Some preliminary observations on auxiliary selection and participle agreement in Greko and Bovese

Norma Schifano, Giuseppina Silvestri & Maria Olimpia Squillaci
University of Cambridge

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to describe the peculiar syntactic behaviour of Greko and Bovese in their patterns of auxiliary selection and participle agreement. Spoken in a small number of villages in southern Calabria (in the area of Aspromonte, province of Reggio Calabria, Italy), Greko is a highly endangered Italo-Greek variety (Katsoyannou 1995: 25-7). The data presented in the following paper have been collected in the village of Bova, where Greko is spoken alongside the local Romance variety, here referred to as Bovese.

The paper is organised as follows. First, the major patterns of auxiliary selection attested across different Romance (§2) and Greek varieties (§3) are presented. Second, the peculiar pattern exhibited by Greko and Bovese is described, alongside the striking lack of past participle agreement shown by the latter variety (§4). Third, a number of speculations regarding both phenomena will be offered (§5). Far from providing an explanation for these peculiar patterns, this section will include both diachronic and diatopic observations, as well as more theoretically-oriented remarks, which hopefully will lay the ground for further research on such a challenging area of investigation.

2. Auxiliary selection across Romance

The choice of auxiliary in the formation of various perfective periphrases is an area of great microvariation across Romance. Indeed, extensive work carried out over recent decades has brought to light an unparalleled degree of variation (see overviews in Loporcaro 2001, forth.; Manzini & Savoia 2005, II-III; Ledgeway 2012, a.o.). More recently, the patterns of auxiliary distribution and their interplay have also been modelled in terms of parameter hierarchies (Ledgeway in press), which are able to reveal broad dimensions of (meso)variation, along the lines depicted by the *Rethinking Comparative Syntax* research group.[1] In what follows, we shall briefly review the major patterns of auxiliary selection attested across Romance, where (at least) 8 patterns of variation can be detected:

(i)   transitive-unaccusative split: this is the most common conservative pattern, whereby auxiliary selection is determined by the semantic class of the verb, and is widely attested across Romance, including standard Italian and in many northern and central dialects of the Italian peninsula;

(ii)   person-driven split: commonly attested across dialects of central and southern Italy, this is a system where auxiliary selection patterns with the grammatical person;

(iii)   triple auxiliation system: a dialect that exemplifies this system is the one spoken in Altamura (Bari), which displays free BE/HAVE variation in the pluperfect, but in the present 1st/2nd person subjects align with BE, yet in free alternation with HAVE, while 3rd person subjects retain the conservative transitive-unaccusative HAVE/BE split (Loporcaro 1988);

---

[1] Recent publications by the *ReCoS* include Biberauer et al. (2014) and Biberauer & Roberts (2015).

(iv)   HAVE or (v) BE generalisation: the former pattern, whereby HAVE invariably surfaces regardless of verb class and person, is attested in many Campanian and Calabro-Lucanian dialects, as well as in northern dialects of Salento, while the latter, where only BE surfaces, can be observed in some central dialects, as well as in some dialects of northern Piedmont;

(vi)   modal split: this is the system attested in Old Spanish, whereby the traditional transitive-unaccusative split is overridden in irrealis modal contexts, with the extension of HAVE to all predicates;

(vii) finiteness split: in this system, HAVE surfaces in finiteness contexts, where the verb is overtly marked for p/n agreement, while BE is found in all other non-finite constructions, i.e. the perfect infinitive, the future and conditional perfect and the perfect subjunctive, as attested in Romanian;

(viii) temporal split: this system can be further divided into three different subtypes.

Pattern (A):   a person-driven split in the present perfect and HAVE or BE generalisation in the pluperfect and counterfactual; the generalisation of BE is typically attested across central dialects, whereas the generalisation of HAVE is more common across upper southern Italian dialects;[2]

Pattern (B):   a traditional HAVE-BE transitive-unaccusative split in the present perfect and BE generalisation in the pluperfect and counterfactual, as attested in some varieties of Lucania and Apulia;

Pattern (C):   HAVE generalisation in the present perfect and BE generalisation in the pluperfect, as in Torre S. Susanna (Brindisi).

