

Chapter 1

Microvariation in dative-marking in the Romance and Greek varieties of Southern Italy

Adam Ledgeway

Norma Schifano

Giuseppina Silvestri

*Abstract. Greek and Romance have been spoken alongside of one another for centuries in southern Italy. Even though the Greek-speaking areas have been dramatically reduced over the centuries such that today Greek is now only spoken by a small number of increasingly elder speakers in a handful of villages of Calabria and southern Apulia (Salentino), the influence of Greek is still undeniable in that it has left its mark on the structures of the surrounding Romance dialects. Indeed, in this respect Rohlfs aptly coined the phrase *spirito greco, materia romanza* (literally “Greek spirit, Romance material”) to highlight the fact that in many respects the syntax of these so-called Romance dialects is underlying Greek, despite employing predominantly Romance lexis. In this paper we draw on two cases studies from the Romance and Greek varieties spoken in Calabria to illustrate how the syntax of argument-marking has variously been subject to contact-induced change, giving rise to significant variation in the marking and distribution of RECIPIENT arguments in accordance with both pragmatic and structural factors. In both cases, it will*

be shown that contact-induced borrowing does not replicate the original structure of the lending language but, rather, produces hybrid structures which are ultimately neither Greek nor Romance in nature.

Introduction: Greek-Romance contact in southern Italy As is well known, Greek has been spoken as an indigenous language in southern Italy since ancient times (\citealt[12-38]{Falcone1973}; \citealt[304-306]{Horrocks1997}; \citealt[112-121]{Manolessou2005} \citealt[133]{Ralli2006}).¹ According to one, albeit now unpopular, view championed most notably by \citet{Rohlf1924, Rohlf1933, Rohlf1974, Rohlf1977}, the Greek spoken in southern Italy, henceforth Italo-Greek, is to be considered a direct descendant of the ancient (mainly Doric) Greek varieties which were imported into *Magna Graecia* as early as the eighth century BC with the establishment of numerous Greek colonies along the coasts of southern Italy. The opposing – and now widely accepted – view, argued most vehemently by \citet{Battisti1927} (cf. also \citealt{Morosi1870}; \citealt{Parlangeli1953}), sees the Greek of southern Italy as a more recent import dating from the Byzantine period of domination between the sixth and eleventh centuries (though see \citealt{Fanciullo2007}, for a conciliatory approach to these apparently two opposing views). Whatever the correct view, it is in any case clear that by the beginning of the second millennium AD Greek was still widely spoken as a native language in north-western Sicily, Calabria and Apulia.

Today, by contrast, Italo-Greek survives precariously only in a handful of villages of southern Calabria and Salento in the respective areas of Bovesia and Grecia Salentina. In Bovesia, where the local variety of Greek is known as *Greko* (though usually known as *grecanico* in Italian), the language is today confined to five remote villages of the Aspromonte mountains (namely, Bova (Marina), Chorío di Rochudi, Condofuri (Marina), Galliciano and Roghudi (Nuovo)), where it is reputed (\citealt{Spano1965}; \citealt[308-313]{Martino1980}; \citealt[16-19]{Stamuli2007}; \citealt[126-127]{Remberger2011}), at least according to some of the most generous estimates (cf. \citealt[27-31]{Katsoyannou1995}; \citealt[8-9]{Katsoyannou2001}), to be spoken by as many as about 500 speakers (cf. however \citealt{SquillaciInpress}). In Grecia Salentina, on the other hand, the language, locally known as *Griko*, appears to have fared somewhat better, in that it continues to be spoken in a pocket of seven villages of the Otranto peninsula (Calimera, Castrignano dei Greci, Corigliano d'Otranto, Martano, Martignano, Sternatia, Zollino) by as many as 20,000 speakers according to the most optimistic estimates (\citealt{Comi1989}; \citealt{Sobrero2005}; \citealt[105]{Manolessou2005}; \citealt[52-53]{Marra2008};

¹ This work is part of the Leverhulme Research Project RPG-2015-283 *Fading voices in southern Italy: investigating language contact in Magna Graecia*.

\citealt{Romano2008}; \citealt[3-4]{Baldissera2013}), though once again our recent investigations would indicate a considerably lower figure.

Now, although Greek was extensively spoken in southern Italy for centuries, following the gradual expansion first of Latin and then what were to become the local Romance varieties in this same area, Greek and Romance came to be used alongside of each other in a complex situation of diglossia with expanding bilingualism. As a consequence, the Romance dialects of these two areas, namely *Calabrese* and *Salentino*, display huge structural influences from Italo-Greek, since they first emerged among speakers whose mother tongue was Greek (the “substrate”) and continued to develop and expand to the present day in the shadow of the surrounding, albeit shrinking, Italo-Greek dialects (the “adstrate”). In recent times these latter varieties also increasingly show some structural influences from the local Romance dialects and, in particular, from regional Italian which has also been thrown into the mix, at least among younger members of the speech community (cf. \citealt[338]{Martino1980}; \citealt{Profili1985}; \citealt{Marra2008}; \citealt{Romano2008}), as witnessed, for example, in causative constructions (\citealt{LedgewaySchifanoSilvestriInpress, LedgewaySchifanoSilvestriInPrep}).

Consequently, it has become commonplace in the literature to claim that once extensive Greek-Romance bilingualism throughout the extreme south of Italy has given rise to an exceptional Hellenization of the local Romance dialects or, as \cite[61]{Rohlf1933} aptly put it, a case of *spirito greco, materia romanza* “Greek soul, Romance (lexical) material”.² While accepting Rohlf’s general thesis that the Romance dialects of this area superficially appear to be nothing more than Greek disguised as Romance, such broad-brush generalizations obscure many subtle differences between Italo-Greek and the local Romance varieties which have largely gone unnoticed (for an overview, see \citealt{Ledgeway2013}). In what follows we shall therefore consider two case studies in microvariation involving dative structures born of Greek-Romance contact in Calabria. More specifically, these case studies illustrate the influence of Grecanico on Calabrese involving the so-called Greek-style dative whereby the relevant Romance dialects have variously adopted and adapted an original Greek structure that highlights both significant diatopic and diachronic microvariation in the structural realization of dative marking within the DP, as well as in the structural positions in which dative-marked DPs are licensed. In both cases, the varieties in question marry together in still poorly explored and largely little understood ways facets

² Cf. the distinction between PAT(ern) and MAT(erial) discussed in \cite[Matras2004; Matras2007].

of core Romance and Greek syntax to produce a number of innovative hybrid structures, the evidence of which can be profitably used to throw light on the nature of parametric variation and the proper formal characterization of convergence and divergence. Indeed, once we begin to peel back the layers, it soon becomes clear that convergence through grammars in contact does not necessarily lead to simple borrowing and transference through interference, but more frequently gives rise to new hybrid structures born of reanalysis of the original Italo-Greek structures within a Romance (or Italo-Greek) grammar instantiating “deeper” microparametric options.

