Modality, antiveridicality and complementation: The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item

Ioanna Sitaridou [a,b,*]

[a] *University Senior Lecturer in Romance Philology, University of Cambridge, UK*
[b] *Fellow and Director of Studies in Linguistics and MML, Queens' College, Cambridge, UK*

Abstract

In this paper I examine the syntax–semantics of the Romeyka infinitive, still to be found in an endangered Greek variety uninterruptedly spoken in the historical region of Pontus, Turkey. It is shown that the infinitive is found: (a) as a complement to negated past tense modals; (b) in *before*-clauses; (c) in counterfactuals. My proposal is that the Romeyka infinitive is licensed as a NPI. It is argued that antiveridicalidity (in the sense of Giannakidou, 1998 *et seq.*) licenses the infinitive and therefore explains the unavailability of the Romeyka infinitive in other nonveridical contexts such as: (i) questions, (ii) nonveridical conditionals, (iii) present and imperfect tense negated modals. The analysis set out here (i) proposes a new type of NPI, namely an infinitive; (ii) reinforces the disengagement between morphological negation and antiveridicality; (iii) highlights parallels with Romance polarity subjunctives, which, like the infinitive, also share a T-C dependency; the latter may have rendered the Romeyka infinitive diachronically more prone to developing a neg-dependency too (Sitaridou, 2014).
© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Romeyka; Pontic Greek; Standard Modern Greek; Complementation; Infinitive; Antiveridicality; NPI; Modality

1. Survival against all odds: the Romeyka infinitive

The present article constitutes a first attempt at analysing complementation strategies in Pontic Greek (but cf. also Drettas, 1997; Mackridge, 1987, 1995), an understudied syntactic area of Pontic Greek and a relatively under-explored area in the study of Greek dialects in general (but cf. Nicholas, 2001; Ralli, 2007). Drawing data from two different varieties of Pontic Greek, namely Northern Pontic Greek (NPG) and Romeyka, the latter a Greek variety on which little is known (but cf. Parcharidis, 1880; Deffner, 1878; Dawkins, 1937; Mackridge, 1995, 1996; Sitaridou, 2013, 2014), we focus on the Romeyka infinitive.

Romeyka is still spoken in north-eastern Turkey, in the area traditionally known as Pontus (Sitaridou, 2013), and displays a plethora of archaic features – the *pièce de resistance* being the infinitive. Consider (1) where the infinitive surfaces as a complement to a *negated past tense modal*:

---

* Correspondence to: Queens' College, Silver Street, Cambridge CB3 9ET, UK. Tel.: +44 01223 331943; fax: +44 01223 335062.
E-mail address: is269@cam.ac.uk.

(1) Utš eporesa   mairepsini.[1]   (Romeyka)
     not can.PP.1SG   cook.INFIN
     'I could not cook.'

As is well-known, neither Standard Modern Greek (SMG) (presumably as a result of Balkan Sprachbund, see Joseph, 1983) nor NPG have an infinitive, as shown in (2):

(2) a.   ðen boresa   na   kimiθo.   (SMG)
          not can.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ sleep.PNP.1SG
          'I could not sleep.'
     b.   Kʰ' eporesa   na   kimume.[2]   (NPG)
          not can.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ sleep.1SG
          'I could not sleep.'

Instead both SMG and NPG employ finite complementation (cf. Roussou, 2009 and references therein); in particular, SMG uses *oti-*, *pu-* and *na-* complements which roughly correspond to declarative (3), factive (4) and subjunctive complements (5):

(3) Nomizo   oti   o   θoðoris   majirevi   kala.   (SMG)
     think.1SG that the theodore.NOM cook.3SG   well
     'I think that Theodore cooks well.'

(4) Lipame   pu   o   θoðoris   ðen majirevi   kala.   (SMG)
     regret.1SG   COMP the theodore.NOM not cook.3SG   well
     'I'm sorry to say that Theodore doesn't cook well.'

(5) O   θoðoris   bori   na   majirevi   kala.   (SMG)
     the theodore.NOM may.3SG   PRT.SUBJ cook.INP.3SG well
     'John may cook well.'