A schematic overview of these patterns, as well as a selection of representative examples, are offered in the table below:[3]

PATTERN	DISTRIBUTION	EXAMPLES

(i) transitive-unaccusative split	widely attested across Romance (Including st. It.)	a. *hanno dormito per due ore*
		   have.3PL slept for two hours
		b. *sono andati al mare*
		   are.3PL gone.MPL to.the sea (standard Italian)

(ii) person-driven split	several CIDs and SID	*so / si / a fatecate / ite* [4] am are has worked/gone (Ariellese, D' Alessando-Roberts 2010; in Ledgeway in press)

(iii) triple auxiliation system	some USIDs	a. *sɔ / aʧ̬ə manʤɛit - sə /a manʤɛit*
		   am/I.have.1SG eaten - are/have.2SG eaten
		b. *a manʤɛit /e rʊmwesə sʊul*
		   has eaten / is remained alone
		          (Altamurano, Loporcaro 1988; in Ledgeway 2014)

(iv) HAVE generalisation	several Campanian, Calabro-Lucanian and northern Salento dialects	*adʤu rurmutə / vənutə* have.1SG slept / come (S. Maria a Vico; Manzini & Savoia 2005: II, 779)
(v) BE generalisation	CIDs, some dialects of northern Piedmont	*so dərmitə / vənutə* am slept / come (Offida; Manzini & Savoia *ib.*, 760)

---

[2] This is the most common subcase for person-driven systems, as person-based auxiliary selection is generally restricted to the present perfect, while in the pluperfect and counterfactual a generalisation of either HAVE or BE is typically observed.

[3] In the following article we adhere to the Leipzig glossing rules.

[4] The present indicative regular forms of BE (i.e. /so/, /si/, /e/) variously trigger initial-consonant lengthening of the following past participle, which is not indicated Table 1.

(vi) modal split	Old Spanish	a. *si el sieruo que es fuydo mora mucho en casa de algun omne*
		  if the servant that is fled remains much in house of some man
		b. *si ladrones que furtan de dia & de noche ouissen entrado*
		  if thieves that steal of day and of night had.SUBJ entered
		  (Old Spanish, Ledgeway 2014)

(vii) finiteness split	Romanian	a. *am / ai / a / am / aţi / au mâncat / plecat*
		  have.1/2SG / has / have.1/2/3PL eaten / left
		b. *înainte de a fi mâncat / plecat, citeam ziarul*
		  before of to be.INF eaten / left read.PAST.1SG/PL newspaper.DEF
		  (Romanian, Ledgeway 2014)

(viii) temporal split	CIDs, some USIDs	**Pattern A**
		a. *sɔ / si /a / semo / sete / au mmaɲɲatu*
		  am/are/is/ have.1/2/3PL eaten
		b. *ɛra / ɛri / ɛra / ɛmmo / ɛʃte / ɛrinu maɲɲatu*
		  was.1SG / were.2SG / was.3SG / were.1/2/3PL eaten
		  (Borgorose-Spedino, Manzini & Savoia *ib.*, 699)
		
		Pattern B
		a. *ɛʧʧə dərmoutə / sɔ vvənoutə*
		  have.1SG slept / am come
		b. *erə dərmoutə / vənoutə*
		  was.1SG slept / come (Putignano, Manzini & Savoia *ib.*,752)
		
		Pattern C
		a. *ɛʧʧu / ɛ / ɛ / ɛmmu / ɛvvu / ɛnnu turmutu / vinutu*
		
		  have.1/2/3SG / have1/2/3PL slept / come
		b. *ɛra / jeri / ɛra / ɛramu / ɛravu / ɛranu turmutu / vinutu*
		  was.1SG / were.2SG/was3SG/ were.1/2/3PL slept / come
		  (Torre S. Susanna, Manzini & Savoia *ib.*, 794-5)

Table 1: Patterns of Romance auxiliary selection

3. Auxiliary selection across Greek varieties

On a par with Italo-Romance, Greek dialects also exhibit a great degree of variation in their patterns of auxiliary selection. First, consider Standard Modern Greek (henceforth SMG), which exhibits HAVE generalisation both in the present perfect (1) and pluperfect (2):

(1) den exo   fai   proino   simera
    not have.1SG   eaten   breakfast   today
    'I haven't had breakfast today'

(2) ixame   pai   stin   Italia
    had.1PL   gone   to.the   Italy
    'We had gone to Italy'

Agouraki (2006: 42-3; see also Ralli 2006: 136; Melissaropoulou et al. 2013: 161) defines the above structure as the 'A form' of the present perfect/pluperfect which is used in SMG to either express past temporal reference or denote a resultative state. This construction is formed by combining the present/past auxiliary HAVE with an invariable non-finite form of the lexical verb.[5] Along with the 'A form', Agouraki (2006: 42-3) identifies a 'B form', consisting of the present/past of the auxiliaries HAVE/BE and the past participle of the lexical verb. This construction is exclusively employed to denote the results of the action rather than its performance:

(3) ime/imun   grammenos
    be.1SG.PRES/IMPF   written.MSG
    'I am/was enrolled'

---

[5] This form is considered to be a residue of the old Classical Greek infinitive (Holton et al. 1997: 112-3; Horrocks 2010: 296).