Greek-style dative Since at least \citet[§639]{Rohlf1969},³ it has been reported that many Romance dialects of southern Calabria, following an original Greek pattern (cf. \citet[160]{Joseph1990}) now widespread within the Balkan Sprachbund (\citet[187]{Sandfeld1930}; \citet{Pompeo2012}), extended the distribution of the genitive preposition *di* ‘of’ to mark many of the traditional uses of the dative (including benefactive and ethical datives in addition to core RECIPIENT arguments), the so-called *dativo greco* “Greek-style dative”. Consequently, on a par with the Grecanico pattern in (1a) in which the indirect object [*IF4?*]*oséppi* is Case-marked genitive, witness the genitive form of the definite article *tu*, in the Calabrese dialect of S. Ilario in (1b) the RECIPIENT argument is marked with the genitive preposition *d(i)* ‘of’.

- a. Bova *Ordínettse tu [IF4?]oséppi ná 'ne meθéto.*
 he.ordered of.the Giuseppe that he.be with.them
 “He ordered Giuseppe to stay with them.”
- b. S. Ilario
 Si dissì d-u figghiòlu 'u si ndi vaci.
 DAT.3= I.said of-the boy that self= therefrom= he.goes
 “I told the boy to go.”

This pattern of dative marking is attested in several dialects around Bova, witness the examples in (2a-c), although its use today in Bova itself can, at best, be described as moribund. By contrast, no such use of the genitive has been recorded for the Romance dialects of Salento, as further confirmed by our own fieldwork, witness (3) where the RECIPIENT argument is marked by the typical Romance preposition *a* ‘to’.

Calabrese a. *Nci lu dissì di lu párracu.*

³ Cf. \citet[§639]{Rohlf1969}, \citet[232-233]{Trumper2003}, \citet[209]{Vincent1997}, \citet[243, 427-429]{Katsoyannou1995}, \citet[54-55]{Katsoyannou2001}, \citet[140-141]{Ralli2006}, \citet[192-196]{Ledgeway2013}.

DAT.3= it= I.said of the priest

“I told the priest.”

b. *Nci u mandai d-u nonnu.*

DAT.3= it= I.sent of-the grandfather

“I sent it to grandfather.”

c. *Nci u muštrai di lu mè vicinu.*

DAT.3= it= I.showed of the my neighbour

“I showed it to my neighbour.”

Scorrano, Salento *Vene cu lli face lezione alla fija.*

he.comes that DAT.3= does lesson to.the daughter

“He comes to teach their daughter.”

Although there is undoubtedly some truth to these traditional descriptions of the Greek-style dative, they nonetheless conceal some non-trivial differences between Grecanico and Calabrese. In particular, a detailed examination of the distribution of the Greek-style dative highlights the need to distinguish between at least two varieties of Calabrese, henceforth Calabrese₁ and Calabrese₂, in which the distribution of the Greek-style dative not only displays some important differences with respect to Grecanico, but also in relation to each other.

Case study 1: Calabrese₁ From our fieldwork and investigations the varieties that come under the label of Calabrese₁ include, at least, the dialects of Bagaladi, San Lorenzo, Brancaleone, Palizzi, Bovalino, ^(†)Bova, Chorío, Roccaforte, Africo, Natile di Careri, San Pantaleone and S. Ilario.⁴ In contrast to the traditional description of the Greek-style dative reviewed in §2 above, the distribution of the Greek-style dative in these varieties shows some major differences (cf. \citealt{Trumper2003}; \citealt[193-196]{Ledgeway2013}). First, Greek-style genitive marking of indirect objects is not obligatory in Calabrese. Indeed, in accordance with the typical Romance pattern, RECIPIENT arguments surface much more frequently in the dative marked by the preposition *a* ‘to’ (*a* ‘to’ + *u* ‘the.MSG’ > *ô* ‘to the’), witness (4a) which forms a minimal pair with (4b).

Africo a. *Nci dissì ô figghiòlu 'i ccatta u latti.*

DAT.3= I.said to.the boy that he.buys the milk

b. *Nci dissì d-u figghiòlu 'i accatta u latti.*

DAT.3= I.said of-the boy that he.buys the milk

“I told the boy to buy the milk.”

⁴ For full details about the authors’ fieldwork, see the project’s website at <https://greekromanceproject.wordpress.com/the-project/>.

Second, in structures such as (4b) the genitive-marked indirect object DP is always obligatorily doubled by a dative clitic, witness the grammaticality judgments reported in (5a-c).

- a. Africo **(Nci) dissì d-u figghiòlu 'i accatta u latti.*
 DAT.3= I.said of-the boy that he.buys the milk
 “I told the boy to buy the milk.”
- b. Bagaladi
 **(Nci) lu scrissi di mè frati.*
 DAT.3= it= I.wrote of my brother
 “I wrote it to my brother.”
- c. Bagaladi
 **(Nci) lu vindia di Don Pippinu.*
 DAT.3= it= I.sold of Don Peppino
 “I was selling it to Don Peppino.”

It would appear then that we are not dealing with an autonomous genitive structure as in (Italo-)Greek, but, rather, with a hybrid structure in which the indirect object is referenced in part through dative marking on the verbal head and in part through genitive marking on the nominal dependent. This observation is even more striking when we consider that many of the same dialects have an independent genitive clitic (INDE >) *ndi* ‘of it; thereof/-from’ which, despite providing a perfect match for the genitive case of the nominal dependent, cannot double the indirect object in such examples:

- a. Africo **Ndi dissì d-u figghiòlu 'i accatta u latti.*
 GEN= I.said of-the boy that he.buys the milk
- b. Bagaladi
 **Ndi lu scrissi di mè frati.*
 GEN= it= I.wrote of my brother
- c. Bagaladi
 **Ndi lu vindia di Don Pippinu.*
 GEN= it= I.sold of Don Peppino

Finally, the use of the so-called Greek-style dative is not indiscriminate, but carries a marked pragmatic interpretation. Thus, despite appearances, (4a-b) are not entirely synonymous. By way of comparison, consider the English minimal pair in (7a-b), where the indirect object of the first example (*to someone*) has undergone so-called *dative shift* in the second example, instantiating the double object construction where it now appears without the dative marker *to* and comes to precede the underlying direct object (see the contributions in PART I of this volume for further detailed discussions of the double object construction).

