SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD IN GRIKO: A MICRO-COMPARATIVE APPROACH

Abstract

We present an analysis of subjunctive complements in Griko, a Modern Greek dialect spoken in Southern Italy. Despite the obvious similarities with the properties of subjunctive clauses in Standard Modern Greek (SMG), introduced by *na* in both varieties, we capitalize on the contrasting distribution of verbal forms in each case: while in SMG all temporal-aspectual combinations are allowed in *na*-clauses and no specific subjunctive morphology is used, Griko only features perfective non-past in the same context. This fact is argued to instantiate the specialization of aspectual morphology in Griko for the marking of subjunctive on the verb. We propose that the morphological marking of subjunctive that had been lost in earlier stages of the diachronic development of Greek reentered Griko as a result of contact with Salentino, the southern Romance variety spoken in the same area, which also exhibits mood concord between a subjunctive complementizer and dedicated subjunctive morphology on the verb. Although the realization of subjunctive in Griko and in SMG appears to be an instance of microvariation in the syntax (mood concord in the former, no mood concord in the latter), we argue that it ultimately reduces to the feature specification of particular elements, namely inflectional morphemes.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The topic of this paper is the realization of the category “subjunctive” in Griko, an indigenous Greek variety present in Southern Italy till the present day. Griko is spoken in an area known as Grecìa Salentina, in the province of Lecce, in a subset of the villages that officially constitute the Union of the Towns of Grecìa Salentina.1 Salento represents one of the two Greek-speaking enclaves in Italy, the other one being Calabria, where Greko or Grekanico has been spoken (see Katsoyiannou 1995 for Grekanico; see also Ledgeway (2013) for a more recent overview). Griko and Grekanico, referred to jointly as Italiot Greek or Italo-Greek, have been recognized as minority languages by the Parliament of Italy since 1999. They are both under the threat of extinction, the latter more imminently than the former.

We adopt a micro-comparative approach (cf. Kayne 1996), which aims to characterize parametric variation by examining closely-related varieties (as opposed to historically unrelated languages), as a new research tool resembling actual experiments: altering a certain morphosyntactic feature helps determine with which other properties it correlates, if they are linked by some abstract parameter. Specifically, we compare Griko to Standard Modern Greek (henceforth SMG), in particular in connection to the realization of subjunctive clauses. The vast majority of researchers concur on the fact that SMG encodes subjunctive mood not through verbal morphology, but via the choice of complementizer. The lack of designated subjunctive morphology entails that verbal forms inside subjunctive clauses can vary, giving rise to distinct interpretations, depending on their tense and aspect specification. By contrast, in Griko we argue that subjunctive is encoded in both the complementizer and the verbal morphology. The central observation in favour

1 The Union of the Towns of Grecìa Salentina officially consists of 12 villages in the province of Lecce. However, Griko is actually still spoken only in some of them. According to Sobrero & Maglietta (2005), the Griko-speaking villages today are: Calimera, Corigliano d’Otranto, Martano, Sternatia, Castrignano dei Greci, Zollino. Unless otherwise indicated, the data discussed in this paper are from Calimera, Corigliano d’Otranto, Martano and Sternatia, and are contained in the database available at http://griko.project.uoi.gr/.
of this claim is the attested restriction on a particular verbal form inside subjunctive clauses. We implement the concord between complementizer and verb in terms of a syntactic agreement relation. The directionality of agreement is in this case upward, in the spirit of Zeijlstra (2012) and related work.

The attested morphosyntactic microvariation manifests itself in the syntax: SMG shows no mood concord, whereas Griko does. However, the locus of variation is arguably the lexicon, namely in the feature specification of particular functional elements. Our work thus bears on the question of the nature and locus of syntactic (micro)variation (lexicon, syntax, or PF), namely questions that have been at the forefront of (micro)comparative syntactic research (see e.g. Kayne 1996, Baker 2008, Barbiers 2009, 2013).

Interestingly, mood concord has been argued to exist also in Italo-Romance varieties spoken in the larger area of southern Italy, namely in Salentino and Calabrian (Damonte 2010). We propose that this is no accident; on the basis of different sets of data, including other Greek varieties, we argue that mood concord in Griko is a grammatical feature induced by contact with Salentino. Our work thus interests the body of research surrounding contact-induced change in general, and in particular relations between Italo-Greek and Italo-Romance (cf. Ledgeway 2013 and references therein).

Our paper is structured as follows: in section 2 we describe the properties of subjunctive clauses in SMG, and motivate the structure of their left periphery which we adopt, originally proposed by Roussou (2000). We also show that the distribution of verbal forms inside na-clauses is as expected, on the basis of the non-existence of a morphological category ‘subjunctive’. In Section 3 we turn to Griko, and show that na-clauses are very similar to those of SMG, except for the distribution of verbal morphology inside them. We argue that a particular aspectual form has been re-analyzed as subjunctive morphology in Griko, which thus encodes subjunctive mood in two ways: via the choice of complementizer and on the verb. In the spirit of Damonte (2010), we propose to analyze this as a manifestation of mood concord, i.e. as agreement in terms of mood features, which we implement in terms of Zeijlstra’s (2012) operation of Upward Agree. In section 4, we argue that mood concord arose in Griko through contact with Salentino, on the basis of
evidence from Salentino, but also from Medieval Greek and from Pontic Greek of Of (Turkey). Both varieties are relevant in ruling out other potential sources for the emergence of mood concord in Griko. Section 5 summarizes and concludes.

2 SUBJUNCTIVE IN SMG

As is well known, SMG lacks infinitives and employs finite complementation instead, which is a well-known feature of the Balkan Sprachbund (Joseph 1983, Terzi 1992, Rivero 1994). In the realm of complement clauses, *oti* introduces declaratives, *pu* factives and relative clauses, *na* so-called subjunctive complements, and *an* embedded interrogative clauses (as well as conditionals). The examples in (1)-(5) illustrate.

(1) Ksero oti o Janis agapai ti Maria.
    know.1SG that the Janis love.3SG the Maria
    ‘I know that Jani loves Maria.’

(2) Lipame pu i Maria den agapai to Jani.
    regret.1SG that the Maria NEG love.3SG the Jani
    ‘I regret that Maria doesn’t love Jani.’

(3) Pandreftike ton andra pu agapise.
    married.3SG the.ACC man.ACC REL loved.3SG
    ‘S/he married the man s/he loved.’

(4) I Eleni bori na agapai to Jani.
    the Eleni may.3SG SUBJ love.3SG the Jani
    ‘Eleni may love Jani.’

(5) Anarotjeme an i Eleni agapai to Jani.
    wonder.1SG if the Eleni love.3SG the Jani
    ‘I wonder if Eleni loves Jani.’

Subjunctive complements (or more neutrally *na*-complements, see below) occur under three main categories of verbs: modals, aspectuals and
volitionals. These categories appear in (6) (from Roussou 2009).²

(6) a. Modals: prepi ‘must’, bori ‘may’, ...
    b. Aspectuals: arxizo ‘start’, stamato ‘stop’, ...
    c. Volitionals: thelo ‘want’, protimo ‘prefer’, ...

In addition to the verbs in (6), which only embed na-complements, there are other classes of verbs which optionally do so; the classes of verbs in (7) (from Roussou 2009) may take a na- complement, or else an oti-, pu or an- complement, and the choice results in subtle semantic effects (see Roussou (2009:1814-1815) for some discussion). For instance, a perception verb taking a na-complement, as in (8a), yields a direct perception reading; when it takes an oti-complement, as in (8b), the interpretation is that of indirect perception (namely, deduction from available evidence) (Veloudis 2001). The two different interpretations are conveyed by the English translations. Additionally, in the presence of matrix negation or a question operator, na-clauses become available under e.g. epistemic predicates – an instance of the so-called polarity subjunctive (see Author 1998).

(7) a. Perception verbs: vlepo ‘see’, akuo ‘hear’, ...
    b. Verbs of mental perception: thimame ‘remember’, ksexno ‘forget’, ...
    c. Psych verbs: xerome ‘be glad’, lipame ‘regret’, ...
    d. Epistemic predicates: pistevo ‘believe’, nomizo ‘think’, ...
    e. Verbs of saying (directive interpretation): leo ‘say’, dhiatazo ‘order’, ...
    f. Verbs of knowing/ability: ksero ‘know’, matheno ‘learn’, ...