It is considered, trivially, that subjunctive complements replaced infinitives (Joseph, 1983:49–55). According to Giannakidou (1998, 2009), *na-*complements are found with: (i) *nonveridical* predicates (6), that is, predicates whose truth value is unknown or as yet undefined (Giannakidou, 2009:1889), whereas (ii) perception, emotive, epistemic, verbs of saying and knowing may take a *na-*complement under certain conditions (cf. Roussou, 2007):

(6) *Nonveridical* predicates (see Giannakidou, 1998, 2009)
     a.   Volitionals: *θelo* 'I want', *elpizo* 'I hope', *skopevo* 'I plan'
     b.   Directives: *ðiatazo* 'I order', *simvulevo* 'I advise', *protino* 'I suggest'
     c.   Modals: (invariant) *prepi* 'must', *bori* 'may'
     d.   Permissives: *epitrepo* 'I allow', *apaɣorevo* 'I forbid'

Curiously, the Romeyka infinitive is not found in all nonveridical contexts in (6), in which *na-*clauses are found in SMG – consider the contexts of positive past tense modals in (7a), negated present tense modal in (7b), and modals in questions in (7c), all of which do not allow an infinitive:

(7) a.   *eporesa   tšimiθini.   (Romeyka)
          can.PP.1SG   sleep.INFIN
          'I was able to sleep.'

---

[1] Abbreviations: ACC, accusative; COMP, complementiser; EPP, Extended Projection Principle; ENUN, enunciative; GEN, genitive; IMPER, imperative; INFIN, infinitive; INP, imperfective non-past; IP, past imperfect; m-negation, morphological negation; NEG, negator; neg-agreement, negative agreement; NOC, non-obligatory control; NOM, nominative; NPG, Northern Pontic Greek; NPI, negative polarity item; OC, obligatory control; OPT, optative; PL, plural; PNP, perfective non-past; PP, past perfect; PRT, particle; ROf, Romeyka of Of; SG, singular; SMG, Standard Modern Greek; SUBJ, subjunctive; FUT, Future.

[2] In the Romeyka and NPG glosses *na-*complements are not marked with either INP or PNP since the distinction does not hold.

b. *tši   poro   tšimiθini.   (Romeyka)
    not can.1SG sleep.INFIN
    'I can't sleep.'

c. *eporeses   tšimiθini?   (Romeyka)
    can.PP.2SG   sleep.INFIN
    'Were you able to sleep?'

Rather, in Romeyka, the infinitive only surfaces when a nonveridical past tense predicate is negated, as shown in (1). In fact, what seems to be at work is not morphological negation, but *antiveridicality* (8) instead since: (i) a negated present tense modal (7b) does not imply *not p_* in sharp contrast to a negated past tense modal.

(8) A nonveridical operator F is antiveridical iff Fp entails not p in some
     model: iff $M(x) \cap p = \emptyset$, i.e. all worlds are non-p.
     (Giannakidou, 1997 *et seq.*)

Additionally, (ii) the infinitive is also found in two more antiveridical contexts, namely *before*-clauses (9a) and counterfactuals (9b):

(9) a. Prin   spudžisini   so   mandrin, tši   pao.   (Romeyka)
         before clean.INFIN at.the barn   not go.1SG
         'I am not leaving before I clean the barn.'

     b. As   išen   porpatesini sa   rašia!   (Romeyka)
         PRT.OPT have.PP.3SG   walk.INFIN to.the mountains
         'S/he should have taken a walk in the mountains.'

In this paper, it is claimed that: (i) the Romeyka infinitive behaves like a negative polarity item (NPI) which, however, is not licensed by morphological negation but antiveridicality: the implication that *not p_*; (ii) therefore, we identify a new NPI-type. This property fundamentally places the Romeyka infinitive on a par with German *brauchen* 'need', SMG *xriazete* 'need' (in its impersonal variant only, see Giannakidou, 1997), English *need* (Iatridou and Zeijlstra, 2012), and Dutch *hoeven* 'need' (Van der Wouden, 1994; Giannakidou, 1998:370); (iii) this analysis in essence aligns the Romeyka infinitive with the Romance polarity subjunctive. More broadly, the polarity path of the Romeyka infinitive postulated here suggests an interaction between negation, modality, and polarity that is worth raising awareness about.