- a. *I promised to rent every apartment in the building to someone.* b. *I promised to rent someone every apartment in the building.*

As is well known, one of the pragmatico-semantic consequences of *dative shift* in English is to force a known or given interpretation of the RECIPIENT argument, as can be clearly seen by the contrast in (7a-b):⁵ whereas the quantifier *to someone* in (7a) typically refers to an unknown individual or group of individuals (e.g. whoever I can find who is willing to pay the rent), dative-shifted *someone* in (7b) typically, though not necessarily unambiguously for all speakers, refers to a particular individual already known to the speaker (e.g. my father's best friend), but whom the speaker simply chooses not to name in this particular utterance (for discussion, see \citealt{Aoun1993}). By the same token, it is this same presuppositional reading of the RECIPIENT that is licensed by the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₁, witness the implied specific reading of *studenti* in (8b) when marked by the genitive *di* in contrast to its non-specific reading in (8a) when it surfaces with the dative *a*; similarly, the identity of "the boy" in (4b) is assumed to be known to the addressee.⁶

Bova a. *La machina, nci la vindu a nu studenti.*

the car DAT.3= it= I.sell to a student

"I'll sell the car to a student (= not known to me, any gullible student I can find)."

b. *La machina, nci la vindu di nu studenti.*

the car DAT.3= it= I.sell of a student

"I'm selling a student the car (= specific student known to me)."

Integrating these observations with the results of the investigation of indirect object marking across Greek dialects carried out by \cite{Manolessou2004} (cf. also \cite[160]{Joseph1990}; \cite[125-126]{Horrocks1997}; \cite[628-629]{Horrocks2007}; \cite[140-141]{Ralli2006}), \cite[194-195]{Ledgeway2013} proposes a partial parameter hierarchy based on the marking of indirect objects (IOs) along the lines of (9) with representative examples in (10a-d), ultimately to be understood as part

⁵ For full discussion, see \cite{Larson1988, Larson1990}, \cite{Jackendoff1990}, \cite{Torrego1998} and references cited there.

⁶ An anonymous reviewer points out that the alternation between the analytic prepositional construction with $\sigma\epsilon$ 'to' and the synthetic genitive is not necessarily free in Standard Modern Greek where the difference between the non-specific and specific readings in (8a-b) finds an exact parallel (cf. \cite{Dimitriadis1995}; \cite{Michelioudakis2012}). Nonetheless, there still remains a significant difference between Calabrese₁ and Standard Modern Greek, in that the use of the genitive in Calabrese₁ is only ever employed as a marked strategy to signal the presuppositional reading, whereas in Standard Modern Greek the synthetic genitive can also mark non-presuppositional readings just like the analytic prepositional construction.

of a larger hierarchy related to argument marking and alignments (cf. (\citealt{Sheehan2014})).

Are all internal arguments Case-marked accusative? ru

Yes: nth. Gk dialects No

Asia Minor Are all IOs Case-marked dative?

Tsak., Dodec. (10a) ru

Yes: AG, Sal. (10b) No

Are all IOs Case-marked genitive?

ru

Yes: SMG, sth. dialects No

Italo-Gk (10c) Are a subset of IOs Case-marked genitive (= hybrid Case)?

ru

Yes: Calabrese (10d)

[+presup. \Rightarrow dative-genitive]

a. Tsakonian (\citealt{Manolessou2004}) επ'ετσε τον 'ονε

he.said the.ACC donkey.ACC

“he said to the donkey.”

b. Ancient Greek (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 3.1.7)

λεγει τ'ην μαντε'ιαν τω| Σωκρ'ατει.

he.says the.ACC oracle.ACC the.DAT Socrates.DAT

“I am a servant to the gods.”

c. Martano, Griko

Ce t' adrèffiātu tū 'pane

and the brothers=his him.GEN said

“And his brothers said to him”

d. Africo

Nci dissì ô figghiòlu 'i ccatta u latti.

DAT.3= I.said to.the boy that he.buys the milk

“I told the boy to buy the milk.”

The first option in (9) represents the least marked question that we can ask about the marking of indirect objects, namely whether they are formally distinguished at all from other internal arguments (cf. also the contribution by Manzini, this volume). The negative reply to this question thus isolates a group of northern Greek dialects, Asia Minor dialects, Tsakonian and Dodecanese which, in contrast to all other Greek varieties, fail to mark a formal distinction between direct and indirect objects, witness the accusative-marking of the RECIPIENT in (10a). We are thus dealing with a case of mesoparametric variation, in that in these varieties accusative, arguably the core object Case crosslinguistically and

licensed by *v*, hence situated at the top of our hierarchy, indiscriminately marks all DP objects, a naturally definable class (namely, [-NOM] Ds). The next option is that exhibited by varieties such as ancient Greek and Salentino which, by contrast, unambiguously distinguish indirect objects by marking them dative (10b; cf. also (3) above), in contrast to varieties such as standard modern Greek, southern Greek dialects and Italo-Greek which are situated further down the hierarchy in that they conflate this category with the genitive (10c). The greater and increasing markedness of these latter two options follows from the observation that crosslinguistically dative, generally taken to be licensed by an Appl(icative) functional head (see, for example, Cuervo, this volume; for an opposing view, see however Manzini, this volume), represents the least marked distinctive Case for indirect objects, whereas genitive, at least in those languages with rich case systems, typically displays all the hallmarks of an inherent Case whose distribution is largely defined by not entirely predictable lexical factors, hence taken here to be assigned by a lexical V head. These two options reflect, respectively, micro- and nanoparametric variation. In the former case dative serves to uniquely mark a small, lexically definable subclass of functional heads, namely all Ds bearing the RECIPIENT feature (for arguments in favour of treating theta roles as formal features, see \citealt{Hornstein1999}). In the latter case, by contrast, genitive is associated with a class of predicates whose membership can only be established on purely lexical grounds, inasmuch as the RECIPIENT feature is just one of many semantic roles associated with genitive marking.

The final option in (9) is represented by the *dativo greco* in Calabrese (10d), clearly the most marked option of all, insofar as the marking of RECIPIENT arguments in this variety is strictly context-sensitive, with the *dativo greco* serving to narrowly delimit individual RECIPIENT arguments in accordance with their [\pm presuppositional] reading. This more complex and non-uniform behaviour is further reflected in the surface form of the so-called *dativo greco* which, we have observed, involves a composite Case structure combining dative clitic marking on the verbal head with genitive prepositional marking on the nominal dependent, presumably reflecting the simultaneous intervention of Appl_{DAT} and V_{GEN} heads in the licensing of such indirect objects. These facts highlight how convergence through grammars in contact does not necessarily lead to simple borrowing, but frequently yields new hybrid structures born of reanalysis. Below we shall explore the syntax of this instantiation of the Greek-style dative in greater detail to ascertain its significance for theoretical issues about argument structure and especially the mapping between morphological marking and syntactic configurations.