While the 'A form' is specific to SMG, the 'B form' is shared by all Greek varieties. In some of these varieties, the 'B form' has undergone a full or partial process of grammaticalisation as present perfect tense, while in many other dialects it only maintains the resultative interpretation (Ralli et al. 2007). Consider the following example from Cypriot, which has only recently developed the 'A form' (4) mostly due to SMG influence, while retaining a productive 'B form' (5):[6]

(4) den exume   vali   xronodiagrama emis jati   en   ekseramen   an
     not have.1PL set.INF.PRF   timeline   we   because not   we.knew   if

     engrinetun
     it.approve.IMPF
     'We have not set a timeline ourselves, because we didn't know if it was going to be approved'

(5) I   Sofia ine diavazmeni
     the.FSG   Sofia is   studied.FSG
     'Sofia has studied (intended meaning: she is ready for the exam)'
                                    (examples adapted from Melissaropoulou et al. 2013: 164, 161)

On the other hand, the use of the pluperfect is widespread among the Greek varieties, although the constructions employed to express this temporal reference vary consistently from dialect to dialect, as illustrated in the Table below which summarises the analytic forms used in some Greek dialects:[7]

	Present Perfect	Pluperfect	Resultative
SMG	have.PRES + inf. *exo pai*	have.PAST +inf. *ixa pai*	have.PRES+PastParticipleAgreement *to exo grammeno*

Cypriot	NO[8]	be.PAST + -onda
		
		imu pphesonda (Rohlfs 1972: 82)
		
		have.PAST + PPA
		ixamen kalesmenus [..]
		  (Karyolemou 1995 in Agouraki 2006: 55)
		
		have.PAST +inf.
		ixa milisi [..]
		  (Karyolemou 1995 in Agouraki 2006: 55)
			have/be.PRES + PPA
			exo ta mairemena ta faja
			          (Agouraki 2006: 53)

Griko	have/be.PRES + -mena
	
	ime pamena (Baldissera 2013: 38)
		have.PAST + -onta
		ixa ndisonta
		              (Baldissera 2013: 42)
			have.PRES + PPA
			exo demeno
			          (Karanastasis 1997: 144)

Greko	NO	be.PAST+ onda *immon platezzonda*	have/be.PRES + PPA *exo to fai jenameno*
Lesbian	NO	?	have/be.PRES + PPA *tun exu dimeno* (Ralli 2006: 134)

Tsakonian	be.PRES + have.Prt + Prt (-tos)
	emi exu grafté
	          (Liosis 2011: 469)
		be.PAST+ have.Prt + Prt (-tos)
		ema exu grafté
		              (Liosis 2011: 469)
			be.PRES + Prt (-tos)
			emi grafté
			              (Liosis 2011: 469)

Cappadocian	NO	lexical verb + be.PAST.3sg *irten iton* (Janse forth.)	YES (see Ralli et al. 2007: 36)

Table 2: (adapted from Squillaci in prep.)

[6] The SMG form of the perfect tense is also an innovative formation, first attested in the 16th century (see Ralli 2006 and references therein). As for the HAVE + -*onta* periphrasis in Griko, Rohlfs (1972: 82, fn185) argues that this is a more archaic formation than the one attested in Greko, which is independent from Byzantine influence.

[7] Table 2 is to be considered as work in progress.

[8] As outlined above, Cypriot is developing 'Form A' of the present perfect due to language contact with SMG (cf. example in (4); see Melissaropoulou et al. 2013 for further remarks). Nevertheless, this is only a very recent development and therefore we decided not to consider it as a structure consistently used in this language.