The article is presented as follows. Section 2.1 introduces the verbal and negation systems found in Romeyka. Section 2.2 outlines the morphological makeup of the Romeyka infinitive. Section 3 presents the five patterns of complementation in Romeyka. Sections 4.1–4.3 examine the Romeyka infinitive in negated past tense modals and volitionals, *before*-clauses and counterfactuals, respectively. In section 4.4 we put forward the proposal that the Romeyka infinitive is licensed in the same way as a NPI. In section 5 we discuss the interaction between negation, modality, and polarity. Section 6 compares Romance polarity subjunctives to the Romeyka infinitive. Finally, we conclude our findings in section 7.

2. Background information on Romeyka

The data in this article derive from two sources: (i) NPG data, collected in Northern Greece (from the same group of speakers as the ones in Michelioudakis and Sitaridou, 2012; Sitaridou and Kaltsa, 2014); and (ii) Romeyka which is an umbrella term for three sub-varieties, namely those in the historical region of Of, Tonya and Sürmene provinces. In this article, we focus on the first of these and, therefore, when we use the term 'Romeyka' we essentially refer to Romeyka of Of (ROf). The ROf data result from fieldwork carried out in Çaykara, Turkey during the course of three fieldtrips (2009, 2010, 2012) to the village of 'Anasta'. The methodology used entailed oral interviews based on structured questionnaires, but also spontaneous and semi-spontaneous data collection. The speakers are all female and aged from 41 to 70 years old (see Sitaridou, 2013 for a discussion on the methodology).

2.1. Notes on the verbal and negation systems of Romeyka

Since very little is known on Romeyka, it is important to present some properties which are pertinent to the discussion on the infinitive and the complementation strategies more generally. First, let us consider the verbal paradigm in Romeyka and contrast it with the verbal system in SMG:

(a) There is no morphologically distinct future tense, unlike SMG where *θa* is used; Romeyka uses *na* instead (and so does NPG);

(b) The SMG perfect/aorist distinction does not hold in Romeyka;

(c) There are four moods: indicative (*trois* 'you eat') and imperative (*fa*, 'eat!') which are morphologically marked on the verb; subjunctive (*na troɣo*, 'I should eat') and optative (*as troɣo*, 'let me eat') which are marked by the particles *na* and *as*, respectively; the situation mirrors that found in SMG;

(d) SMG verbs inflect for both tense and aspect (see Lekakou and Nilsen, 2008), as shown in (10). In sharp contrast in Romeyka (and NPG), aspectual distinctions between perfective and imperfective are only maintained in the past tense of the indicative, but not in the subjunctive hence (10b) is ungrammatical in Romeyka:

(10) a. troo (INP)   b. fao (PNP)   (SMG)
          eat.IMPNONPAST.1SG   eat.PERFNONPAST.1SG
          'I am eating.'   dependent form 'I eat (habitually).'

      c. etroɣa (IP)   d. efaɣa (PP)
          eat.IMPPAST.1SG   eat.PERFPAST.1SG
          'I was eating.'   'I ate.'

(e) The only participle is the passive *-menos*, also found in SMG;

(f) There is no gerund in Romeyka, unlike SMG.

Second, let us consider negators. Romeyka negators are significant to our discussion because of: (i) the analysis of the Romeyka infinitive as an NPI; (ii) the considerable amount of cross-dialectal variation and the allomorphy they present in Romeyka. SMG preserves a binary negator distinction whose roots are found in Classical Greek. Currently, the division of labour is between the negators *ðe(n)* and *mi(n)* (see Willmott, 2013; Chatzopoulou, 2012:249). Broadly, imperatives, subjunctives (embedded and otherwise), and optatives are negated with *min*, while other sentential negation is performed by *ðen*. A binary distinction between negators is also maintained in NPG where the equivalent form of the *ðe(n)* negator is *kʰ*. However, ROf presents a four-way distinction between negators, namely (i) *utš*, the equivalent form of the *ðe(n)* negator – see Table 1 for the considerable allomorphy; (ii) *min* in imperatives and wishes; (iii) *xe* in subjunctives and (iv) *mutš* in counterfactuals. Clearly, further consideration of this topic is needed and we leave the discussion for future work (but see Chatzopoulou and Sitaridou, 2014).

Table 1
Negation allomorphy in Romeyka matrix indicative clauses.