Case study 2: Calabrese₂ The second variety of Calabrese identified through our fieldwork that we must consider, henceforth Calabrese₂, is found in the villages of Gioiosa Ionica and San Luca. In contrast to Calabrese₁, the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₂ displays a much more restricted distribution subject to lexico-structural factors. In particular, the Greek-style dative in this variety only surfaces when the RECIPIENT argument is introduced by a definite article (11a), with the typically Romance prepositional marker *a* ‘to’ surfacing in all other contexts, witness (11b) where the RECIPIENT is headed by the indefinite article.⁷

Gioiosa Ionica a. *Nci detti nu libbru d-u figghjiolu.*

DAT.3= I.gave a book of-the kid

“I gave a book to the kid.”

b. *Nci detti nu libbru a nu figghjiolu.*

DAT.3= I.gave a book to a kid

⁷ The variety of San Luca dialect investigated by \citet{Chila2017} – henceforth San Luca2 – appears to represent a more conservative variety in which all dative arguments are marked by *di* ‘of’, and not just those introduced by the definite article as shown by the examples in (i.a-b):

San Luca2

Telefonanzi 'i zziuta! telephone.IMP.2SG=DAT.3 of uncle=your

“Ring your uncle!”

b. *'A torta si piaciù 'i tutti.*

the cake DAT.3 pleased of all

“Everyone liked the cake.”

Although \citet[4-5]{Chila2017} argues that presuppositionality – or, in her terms, the feature [±known] – plays no role in the licensing of the Greek-style dative in San Luca2, all her examples involve specific and definite referents, including those such as (ii.a-c) which she claims are [–known] but which are clearly presupposed (note that Chilà does not provide any examples with nominals introduced by the indefinite article).

San Luca2 a. *Si dissì d 'u postinu 'u si ndì vai.*

DAT.3 I.said of the postman that self= therefrom= he.goes

“I told the postman to leave.”

b. *Si fici 'na telefonata d 'u funtaneri.*

DAT.3 I/made a telephone.call of the plumber

“I gave the plumber a call.”

c. *Si telefonai d 'a putica / 'u bonchettu.*

DAT.3 I.telephoned of the shop the restaurant

“I rang the shop / the restaurant.”

Pending further investigation, it might then be that San Luca2 is not necessarily the most conservative Calabrian variety replicating the generalized distribution of the Greek-style genitive of Grecanico, but, rather, represents another variety to be included among those grouped under the label of Calabrese1.

“I gave a book to a kid.”

This contrast can be seen even more clearly through a comparison of the dialects of Gioiosa Ionica and San Luca in relation to the behaviour of proper names. As in many Romance varieties (cf. \citealt[103-104]{Ledgeway2012}; \citealt[111-112]{Ledgeway2015}), proper names do not co-occur with a definite article in the dialect of Gioiosa Ionica, whereas in the dialect of San Luca proper names are introduced by an expletive definite article just as in Greek (\citealt[198]{Mackridge1985}; \citealt[276-278]{Holton1997}; \citealt[208-209]{Ledgeway2013}). As a consequence, whenever a RECIPIENT is lexicalized by a proper name it is marked by *a* ‘to’ in Gioiosa Ionica (12a), but by *di* ‘of’ in San Luca since the presence of the definite article in this variety automatically triggers and licenses the use of the Greek-style dative (12b).

- a. Gioiosa Ionica *Nci detti nu libbru a Maria.*

DAT.3= I.gave a book to Maria

“I gave a book to Maria.”

- b. San Luca

Stamatina si detti nu pocu i pani d-u Petru.

this.morning DAT.3= I.gave a little of bread of-the Petru

“This morning I gave a bit of bread to Petru.”

To sum up, we note then that in Calabrese₂ dative is marked by *a* ‘to’, and not by the Greek-style dative with *di* ‘of’, whenever the RECIPIENT surfaces as: (a) a proper name (12a; but cf. 12b), singular kinship term (13a) or tonic pronoun (13b); (b) an indefinite DP (13c); (c) a nominal introduced by a demonstrative (13d) or a bare quantifier (13e). In structural terms, what all three contexts have in common is that the D position is either not available to the definite article, since this position is already directly lexicalized by the nominal (e.g. pronoun) or through N-to-D movement (e.g. proper name, kinship term), or the D position is simply not lexicalized, as happens with indefinite DPs, where the cardinal lexicalizes the head of a lower functional projection (variously termed CardP/NumP), and with demonstratives and bare quantifiers where the DP is embedded within a DemP and a QP, respectively.

- Gioiosa Ionica a. *Non nci telefonari a ziuma!*

not DAT.3= phone.INF to uncle=my

“Do not phone my uncle!”

- b. *Maria m' u detti a mia.*

Maria me= it= gave.3SG to me

“Maria gave it to me.”

- c. *Ajeri nci telefonau a nu previte.*

- yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to a priest
 “Yesterday I phoned a priest.”
- d. *Ajeri nci telefonava a iju previte i Messina.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to that priest of Messina
 “Yesterday I phoned that priest from Messina.”
- e *Non telefonari a nuju!*
 not phone.INF to nobody
 “Don’t phone anybody!”

Interim conclusions and questions We have seen that the Romance dialects of Calabria have been in centuries-old contact with Grecanico as the sub- and adstrate contact language. As a consequence, Calabrese has adopted and, in turn, adapted a number of original Greek structural traits, including the Greek-style genitive-dative syncretism which has led to a certain degree of competition in the marking of RECIPIENT arguments which may variously surface in conjunction either with *di* ‘of’ or *a* ‘to’ in accordance with the competing Greek and Romance patterns, respectively. In particular, in Calabrese₁ the Greek-style dative is pragmatically restricted, in that it has been shown to be intimately linked to presuppositionality, marking just those RECIPIENTS which are interpreted as being highly individuated and specific. By contrast, in Calabrese₂ the Greek-style dative is structurally restricted, in that its distribution has been shown to be strictly linked to the availability of the definite article and, by implication, the lexicalization or otherwise of the D position, with the Greek-style dative occurring just in those contexts in which the D position is realized by the definite article.

Against these considerations, we must consider a number of related questions. First, are the distributions of the Greek-style dative witnessed in Calabrese₁ and Calabrese₂ related, or should they be seen as separate developments arising from the reanalysis of the original underlying Greek pattern? Second, if they are related, as we shall argue below, how then does one develop from the other and, what is their diachronic relationship? Third, we have superficially observed how in both varieties of Calabrese the Greek-style dative (*di*) variously alternates with a Romance-style dative (*a*), but it remains to be understood how this alternation is to be interpreted in structural terms. Finally, we must also ask what these competing structures tell us about the structural positions in which dative DPs are licensed, and about the locus of dative-marking in DPs.