The productive usage of the pluperfect can be traced back to Classical and Medieval Greek. In Classical Greek the pluperfect exhibited a synthetic form (e.g. *etethykein* 'I had sacrificed'), although there are also attestations of an analytic form consisting of the auxiliary BE and the active aorist participle of the lexical verb (6):

(6) **en** gar ho Themistokles bebaiotata de physeos isxyn
    was indeed the Themistocles most.truly even nature.GEN strength

    delosas
    show.PRT.AOR.NOM.MSG
    'Themistocles had shown the strength of his nature'

    (Thuc. I.138.3, in Rohlfs 1972: 82)

In Medieval Greek, new analytic forms were developed, while the synthetic form of the tense was no longer attested. Crucially, the Classical Greek BE + active aorist participle form was still productive in this period (Horrocks 2010; Giannaris 2011):[9]

(7) ho de Andreas... ouk epegno auton **en** gar ho
    the even Andrew... not recognised him was.3SG indeed the

    iesous **krupsas** ten heutou theoteta
    Jesus hide.PRT.AOR.NOM.MSG the his divinity
    'Andrew didn't recognise him: Jesus had hidden his divinity'

    (Acta Andr. et Matth.114, 5, in Giannaris 2011: 238)

As we shall see below, the above construction is of particular interest for the present discussion since it is still found in the Greek dialect of Calabria, and partially in Apulia, although in the latter area the auxiliary HAVE is selected (Baldissera 2013: 42). Crucially, the former structure seems to have considerably influenced also the Romance variety spoken in the same area, giving rise to a hybrid structure specific to Greko and Bovese.

4. Auxiliary selection and participle agreement in Greko and Bovese

Having completed our overview of the main patterns of auxiliary selection attested across Romance and Greek, we can now focus our attention on Greko and Bovese, whose behaviour proves particularly interesting.

We start by observing that the main past tense perfective form used in these varieties is the aorist, which is used to convey two distinct readings, namely actions which have been completed (8) and past events bearing present relevance (9) (examples adapted from Katsoyannou 1995: 313-7):

(8) man imera m'ekapitesse ti immo manaxi mu
    a day to.me happened.3SG that was.1SG alone of.me
    'once it happened that I was on my own'

---

[9] Note that in Medieval Greek the original active aorist participle in *-sas*, *-sasa*, *-san* underwent a morpho-syntactic change turning into the invariable form *-onta* (see fn.14).

(9) arte irthen   o   himona ce   immaston   ossu
     now came.3SG   the   winter and   are.1PL   inside
     'the winter has arrived and we stay at home'

Unlike the neighbouring Romance varieties, neither Greko nor Bovese make use of the present perfect instead (Rohlfs 1977: 196; Scott 1979: 43; Katsoyannou 1995: 313-7). On the contrary, they both productively employ the periphrasis HAVE/BE + agreeing past participle to express the resultant state of the action, on a par with many ESIDs and Greek dialects.[10] Notably, the past participle of the resultative periphrasis must agree with the direct object in gender and number in both varieties. This characteristic indicates the adjectival function of the participle, rather than a verbal one, as illustrated in examples (10) and (11):

(10) ego panda   s'exo   grammeni   stin   gardia
      I   always   you=have   written.FSG   in.the   heart
      'I have you written on my heart'

(Caracausi & Rossi-Taibbi 1959: 313)

(11) Peppi   avi   a   maglietta   strazzata
      Peppi   has   the   t-shirt.FSG   shredded.FSG
      'Peppi has the torn T-shirt on'

Along with the aorist, the pluperfect is employed to convey anteriority in the past. This form consists of the auxiliary BE and the past participle of the lexical verb. In Greko, the participle is formed from the aorist stem of the verb and the active participial -*onda* form (Rohlfs 1969; Falcone 1973; Katsoyannou 1995). By way of illustration, consider the following examples:

(12) a. Maria   nd'era dittu   a   verità
        Maria   us=was told   the   truth
        'Mary had told us the truth'
     b. i   Maria   ito   catharìonda   tin   cammara
        the Maria   was   cleaned   the   room
        'Mary had cleaned the room'

(13) a. Maria   non   c'era   parratu
        Maria   not   him/her=was   talked
        'Maria had not talked to her/him'
     b. i   Maria   ito   tragudìonda
        the Maria   was   sung
        'Mary had sung'

(14) a. a   grasta   era   cadutu
        the   flower-pot   was   fallen
        'The flower-pot had fallen'
     b. i   Maria   ito   erthonda/chorìonda
        the Mary   was   left/arrived
        'Mary had left/arrived'

---

[10] The periphrastic form in Greko selects the participial form in -*menos*, whereas the participle used in Bovese is the Romance formation in -*(a/u)tu*.