Preceding word ending in	Negator	Following word starting with
Ø/-C	utš	V-
-V	tš	V-
-V	tši	C-
-C	u	C-
Ø	utši	C-

2.2. The morphology of the Romeyka infinitive

Let us now consider the morphological formation of the Romeyka infinitive which is shown in Table 2.

Table 2
The productive nature of the Romeyka infinitive.

Present (1st person)	Past tense (1st person)	Infinitive
tšimume 'I sleep'	etšimeθa	tšimethini
almeɣo 'I milk'	almeksa	almeksini
xtizo 'I build'	extisa	xtisini
kofto 'I cut'	ekopsa	kopsini
θerizo 'I harvest'	eθerisa	θerisini
porpato 'I walk'	eporpatesa	porpatesini
leɣo 'I say'	ipa	ipene
ilazo 'I bark'	ilaksa	ilaksini
pino 'I drink'	epia	pieni
troɣo 'I eat'	efaa	fanini
alevrume 'I am covered in flour'	alevroθa	alevroθini
trexo 'I run'	etreksa	treksini
ðiɣo 'I give'	eðosa	ðosini

Table 2 (*Continued*)

Present (1st person)	Past tense (1st person)	Infinitive
steko 'I stand'	estaθa	staθini
maθizo 'I teach'	emaθisa	maθesini
sindišeno 'I talk, discuss'	esindišena	sinditšesini
vrisko 'I find'	evrika	evrini
fitrono 'I grow'	efitrosa	fitrosini
fevo 'I run away'	efia	fieni
kovalo 'I carry'	ekovalesa	kuvalesini
mairevo 'I cook'	emairepsa	mairepsini
aɣapo 'I love'	aɣapesa	aɣapesini
elepo 'I see'	iða	iðene
no(j)izo 'I feel'	enoisa	noisini
xlime 'I warm up'	exleθa	xleθini
kloskume 'I turn'	eklosta	klostini
anizo 'I open'	anisa	anisini
ðakno 'I bite'	eðaksa	ðaksini
luxkome 'I bathe'	eluxka	luxtini
ðeno 'I tie'	eðesa	ðesini

As Table 2 shows, morphologically, the Romeyka infinitive consists of the aorist stem followed by the infinitival ending *-ini* (or *-ine/-in* for very few speakers) which is the same for both the active and the passive voice (Sitaridou, 2014:35).

To demonstrate beyond any doubt that the verbal form in *-ini* is indeed the infinitive and, therefore, invariable in not bearing any agreement features, consider (11) where we observe obligatory control (OC), whereby the matrix subject controls the subject of the embedded verb – the latter remaining unchanged in form:

(11)   a.   utš   eporesa   tšimiθini   (ROf)
              not   can.PP.1SG sleep.INFIN
        b.   utš   eporeses   tšimiθini
              not   can.PP.2SG sleep.INFIN
        c.   utš   eporesen   tšimiθini
              not   can.PP.3SG sleep.INFIN
        d.   utš   eporesame   tšimiθini
              not   can.PP.1PL sleep.INFIN
        e.   utš   eporesate   tšimiθini
              not   can.PP.2PL sleep.INFIN
        f.   utš   eporesane   tšimiθini
              not   can.PP.3PL sleep.INFIN
              'I/You/He/She/It/We/They could not sleep.'

Moreover, the infinitive also participates in the formation of a complex predicate. Morphologically, this form resembles a 'past perfect' form since it comprises the verb 'have' in the past tense declinable, followed by the infinitive. However, this 'past perfect' form containing the infinitive only functions as a counterfactual, as presented in Table 3:

Table 3
Complex infinitival predicate in Romeyka conditionals.

Types of conditionals	Protasis	Apodosis
Nonveridical		
Possible	a. *na* + present	*na* + present (=future)
	b. *an* + present	
Irrealis	a. *n'* + imperfect	*n'* + imperfect
	b. *an* + imperfect	
Antiveridical (counterfactual)		
	a. *n/n'* + *ixa* 'I had' + infinitive	*n'* + imperfect
	b. *an* + *ixa* 'I had' + infinitive	*ixa* 'I had' + infinitive

As we can see from Table 3, the form *had* + infinitive is found exclusively as a counterfactual in both the protasis and apodosis. This context is very important, as we shall see in section 4.3, because: (i) it is one of the three contexts in which we find the Romeyka infinitive; and (ii) it is antiveridical.