(8) a. Ida to Jani na troi stafilja.
    saw-1SG the Jani SUBJ eat-3SG grapes

² To these we should add causative kano ‘make’. This verb presumably belongs to category (6c), which Roussou (2009) re-labels, in the spirit of Holton et al. (2012), as ‘future-refering’ (see also Author 1998). Volitional predicates are a subset of this ‘future-refering’ category of verbs.
‘I saw Jani eating grapes.’

b. Ida oti o Janis efaje stafilia.
saw-1SG that the Jani ate-3SG grapes
‘I saw that Janis ate grapes.’

Finally, *na* is used in (unembedded) clauses that function as surrogate imperatives – especially in the context of negation, where morphological imperatives are banned in SMG.

Given the above considerations, it becomes clear that subjunctive is a misnomer in the context of SMG (as suggested also in Roussou 2009:1820), if by subjunctive one has in mind a semantic category, relating to intensionality (e.g. irrealis or non-veridicality). There is nothing intensional about a complement to an aspectual verb, for instance, or a complement to a direct perception predicate. More in general, it is not clear whether a uniform semantics for *na*-clauses is possible, even within a single language (e.g. Author 2009). We will therefore be discussing subjunctive mood in Modern Greek varieties (including Griko) as a morphosyntactic category, not a semantic one (though the issue of the semantics of *na*-clauses will be raised briefly again in section 3.2.2). We use the term ‘subjunctive’ as a well-established descriptive label for ease of reference.

2.1 **THE CATEGORIAL STATUS OF NA AND THE LEFT PERIPHERY OF EMBEDDED CLAUSES**

The categorial status of *na* has been a matter of considerable controversy in the literature on Greek morphosyntax. On the one hand, *na* has been treated as an inflectional particle realizing mood (Veloudis & Philippaki-Warburton 1983, Philippaki-Warburton 1992, 1998; Tsimpli, 1990; Terzi, 1992, Rivero, 1994). This view essentially aligns *na* with verbal particles such as modal *tha* and optative *as*. When these elements combine with a verb, e.g. the form *fiji* (whose temporal-aspectual specification we return to presently), *tha* yields a future interpretation, *na* introduces a surrogate imperative, and *as* an optative interpretation. As expected on this view, there is complementary distribution among these elements, shown in (10).
(9) a. Tha fiji.
   MOD leave-3SG
   ‘S/he will leave.’

   b. Na fiji.
   SUBJ leave-3SG
   ‘S/he should leave.’

   c. As fiji.
   OPT leave-3SG
   ‘Let her/him leave.’

(10) a. *Na tha/as fiji.
    MOD MOD MOD leave-3SG

   b. *Tha/as na fiji.
    MOD MOD SUBJ leave-3SG

Moreover, na, tha and as are similar in their requirement to appear adjacent to
the verb, from which they can be separated only by object clitics. Negative
mi(n) can also intervene between na and as and the verb. Here tha patterns
differently, in being negated by a different element, namely de(n), which
precedes the particle:

(11) a. Na min to pi.
    SUBJ NEG it say-3SG
    ‘S/he should not say it.’

   b. As min to pi.
    MOD NEG it say-3SG
    ‘Let her/him say it.’

   c. De tha to pi.
    NEG MOD it say-3SG
    ‘S/he will not say it.’

A different view holds that na is a complementizer, on a par with
declarative oti (Agouraki 1991, Tsoulas 1993). In support of this view is the
complementary distribution between na and oti (or conditional an ‘if’), shown
in (12b). Note that, in this, *na* is dissimilar from the modal particle *tha*, which can happily co-occur under *oti*, cf. (12a) from Roberts & Roussou (2003:76).

(12)  a. Apofasisa oti tha to aghoraso.
    decided-1SG that PRT it buy-1SG
    'I decided that I will buy it.'

 b. Apofasisa (*oti) na to aghoraso.
    decided-1SG that PRT it buy-1SG
    'I decided to buy it.'

However, *na* is not incompatible with all complementizers: it can co-exist with relative-*pu*, as shown in (13a). When it does, it yields an intensional interpretation of the nominal description. Thus, while the indefinite object is interpreted with specific reference (i.e., outside the scope of the intensional predicate *psaxno*) in (13b), in (13a), where the relative clause includes the subjunctive marker, it receives a non-specific, narrow-scope reading.

(13) a. Psaxno  ena spiti pu   na exi megalo kipo.
    search.1SG  a house that SUBJ has big garden
    'I am searching for a house that has a big garden.'

 b. Psaxno  ena spiti pu exi megalo kipo.
    search.1SG  a house that has big garden
    'I am searching for a house that has a big garden.'

A recent view that reconciles the two approaches to *na* has been advanced by Roussou (2000), within a Split-CP framework (Rizzi 1997). Roussou captures the data reviewed above by generating *na* in a lower C head, which encodes modality (whence the label CModal). This is the position where *tha* and as are also generated. From there, *na* (and as) raises to an intermediate COp head. The intermediate COp head is the position where declarative *oti* and interrogative/conditional *an* are merged. From this it follows that *nalas* can never co-occur with *otilan*. Finally, Roussou postulates a third C position, where *pu* is merged. Nothing rules out *pu na* sequences, which as we saw in (13) is a welcome prediction. Moreover, *oti* optionally moves to this highest C
position. Roussou’s proposed structure is given in (14):

\[(14) \quad [c\ pu\ [\text{Topic/Focus}\ [c_{\text{Op}}\ oti/\ an/\ na/\ as\ [\text{Neg}\ \delta e n/\ min\ [c_{\text{CM}}\ \theta a/\ t_{\text{na/\ as}}\ [\text{cl+V}\ldots\ ]]]]]]]

The structure in (14) successfully derives the word order facts in the presence of topicalized and focused material: as the following data from Roussou (2000: 76-78) show, whereas \textit{na} is strictly preceded by topicalized/focused material, \textit{pu} is strictly followed by such elements; \textit{oti} either follows or precedes topicalized/focused material.³

(15) a. Nomizo (ta mila) oti (ta mila) \(\delta e\ \theta a\ ta\ fai\)
think-1SG the apples that the apples NEG MOD them eat-3SG
\(\text{O Petros.}\)
\(\text{the Peter}\)
\(\text{‘The apples, I think Petros will not eat them.’}\)

b. Elpizo ta mila na (*ta mila) min ta fai o Petros.
hope-1SG the apples SUBJ *the apples not them eat-3SG the Peter
\(\text{‘The apples, I hope Petros won’t eat them.’}\)

³ Two aspects of Roussou’s proposal have been brought up to us as problematic by anonymous reviewers. The first one concerns the trigger for movement of the complementizers. See Roussou (2000:75) for comparative evidence in favour of this kind of movement. The second aspect of her analysis concerns the assumed fixed position of topics and foci (cf. Rizzi 1997). It is true that in Greek, quite generally, topics and foci show a greater degree of freedom than what is suggested by (14), in the sense that topicalized and focused constituents need not necessarily appear in the left periphery of the clause (see Tsimpi 1995, Author 2000, Gryllia 2009 for discussion of focus in particular). As far as the position of such material within the left periphery is concerned, however, \textit{oti}- and \textit{na}-clauses show a clear discrepancy, which (14) readily captures: only the former can be immediately followed by a topic or a focus. Since our main concerns here relate to the encoding of subjunctive mood and not to the phrase structure of Greek (complement) clauses on the whole, we will couch our proposal concerning \textit{na}-clauses within Roussou’s approach, and leave it to future research to further improve it. See also footnote 4.
c. Θελώνεινα αντανακλάνοντας την Αγγλική για την Αγγλική SUBJ την
μιλάει καλά.

‘They want an assistant who speaks English well.’

Since, according to the structure in (14), *pu* is generated in a different position
than *oti*/*na*, and one to which only *oti* optionally moves, the word order
patterns indicated in (15) are captured.4

2.2 THE DISTRIBUTION OF VERB FORMS IN NA-CLAUSES

After this brief overview of the external syntax and left periphery of na-
clauses, let us turn to their internal properties. The question we are interested
in is whether subjunctive is encoded not only on the complementizer, but also
on the verb in na-clauses, similarly to e.g. Romance languages (see
Ledgeway & Lombardi (2014) for a recent overview of the various possibilities
across Romance varieties). Here, the consensus is that in SMG, the only
mood distinction encoded on verbs is between Indicative and Imperative
(Veloudis & Philippaki-Warburton 1983; Holton et al. 2012, Roussou 2009 and
references therein), Indicative constituting the unmarked case. Crucially, the
distinction between Indicative and Subjunctive is not expressed on verbs. For
the purposes of morphology, then, the verbal form in na-clauses can be
considered Indicative (Lightfoot 1979, Tsangalidis 2002, Roussou 2009)
(since *na* cannot combine with the imperative forms).5

---

4 An anonymous reviewer asks whether the data above cannot be handled within an
approach that does not assume a split-CP. As the reviewer suggests, a non-
cartographic analysis would invoke not different C heads, but rather the different size
of different complement clauses (see for instance Todorovic & Wurmbrand 2015 for
such an analysis of Serbian complement clauses). To the best of our knowledge, a
non-cartographic analysis of the clause structure of Modern Greek has not yet been
undertaken. We agree with the reviewer that it would be extremely interesting to
investigate whether a non-cartographic analysis could capture the facts, but such an
endeavor is beyond the scope of this paper.