Focusing our attention on auxiliary selection first, the examples above show that in Bovese (a) and Greko (b) pluperfect, the auxiliary BE is invariably selected with all verb types, including transitive (12), unergative (13) and unaccusative verbs (14) (see Squillaci in prep. for a detailed discussion). This is a rather surprising state of affairs. Recall from the above discussion that BE generalisation is indeed attested in Italo-Romance, such as in the central Italian dialects and the dialects of northern Piedmont of pattern (v) and the varieties belonging to the temporal split pattern in (viii), which include again central dialects and some varieties of Lucania and Apulia. However, the Romance dialects surrounding Bovese and Greko only exhibit HAVE generalisation (cf. pattern iv), thus rendering the Bovese/Greko BE selection a rather unexpected choice in that area.[11] Similarly, the peculiar BE selection of Greko is not found in any Greek varieties either, which exhibit rather different constructions to denote the pluperfect, as discussed above. Finally, it is also worth noting that, although some other Romance dialects do exhibit BE generalisation, they typically also make a productive use of the present perfect paradigm, unlike Greko and Bovese, thus suggesting that the two systems cannot be fully equated, even glossing over their distinct geographical location.

In the literature, some claims have already been advanced to explain this unexpected choice. According to Rohlfs (1972), from an ancient Greek template where the imperfect of BE was combined with the active aorist participle (which already had the pluperfect function), Greko retained the same structure with the BE auxiliary.[12] Falcone (1973: 289-90) identifies the BE configuration as a calque from the surrounding Calabrian dialect. Nevertheless, note that, except from the varieties which have maintained a long and intense contact with Greko, no other ESIDs display this pattern, hence suggesting that the influence has probably come from the opposite direction. Katsoyannou (1995: 352) recognises the importance of contact interference ('[…] un trait qui tire son origin du contact des langues'), while Remberger (2009, 2011) has recently suggested that Greko might have developed this pattern internally.[13]

Before we offer some further speculations about this peculiar pattern of auxiliary selection, we would like to comment on a further remarkable feature which emerges from the examples above, i.e. the consistent lack of agreement between the participle of Bovese and its related DPs, including the external and internal arguments of transitive (12) and unergative verbs (13) and the internal argument of unaccusative ones (14).[14] Again, this pattern seems to be unparalleled across Romance, where some degree of agreement in combination with BE is typically observed (Loporcaro forth.).

5. Some speculations on auxiliary selection and participle agreement in Greko and Bovese

In what follows, we would like to put forward some preliminary observations regarding the two macroscopic properties of the Greko/Bovese pluperfect depicted above, i.e. the auxiliary selection and past participle agreement, along the lines sketched in Schifano and Silvestri (2014).

---

[11] The only exception among ESIDs is Torre S. Susanna (Brindisi) (cf. Pattern C of viii). However, in this variety a full paradigm for the present perfect is found too, contrary to Bovese.

[12] Other authors mention the selection of either HAVE or BE without further indication (e.g. Massaro 1995: 137; Basile 1998: 395).

[13] '[…] the development of a pluperfect with BE + active past participle in Greco seems indeed to be a language internal development' (Remberger 2009: 17).

[14] From a synchronic perspective, the issue of past participle agreement does not arise in Greko instead, where the -onda form is morphologically invariable. However, in Classical Greek the form was inflected for gender and number (-sas, -sasa, -san), although these endings were lost already in the Koiné period (Rohlfs 1972: 82; Browning 1969: 39; Horrocks 2010: 181-2; Manolessou 2005: 242-3).

5.1 Auxiliary selection

Capitalising on a number of both empirical and theoretical arguments, we suggest that the Greko BE-selection in the pluperfect is better interpreted as a result of a convergence of factors. First, the fundamental role played by Classical/Medieval Greek in offering the model of BE selection should be recognised, which was strengthen at a later stage by Byzantine influence (cf. Rohlfs 1972). Second, it is worth observing that, cross-linguistically, BE seems to be the default perfect auxiliary, as opposed to the more rare HAVE option. Indeed, among Indo-European varieties, HAVE is not attested in Celtic or Slavonic (with the exception of Macedonian) nor in Hindi. Moreover, in same contexts where HAVE is selected, it is likely that BE will be found in some other languages, but not vice versa (Roberts 2013). This empirical fact seems to be supported by those theoretical models which interpret BE as the default option, HAVE being the surface spell-out of an underlying BE+Locative element structure and thus more marked in its derivation (Freeze 1992; Kayne 1993; see also Roberts 2013: 20-3 and Ledgeway 2014 for recent implementations). As for Bovese, we claim that mechanisms of language contact have combined with the model offered by Classical/Medieval Greek to trigger the BE selection exhibited by this dialect too (see details in Squillaci in prep.).