3. Patterns of complementation in Romeyka from a micro-/nano-comparative perspective

The aim of this section is to outline all patterns in the syntax of complementation in Romeyka without, however, offering a detailed account of every strategy. It will be shown that the investigation of the complementation strategies in Romeyka from a micro-(in correlation to SMG)/nano-(in correlation to NPG) comparative perspective (à la mode of Michelioudakis and Sitaridou, 2012) reveals five main strategies: (i) *na*-clauses; (ii) bare infinitives; (iii) null complementisers; (iv) embedded imperatives; and (v) infinitive nominalisations. In examining these complementation patterns in Romeyka the distribution of the Romeyka infinitive starts to emerge.

3.1. na-*clauses in Romeyka*

SMG makes extensive use of *na*-clauses. In contrast, in Romeyka, they have a more restricted distribution. First, in Romeyka, *na*-clauses are encountered as complements to negated present tense modals such as *u poro* 'I can't' (12a) and *ile* 'must' – a loanword from Turkish which functions as an invariant modal (12b):

(12) a.   U   poro   n'   almeɣo.   (ROf)
         not   can.1SG   PRT.SUBJ milk.1SG
         'I cannot milk (the cows).'
      b.   Ile   na   porpato/porpatis/porpati.   (ROf)
         must PRT.SUBJ walk.1SG/walk.2SG/walk.3SG
         'I/you/s/he/it must walk.'

The same pattern is observed in both SMG (13a) and NPG (13c) for which the pattern is, of course, not restricted to negated present tense modals, but extends to positive modals as well (13b–d):

(13) a.   ðen boresa   na   kimiθo.   (SMG)
         not can.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ sleep.PNP.1SG
         'I couldn't sleep.'
      b.   Prepi na   kimiθo.   (SMG)
         must PRT.SUBJ sleep.PNP.1SG
         'I must sleep.'
      c.   Kʰ' eporesa   na   kimume.   (NPG)
         not can.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ sleep.1SG
         'I couldn't sleep.'
      d.   Prep n'   almeɣo.   (NPG)
         must PRT.SUBJ milk.1SG
         'I must milk (the cows).'

Second, in Romeyka, *na*-clauses are selected by a volitional, such as *θelo* 'I want', on the non-controlled interpretation (14a), and *tši θelo* 'I don't want' and *utš eθelna* 'I wasn't wanting' on the controlled interpretation (14b and c) only when negated. Importantly, *θelo* 'I want' and *eθelna* 'I was wanting' on the positive controlled interpretation (14d and e) do not:

(14) a.   Esi   θelis   eɣo   xe[3] na   troɣo.   (ROf)
         you.NOM want.2SG I.NOM not PRT.SUBJ eat.1SG
         'You don't want me to eat.'
      b.   Tši θelo   na   porpato.   (ROf)
         not want.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.1SG
         'I don't want to walk'
      c.   Utš eθelna   n'   emaireva.   (ROf)
         not want.IP.1SG PRT.SUBJ cook.IP.1SG
         'I didn't want to cook'
      d.   *Pola eθelna   (n')   etroɣa; ama u   poro   na   troɣo.   (ROf)
         very want.IP.1SG (PRT.SUBJ) eat.IP.1SG but not can.1SG PRT.SUBJ eat.1SG
         'I wanted to eat a lot but I can't.'

---

[3] Moreover, a further difference is noted between SMG and Romeyka where *xe* in (14)a is located higher than *na* in (17)e where the negation is found between *na* and the verb (see also Chatzopoulou and Sitaridou, 2014).

e.   *θelo   na   porpato.   (ROf)
      want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   walk.1SG
      'I want to walk.'