Calabrese₁ revisited With these considerations in mind, we now return to Calabrese₁. The basic facts which need to be accounted for include why: (i) the

use of the Greek-style dative gives rise to a presuppositional reading of the RECIPIENT; (ii) the DP has to be clitic-doubled; (iii) the doubling clitic has to be marked dative, rather than genitive; (iv) there is an apparent Case mismatch between the dative-marked clitic on the verbal head and the genitive-marked DP dependent, giving rise to an apparently hybrid Case structure; and (v) canonical datives are marked with (AD >) *a* ‘to’. Superficially, then, one might be tempted to propose a double object analysis for the Calabrese₁ facts,⁸ since, on a par with the double object construction reported in many languages, the RECIPIENT necessarily receives a presuppositional reading, is animate, and is clitic-doubled (for further discussion, see also Cuervo this volume). Furthermore, double object constructions have previously been independently reported for other dialects of southern Italy (cf. \citealt[ch.2]{Ledgeway2000}; \citealt[844-847]{Ledgeway2009}), witness the representative examples in (14a-d).

- a. Naples *'A purtaie a Maria o rialo (*a Maria).*
her.ACC= I.brought DOM Maria the.M gift.M DOM Maria
“I took Maria the present.”
- b. Curti, Caserta
'O facettero n' ata paliata.
him.ACC= they.did an other.F thrashing.F
“They gave him another thrashing.”
- c. Calvello, Potenza
la 'rak[1DD?] nu ka'vadd[1DD?].
her.ACC= I.give a.M horse.M
“I’ll give her a horse.”
- d. Mattinata, Foggia
lu tur'[2A7?]i lu 'ku[1DD?]dd[1DD?].
him.ACC= he.wrung the.M neck.M
“He wrung its neck.”

In the Neapolitan example (14a), for instance, the RECIPIENT argument *a Maria* has been “shifted” such that it obligatorily surfaces, as in the corresponding English sentence, to the left of the THEME argument marked by the prepositional accusative *a* (< AD) and doubled by the accusative clitic *'a*. Similarly, in examples

⁸ Cf. a.o. \cite{Barss1986}, \cite{Larson1988, Larson1990}, \cite{Jackendoff1990}, \cite{Collins1993}, \cite{Marantz1993}, \cite{Demonte1995}, \cite{Pesetsky1996}, \cite{Collins1997}, \cite{Torrego1998}, \cite{Harley2002}, \cite{Pytkkanen2008}, \cite{Anagnostopoulou2003}, \cite{Cuervo2003}, \cite{Jeong2007}, \cite{Bruening2010a, Bruening2010b}, \cite{Ormazabal2010}, \cite{Harley2015}, \cite{Pineda2016}.

(14b-d) the RECIPIENT surfaces as a pronominal clitic, but is marked accusative, not dative (for further discussion, see also the chapter by Manzini, this volume)

Although the parallels between the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₁ and the double object construction initially appear quite compelling, a closer look at the relevant facts reveals a number of problems with such an analysis. First, the RECIPIENT in the Greek-style dative is not, at least superficially, “shifted” to a position in front of the THEME (cf. 14a), although this does not necessarily appear to be a precondition for the RECIPIENT in the double object construction, witness, for example, the position of the RECIPIENT in the Spanish construction (\citealt{Demonte1995}; see also the discussions in the chapters by Cuervo, by Calindro, and by Cépeda & Cyrino, this volume). Second, there is no requirement that the subject in a Greek-style dative construction be interpreted as a causer (cf. 13a-d), a reading which is standardly taken to be characteristic of the subject in the double object construction. Third, an analysis in terms of a double object construction fails to offer any explanation for the apparent mismatch between the dative and genitive Case-marking borne by the clitic and coreferent DP, respectively. Fourth, unlike what happens in the double object construction (cf. \citealt{Barss1986}; \citealt{Larson1988}), where the asymmetrical binding of the dative-marked RECIPIENT by the accusative-marked THEME in the prepositional dative construction (cf. 15a) is reversed allowing the accusative-marked RECIPIENT to bind into the THEME (cf. 15b), the use of the Greek-style dative does not engender a reversal in the asymmetrical c-command relations between the THEME and RECIPIENT (cf. 16a-b; see Cornilescu, this volume, for discussion of the binding facts in Romanian ditransitives).

- a. *I sent every book to its author.* b. *I sent every author his book.*

- Africo a. *A sarta (nci) mandau ogni vesta â so*
 the dressmaker DAT.3 sent each dress to.the its *patruna*.
 owner
 b. *A sarta nci mandau ogni vesta d-a so*
 the dressmaker DAT.3 sent each dress of-the its *patruna*.
 owner
 “The dressmaker sent each dress to its owner.”

Finally, a very clear piece of evidence that the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₁ is not amenable to a double object analysis comes from the observation that the Greek-style dative is not limited to ditransitive clauses, but is also found with monotransitives (cf. 17a-b) that otherwise canonically select for dative arguments.

- a. Natile di Careri *Non si gridari d-u figghiolu!*

not DAT.3= shout.INF of-the son

“Don’t shout at the child!”

- b. Palizzi

Nci parrai / scrivai / telefunai d-u sindaco.

DAT.3= I.spoke I.wrote I.phoned of-the mayor

“I spoke to / wrote to / rang the mayor.”

In what follows, we thus exclude the possibility of a double object analysis for the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₁. Instead we adopt the view here that, on a par with other Romance varieties (though not Romanian), dative is canonically marked in Calabrese₁ with the preposition *a* ‘to’, giving rise to a structure like that in (18a) and exemplified in (19a). The RECIPIENT DP thus constitutes a core argument which in Calabrese₁ is very frequently, though not obligatorily, doubled by a dative clitic. By contrast, we analyse the Greek-style dative exemplified in (19b) along the lines of (18b), where we take dative once again to be assigned to a core argument, here instantiated by *pro* and obligatorily referenced by a dative clitic on the verb. Consequently, we interpret the DP introduced by *di* ‘of’ to be an adjunct, albeit coreferential with the clitic-*pro* argument chain.⁹

- a. (Cl_i)...T-V...(DP_{ACC})...[a DP_{DAT}]_i b. *(Cl_i)...T-V...(DP_{ACC})...[pro_{DAT}]_i, [di DP]_i

- a. (*Nci*) *la vindu a nu studenti.* DAT.3= it= I.sell to a student

“I’ll sell it to a student.”