5.2 Past participle agreement

If the diachronic and diatopic factors mentioned above may shed some light on the peculiar pattern of auxiliary selection exhibited by Greko and Bovese, the systematic lack of participle agreement of this latter may find a possible synchronic interpretation under the Agreement models developed by recent generativist works, such as D'Alessandro and Roberts (2008, 2010). In what follows, we will briefly outline their proposal and sketch a possible implementation of this model to the Bovese empirical scenario.

   Building on Chomsky (2000, 2001) and the basic tenets on the Phase Impenetrability Condition (Chomsky 2001: 13), D'Alessandro and Roberts (2008: 482) have proposed an analysis of the morpho-phonological realisation of Agreement along the following lines:

(i)   Given an Agree relation between Probe and Goal, the morpho-phonological agreement between Probe and Goal is realised *iff* they are both contained in the complement of the minimal phase head H;

(ii) XP is the complement of a minimal phase head H *iff* there is no distinct phase head H′ contained in XP whose complement YP contains Probe and Goal;

(iii) [for a strong phase HP with head H] the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside HP; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

As for sentence structure, the following configuration is assumed for both transitive and unergative constructions (adapted from D'Alessandro & Roberts 2008: 481):[15]

(15)   [$_{TP}$ T [$_{vP}$ [$_v$ Aux [$_{vPrtP}$ EA   [$_{vPrt°}$ Prt   [$_{VP}$ V   DP]]]]]

Now, if we combine the above assumptions about the mechanism of Agreement with the structure in (15), the lack of agreement exhibited by Bovese transitive (16a) and unergative verbs (16b) finds a rather straightforward interpretation:

---

[15] Drawing on D'Alessandro and Roberts (2008: 481), we assume that the external argument is merged in Spec,*v*PrtP, which amounts to treating the auxiliary in *v* as a raising predicate that selects *v*PrtP (see Ross 1969).

(16) a. Maria era   pulizziatu dda   stanza
        Maria was   cleaned   that room

    b. Maria e   Peppi eranu   cantatu
       Maria and   Peppi were.3PL   sung

In both (16a) and (16b) the participle has moved to *v*Prt°, as shown by its distribution with respect to low manner adverbs (Cinque 1999):

(17) a. Maria era   pulizziatu bonu a   stanza
        Maria was   cleaned   well the   room
        'Maria had cleaned well the room'
    b. Maria e   Peppi eranu   cantatu bonu dda   canzuni
       Maria and   Peppi were.3PL   sung   well that song
       'Maria and Peppi had sung well that song'   (Bovese)

This means that, at the point of Spell-Out, the participle occupies *v*Prt°. Since the transitive/unergative *v*Prt heads a non-defective phase (Chomsky 2001), its complement VP is sent to PF on a distinct cycle. Consequently, when reaching PF, the participle and the direct object do not longer belong to the complement of the same minimal phase head and agreement fails to take place, as correctly predicted by (i).

Interestingly, it is not immediately clear how the same account could be applied to unaccusative structures, which equally fail to exhibit agreement and whose internal structure can be represented as in (18):

(18)   [$_{TP}$ T [$_{vP}$ [$_v$ Aux [$_{vPrtP}$ (EA) [$_{vPrt°}$ Prt [$_{VP}$ ~~V~~ DP]]]]]

Unlike with transitives/unergatives, the *v*Prt° of unaccusatives is not the head of a non-defective phase, as the external argument is present and *v*Prt° is unable to case-license the object DP (see Burzio's Generalisation, as outlined in Burzio 1986: 178ff). Even if the participle raises to *v*Prt° (see derived structure 18), the participle and the object are still contained in the complement of the same minimal phase head (i.e. the TP dominating the higher *v*P, the complement of C). Hence, the overt morpho-phonological agreement between the participle and the direct object would be expected (19), as a reflex of the Agreement mechanism outlined in (i-iii) and contrary to fact (20):

(19) *Maria$_{FSG}$ era   partuta$_{FSG}$/   Peppi$_{MSG}$ era   partutu$_{MSG}$/ Peppi e
       Maria   was   left/   Peppi   was   left/   Peppi and

      Maria   eranu   partuti$_{MPL}$
      Maria   were   left

(20) Maria$_{FSG}$ era   partutu$_{MSG}$/   Peppi$_{MSG}$ era   partutu$_{MSG}$/ Peppi e
      Maria   was   left/   Peppi   was   left/   Peppi and

      Maria   eranu   partutu$_{MSG}$
      Mary   were   left
      'Mary had left/Peppi had left/Peppi and Mary had left'