In fact, in Romeyka, in contexts such as (14d and e), another volitional verb surfaces, namely *aɣapo* 'I love/like'. For the latter, the only available type of complement is a *na*-clause, which surfaces regardless of the presence of negation and the control properties. This is demonstrated in (15a and b) where there is both negation and control and in (15c and d) where there is non-obligatory control (NOC):

(15)   a.   Utš aɣapo   na   paɣo   sa   rašia.   (ROf)
            not love.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   go.1SG to.the mountains.ACC
            'I don't like to go in the mountains.'

       b.   Utš aɣapena   n'   emaireva.   (ROf)
            not love.IP.1SG PRT.SUBJ   cook.IP.1SG
            'I wasn't fond of cooking.'

       c.   To peði = m   aso   xorion aɣapo   na   pai.   (ROf)
            the child = my from.the village want.1SG PRT.SUBJ go.3SG
            'I want my child to leave the village.'

       d.   Aɣapo   na   tšimaste.   (ROf)
            love.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   sleep.2PL
            'I want you to sleep.'

Turning to NPG, we observe a pattern similar to that in Romeyka:

(16)   a.   Aɣapo   na   troo.   (NPG)
             love.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   eat.1SG
             'I like eating.'

       b.   *θelo   na   troo.   (NPG)
            want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   eat.1SG
            'I want to eat.'

       c.   Ki   θelo   na   troo.   (NPG)
            not want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   eat.1SG
            'I don't want to eat.'

       d.   Ki   θelo   na   troi   i   nifæ = m;   (NPG)
            not want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   eat.3SG   the   daughter-in-law = my;
            ɣurzula   na   troi!
            poison.NOM   PRT.SUBJ   eat.3SG
            'I don't want my daughter-in-law to eat – she should eat poison!'

However, in SMG, volitionals, namely *θelo* 'I want' and *mu aresi* 'I like', behave alike in only allowing a *na*-clause irrespective of: (i) whether there is negation or not (17b/c); and (ii) the control properties (17a–d) (see also section 4.1). On the other hand, *aɣapo* 'I love' with a *na*-complement is not productively used in SMG (17e/f). Instead, *aɣapo* takes a deverbal NP as its complement (17g):

(17)   a.   θelo   na   troo   (oli tin ora).   (SMG)
            want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   eat.INP.1SG (all the time)
            'I like eating (all the time).'

       b.   Mu   aresi   na   troo.   (SMG)
            I.GEN like.3SG PRT.SUBJ   eat.INP.1SG
            'I like to eat.'

       c.   ðen θelise   na   fai.   (SMG)
            not want.PP.3SG PRT.SUBJ   eat.PNP.3SG
            'He didn't want to eat.'

       d.   Esi   θelis   eɣo   na   min troo.   (SMG)
            you.NOM want.2SG I.NOM PRT.SUBJ   not eat.INP.1SG
            'You don't want me to eat.'

   e.   *Aɣapo   na   troo.   (SMG)
        love.1SG PRT.SUBJ eat.INP.1SG
        'I like eating.'

   f.   O   Janis   aɣapa   na   majirevi   me   tis ores.   (SMG)
        the John.NOM love.3SG PRT.SUBJ cook.INP.3SG with the hours
        'John loves to cook all the time.'

   g.   Aɣapao   to   perpatima.   (SMG)
        love.1SG the walking
        'I love walking.'

Third, in Romeyka, *na*-clauses are found as complements to causatives, as in (18):

(18) a.   Efikane = sas   na   skaftete ta   xorafæ = suna.   (ROf)
        let.PP.3PL = you PRT.SUBJ dig.3PL the   fields = his
        'They let you dig his fields.'

      b.   I   džandarmaðes utš' efikane   na   skaftete ta   xorafæ.   (ROf)
        the policemen.NOM not let.PP.3PL PRT.SUBJ dig.2PL the fields.ACC
        'The policemen didn't let you dig the fields.'

On a par with Romeyka, *na*-clauses are found as complements to causatives in both SMG (19a) and NPG (19b):

(19) a.   I   astinomiki   ðen sas afisan   na   skapsete ta xorafia   sas.   (SMG)
        the policemen.NOM not you let.PP.3PL PRT.SUBJ dig.PNP.2PL the fields.ACC your
         'The policemen didn't let you dig the fields.'

      b.   I   mana = m k' efeke = sas   na   skaftete ta xorafæ.   (NPG)
        the mother.my not let.PP.3SG = you PRT.SUBJ dig.2PL the fields.ACC
        'My mother didn't let you dig the fields.'

Fourth, in Romeyka, *na*-clauses appear as complements to mental perception verbs such as *enespala* 'I forgot' (20a) – interestingly, the corresponding antonym is only rendered periphrastically, namely *erte so tšefali = m* 'it came to mind', which also selects a *na*-clause (20b).

