinischen Syntax*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Palumbo, Vito D. 1971. *Roda ce kattia (Rose e spine)*. Con introduzione, trascrizione fonetica, traduzione e note di Paolo Stomeo. Lecce: Centro di studi salentini.

Papageorgiadis, Iannis, ed. N.D. *Grammatica degli idiomi del Sud Italia parlati in Grecìa salentina (Puglia) e in Calabria*. From the Grammar by A. Karanastasis published by the Academy of Athens in 1997. Web version in Italian. Available at: http://www.grecosuditalia.it/SiteGramm_juillet2018/menu_inc/index_2.php.

Parlangèli, Oronzo. 1953. *Sui dialetti romanzi e romaici del Salento*. Milan: Hoepli.

Pellegrino, Manuela. 2016. Performing Griko beyond 'death'. *Palaver* 5(1): 137–162.

Pensado, Carmen. 1986. Inversion de marcage et perte du système casuel en ancien français. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 102: 271–296.

Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 157–189.

Philippaki-Warburton, Irene. 1985. Word-order in Modern Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 83(1): 113–143.

Pieroni, Silvia. 1999. Non-promotional objects in Late Latin. *Verbum* 21: 117–129.

Plank, Frans. 1985. The extended accusative/restricted nominative in perspective. In *Relational typology*, ed. by Frans Plank, 269–310. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Profili, Olga. 1983. *Le parler grico de Corigliano d'Otranto (province de Lecce, Italie): phénomènes d'interférence entre ce parler grec et les parlers romans environnants, ainsi qu'avec l'italien*. University of Grenoble, doctoral thesis.

Ralli, Angela. 2006. Syntactic and morphosyntactic phenomena in modern Greek dialects. The state of the art. *Journal of Greek linguistics* 7: 121–159.

Ralli, Angela. Forthcoming. Greek in contact with Romance. In *The Oxford encyclopedia of Romance languages*, ed. by Francesco Gardani & Michele Loporcaro. New York: Oxford University Press.

Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2011. Morfosintassi verbale dei dialetti neogreci in Calabria. In *L'influsso dell'italiano sul sistema del verbo delle lingue minoritarie. Resistenza e mutamento nella morfologia e nella sintassi*, ed. by Walter Breu, 123–148. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer.

Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2018. Greek in southern Italy: morphosyntactic isomorphism and a possible exception. In *Balkan and South Slavic enclaves in Italy: Languages, dialects and identities*, ed. by Thede Kahl, Iliana Krapova & Giuseppina Turano, 135–152. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1924. *Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien*. Geneva: Olschki.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1933. *Das Fortleben des antiken Griechentums in Unteritalien*. Cologne: Petraca Haus.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1974. *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*. Galatina: Congedo.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1977. *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci*. Monaco: C.H. Beck'sche.

Romano, Antonio. 2008. Riflessioni preliminari sulla situazione linguistica della Grecìa Salentina. In *Il griko nel terzo millennio: 'Speculazioni' su una lingua in agonia*, ed. by Antonio Romano & Piersaverio Marra, 13–47. Lecce: Il Laboratorio.

Rossi Taibbi, Giuseppe & Girolamo Caracausi. 1959. *Testi neogreci di Calabria. Parte I: Introduzione, prolegomeni e testi di Roccaforte a cura di Giuseppe Rossi Taibbi. Parte II: Testi di Rochudi, di Condofuri, Di Bova e indici a cura di Girolamo Caracausi*. Palermo: Istituto siciliano di studi bizantini e neoellenici.

Roussou, Anna & Ianthi-Maria Tsimpli. 2004. The derivation of VSO in Greek and its implications for word order variation. *Proceedings of the UCL Alumni Reunion Conference*, 19–23. UCL: Department of Linguistics.

Rovai, Francesco. 2005. L'estensione dell'accusativo in latino tardo e medievale. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 90(1): 54–89.

Rovai, Francesco. 2007. Manifestazioni di sub-sistemi tipologici attivi in latino. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 92(1): 51–64.