5 Alternatively, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, it may be historically more
Although mood distinctions are thus not robustly attested on SMG verbs, other grammatical distinctions are systematically present. Finite verbs inflect for voice, tense and aspect, and subject agreement. In terms of tense and aspect, more specifically, the distinctions SMG makes are between past and nonpast, and between perfective and imperfective, respectively. The combination of these tense and aspect values results in the four forms given in (16) from Holton et al. (2012:131) (ignoring the periphrastic compound tenses, which are formed with auxiliary ‘have’ and a non-finite verbal form):

(16)  

a. graf-o.  
write.IMPNONPAST-1SG
'I am writing.'
'I write (habitually).'

b. graps-o  
write.PERFNONPAST-1SG
DEPENDENT

c. egraf-a  
write.IMPAST-1SG
'I was writing.'
'I used to write (habitually).'

d. egraps-a  
write.PERFPAST-1SG

What is important for the purposes of our paper is that the morphological distinctions correspond to semantic categories in a predictable way (Rouchota 1994; Tsangalidis 1999; Roussou 2009, Author et al 2009). Perfective aspect is used for punctual events, imperfective aspect for habitual or ongoing events. Past tense forms relate to events which are temporally located prior to

accurate to talk not of an Indicative in SMG, but of a (modally) un(der)specified finite verb form. This would be consistent with a characterization of the SMG system in terms of the opposition between Imperative and Nonimperative (or default/unmarked).
utterance time, and non-past forms refer to events that are contemporaneous
or posterior with respect to utterance time. Of all forms in (16), the form in
(16b), which combines perfective aspect with non-past tense (aka the PNP),
is ungrammatical in isolation (requiring immediate precedence by one of the
particles *na, tha, as*, modal *isos* ‘perhaps’, or a temporal connective such as
*prin* ‘before’) — whence the characterization ‘dependent’ (Holton et al. 2012;
Tsangalidis 2002; Giannakidou 2009). Verbal forms such as the PNP are
known to be cross-linguistically special (and rare), in that the particular
combination of values they instantiate is, in a sense, contradictory: an event
rendered in perfective aspect entails completion, yet the non-past temporal
specification makes it at least incompatible with a present interpretation
(Smith 1997), since utterance time is conceptualized as a point and a point is
‘too small’ to contain completion of an event.6

That the four different verbal forms contribute distinct and predictable
temporal-aspectual interpretations can be shown on the basis of the following
data, where the verbal forms inside embedded *na*-clause alternate in terms of
tense and aspect. The interpretation of the matrix modal verb *bori* ‘may’ is
consistently epistemic (exclusively so in (18); see Author et al 2009 for
discussion). As is obvious, all verbal forms in (16) can surface inside the *na-
clause, giving rise to the expected interpretation (e.g. perfective is interpreted
as punctual, as in (17b)-(18b), and imperfective as habitual/generic or
progressive, as in (17a)-(18a), as indicated in the translations).

(17)  a. Bori * na grafi.
    * may.3SG SUBJ write.INP.3SG
    * ‘S/he may be writing (now).’
    * ‘S/he may write (habitually).’

     b. Bori * na grapsi.

---

6 In several languages, perfective non-past forms are interpreted as future tenses
(see Comrie 1976:66ff). In Greek, the PNP can indeed serve as a punctual future, as
long as it is accompanied by the modal particle *tha*. See Giannakidou (2009) and
Author et al (2009) for the claim that the distribution of the PNP follow from its
semantics, and in particular its purported temporal deficiency (cf. Tsangalidis 1999).
may.3SG  SUBJ  write.PNP.3SG
’S/he may write (in the future).’

(18) a. Bori  na  egrafe.
may.3SG  SUBJ  write.IP.3SG
’S/he may have been writing (progressively).’
’S/he may have been writing (habitually).’
b. Bori  na  egrapse.
may.3SG  SUBJ  write.PP.3SG
’S/he may have written.’

Summing up, what we have seen regarding SMG is that it encodes subjunctive mood syntactically, via the element na, and not through verbal morphology. Following Roussou (2000), na heads a lower CP and raises to a higher head in the left periphery. The finite verb within the na-clause bears tense and aspect morphology, both of which make distinct and semantically predictable contributions.

3  SUBJUNCTIVE IN GRIKO

In this section, we turn to Griko, which is quite similar to SMG in terms of the existence and distribution of na-clauses, as well as the tense and aspect distinctions encoded on finite verbs. Despite the attested similarities, however, we find a number of interesting diverging properties between the two languages, pointing to two closely related but different systems. In section 3.1 we discuss the complementation strategies of Griko, focusing specifically on the properties of subjunctive clauses. In section 3.2 we offer an analysis of subjunctive clauses that accounts for the differences with respect to the same category in SMG.

3.1 DISTRIBUTION

The major difference between SMG and Griko regarding the complementation system is that Griko displays some remnants of non-finite complementation: it
retains the infinitive as a complement to the modal ‘can’, as illustrated in (19) (see Baldissera 2013, Ledgeway 2013 for recent discussion and references)7:

(19)  Sodzo pai.
      can-1SG go-INF
      ‘I can go.’

Finite complementation involves predominantly the complementizer ka, borrowed from Salentino. In older texts the complementizer ti, corresponding to SMG otì, is also attested, but it has virtually disappeared from current Griko varieties (Baldissera 2013:118). Romance-based ka introduces declarative complements (20), relative clauses (21), complements to factive verbs (22), and adjunct clauses expressing cause (23) (we discuss the potential origin of ka in section 4.2):8

(20)  Itsere ka simmeri ixe na kami frisko.
      knew-3SG COMP today had SUBJ make-3SG cold
      ‘He knew that today it would be cold.’

(21)  Is doka o jiddho mu tis Paola, ka m’o
      she-GEN gave-1SG the dog my the-GEN Paola, COMP me-GEN it
      kratenni kala.
      keep-3SG well
      ‘I gave my dog to Paola, who will keep it well.’

7 According to Baldissera (2013b), the infinitive in Griko is also optionally found after spicceo ‘finish’, the other alternative being, unsurprisingly, a na-clause. Ledgeway (2013) argues that the optional infinitival complement is the result of borrowing from Romance.

8 It is interesting to note that Griko does not display the complementizer pu introducing the clausal argument of factive verbs, unlike SMG. According to Baldissera (2013a), in Griko pu is only used as an alternative complementizer introducing relative clauses. Its distribution vis-a-vis ka in such contexts is, however, not clear.
(22) I'm happy that it is raining today.

(23) He didn't come with us, because he doesn't like the sea when it's cold.

For finite complementation, Griko also employs na-clauses, whose distribution is very similar to the one we find in SMG, displaying both control and non-control patterns. The selecting contexts are displayed in (24)-(26), which are parallel to those reviewed for SMG in (6)-(7) above, namely volitionals with both non-control and control complements (24), ability predicates (25), modals (26a), aspectuals (26b), verbs of physical perception (26c), or verbs of mental perception (26d), among others.

(24) a. I wanted Karlo to come alone.

(25) Anna can swim very well.

(26) a. You must come at eight.

b. I finished writing.
c. ‘On itane na’rti.
   him see-3PL SUBJ come-3SG
   ‘They saw him coming.’

d. Allimonisamena’rtume ittu.
   forget-1PL SUBJ come-1PL here
   ‘We forgot to come here.’ (Baldissera 2013)

Na-clauses in Griko are also found in root contexts, just as in SMG, functioning as surrogate imperatives and hortatives:

(27) Kalimera na sas po.
   good.morning COMP you-PL say-PNP.1SG
   ‘Let me tell you “good morning”!’ (Morosi 1870:3)

Root subjunctives are also attested in the absence of na, introduced by other complementizer-like particles such as optative as or prohibitive mi(n), similarly to what we saw previously for SMG.