(20) a.   Enespala   na   leɣo   ti   mami   ta xaberæ.   (ROf)
        forget.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ say.1SG the grandmother.ACC the news.ACC
        'I forgot to tell the news to the grandmother.'

      b.   Erte   so   tšefali = m na   leɣo = se   do   epike.   (ROf)
        come.PP.3SG to.the head = my PRT.SUBJ tell.1SG = you what do.PP.3SG
        'It came to mind to tell you what he did.'

The same *na*-clause pattern with mental perception verbs obtains in SMG (21a), where we also observe: (i) a *pu*-strategy (21b); and (ii) a positive expression *θimiθika* 'I remembered' (21c) – cf. (20b).

(21) a.   Ksexasa   na   po   ta nea   sti   jaja.   (SMG)
        forget.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ say.PNP.1SG the news.ACC to.the grandmother.ACC
        'I forgot to tell the news to grandmother.'

      b.   Ksexasa   pu   ipa   ta nea   sti   jaja.   (SMG)
        forget.PP.1SG COMP say.PP.1SG the news.ACC to.the grandmother.ACC
        'I forgot to tell the news to grandmother.'

      c.   θimiθika   na   po   sti jaja   ta nea.   (SMG)
        remember.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ say.PNP.1SG the grandmother.ACC the news.ACC
        'I remembered to tell the news to grandmother.'

NPG (22) shares properties with ROf in that: (i) no *pu*-strategy is found, as in (22c); and (ii) *na* surfaces with positive periphrastic mental perception verbs (22d), which is the equivalent of (20b) (cf. (21c)):

(22) a. Enespala   na   leo   sin   jajan   ta   xaparæ.   (NPG)
          forget.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ say.1SG to.the grandmother.ACC the news.ACC
          'I forgot to tell the news to grandmother.'

      b. Enθimeθa   na   leo   sin   jaja   ta   xaparæ.   (NPG)
          remember.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ say.1SG to.the grandmother.ACC the news.ACC
          'I remembered to tell the news to grandmother.'

      c. *Enθimeθa   pu   ipa   sin   jajan   ta xaparæ.   (NPG)
          remember.PP.1SG   COMP   say.PP.1SG to.the grandmother.ACC the news.ACC
          'I remembered to tell the news to grandmother.'

      d. Endoken   so num na   leo   sin   jaja   ta   xaparæ.   (NPG)
          come.PP.1SG to mind PRT.SUBJ say.1SG to.the grandmother.ACC the news.ACC
          'I remembered to tell the news to grandmother.'

Fifth, in Romeyka, *na*-clauses appear as complements to emotive verbs, as shown in (23):

(23) Exara   na   mairevo.   (ROf)
      be-happy.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ cook.1SG
      'I was happy I had cooked.'

This is the same as what we find in SMG (24a) and NPG (24b), although we note that in Romeyka: (i) there is no *pu*-strategy in contrast with SMG (24c); and (ii) there is no *do*-strategy, unlike NPG (24d):

(24) a. Xerome   na   majirevo.   (SMG)
          be-happy.1SG   PRT.SUBJ cook.INP.1SG
          'I am happy to cook.'

      b. Exara   na   mairevo.   (NPG)
          be-happy.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ cook.1SG
          'I was happy I had cooked.'

      c. Xarika   pu   majirepsa.   (SMG)
          be-happy.PP.1SG COMP   cooked.1SG
          'I was happy I had cooked.'

      d. Exara   do   erθen   o   peðas.   (NPG)
          be-happy.PP.1SG COMP   come.PP.3SG the boy.NOM
          'I was happy that the boy came.'

To sum up, in Romeyka, *na*-clauses are selected by nonveridical predicates such as negated present tense modals and volitionals, as well as by causatives, mental perception and emotive verbs.

3.2. Infinitives in Romeyka

As we have already seen in the introduction, infinitives appear as complements to negated past tense modals (cf. also Mackridge, 1995:158 for a similar observation):

(25) a. Utš eporesa   tšimiθini.   (ROf)
          not can.PP.1SG   sleep.INFIN
          'I could not sleep.'

      b. *Eporesa   tšimiθini.   (ROf)
          can.PP.1SG   sleep.INFIN

Second, in Romeyka, infinitives appear as complements to the negated past tense volitional *utš eθelesa* 'I didn't want' (26a and b):

(26) a. Utš eθelesa   mairepsini.   (ROf)
          not want.PP.1SG   cook.INFIN
          'I didn't want to cook.'

b.   *Eθelesa   mairepsini.   (ROf)
      want.PP.1SG   cook.INFIN
      'I wanted to cook.'

