

Syntactic microvariation in complementation strategies in Pontic Greek varieties

Background: The present paper constitutes a first attempt at a syntactic analysis of complementation strategies in different varieties of Pontic Greek (PG) (but see also Drettas 1997; Mackridge 1987, 1995; Tombaidis 1996; Janse 2006), quite an understudied syntactic area of Pontic Greek, and a relatively underexplored area in the study of Greek dialects in general (but see Nicholas 2001 for a detailed survey; Ralli 2008; Roussou 2008). Drawing data from two different varieties of PG namely, Northern Pontic Greek (NPG) and Romeyka of Of (ROf), we explore all possible patterns in the syntax of complementation. **Methodology:** Original data collection involving structured questionnaires (orally administered) from two locations so far: Northern Greece and Of (north-eastern Turkey). **Research objectives:** (a) Establish the different complementation patterns among PG varieties and contrast them to Standard Modern Greek (SMG); (b) Relate the syntax of complementation to some more general properties of obligatory control (OC)/non-obligatory-control (NOC); (c) Discuss the articulation of the complementiser system. **Data:** (verbs exemplifying each semantic class of predicates are given in SMG; unless otherwise stated all examples are from ROf)

A. Complements to modals: *prepi* (must), *bori* (can/may), ...

- (1) a. *tʃ eporesa tʃimithini*
not could-1SG sleep-*INFIN.AOR*
a'. *Ki poresa na kimume* (NPG)
not could-1SG PRT sleep-1SG
a''. *ðen boresa na kimitho* (SMG)
not could-1SG PRT sleep-1SG
'I couldn't sleep'
- b. *u poro n'armevo*
not can-1SG PRT milk-1SG
'I cannot milk (the cows)'
- c. *Ile na porpato*
must-*INVAR* PRT walk-1SG
'I must walk'

B. Complements to aspectuals: *arxizo* (start), *stamato* (stop), ...

- (2) a. *baʃlæpsa pola so ðipsasinimu*
started-1SG lot to get.thirsty-*NOM.INFIN.POSS*
'I started to get very thirsty'
- b. *Mathan tʃe stetʃi*
learn-3SG and stand-3SG
'He starts to learn'
- c. *arxizi na matheni* (SMG)
learn-3SG PRT stand-3SG
'He starts to learn'

C. Complements to volitionals: *thelo* (want), *aɣapo* (love), ...

- (3) a. *esi thelis eyo uhe na troyo*
you want-2SG I not PRT eat-1SG
a'. *esi thelis ego na min troo* (SMG)
you want-2SG I PRT not eat-1SG
'You don't want me to eat'
- b. *Utʃ ethelna nemáireva*
not want-1SG.*IMPERF* cook-1SG.*COUNTERF*
'You didn't want me to eat'
- c. *tʃi thelo na porpato*
not want-1SG PRT walk-1SG
'I don't want to walk'
- d. *tʃi thelisa mairepsini*
not wanted-1SG cook-*INFIN.AOR*
'I didn't want to cook'
- e. *To peðim aso xorion to panimon thelo*
the kid from the village the going want-1SG
'I want the kid to leave the village'
- f. *Aɣapo na tʃimaste*
love-1SG PRT sleep-2PL
'I want you to sleep'

E. Complements to perception verbs: *vlepo* (see), *akuo* (hear), ...

- (4) *Eyo ekusa o tʃoanon ton arko endoke*
I heard-1SG the shepard the wolf-*ACC* killed-3SG
'I heard that the shepard killed a wolf'

F. Complements to verbs of mental perception: *thimame* (remember), *ksexno* (forget) ...

- (5) a. *Enespala na leyó ti mami ta xaberæ*
forgot-1SG PRT say-1SG the grandma the news
'I forgot to tell the news to the grandma'
- b. *Enespala etroya*
forgot-1SG eat-1SG.*IMPERF*
'I forgot to eat'