In order to account for the data in (19-20), we can recur to a feature-driven implementation of Agreement, whereby Agreement proceeds in two steps, i.e. Match and Agree proper (Chomsky 2001). According to this model, the Probe first searches its c-command domain to find a Goal with

matching features. Match obtains when the feature attributes are the same, as the Match procedure corresponds to feature identity. Once Match has taken place, Agree then copies the feature value of the Goal into the Probe. This mechanism necessary entails a requirement for the Goal, i.e. in order for a Goal to be visible to Agree, it must be *active*, i.e. some of its features must be unvalued. If one assumes that in Modern Romance past participle agreement takes place between a DP in Spec, PrtP and a verb in Prt and that Prt must be probing for a subset of those features (Roberts 2013: 1; Ledgeway in press), perhaps gender and number, we can claim that the participle of Bovese is not an active goal for the subject, i.e. it does not have (unvalued) gender and number features. Consequently, the Match operation between the subject and the past participle cannot take place, resulting in the lack of superficial agreement.[16]

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented two striking syntactic properties of Greko and Bovese, i.e. the systematic BE selection in the pluperfect and the lack of agreement on the past participle in the latter variety. In order to underline the peculiarity of this pattern of auxiliary selection, we have provided an overview of the main systems attested across Romance and Greek and we have concluded that, although BE generalisation is not unknown to Romance, it is certainly not attested in the area where Greko and Bovese are spoken. The fact that a similar construction was attested in Classical/Medieval Greek, coupled with the crosslinguistic unmarkedness of BE, may have contributed to this peculiar choice of Greko and may have been transferred onto Bovese by contact. The systematic lack of agreement exhibited by the Bovese participle proved particularly striking as well. Although an in-depth diachronic investigation of this pattern does not exist, modern generativist implementations of the mechanism of Agreement, such as the one depicted by D'Alessandro and Roberts (2008, 2010), may help shedding some light on the synchronic nature of this pattern.

In conclusion, we hope that the empirical evidence provided in this paper, along with some preliminary observations regarding its peculiar nature, will eventually lead to an integrated diachronic and synchronic analysis of these patterns, where relevant mechanisms of language contact are also properly taken into account.

References

Agouraki, Y. (2006) The Perfect category: a comparison of Standard Greek and Cypriot Greek. In: M. Janse, B. D. Joseph & A. Ralli (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Patras: University of Patras, 42-57.

Baldissera, V. (2013) *Il dialetto grico del Salento. Elementi balcanici e contatto linguistico*. Ph.D thesis. Venezia: Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia.

Basile, N. (1998) *Sintassi storica del greco antico*. Bari: Levante.

Biberauer, T., Holmberg, A., Roberts, I. & M. Sheehan (2014) Complexity in comparative syntax: the view from modern parametric theory. In: F. Newmeyer & L. Preston (Eds.), *Measuring Linguistic Complexity*. Oxford: OUP, 103-27.

Biberauer, T. & I. Roberts (2015) Clausal hierarchies. In: U. Shlonski (Ed.), *Beyond Functional Sequence*. Oxford: OUP, 295-313.

Browning, R. (1969) *Medieval and Modern Greek*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Burzio, L. (1986) *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Caracausi, G. & G. Rossi-Taibbi (1959). *Testi neogreci di Calabria*. Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici.

---

[16] See Squillaci (in prep.) for an alternative analysis which links the absence of participle agreement in Bovese to the contact with the invariable Greko form in *-onda*.

Chomsky, N. (2000) Minimalist Inquiries: the framework. In: R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (Eds.), *Step by step: essays on minimalist syntax in honor of H. Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 89-155.

Chomsky, N. (2001) Derivation by phases. In: M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1-52.

Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford: OUP.

D'Alessandro, R. & I. Roberts (2008) Movement and agreement in Italian past participles and defective phases. *Linguistic Inquiry 39*: 477-91.

D'Alessandro, R. & I. Roberts (2010) Past participle agreement in Abruzzese: split auxiliary selection and the null-subject parameter. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 28*: 41-72.

Falcone, G. (1973) *Il dialetto Romaico della Bovesía*. Milano: Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere.

Freeze, R. (1992) Existentials and other locatives. *Language 68*: 553-95.

Giannaris, A. (2011) Pluperfect periphrases in Medieval Greek: A perspective on the collaboration between linguistics and philology. *Transactions of the Philological Society 109*: 1-14.

Holton, D., Mackridge, P. & I. Philippaki-Warburton (1997) *Greek: A Comprehensive Reference Grammar of the Modern Language*. London: Routledge.