(28) a. As ertu ta korasiama.
   as come-PNP.3PL the virgin.PL-ours
   ‘Let our virgins come!’ (Comparetti 1866:60)

b. Min embi tossu ka e fotiasu me sicchei!
   neg enter-PNP.3SG herein COMP the fire-yours me dry-3SG
   ‘Don’t come in, because your fire dries me up!’
   (Comparetti 1866:50)

As for the verbal paradigm of simple forms, Griko has all forms found in SMG, i.e. it distinguishes between past/nonpast and perfective/imperfective in the verbal paradigm. The combinations give rise to the INP, IP, PNP and PP forms, as illustrated in (29) (cf. Karanastasis 1997:83-85). Characteristically, Griko lacks a future particle (cf. SMG tha). Futurity is expressed by the simple
present tense, namely the INP; in other words, the Griko INP, given in (29a),
is three-way ambiguous.\footnote{Futurity is also expressed in Griko via the form e’\textit{onna}, as indicated in (i) from Author et al (2013). For some details about the origin and possible analysis of this form, see Baldissera (2013a:32,115-117).}

(29)  a. graf-o. \hfill (INP)
      write.IMPNONPAST-1SG
      ‘I am writing’
      ‘I write (habitually).’
      ‘I will write’

b. grafs-o \hfill (PNP)
      write.PERFNONPAST-1SG

c. egraf-a \hfill (IP)
      write.IMPPAST-1SG
      ‘I was writing.’
      ‘I used to write (habitually).’

d. egrafs-a \hfill (PP)

\footnote{O chròno ka mbènni e’\textit{na fào poddhà glicèa.}
the year that enters has SUBJ eat.PNP-1SG many sweets
‘Next year I will eat a lot of sweets.’}

On its future use, e’\textit{onna} embeds the PNP as in (i) (see also discussion in main text). However, there is an epistemic use, indicated in (ii), where e’\textit{onna} can combine with a past tense (much like the modal particle \textit{tha} in SMG).

(ii) E’\textit{onna guikane.}
      has SUBJ go.out.PP-3PL
      ‘They must have gone out.’

We hypothesize that in (ii) we are dealing with an invariant epistemic marker that the original future periphrasis has grammaticalized into. This would confirm Baldissera’s (op.cit.) claim that \textit{onna} is invariant, but only for the epistemic use; data such as (20) show that as a future periphrasis e’\textit{onna} can vary. Such data confirm Baldissera’s claim that the form originates from a ‘have’-periphrasis.
There exists one major difference between SMG and Griko in the
distribution of the verbal forms above: while, as we saw in section 2, all four
simple forms can appear with na in SMG, in Griko na is only compatible with
the PNP (cf. Katsoyiannou 1995 for Grecanico). This holds even in contexts
where SMG shows INP under na exclusively for selectional reasons, e.g. in
aspectual periphrases, with ability modals, and in the na-complements to
perception verbs. The contrasting selectional restrictions between the two
varieties are shown in (30)-(32).

(30) a. Spitfetsa na polemiso/*polemo stes etse. (Grk)
    finished-1SG SUBJ work-PNP.1SG/work-INP.1SG at.the six
    'I finished working at six.'

b. Stamatisa na dulepso/dulevo stis eksi. (SMG)
    finished-1SG SUBJ work-PNP.1SG/work-INP.1SG at.the six
    'I stopped working at six.'

(31) a. En etsero na nateso/*nateo kala. (Grk)
    NEG know-1sg SUBJ swim-PNP.1SG/swim-INP.1SG well
    'I can’t swim well.'

b. Den ksero na *kolimbiso/kolimbo kala. (SMG)
    NEG know-1SG SUBJ swim-PNP.1SG/inP.1SG well
    'I can’t swim well.'

(32) a. ‘On itane na’ rti/*erkete. (Grk)
    him see-PP.3PL SUBJ come-PNP.3SG/ come-INP.3SG
    ‘They saw him coming.’

b. Ton idane na *rthi/ erxete. (SMG)
    him see-PP.3PL SUBJ come-PNP.3SG/ come-INP.3SG
    ‘They saw him coming.’

The robustness of the selection of the PNP form under na in Griko is
confirmed by the fact that the aspectual distinction perfective/imperfective is
neutralized even in contexts of habituality, where the PNP is the only possible
option again (cf. Baldissera 2013:118). Again, SMG diverges in only allowing
imperfective aspect in habitual contexts, as shown in (33b), (34b) and (35b).
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(33) a. Mu piatʃei na dziso/*dzo ittu. (Grk)
me-GEN please-3SG SUBJ live-PNP.1SG/live-INP.1SG here

b. Mu aresi na *ziso/zo edo. (SMG)
me-GEN please-3SG SUBJ live-PNP.1SG/live-INP.1SG here

'I like living here.'

(34) a. (Se kunsiljeo) na fai simmeri/ panta pleo laxano
you-ACC advise-1SG SUBJ eat-PNP.2SG today/ always more vegetable
tʃe pleon olio krea. (Grk)
and more less meat

'I advise you to today/generally eat more vegetables and less meat.'

b. (Se simvulevo) na *fas/ tros panda perisotera
you-ACC advise-1SG SUBJ eat-PNP.2SG/eat-INP.2SG always more
laxanika ke lijotero kreas. (SMG)
vegetables and less meat

'I advise you to always eat more vegetables and less meat.'

(35) a. Ifonasa mian ghineka na pulidzedzi e skale
called-PP.1SG a woman SUBJ clean-PNP.3SG the.ACC stairs
avri/ kai addoma. (Grk)
tomorrow/every week

'I hired a woman to clean the stairs tomorrow/every week.'

b. Proselava mia jineka na *katharisi/katharizi tis skales
hired-1SG a woman SUBJ clean-PNP.3SG/clean-INP.3SG the stairs
mia fora ti evdomada. (SMG)
one time the week

'I hired a woman to clean the stairs once a week.'

Crucially, the neutralization of the aspectual contrast between imperfective and perfective forms in Griko is restricted to na-clases. The perfective-imperfective distinction is present in indicative contexts, as witnessed in examples (36) and (37), which express habituality in the past, and where past imperfective (IP) verbal forms are the only option.

(36) Motte isamo pedi, *epirta/ ibbionna na xoretso
when was.1SG child went-PP.1SG/went.-IP.1SG  SUBJ dance-PNP.1SG
kai samba.
every saturday
'When I was a child, I used to go dancing every Saturday.'
(37)  Persi *pulidzesamo/ pulidzeamo to spiti      panta  to samba.
last year clean-PP.1PL/ clean-IP.1PL the house always  the Saturday
'Last year we used to clean the house every Saturday.'

Despite the close similarities between SMG and Griko in clausal complementation, we thus observe a crucial difference, which needs to be accounted for: *na in Griko exclusively combines with the PNP in Griko, ruling out the combinations *na + INP, * na + PP and * na + IP, all of which are licit in SMG. This means that, to derive the distribution of verbal forms in Griko na-clauses, it simply does not suffice to simply deem na the subjunctive complementizer. In the next section we propose an analysis of subjunctive clauses that accounts for the contrasting behaviour in the two varieties in this domain of their morphosyntax.

3.2 ANALYSIS
3.2.1 PHRASE STRUCTURE
Like SMG na, we take Griko na to be a low complementizer, encoding subjunctive mood. For the left periphery of SMG embedded clauses we assumed, following Roussou (2000), the structure in (38), repeated from section 2. The complementary distribution between na and oti follows from the fact that na moves to the position where oti is base-generated, namely COp in Roussou’s terms. Pu is generated in an even higher position, C. Oti optionally moves to this higher C position.

(38)  [C pu [Topic/Focus [Cop otilan/nal/ as [Neg δen/min [CM θa/lna/as [i cl+V… ]]]]]

As discussed in section 2, the third C-position postulated for SMG by Roussou (2000) allows her to capture the fact that topicalized and focused
material either precede or follow oti, whereas they obligatorily follow pu and precede na. The relevant data are repeated in (39).