- b. *(*Nci*) *la vindu pro_i di nu studenti.*

DAT.3= it= I.sell of a student

“I’ll sell a student it.” (lit. “I’ll sell it to him, a student.”)

Under this analysis we can now capture the principal characteristics of the Greek-style dative. First, the obligatory presuppositional reading of the RECIPIENT argument follows immediately from the fact that the dative argument is instantiated by a *pro* licensed and referenced by a dative clitic, inasmuch as clitic-*pro* chains invariably yield presuppositional readings of their pronominal referents which are interpreted as known, specific and highly salient in the discourse. This is not the case in the canonical Romance-style dative construction (18a, 19a), where the dative argument is realized by a lexical DP and hence not pragmatically restricted.

⁹ Observe that this analysis comes very close to, and indeed is compatible with, the idea in many analyses of the double object construction that the RECIPIENT argument is not a core argument but, rather, is an adjunct licensed by an Appl head.

Second, we now have a straightforward explanation for the obligatory presence of the dative clitic in the so-called Greek-style dative construction, since the clitic is part of a clitic-pro argument chain and is therefore necessary to reference and license pro. Despite appearances, there is then no doubling as such involved, inasmuch as the clitic licenses pro rather than doubling the coreferential DP adjunct.

Third, and by the same token, the observed Case mismatch between the clitic, marked dative, and the full DP, marked genitive, is only apparent, since dative Case is exhausted by the clitic-pro argument chain, whereas the coreferential DP represents an adjunct licensed by the canonical marker of obliques/non-arguments, namely the genitive preposition *di* ‘of’.

Fourth, the rightmost position of the DP in examples such as (19b) now follows without further stipulation, since the DP is an adjunct and hence occurs in extrasentential positions (whether to the right or to the left) outside of the sentential core, thereby also excluding any form of “dative shift”. Indeed, when the RECIPIENT is marked by *a* ‘to’ it can bind into the THEME in examples such as (20a), where the latter presumably involves a case of marginalization occupying its in situ position within the *v*-VP, witness the absence of a resumptive accusative clitic, and the RECIPIENT has been raised to a focus position within the lower left periphery crossing the THEME (Frascarelli 2000s; Cardinaletti 2002; [42–47] Cruschina 2012). However, when the RECIPIENT occurs in the so-called Greek-style dative (20b), such binding is not possible. Given our (topical) adjunct interpretation of DPs marked by the Greek-style dative, the ungrammaticality of (20b) is fully expected since the RECIPIENT is merged in an extrasentential right-peripheral position from where it cannot precede the THEME in its in situ position within the *v*-VP.

- Africo a. *A sarta nci mandau a ogni patruna a so vesta.*
 the dressmaker DAT.3= sent to each owner the her dress
 b.**A sarta nci mandau di ogni patruna a so vesta.*
 the dressmaker DAT.3= sent of each owner the her dress
 “The dressmaker sent each owner her dress.”

Fifth, the stability of the binding facts observed in (16) now follows straightforwardly since, even when the Greek-style dative is employed (cf. 16b), the RECIPIENT is still realized by a core DP argument (viz. pro) Case-marked dative and licensed in the same argument position as a lexical DP in the so-called Romance-style dative (cf. 16a) from where it can be bound by the c-commanding THEME argument. The presence or otherwise of a coreferential topic adjunct introduced by *di* ‘of’ therefore proves irrelevant to the basic binding facts, which are invari-

ably determined within the sentential core by the two internal arguments whose licensing positions, and hence also their binding relations, remain unchanged. However, one respect in which the two sentences in (16a-b) differ concerns the availability of the individual and distributive scopal readings of *patruna*. Whereas both readings of *patruna* are available in (16a) where both scope relations can be reconstructed within the v-VP between the QP *ogni* and the possessive anaphor *so*, only the individual reading is possible in (16b) in accordance with the characteristic presuppositional reading of the so-called Greek-style dative noted above. The absence of this distributive reading in (16b) highlights how the adjunct *d-a so patruna* takes scope over the THEME *ogni vesta*, but not vice versa, providing further proof for the fact that right-peripheral (familiar) topics like *d-a so patruna* are merged in extra-sentential positions from where quantifiers like *ogni* ‘each’ cannot scope over them at LF (cf. \citealt{Cardinaletti2002}; \citealt{Frascarelli2004}; \citealt{Frascarelli2007}).¹⁰

Finally, the analysis outlined in (18b) correctly predicts that the distribution of the Greek-style dative should equally occur in monotransitives as in ditransitives, inasmuch as its distribution is not linked to the presence of a THEME argument. Furthermore, the use of the Greek-style dative with monotransitives also highlights the weakness of functionalist accounts which take the obligatory use of the dative clitic as a means of distinguishing between the dative-RECIPIENT and genitive-POSSESSOR readings of the lexical DP in examples such as (21a). However, the evidence of monotransitives such as (21b), where there is no ambiguity regarding the dative-RECIPIENT interpretation of the lexical DP but the dative clitic continues to be obligatory, excludes any such functionalist interpretation of the facts.

- a. Bova *Nci vindu la machina di lu studenti.*
 DAT.3= I.sell the car of the student
 “I’ll sell the student the car.” (“I’ll sell the student’s car.”)

- b. Natile di Careri
 *Non *(si) gridamu d-i nostri figghioli!*
 not DAT.3= we.shout of-the our children
 “Let’s not shout at our children!”

To conclude, we have established that in Calabrese₁ the dative is invariably

¹⁰ In fact, in (16a) when the dative clitic is absent both the individual and distributive readings are possible, although the distributive interpretation is strongly preferred, whereas only the individual reading is possible when the clitic is present. Thus, just as in (16b), it would appear that the presence of the clitic in (16a) forces a right-dislocated topical interpretation of the RECIPIENT DP which takes scope over the THEME licensing the individual reading.

marked by *a* ‘to’ as in most other varieties of Romance. By contrast, the use of *di* ‘of’ in the so-called Greek-style dative has been shown to mark right-peripheral adjuncts, with the dative-marked RECIPIENT still licensed as a core argument (pro) in association with a coreferential dative clitic (cf. pronominal argument hypothesis developed in \citealt{Jelinek1984}). It thus appears that Greek-Romance contact in the case of Calabrese₁ has given rise to an imperfect replication of the corresponding Grecanico genitive-marked RECIPIENT structure. In particular, in Calabrese₁ dative is canonically marked by *a* ‘to’, with Greek-style marking of RECIPIENTS by means of *di* ‘of’ having been reanalysed as a marked structure pressed into service as a last resort option to Case-mark adjunct DPs whenever dative Case has been otherwise exhausted within the sentential core. Indeed, as argued in \cite{Ledgeway2013}, such exaptive outcomes are far from infrequent in the Greek-Romance contact situation of southern Italy where contact-induced borrowing typically does not replicate the original structure of the lending language but, rather, produces hybrid structures which are ultimately neither Greek nor Romance in nature.