Rovai, Francesco. 2012. Between feminine singular and neuter plural: Re-analysis patterns. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110(1): 94–121.

Rovai, Francesco. 2014. Case marking in absolute constructions: Further evidence for a semantically based alignment in Late Latin. *Journal of Latin linguistics* 13(1): 115–143.

Schifano, Norma & Giuseppina Silvestri. 2017. Nuove indagini linguistiche sulla varietà greca del Salento. *L'Italia dialettale* 78: 279–312.

Schifano, Norma, Giuseppina Silvestri & Maria Olimpia Squillaci. 2016. Some preliminary observations on auxiliary selection and participle agreement in Greko and Bovese. In *Proceedings of the 6th Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, Univer-*

sity of Patras, 25–28 September 2014, ed. by Angela Ralli, Nikos Koutsoukos & Stavros Bompolas, 166–177. Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2014. Towards a parameter hierarchy for alignment. In *Proceedings of wccfl 31*, ed. by Robert E. Santana-LaBarge, 399–408. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, ed. by Robert Dixon, 112–171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. Republished in *Features and Projections*, ed. by Peter Muysken & Henk van Riemsdijk (1986), 163–232. Dordrecht: Foris.

Sobrero, Alberto. 1980. Conservazione e trasformazione nella storia più recente del grico salentino. In *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano, Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di studi della SLI* (Cagliari, 27–30 maggio 1977), ed. by Federico Albano Leoni, 389–401. Bulzoni: Roma.

Sobrero, Alberto & Annarita Miglietta. 2005. Politica linguistica e presenza del Griko in Salento, oggi. In *Lingue, istituzioni, territori. Riflessioni teoriche, proposte metodologiche ed esperienze di politica linguistica*, ed. by Cristina Guardiano, Emilia Claresu, Cecilia Robustelli & Augusto Carli, 209–226. Roma, Bulzoni.

Sorace, Antonella. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76: 859–890.

Sornicola, Rosanna. 2011. Romance Linguistics and Historical Linguistics: Reflections on synchrony and diachrony. In *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Vol. 1: Structures*, ed. by Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway, 1–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spano, Benito. 1965. *La grecità bizantina e i suoi riflessi geografici nell'Italia meridionale e insulare*. Pisa: Goliardica.

Spencer, Andrew. 2009. Case as a morphological phenomenon. In *The Oxford handbook of case*, ed. by Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer, 185–199. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Squillaci, Maria Olimpia. 2017. *When Greek meets Romance. A morphosyntactic analysis of language contact in Aspromonte*. University of Cambridge, doctoral thesis.

Stamuli, Maria Francesca. 2007. *Morte di lingua e variazione lessicale nel greco. Tre profili dalla Bovesìa*. University of Naples, doctoral thesis.

Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tommasi, Salvatore. 2001. *Katalìsti o Kosmo. Tra passato e presente. Lingua, tradizione e folklore nella Grecìa Salentina. Materiali per un seminario sul griko 1995–1996*. Galatina: Editrice Salentina.

Tsimpli, Ianthi Maria. 1990. The clause structure and word order of Modern Greek. *UCL working papers in Linguistics* 2: 226–255.

Väänänen, Veikko. 1982. *Introduzione al latino volgare*. Bologna: Pàtron.

Vincent, Nigel. 1982. The development of the auxiliaries *habere* and *esse* in Romance. In *Studies in the Romance verb*, ed. by Nigel Vincent & Martin Harris, 71–96. London: Croom Helm.

Westerbergh, Ulla. 1956. *Chronicon Salernitanum: A critical edition with studies on literary and historical sources and on language*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Willis, David. 2017. Endogenous and exogenous theories of language change. In *The Cambridge handbook of historical syntax*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts, 491–514. Cambridge: Cammbrige University Press.

Zamboni, Alberto. 1998. Dal latino tardo al romanzo arcaico: Aspetti diacronico-tipologici della flessione nominale. In *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX congresso internazionale della Società di linguistica italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*, ed. by Paolo Ramat & Elisa Roma, 127–146. Rome: Bulzoni.