(39) a. Nomizo (ta mila) oti (ta mila) δεν θα ta fai o Petros.
   ‘The apples, I think Petros will not eat them.’

b. Elpizo ta mila na (*ta mila) min ta fai o Petros
   ‘The apples, I hope Petros won’t eat them.’

   c. θελον ena voiθo (*ta aglika) pu ta aglika
   ‘They want an assistant who speaks English well’

Turning now to Griko, no differences seem to exist with respect to the structural position of na: as noted by Baldissera (2013a), Griko na is like SMG na, in that it precedes negation and follows focused material:

(40) O iljo ampi sto fengo ivarti na min di.
   ‘The sun fell behind the moon, in order not to see.’ (Morosi 1870:37)

(41) Telo E MARIA na’rti avvri, en o Mario.
   ‘I want MARIA to come tomorrow, not Mario.’ (Baldissera 2013:120)

Griko ka, however, is different from SMG oti: ka strictly precedes focalized constituents, cf. (42) from Author et al. (2009) (see also Baldissera (op.cit: 118-9):

(42) Pisteo ka O TjIURI-SSA telefanese, en o tjiuri-mma.
   ‘I believe it was your father that called, not ours.’
To capture this difference between *ka* and *oti*, we propose that *ka* is base-generated in the position where *oti* is, but unlike *oti*, *ka* obligatorily moves to C. This is reflected in our proposed structure in (43).

\[\begin{align*}
(43) & \quad [c \text{Topic/Focus} \cop \text{t$_{ka}$/}na \text{Neg/}min \text{CM} \text{t$_{na}$ [i cl+V... ]]}]
\end{align*}\]

The proposed structure predicts that *ka* and *na*, like *oti* and *na*, never co-occur. This is correct.\(^\text{10}\) In contrast to SMG, where as we have already seen *pu* and *na* co-occur in intensional relatives (see (45) repeated from above), in Griko intensional relatives disallow the co-occurrence of *ka* and *na*, regardless of whether the PNP is used; intensional relatives can only be feature *ka* in combination with the simple present tense (aka the INP), as shown in (44).\(^\text{11}\)

\(^\text{10}\) Baldissera (2013a:121) reports instances such as (i) below, which are not stable across her informants (personal communication, and Baldissera 2013a:123-124). Our speakers, though, have not confirmed this judgment, so this seems to be a variable pattern vis-à-vis the one without *ka*.

\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad \text{Telo ka i Maria na'rti avri.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{want-1SG comp the Maria subj come-3SG tomorrow}
\end{align*}

'I want for Maria to come tomorrow.'

To accommodate data such as (i), one could say that *ka* does not actually move to C from \(\cop\), but is base-generated there, a position which is consistent with the parallel data of recomplementation in Grekanico and Salentino, as an anonymous reviewer points out. This, however, presents *ka* \(\text{na}\) in a way that does not correspond to the unstable distribution across speakers, as suggested also by the discussion in the main text. The only generally accepted co-occurrence of *ka* with *na* that we have encountered is in the syntagm *prita* (\(\text{ka}\)) \(\text{na}\) ‘before’, which we discuss in section 4.2. Arguably, this involves a complex C head *prita* \(\text{ka}\), or an adverb *prita* external to the entire embedded CP.

\(^\text{11}\) That intensional relatives as in (44a) employ the simple present tense (the INP) in Griko suggests a modal analysis of this particular verbal form. This is hardly surprising, given that, as we have mentioned already, the INP systematically also functions as a future tense in Griko.
(44) a. Pao tjerkeonda ena makina ka (*na) kunsumei oli benzina. (Grk)
   go-1SG searching a car COMP SUBJ consume-3SG.INP little petrol
   ‘I’m looking for a car that consumes little petrol.’

b. *Pao tjerkeonda ena makina ka (na) kunsumezzeli oli benzina.
   go-1SG searching a car COMP SUBJ consume-3SG.PNP little petrol
   ‘I’m looking for a car that consumes little petrol.’

(45) Psaxno ena spiti pu na exi megalo kipo. (SMG)
   search.1SG a house that SUBJ has big garden
   ‘I am searching for a house that has a big garden.’

Summing up, we have argued that the left periphery of embedded clauses in Griko is very similar to that of SMG, the differences relating to the higher portion of the left periphery, and in particular to the position of ka. In terms of the position na occupies in the clausal spine, no differences were found which could be implicated in the different relations na bears to verbal forms inside its clause in SMG and in Griko. We claim that the exclusive relation that Griko na entertains with the PNP follows from the characterization of the latter as a verbal subjunctive form. We articulate this claim in the next section.

3.2.2 MOOD CONCORD IN GRIKO

To derive the distribution of verbal forms inside na-clauses in Griko, we propose that in this language, subjunctive mood is encoded not only in the complementerizer, as it is in SMG, but on verbal forms as well: unlike SMG, Griko encodes subjunctive mood in the verbal inflection and in particular in the PNP. That verbal subjunctive marking may obtain through the loss of inflectional oppositions is not unexpected; it is an old observation that in the context of subjunctive clauses temporal oppositions are typically reduced with respect to indicative (main) clauses (e.g. Picallo 1985). Our claim therefore is that subjunctive marking is encoded through the neutralization of aspectual oppositions. If subjunctive in Griko is encoded on both the complementerizer and the verb, i.e. the PNP, the two elements are in a relation of concord in
terms of mood (cf. Damonte 2010). We explicate the details of this relation immediately below.¹²

We conceive of mood concord as syntactic agreement in terms of a morphosyntactic feature which we dub [Subj]. Recall that throughout the paper we have been treating subjunctive mood in Greek as a morphosyntactic category, and have abstained from characterizing the semantics of na-clauses (though see below). The syntactic relation Agree involves two elements, one of which bears an interpretable feature and the other a matching uninterpretable feature. In a series of publications, Zeijlstra (2012, 2014) has argued that the directionality of the syntactic operation Agree is not the one envisaged by Chomsky (2000, 2001) and most minimalist literature (see also Wurmbrand (2012a,b, 2014), and Bjorkman & Zeijlstra (2014)). In particular, Zeijlstra has argued for what he calls upward Agree as in (46) from Bjorkman & Zeijlstra (2014) citing Zeijlstra (2012):

(46) Upward Agree: α can Agree with β iff:

a. α carries at least one uninterpretable feature and β carries a matching interpretable feature;

b. β c-commands α;

c. β is the closest goal to α

On this conception of Agree, the operation takes place between a probe that carries an uninterpretable feature and a goal that carries a matching interpretable feature, where the goal c-commands the probe and not vice versa. In other words, the element bearing the uninterpretable feature probes

¹² The idea that mood concord is at play has been proposed by Damonte (2010) for Salentino, the Romance variety spoken in the area of Grecia Salentina (see also Rivero 1988; Calabrese 1993). Capitalizing on the double marking of mood in Salentino, both on the complementizer and on the verbal form, Damonte proposes that the relevant mood feature is spelled out both in Fin⁰ (within the CP domain) and on Mood⁰ (within the IP domain). We have been inspired by this proposal, but we depart from it in terms of technical execution. In section 4, we argue that mood concord arose in Griko precisely as a result of contact with Salentino.
upwards (hence the term ‘Upward Agree’). There is an ongoing debate as to 
whether this is the only way to Agree (see Zeijlstra 2012, Bjorkman & Zeijlstra 
2014, Preminger 2013, Preminger & Polinsky 2015 for discussion); we will not 
address this issue here, but will assume that Upward Agree is an option 
allowed by grammar, at least for concord phenomena (if not for phi-
agreement).

If mood concord is to be analyzed as agreement in terms of a formal 
feature, it is important to ask which element bears [iSubj] and which one bears 
[uSubj] in the varieties under discussion. The most natural rendition, within a 
feature-based system, of the claim that SMG expresses subjunctive mood 
syntactically, via selection of na, is to assign [iSubj] to this element; the same 
applies to Griko. In other words, [iSubj] is part of na’s feature specification in 
SMG and also in Griko. What is special about Griko, we propose, is that there 
is a verbal form bearing [uSubj]. This form is the PNP. Na enters an Agree 
relation with this form, along the lines of (45). By contrast, no verbal form 
bears a [uSubj] feature in SMG. Since only [iSubj] is instantiated in SMG, no 
Agree in terms of mood is established in this variety. The proposed difference 
in feature specification is summarized in (46) and (47) below. On our 
proposal, it is precisely the composition of particular elements (such as 
inflectional morphemes in the case at hand) that is ultimately responsible for 
the observed morphosyntactic microvariation.