4. Calabrese₂ revisited

We now return to Calabrese₂ where the facts to be accounted for include: (i) why the Greek-style dative only occurs in conjunction with the definite article (cf. 22a); (ii) why the dative is marked by *a* ‘to’ (cf. 22b) if the definite article is absent; and (iii) what the relationship, if any, is between the distribution of the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₂ and Calabrese₁ (cf. 19a-b).

Gioiosa Ionica a. *Ajeri nci telefonau d-u previte.*

yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned of-the priest
 “Yesterday I phoned the priest.”

b. *Ajeri nci telefonau a nu previte.*

yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to a priest
 “Yesterday I phoned a priest.”

We begin with the last question regarding the diachronic relationship between the distribution of the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₁ and Calabrese₂, which, we will see, also provides an answer to our first question regarding the restriction of the Greek-style dative to nominals introduced by the definite article. In particular, we argue that the use of the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₂ represents a development from the more conservative distribution observed in Calabrese₁ where it was seen to license a presuppositional reading of the DP adjunct. In such cases, the DP is typically headed by the definite article, the archetypal marker of presuppositionality, thereby creating a strong association between the definite article and the Greek-style genitive. It is therefore entirely plausible

to suppose that this frequent pairing of the definite article with the Greek-style dative under the presuppositional reading eventually led in Calabrese₂ to a distributional reanalysis of the Greek-style dative which came to be restricted to the definite article. We thus also have a highly natural explanation for our first question regarding the distributional restriction of the Greek-style dative to nominals headed by the definite article.

Further proof for this diachronic development comes from the observation that while most speakers of Calabrese₂ today restrict the Greek-style genitive to definite DPs introduced by the definite article, some speakers of the dialect of San Luca (but not the dialect of Gioiosa Ionica) are less restrictive in that they optionally extend the use of the Greek-style genitive to definite DPs situated higher up the animacy/definiteness hierarchy (\citealt{Silverstein1976}; \citealt{Aissen2003}) to also include, for example, kinship terms (23).

San Luca *Aieri u Petru si talefunau 'i / a fratima.*

yesterday the Peter 3.DAT= telephoned of to brother=my

“Yesterday Pietro rang my brother.”

In this respect, it is not coincidental that San Luca is also the variety that employs the definite article with proper names, hence also systematically marked by the Greek-style dative (cf. 12b) and therefore extending its distribution higher up the animacy/definiteness hierarchy. Evidence like this highlights how the pragmatic-semantic category of presuppositionality has been subject to formal reinterpretation and reanalysis in the passage from Calabrese₁ to Calabrese₂, such that today the distribution of the Greek-style dative variously maps onto different subgroupings of nominals characterized by differing degrees of animacy and definiteness, but ultimately all interpreted in some sense as presupposed.

Unlike in Calabrese₁ where *di*-marked DPs were shown to be adjuncts that occur in extra-sentential positions (24a), in Calabrese₂ RECIPIENT DPs introduced by *di* ‘of’ therefore represent genuine dative arguments integrated and licensed within the sentential core, as further witnessed by the optionality of the doubling dative clitic *nci* on the verb in (24b), although it proves extremely common.

a. Calabrese₁ **(Nci_i) lu dissì pro_i, di lu párracu.*

DAT.3= it= I.told of the priest

b. Calabrese₂

(Nci) u dissì d-u previte.

DAT.3= it= I.told of-the priest

“I told the priest.”

We turn finally to consider the formal alternation between *a* ‘to’ and *di* ‘of’ in the marking of RECIPIENT arguments in Calabrese₂. Above we noted that *a* ‘to’

surfaces whenever D^o is lexicalised by a pronominal D (25a) or a raised N (25b) and whenever D^o is not lexicalised (25c-e).

- Gioiosa Ionica a. *Maria m' u detti a mia.*
 Maria to.me= it= gave.3SG to me
 “Maria gave it to me.”
- b. *Non nci telefonari a ziuma!*
 not DAT.3= phone.INF to uncle=my
 “Do not phone my uncle!”
- c. *Ajeri nci telefonau a nu previte.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to a priest
 “Yesterday I phoned a priest.”
- d. *Ajeri nci telefonava a iju previte i Messina.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to that priest of Messina
 “Yesterday I phoned that priest from Messina.”
- e. *Non telefonari a nuju!*
 not phone.INF to nobody
 “Don’t phone anybody!”

Consequently, we concluded that *di* ‘of’ surfaces uniquely in conjunction with nominals introduced by the definite article (26a). While this descriptive generalization captures the core distributional facts of the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₂, it is not entirely correct and needs to be revised in the light of evidence such as (26b).

- Gioiosa Ionica a. *Ajeri nci telefonau d-i cugini mei.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned of-the cousins my
 “Yesterday I phoned my cousins.”
- b. *Ajeri nci telefonau a /*di tutti i cugini mei.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to of all the cousins my
 “Yesterday I phoned all my cousins.”

Although example (26b) involves a nominal introduced by the definite article, just as in (26a), it is also preceded by the universal quantifier *tutti* ‘all’ and dative is marked by the preposition *a* ‘to’ rather than *di* ‘of’. This seems to suggest that the correct descriptive generalization is that the Greek-style dative in Calabrese₂ only occurs in conjunction with the definite article (cf. 26a), but that it does not necessarily always occur whenever the definite article is employed (cf. 26b). Indeed, the contrast witnessed in (26a-b) highlights how morphosyntactic variation in dative-marking through the formal alternation between *a* ‘to’ and *di* ‘of’ crucially depends on whether K(ase) is realized in a scattered or syncretic fashion (cf. \citealt{Giorgi1997}). In particular, as illustrated structurally in (27a)

and exemplified in (28a-c) we see that whenever lexical material intervenes between the K° and D° positions, whether the latter is lexicalized (cf. 28a) or not (cf. 28b-c), then these two positions are independently projected and the two heads are realized in a scattered fashion with the K° head lexicalized by *a* ‘to’. When, however, the two heads are adjacent and the D° position is lexicalized, as in examples (29a-b), then a syncretic K/D head obtains in which both Case and definiteness are inextricably bound together and morphologically spelt out as a single head *d-u/-a/-i* ‘of-the.MSG/FSG/PL’.