- c. To tʃimithinimu enespala
the sleep-NOM.INFIN.POSS forgot-1SG
'I forgot to sleep'
- G.** Complements to psych verbs: *xerome* (be pleased), *fovame* (be afraid), ...
- (6) a. Exara na mairevo
was-happy-1SG PRT cook-1SG
'I was happy to cook'
- b. fovume xanis ton paras
fear-1SG lose-2SG the money.POSS
'I fear you lose your money'
- H.** Epistemic predicates: *pistevo* (believe), *nomizo* (think), ...
- (7) Tharo xastasa ine
think-1SG sick.FEM are.3SG
'I think she is sick'
- I.** Verbs of saying: *leo* (say), ...
- (9) a. ti nifim ipa armekson
the daughter-in-law.POSS said-1SG milk-2SG.IMPER
'I said to my daughter-in-law to milk (the cows)'
- b. Tin patsim ipatin na pero tin ena yalemi
the daughter told-her PRT.FUT take-1SG a pen
'I told my daughter that I will buy her a pen'

Analysis: (a) OC/NOC: In SMG and NPG both OC and NOC are with *na*-clauses. In Romeyka OC with modals and volitionals (in some idiolects aspectuals as well) when the matrix verb is present tense, there is a *na*-clause; when the matrix verb is [+past, +neg], there is an (aorist) infinitive; when the matrix verb is [+imperf] the complement is a verb form with *na*-incorporation –also found in/is a counterfactual. On the other hand, in OC with aspectuals there two strategies: (i) nominalisations; and (ii) periphrastic constructions. (i) With regards to NOC, there are two strategies: *na*-clauses; (ii) nominalisations of the infinitive. Overall, in contrast to both SMG and NPG there is an infinitive and nominalisations. (b) If we follow Landau's (2004) "Calculus of Control", in Romeyka, in both OC subjunctives and OC infinitives C^0 being [-T], cannot license a [+R] element such as *pro*; only PRO, a [-R] element. However, in OC infinitives I^0 is [-T, -Agr], whereas in OC subjunctives I^0 is [-T, +Agr]. Although anti-economical for a language to have both options, should they were interchangeable there would not have been a problem. Crucially, they are not. When the matrix verb is [+T] (negation is needed for independent reasons pertaining to the expression of modality in this variety), an infinitive is yielded whereas when the matrix verb is [-T] a *na*-complement is produced. Yet they both license PRO. Note that the Romeyka infinitive is an Aorist one. A possible solution would be to claim that the difference between the two constructions may have to do with *consecutio temporum* being operative and which would have to be formalised along the lines of tense construals between complement and matrix clauses according to which the Reference-time (Ref-T) (Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 2000, 2005). Importantly, there is independent evidence that *consecutio temporum* holds very strongly in Romeyka (3b). (c) In all other biclausal predicates (in the sense of Wurmbrand 2001), the strategies are: *na* clauses; zero complementisers and paratactic syntax (also found in Cappadocian and other Greek dialects). (d) Complementiser system: SMG enjoys a rich complementiser system with *oti* (non factive)/*pos* (non factive)/*pu* (factive)/*na* (modalised complementiser) (see Roussou for detailed discussion of COMP in SMG); NPG has *oti/na*; Romeyka only has *na*. However, the status of *na* in Romeyka and SMG is not identical namely low rank complementiser (à la Rizzi 1997). In Romeyka *na* is a modal element par excellence and never found higher than negation (3a) (except when found in the speech act of cursing).

Selected References: Drettas, G. (1997). *Aspects Pontiques*. Paris: Association de recherches pluridisciplinaires. Mackridge, P. (1996). 'The Medieval Greek Infinitive in the Light of Modern Dialectal Evidence' in C. N. Constantinides et al., *ΦΙΛΕΛΛΑΗΝ*. Studies in honour of Robert Browning. Venice: Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia, 191-204. Nicholas, Nick (2001). 'A Survey of Modern Greek Dialectal Complementation'. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Ralli, Angela, Joseph, Brian D. & Mark Janse. 193-206. Patras: University of Patras.