(46) Partial feature specification (SMG)
na: [iSubj]
PNP: [ ]

(47) Partial feature specification (Griko)
na: [iSubj]
PNP: [uSubj]

From the feature specification above, it follows that na can combine with 
any verbal form in SMG: since no verbal form bears an [uSubj] feature in 
SMG, any form can occur under na. Moreover, it follows that the PNP in Griko 
makes necessary the presence of na: since the PNP bears [uSubj], it can only
legitimately occur in the context of a c-commanding Goal bearing [iSubj], i.e. *na*.\(^{13}\) Finally, on the assumption that subjunctive forms are in competition with indicative forms, i.e. that there is a corresponding [uIndic] feature on non-PNP forms, the latter are incompatible with *na*, which bears [iSubj]. This means in essence that, whenever *na* occurs, the PNP is obligatory.\(^{14}\)

A reasonable question to ask is whether mood concord could be implemented within a more traditional conception of Agree, where the directionality of the Agree relation is downwards. On this view, SMG would be analyzed in the same way as above: *na* would carry [iSubj], and no element would instantiate [uSubj]. Griko, on the other hand, would be characterized differently: *na* would bear [uSubj] and the PNP [iSubj]. In our view, the

\(^{13}\) In fact, in Griko, as in SMG, *na* is not the sole element that bears [iSubj]. We have already seen that other complementizer-like particles, such as optative as or prohibitive *mi(n)* occur in root contexts in both varieties. What is different is, as expected, the distribution of verbal forms inside these clauses: it is free in SMG, and restricted in Griko. In the Griko examples in (i) repeated from section 3.1, as and *min* obligatorily embed the same form as *na* does, namely the PNP.

(i) a. As ertu ta korasiama.
   as come-PNP.3PL the virgin.PL-ours
   ‘Let our virgins come!’ (Comparetti 1866:60)

   b. Min embi tossu ka e fotiasu me sicchei!
   neg enter-PNP.3SG herein COMP the fire-yours me dry-3SG
   ‘Don’t come in, because your fire dries me up!’
   (Comparetti 1866:50)

\(^{14}\) An alternative explored for SMG in Authors (2015) is closer to Zeijlstra’s (2004) analysis of negative concord in strict negative concord languages like Polish, where both n-words and the sentential negative marker bear a [uNeg] feature and are licensed by a covert negative operator bearing [iNeg]. In particular, the alternative explored in Authors (2015) is that *na* in SMG bears not [iSubj], but [uSubj]. The bearer of [iSubj] is a potentially covert element, which which *na* agrees. This means that the relevant (subjunctive) semantics is to be located in e.g. the predicate selecting the *na*-clause, and not in *na* itself. For our current purposes, this alternative would entail that the difference between Griko and SMG reduces not to the (un)availability of mood concord – since both varieties would involve agreement in terms of mood – but merely to the feature specification of PNP forms.
differences are not merely a matter of technical implementation, since on this alternative two important undesirable consequences obtain. Firstly, the system of Griko and of SMG now look completely different, while the parallel distribution of *na*-clauses, as discussed in the preceding sections, is quite robust. Secondly, on the plausible assumption that the bearer of [iSubj] is the locus of the relevant semantics, [iSubj] on V-T would fail to deliver the C-level scope required for semantic reasons, mood being a clausal-level property.\(^{15}\)

To sum up, our proposal about Griko subjunctives contains two main ingredients: (a) the characterization of PNP forms as subjunctive morphology and (b) the workings of Upward Agree as a means to capture the concord relation between *na* and the PNP in this variety. No morphosyntactic agreement exists in SMG, because no verbal form is endowed with an uninterpretable subjunctive feature. This derives the free distribution of verbs inside *na*-clauses in SMG, and the restriction on PNP forms in Griko.

In the next section, we explore the possible origin of mood concord in Griko and propose that it is a contact-induced grammatical feature, which came about as a result of contact with Salentino.

**4 MOOD CONCORD AS A CONTACT-INDUCED FEATURE**

In this section, we propose that mood concord in Griko is a grammatical feature induced by contact with Salentino, the local Romance variety spoken in the area that includes Grecìa Salentina. The idea that language contact can result in borrowing of not just lexical items, but of grammatical features too is not new (see among many others Thomason & Kaufmann 1998 and Heine & Kuteva 2005). In fact, a number of grammatical features of the southern Romance varieties, such as for instance one of the central features associated with the Balkan Sprachbund, namely the loss of the infinitive and the more extensive use of finite complementation, have been claimed to originate in the Greek varieties spoken in the area (Rohlfs 1924, 1933, 1967). If we are right about mood concord in Griko, it follows that borrowing of

\(^{15}\) A potential way to address the latter point would be to invoke some mechanism of feature inheritance such as the one proposed by Ouali (2008), as suggested by an anonymous reviewer.
grammatical features proceeded in both directions: from Greek to Romance, but also from Romance into Greek. The bi-directionality of contact between Italo-Greek and Italo-Romance has in fact been independently explored in Ledgeway (2013), who highlights that Greek and Romance have been spoken alongside each other in Southern Italy for centuries, in a complex linguistic situation of diglossia and enduring bilingualism. Ledgeway (op. cit.) schematizes the purported bi-directionality of contact-induced change in Southern Italy in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Directionality of change: Ledgeway (2013)](image)

In order to support the claim that the emergence of mood concord in Griko is due to contact with Salentino, we adduce evidence of three sorts: first, we rule out that mood concord existed in a prior diachronic stage of Greek, to which Griko can be linked (section 4.1). Second, we point to the similarities between Griko and Salentino especially in terms of the encoding of mood and the periphery of embedded clauses (section 4.2). Thirdly, we return to Greek and in particular to another Greek dialect, Pontic of Of, which bears interesting similarities to Griko (section 4.3). Despite these similarities, we show that Pontic of Of lacks mood concord. This lends additional plausibility to the claim that this particular way of encoding subjunctive mood in Griko arose as a result of contact with Salentino.
4.1 MEDIEVAL GREEK

Before we focus on the most relevant diachronic stage in the development of Greek, namely Medieval Greek, we provide a brief overview of the diachrony of mood in Greek.

As we saw in section 2, SMG encodes subjunctive mood syntactically. In Classical Greek, by contrast, mood distinctions (indicative, subjunctive, optative, imperative) were encoded morphologically. This changed in the period of Hellenistic and Roman Koine (3rd century BC to 4th century AD): in this period, the optative is lost and the distinction between indicative and subjunctive is no longer encoded in verbal morphology (Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos 2004; Roberts & Roussou 2003). In particular, according to Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos (2004:799) already by the first century AD verb forms no longer encode the distinction between indicative and subjunctive. As a result of deflection of the verbal forms, hina, a complementizer hitherto used to introduce purpose clauses, becomes re-analyzed as a subjunctive particle. Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos (op.cit.) propose that the loss of the morphological distinction led to the emergence of a designated Mood projection, the head of which does not host verbal elements, but rather (reflects the feature specification of) complementizers.16

Our claim regarding the encoding of mood in Griko is tantamount to a re-emergence of the indicative-subjunctive distinction in Griko verbal morphology. The change took place well after the initial loss of the indicative-subjunctive morphological distinction and, as we suggest here, through contact with Salentino. An alternative would be that the morphological distinction, and the operation of mood-concord, was inherited by Griko from its Greek ancestor, which is arguably Medieval Greek.17 However, as we will show, no case can be made for the existence of mood concord in Medieval Greek.

---

16 For a slightly different view, involving no categorial change from hina to na, see Roberts & Roussou (2003:84-87).

17 The relevance of Medieval Greek derives from the currently most widely accepted view (e.g. Manolessou 2005, Ledgeway 2013), according to which Griko dates back to early Byzantine times.
Greek. In particular, on the basis of Markopoulos (2005), it can be shown that in this period, namely between 11th and 15th centuries, following Markopoulos (op.cit), *na* shows both a wider distribution in comparison to SMG and Griko as well as no evidence of participating in a relation of mood concord.

Regarding the first property of *na* in Medieval Greek (henceforth MedGr), example (48) shows that *na* in this period is not in complementary distribution with *oti* (and thus the two elements are not occupying the same position):\(^{18}\)

(48) An thelis oti na to piisis, …

if want-\(\text{INP.2SG}\) that SUBJ it do-\(\text{PNP.2SG}\)

'If you want to do this' *(Chronicle of Morea, 466)*

Moreover, *na* can co-occur with the precursor of modal *tha*, namely the *na*, as (49) shows:

(49) Den en megali mas lolia na the n’ aganaktume?

NEG is great ours folly SUBJ FUT SUBJ be.distraught-\(\text{INP.1PL}\)

'Wouldn’t it be a great folly for us to be distraught [over this]?'