- a. KP b. K/DP 3 3
 K QP K+D NumP
 a 3 d-i 3
 “to” Q DemP “of-the” Num NP
 tutti 3 (du) 6
 “all” Dem DP “two” cugini (di) mei
 ijji 3 “cousins (of) my”
 “those” D NumP
 (i) 3
 “the” Num NP
 du 6
 “two” cugini (di) mei
 “cousins (of) my”

- Gioiosa Ionica a. *Ajeri nci telefonau a tutti i cugini mei.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to all the cousins my
 “Yesterday I rang all my cousins.”
 b. *Ajeri nci telefonau a (tutti) ijji cugini mei.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to (all) those cousins my
 “Yesterday I rang (all) those cousins of mine.”
 c. *Ajeri nci telefonau a du cugini di mei.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned to two cousins of.the my
 “Yesterday I rang two of my cousins.”

- Gioiosa Ionica a. *Ajeri nci telefonau d-i cugini mei.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned of.the cousins my
 “Yesterday I rang my cousins.”
 b. *Ajeri nci telefonau d-i du cugini di mei.*
 yesterday DAT.3= I.phoned of.the two cousins of.the my
 “Yesterday I rang my two cousins.”

In conclusion, we have seen that in Calabrese₂ the Romance-style dative *a* represents the scattered spell-out of a single [Kase] feature in contrast to the Greek-style dative *d-u/-a/-i* which instantiates the syncretic spell-out of a feature bundle [Kase, Definite]. As argued above, this latter development represents the outcome in Calabrese₂ of a progressive association of the definite article with the Greek-style genitive under its original presuppositional reading (as still preserved in Calabrese₁), yielding the portemanteau morphs *du/da/di*. In this respect, it is revealing to note that in conjunction with the genitive preposition *di* ‘of’ we find in Calabrese₁, where there is no necessary structural association of the definite article with the Greek-style dative, both full forms of the definite article preserving the initial lateral as well as aphaeresized forms, namely bisyllabic *di lu/la/li* and monosyllabic *du/da/di*. In Calabrese₂, by contrast, the definite article forms a syncretic head with the genitive preposition and only the aphaeresized forms *du/da/di* are found.

5. Conclusion

The detailed discussion of Grecanico and Calabrese argument marking above has shown how, at least on the surface, the grammars of these two linguistic groups are in many respects very similar, to the extent that the observed structural parallels are far too striking for them to be dismissed as accidental but, rather, must be considered the result of centuries-old structural contact between Greek and Romance, ultimately to be placed towards the upper end of the five-point scale of contact intensity proposed by \citet{Thomason1988}. The direction of such contact has consistently been shown to be unidirectional, involving the transfer and extension of original Greek structural features into the surrounding Romance varieties. At the same time, however, we have seen that a detailed examination of the Greek-style dative reveals how the finer details of such structural parallels often differ in subtle and unexpected ways once adopted in Romance: this highlights how speakers have not so much borrowed actual Greek forms but, rather, reshaped and reanalysed, often in a process of replication (\citet{Heine2003, Heine2005}), already existing Romance categories (e.g. dative and genitive marking) to approximate the superficial Greek models and patterns. Indeed, data from argument marking highlight how the varieties in question marry together in still poorly explored and largely little understood ways facets of core Romance and Greek syntax to produce a number of innovative hybrid structures, the evidence of which can be profitably used to throw light on parametric variation and, in our particular case, on the nature and licensing of dative, as well as the proper formal characterization of convergence and divergence.

In the case of Grecanico and Calabrese, which it must not be forgotten independently share a common Indo-European ancestry that is in large part responsible for their shared macro- and mesoparametric settings (e.g. head-initial, nominative-accusative alignment, pro-drop), observed Greek-biased convergence between the two can typically be reduced to a surface effect of shared microparametric settings. By way of illustration, consider once again the case of the Greek-style dative. Specifically, we saw that Calabrese patterns not with standard Romance varieties such as Italian, but, rather, with Grecanico in exhibiting varying degrees of syncretism in the marking of dative and genitive, the manifestation of which was argued to be ultimately understood as a case of microparametric variation in the marking of RECIPIENT arguments (cf. 9). On the other hand, the more subtle nature of divergence between Calabrese and Grecanico can be reduced to the surface effect of different settings in relation to hierarchically “deeper” microparametric options and, above all, in relation to nanoparametric differences. Returning again to the Greek-style dative, although Grecanico and Calabrese share the same parametric setting in relation to dative and genitive syncretism, we have seen how only distinct deeper microparametric settings can provide the key to understanding the more restricted distribution of the syncretism in Calabrese licensed by specific structural and pragmatic features associated with different functional heads (namely, K° and D°).

Finally, the preceding discussion has provided and reviewed significant evidence to demonstrate that ultimately the local Romance varieties of southern Calabria cannot be regarded as Greek disguised as Romance. Although such a view has traditionally enjoyed a great deal of acceptance since Rohlfs’ now classic slogan *spirito greco, materia romanza*, it is based on rather superficial structural similarities deriving from retained macro- and mesoparametric settings and, above all, from shared “shallow” microparametric settings. However, as soon as one begins to peel back the layers, it soon becomes clear that convergence through grammars in contact does not necessarily lead to simple borrowing and transference through interference, but more frequently gives rise to new hybrid structures born of reanalysis of the original Greek structures within a Romance grammar instantiating “deeper” microparametric options. This observation goes against the general prediction (cf. Biberauer 2012) that, all things being equal, syntactic change should proceed “upwards” within parametric hierarchies as acquirers strip away features in their attempt to postulate the simplest featural analyses compatible with the PLD (Roberts 2003). In the particular cases at hand, however, we are dealing with convergence where speakers are not so much trying to provide the best fit with the PLD, but, rather,

are striving to accommodate fully acquired structures from an increasingly less native/attrited L1 (viz. Grecanico) in a native L2 (viz. Calabrese), frequently introducing competing and additional options within the contact grammar. Within this scenario, one possibility that presents itself to speakers is to reanalyse such optionality as meaningful variation, thereby enriching the contact grammar with new choices and concomitant distinctions. This appears to have been the case with the Greek-style dative, where the introduction of Greek-style genitive marking of RECIPIENT arguments does not replace Romance-style dative marking wholesale, but, rather, emerges in Calabrese₁ as a marked context-sensitive option that is specialized in the marking of individual RECIPIENT arguments in accordance with their [\pm presuppositional] reading,¹¹ a development, in turn, reanalysed in Calabrese₂ as a structurally-conditioned alternation in accordance with the syncretic realization or otherwise of Case and definiteness.

¹¹ The [\pm presuppositional] distinction also plays a crucial role in the licensing of differential object marking in Calabrese, as fully demonstrated in \citet{LedgewaySchifanoSilvestriInpress}.