Horrocks, G. (2010) *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Janse, M. (forth.) Η καππαδοκική διάλεκτος. Στο: Χ. Τζιτζιλής (Εκδ.), *Η ελληνική γλώσσα και οι διάλεκτοί της*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας.

Katsoyannou, M. (1995) *Le parler gréco de Gallicianò (Italie): description d'une langue en voie de disparition*. Ph.D. thesis. Paris: Université Paris VII 'D. Diderot'.

Karanastasis, A. (1997) *Γραμματική των ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας*. Αθήνα: Ακαδημία Αθηνών.

Kayne, R. (1993) Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. *Studia Linguistica 47*: 3-31.

Ledgeway, A. (2012) *From Latin to Romance: morphosyntactic change and typology*. Oxford: OUP.

Ledgeway, A. (2014) Romance Auxiliary Selection in Light of Romanian Evidence. In: G. Pana Dindelegan, R. Zafiu, A. Dragomirescu, I. Nicula & A. Nicolae (Eds.), *Diachronic Variation in Romanian*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 3-35.

Ledgeway, A. (in press) From Latin to Romance syntax: the great leap. In: P. Crisma & G. Longobardi (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Diachronic and Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP.

Liosis, N. (2011) Auxiliary Verbs and the Participle in the Tsakonian Dialect: Towards a Periphrastic Verbal System. In: K. Chatzopoulou, A. Ioannidou & S. Yoon (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Chicago: Ohio State University, 469-79.

Loporcaro, M. (1988) *Grammatica storica del dialetto di Altamura*. Pisa: Giardini.

Loporcaro, M. (2001) La selezione dell'ausiliare nei dialetti italiani: dati e teorie. In: F. Albano Leoni, S. Krosbakken, R. Sornicola & C. Stromboli (Eds.), *Dati empirici e teorie linguistiche*. Roma: Bulzoni, 457-76.

Loporcaro, M. (forth.) Auxiliary selection and participle agreement. In: A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (Eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP.

Manzini, M.R. & L. Savoia (2005) *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manolessou, I. (2005) From participles to gerunds. In: M. Stavrou & A. Terzi (Eds.), *Advances in Greek generative syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 241-83.

Massaro, L.T. (1995) *Sintassi del greco antico e tradizione grammaticale*. Palermo: L'Epos.

Melissaropoulou, D., Themistocleous, C., Tsiplakou, S. & S. Tsolakidis (2013) The Present Perfect in Cypriot Greek revisited. In: A. Peter, J.C. Reina & G. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Language Variation-European Perspectives IV: Selected papers from the Sixth International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 6)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 159-72.

Ralli, A. (2006) Syntactic and morphosyntactic phenomena in Modern Greek dialects. *Journal of Greek Linguistics 7*: 121-59.

Ralli, A., Melissaropoulou, D. & S. Tsolakidis (2007) Form and Function of the Perfect Tense in Greek Dialectal Variation. *Studies in Greek Linguistics 2006*, 361-72.

Remberger, E.-M. (2009) *The Greek-Romance contact situation in Southern Calabria*. Ms. Kostanz: University of Konstanz.

Remberger, E.-M. (2011) Morfosintassi verbale dei dialetti neogreci in Calabria. In: W. Breu (Ed.), *L'influsso dell'italiano sul sistema del verbo delle lingue minoritarie: resistenza e mutamento nella morfologia e nella sintassi*. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 123-48.

Roberts, I. (2013) Some speculations on the development of the Romance periphrastic perfect. *Revue Romaine de Linguistique 58 (1)*: 3-30.

Rohlfs, G. (1969) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole.* Turin: Einaudi.

Rohlfs, G. (1972) *Nuovi scavi linguistici nell'antica Magna Grecia*. Palermo: Luxograph.

Rohlfs, G. (1977) *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italo-greci*. München: Beck.

Ross, J. R. (1969) Auxiliaries as main verbs. In: W. Todd (Ed.), *Studies in philosophical linguistics*. Evanston, IL: Great Expectations Press, 77-102.

Schifano, N. & G. Silvestri (2014) *Auxiliary selection in Greko and Calabrese of Bova*. Talk given at *CIDSM 2014*, University of Padua and Venice.

Scott, S. (1979) *Grammatica elementare del Greco di Calabria*. Melbourne: Palaio Phaliro.

Squillaci, M. O. (in prep.) *When Greek meets Romance: A Morphosyntactic Investigation of Language Contact in Aspromonte.* Ph.D. thesis. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.