*(Falieros, Rima Parigoritiki, 46)*

Regarding the verb form inside *na*-clauses, in (48) we see the familiar PNP, but not exclusively. In (49) *na* co-occurs with a verb marked as imperfective-non.past. In this connection, (50) is also relevant, where *na* combines with an imperfective-past:

(50) Pote na min esholazen, an ezi hiljus xronus.

never SUBJ NEG finished-\(\text{IP.3SG}\) if lived-\(\text{IP.3SG}\) thousand years

‘He would never finish, even if he lived for a thousand years.’

*(Sachlikes, 436)*

\(^{18}\) It seems that, whenever *na* co-occurs with *oti*, it has a future interpretation (unavailable both to SMG and to Griko).
In other words, *na* shows no exclusive relation with PNP. This, in our terms, means that no mood concord occurs in MedGr. Therefore, a different source for the particular encoding of subjunctive mood in Griko is required.

### 4.2 Mood Concord in Salentino

In this section we propose that verbal mood marking and mood concord in Griko is a feature induced by contact with Salentino. This claim is consonant with the long-standing bilingual status of the Griko speaking communities (see Ledgeway 2013). To support our claim, we highlight the similarities between Griko and Salentino with respect to the double marking of subjunctive mood, and we also point to another domain of contact-induced change in clausal complementation in Griko.

Southern Italo-Romance dialects are well-known for the fact that they display dual complementizer systems reflecting mood distinctions. This in fact has been one of the central properties of southern Italian dialects which are considered as borrowings from Greek varieties (e.g. Rohlfs 1969). Salentino, the Romance variety spoken in Grecìa Salentina, offers an instance of such a dual complementizer system, whereby the complementizer *cu* introduces subjunctive clauses and the complementizer *ca* indicative ones. An illustration of this pattern is shown in (51) and (52), adapted from Calabrese (1993):

(51) Lu Karlu ole cu bbene krai. (Salentino)
    the Karlu want-3SG SUBJ come-3SG tomorrow.
    ‘Karlu wants to come tomorrow.’

(52) Kriar ca addʒu raddʒone. (Salentino)
    believe-1SG that have-1SG reason
    ‘I believe to be right.’

According to Ledgeway (2005) and Bertocci & Damonte (2007), some present-day Salentino varieties exhibit, in addition to the specialized subjunctive complementizer *cu*, morphological subjunctive on the verb, as shown in (53). In some of these dialects overt subjunctive morphology is limited to some persons of the auxiliaries ‘have’ and ‘be’, while in others it also
appears with some lexical irregular verbs such as ‘come’, or with regular ones like ‘respond’ (Bertocci & Damonte 2007). These authors also note that the area where subjunctive morphology is most productive is central Salento, roughly corresponding to Grecìa Salentina, where Griko is spoken. Ledgeway (2005) also points out that Salentino varieties are unique among southern Italo-Romance in preserving subjunctive forms.19

(53) Ulia *ca/ cu bbegna qualchedunu. (Salentino)

wanted.1SG that.IND/that.SUBJ come-SUBJ.3SG someone

‘I wanted someone to come.’

The fact that Salentino appears to flag subjunctive clauses with both the specialized complementizer *cu and on the verb led Damonte (2010), building on Rivero (1988) and Calabrese (1993), to propose that the language displays

19 Interestingly, Ledgeway (in press) proposes that the Salentino verbal form appearing under *cu, the subjunctive complementizer, is always marked for subjunctive, irrespective of its subjunctive or indicative endings. Ledgeway observes that *cu (and its covert counterpart, according to his analysis) triggers raddoppiamento fonosintattico ‘phonosyntactic doubling’ in central-southern varieties of Salentino, regardless of whether the verbal form bears subjunctive or indicative morphology. An example of this phenomenon is given in (i), where the initial consonant of the verb is reduplicated as a consequence of the co-occurrence with the subjunctive *Cº *cu under the right structural configuration (simple linear adjacency cannot account for it; cf. Ledgeway 2009). Ledgeway takes this doubling/lengthening to be the PF-reflex of ‘irrealis’ mood synchronically. From this perspective the actual marking in e.g. (i) – or (53) for that matter – is the doubled initial consonant, not the verb ending, which can alternate between indicative and subjunctive in some varieties.

(i) Lu Karlu ole cu bbene/ bbegna krai. (Salentino)

the Karlu want-3SG that come-IND/SUBJ.3SG tomorrow.

‘Karlu wants to come tomorrow.’ (Calabrese 1993: 28, 80)

If this is the right analysis of phonosyntactic doubling in these varieties, then the degree to which distinct verbal endings for the subjunctive survive is irrelevant to determining whether the varieties in question encode subjunctive morphologically.
a phenomenon of mood concord, construed as ‘activation’ of different portions
of the clause, CP and IP, for the encoding of mood. In Damonte’s analysis, an
Agree relation is established between Fin⁰ in the CP-domain and the
dedicated head Mood⁰ in the IP-domain. The obvious parallelism with this
situation in Griko has inspired the analysis of Griko subjunctive clauses
presented in section 3.2. For concreteness, we provide Damonte’s proposal
for Salentino in (54), where the ‘activation’ of mood features in the projection
hosting the head is signaled by ‘+mood’, and we repeat our proposed
structure from Griko in (55) (= (43) above):^{20}

(54) \[
\text{[ForceP ca [TopicP [FocusP [FinP cu [TP … [MoodP +mood ]]])]]}
\]

(55) \[
\text{[C ka [Topic/Focus [Cop t_{ka}/na [Neg en/min [CM t_{na} [\cl+V… ]]]]]]]}
\]

The crucial similarity between Griko and Salentino from our perspective is
the double marking of subjunctive mood, in the choice of complementizer and
on the verbal morphology, as a result of the Agree relation between the V-T
and the C heads. The question that needs to be addressed is how this
similarity in the two independent grammatical systems can be accounted for.
A plausible hypothesis based on the data available is that while Greek had
lost the morphological distinction between indicative and subjunctive on the
verb in the postclassical period, the distinction reentered the system of Griko
through intensive contact with the relevant Salentino varieties, and it did so by
reusing aspectual morphology: the PNP forms became re-analyzed as
subjunctive marked forms.

What turns out to be highly relevant for the contact hypothesis is that Early

^{20} Labels on C-heads differ, as Damonte is closer to Rizzi (1997) than Roussou
(2000) is, whom we have largely followed. Also, on Roussou’s proposal, movement
of the C-heads is employed to derive the complementary distribution between them.
These analytical differences aside, there are subtle empirical differences between cu
and na, an example of which we can only note here: only cu is omissible. See
Calabrese (1993), Terzi (1996), and Damonte (2010) for Salentino, and Baldissera
(2013a) for Griko.
Salentino appears to have a dual complementizer system that systematically correlates with the morphology on the verb: while ca always cooccurs with indicative forms, cu requires subjunctive morphology, as illustrated in (56) from Il libro di Sidrac salentino (15th century, Sgrilli) (apud Ledgeway 2005). The observed overt concord between the specialized subjunctive complementizer and the subjunctive morphology on the verb already at this stage of the history of Salentino (or possibly earlier) must have been the trigger for the specialization of aspectual morphology in Griko (the PNP) as a marker of subjunctive verbal morphology, where the C-head na and the verb entertain a concord relation. It is in this earlier stages of Salentino and Griko, that the contact-induced reanalysis of the Salentino PNP must have taken place.

(56) Commandao cu doy fossero uno.    (Early Salentino)
command-PST.3SG that two be.SUBJ-PST.3PL one
‘He commanded that two should be one.’

Next to the mood concord in subjunctive clauses, a further empirical argument for contact between the two varieties comes from the commonalities observed in their (higher) left periphery. As we saw in section 3.1, Griko employs in a variety of syntactic contexts the complementizer ka, which itself is a calque from Romance. The fact that this complementizer is used as an all-purpose one is a consequence of the general expansion of the higher complementizer che from declarative to all-purpose in Italo-Romance dialects (see Ledgeway 2009). A clear example of this is found in the complex complementizer introducing ‘before’-clauses: the complementizer has the form prita ka na in Griko (57). This directly parallels the complex element prima cu of Salentino, in (58), and the equivalent in Standard Italian prima che, given in (59).

---

21 Here we put aside the complexities of the distribution of che vis-à-vis ca and cu. For details and an analysis that is concordant with the basic fact on subjunctive morphology distribution, see Ledgeway (2005).
Although more research is needed in this domain systematically comparing Griko and Salentino, the evidence discussed in this section strongly supports the idea that language contact between the two varieties resulted in mutual borrowing of a grammatical agreement relation. This contact arguably shaped the morphological expression of subjunctive clauses not only through the emergence of a specialized complementizer cu in Salentino, as is standardly assumed, but also with the specialization of perfective non-past morphology in the Griko verb for encoding subjunctive mood on the verb. As Ledgeway & Lombardi (2014) have convincingly shown, despite the quite generalized loss of subjunctive morphology across southern Italian dialects and of dual complementizer systems in the Upper South, subjunctive/irrealis clauses are systematically marked by the distinct syntactic distribution of complementizer and verbal heads. The robustness of the mood distinction across Romance varieties in the region arguably underlies the marking of subjunctive on the verb in Italo-Greek varieties.22

---

22 Grecanico (or Greko), the Italo-Greek variety of Southern Calabria, also only displays the PNP form under na (as noted by Katsoyannou 1995). Although further detailed research on the varieties in question needs to be carried out, contact between Grecanico and Calabrian, the Italo-Romance dialect spoken in the corresponding area, can be argued to have led to the specialization of the PNP for
4.3 PONTIC GREEK OF OF

Finally, we return to varieties of Greek and briefly examine na-clauses in Pontic of Of (henceforth PGr), which is a Modern Greek dialect of Asia Minor still spoken in present-day Turkey. PGr has most recently been investigated by Sitaridou (2014 (a), (b)); in what follows we base ourselves on Sitaridou’s empirical findings.

PGr is relevant, because it bears interesting similarities with Griko, without it being possible that they derive from contact with Romance. After all, PGr is spoken in the eastern extreme of the Greek-speaking language zone. In PGr too, there is no ‘future’ tha particle. Moreover the infinitive is retained in limited environments (though its distribution does not coincide with the one attested in Italo-Greek; see Mackridge (1987) and Sitaridou 2014(b) for discussion). Finally, na-clauses seem at first sight to favour certain aspectual types (though see below for a more accurate description). The question is whether we see mood concord of the sort attested in Griko in PGr. If mood concord exists in PGr, the plausibility of our claim that it arose in Griko through contact with Salentino is weakened: either mood concord, for some reason, arises in contact situations in general, or it possibly arose (in Griko and maybe also in PGr) independently, due to language-internal processes. We will argue that despite surface similarities with Griko, the system of PGr is quite different. Thus, by eliminating in principle plausible alternatives as to how mood concord arose in Griko, we provide independent – albeit admittedly indirect – support to the claim that mood concord arose in Griko as a result precisely of contact with Salentino.

Subjunctive marking on the verb here as well. See Damonte (2010) for discussion of double subjunctive marking in southern Calabrian.

A related third possibility, brought up by an anonymous reviewer, is that mood concord occurred in both Griko and PGr as a result of systematic change observed in Greek dialects. We find it highly unlikely that this kind of systematic change could affect Griko and PGr, given the geographical distance as well as the different contact situations relating to the two varieties.
The distribution of *na*-clauses in PGr is similar to that of SMG and Griko; they occur as complements to modals, volitionals, mental perception verbs, and causatives (all data below from Sitaridou 2014 (a)):

(60)  

a. U poro n’ almeɣo.
   NEG can-1SG SUBJ milk-INP.1SG
   ‘I cannot milk (the cows).’

b. Esi θelis θγ ho he na troɣo.
   you want-2SG I NEG SUBJ eat-INP.1SG
   ‘You don’t want me to eat.’

c. Enespala na ɣeɣo ti mami ta xaberæ.
   forgot-1SG SUBJ say-INP.1SG the grandmother the news
   ‘I forgot to tell the news to the grandmother.’

d. Efikane sas na skaftete ta xorafæ-suna.
   let-3PL you-ACC SUBJ dig-INP.2PL the fields.his
   ‘They let you dig his fields.’

Regarding the distribution of verbal forms in *na*-clauses, PGr seems different from both SMG and Griko: in all *na*-clauses in (60), it is the INP that occurs. This is so even on an episodic (i.e. non-habitual) interpretation, such as the one conveyed in (60b), where SMG would employ the PNP. The question is whether it could be that in PGr INP is reinterpreted as subjunctive morphology, and *na*+INP is the realization of mood concord. We maintain that this is not the case, and that PGr is in fact closer to SMG than to Griko, in terms of the realization of the category ‘subjunctive’.

The most compelling argument that mood concord is not operative in PGr comes from the existence of data where it is not INP that shows up after *na*,

---

24 Two anonymous reviewers point out that this kind of indicative-subjunctive syncretism is familiar from other languages, such as e.g. Serbian, or most modern Romance dialects of Southern Italy, where the simple present tense (i.e. our INP) shows up in subjunctive contexts. Given the empirical evidence we have from PGr, which we discuss in the main text, this does not seem to be the correct approach to the encoding of subjunctive mood in the variety in question.
but a different verbal form. The example in (61) from Sitaridou (2014a) is one such case. Here it is the imperfective past that occurs inside the *na*-clause.

(61) Utš eθelna  n’emaireva.

```
NEG want-IP.1SG SUBJ cook-IP.1SG
```

‘I didn’t want to cook.’

What about other verbal forms? Sitaridou (2014a, b) provides no instances of *na* co-occurring with the perfective past (PP). However, Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2012:82) include this combination in their discussion of the morphological paradigm of verbs in PGr. As for the PNP, it is, for independent reasons, impossible to test this form in combination with *na*, simply because, for reasons as yet unclear, PGr lacks this form altogether. The reasons underlying this mysterious gap (which plausibly need to be investigated in connection to the diachrony of Greek verbal forms) await further research.

Summing up, the lack of the PNP notwithstanding, *na*-clauses in PGr are more similar to their SMG than to their Griko counterparts: all verbal forms available are licit, depending on the targeted interpretation. Since no verbal form may be characterized as subjunctive in PGr, there is no verbal morphology for the subjunctive in the language, and therefore no grounds for invoking mood concord.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we saw that subjunctive mood is realized differently in Griko than in SMG. We proposed to capture this difference by characterizing the perfective non-past verbal form (abbreviated as PNP) as verbal subjunctive morphology. The otherwise mysterious restriction against all other verbal forms in Griko *na*-clauses follows from this claim.

We further claimed that the re-interpretation of the PNP as subjunctive morphology in Griko came about as a result of contact with Salentino, the local Romance variety which also employs dual marking of subjunctive mood. Consideration of diachronic as well dialectal data (Medieval and Pontic Greek respectively) suggested that alternative explanations of the origin of mood
concord in Griko are less likely, since neither one of the two aforementioned
dayi display mood concord.

Our proposal has repercussions on what we take the directionality of
contact to be between Italo-Greek and Italo-Romance. If we are correct, the
realization of mood reflects influence from Salentino to Griko. Although
traditional wisdom has been that Greek varieties determined the grammatical
properties of Romance varieties in Southern Italy, a number of scholars have
been recently exploring possible cases of contact in the opposite direction. As
independent illustrations of the influence of Romance into Greek, Baldissera
(2013a) mentions the formation of passive with auxiliary *erkome* (Italian
*venire*) and the distribution of ‘middle’ and passive voice: *ndinnome* ‘I dress
(myself)’ vs. *erkome ndimen* ‘I am dressed’). Word-order inside noun
phrases is another empirical domain where we see in Italo-Greek properties
that strongly suggest influence from Italo-Romance (Ledgeway (2013:26),
example (62a), see also Guardiano & Stavrou (2014):

(62) a. ena (spitin) grò (*spiti(n))
    a house damp house

b. ena (spiti) igro (spiti)
    a house damp house

‘a damp house’

On the basis of the data in Author et al (2013), we also observe influence of
Romance in the syntax of non-volitional ‘want’ (see Roussou 2005 for analysis
on the basis of Greek, illustrated in (63b)):

(63) a. E marangiane telune votimmene. (Grk)
    the aubergines want-3PL turn-PART.FEM.PL

b. I melintzanes thelun *jirismenes/jirisma. (SMG)
    the aubergines want-3PL turn-PART.FEM.PL/turning

‘The aubergines need to be turned.’

Differences between SMG, Griko and Salentino, especially concerning the left
periphery require closer (empirical) examination (e.g. unlike *na, cu* is
sometimes omissible; see Calabrese 1993 and Terzi 1996). Future research
is required to evaluate the extent to which transparent contact phenomena
like the ones briefly reviewed here interact with language-internal changes that are triggered independently or precisely by the appearance of those contact-induced properties.
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