To sum up, the Romeyka infinitive surfaces in a subset of nonveridical predicates, namely negated past tense modals and volitionals.

3.3. Null complementisers in Romeyka

Null complementisers employed as a complementation strategy, although very scarce in SMG, are extremely productive in Romeyka. First, null complementisers are selected by perception verbs, as shown in (27):

(27)   Eɣo   ekusa   o   tšopanon   ton   arko   endoke.   (ROf)
        I.NOM hear.PP.1SG   the   shepherd.NOM the   wolf.ACC kill.PP.3SG
        'I heard that the shepherd killed the wolf.'

In comparison, perception predicates select either *na-* or *oti*-complements in SMG:

(28)   a.   Eɣo   akusa   ton   tsopano   na   skotoni   ton   liko.   (SMG)
             I   hear.PP.1SG   the   shepherd.ACC   PRT.SUBJ   kill.INP.3SG the   wolf.ACC
             'I heard the shepherd killing the wolf.'
        b.   Eɣo   akusa   oti   o   tsopanos   skotose   ton   liko.   (SMG)
             I   hear.PP.1SG   that the   shepherd.NOM   kill.PP.3SG the   wolf.ACC
             'I heard that the shepherd killed the wolf.'

In NPG we observe that both the Romeyka (29a) and SMG strategies (29b) are available:

(29)   a.   Eksa   o   tšopanon   endoke   ki   eθeken = ka   ton   likon.   (NPG)
             hear.PP.1SG   the   shepherd.NOM   knock.PP.3SG and   put.PP.3SG = there the   wolf.ACC
             'I heard that the shepherd knocked the wolf down and placed him there.'
        b.   Eksa   oti   o   tšopanon   endoke   ki   eθeken = ka   ton   likon. (NPG)
             hear.PP.1SG   that the   shepherd.NOM   knock.PP.3SG and   put.PP.3SG = there the   wolf.ACC
             'I heard that the shepherd knocked the wolf down and placed him there.'

Second, in Romeyka, null complementisers are selected by some emotive verbs such as *efoveθa* 'I feared' (30a). Crucially, as we have already seen, this strategy does not extend to all emotive verbs, for instance, *exara* 'I was glad' in (23) – repeated here for convenience as (30b):

(30)   a.   Efoveθa   xanis   ton   para = s.   (ROf)
             fear.PP.1SG   lose.2SG   the   money.ACC = your
             'I feared you may lose your money.'
        b.   Exara   na   mairevo.   (ROf)
             be-happy.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   cook.1SG
             'I was happy I had cooked.'

On this occasion, NPG aligns with Romeyka in allowing null complementisers, as shown in (31):

(31)   Aets   opos   epikes   efoeθa   exases   ta   paraðes.   (NPG)
        this-way as   do.PP.2SG   fear.PP.1SG   lose.PP.2SG the   money.ACC
        'From the way you acted, I feared you had lost the money.'

However, these predicates select either *pu-* or *oti*-complements in SMG (32):

(32)   a.   Xarika   pu   majirepsa.   (SMG)
             be-happy.PP.1SG   COMP   cook.PP.1SG
             'I was happy that I cooked.'

b. Fovame   oti/pos/pu xanis   ta   xrimata su   askopa.   (SMG)
    fear.1SG   COMP   lose.2SG   the money   your   aimlessly
    'I fear that you are wasting your money.'

Third, in Romeyka, null complementisers are selected by epistemic predicates (33):

(33) a. θaro   xastas en.   (ROf)
          think.1SG   sick   be.3SG
          'I think s/he is sick.'
      b. Eɣriko   aðakes pola kleftes ine.   (ROf)
          believe.1SG here   very thieves are.3PL
          'I believe that the people here are real thieves.'

NPG exhibits the same pattern as that attested in Romeyka, as shown in (34):

(34) a. Eθaro   amon pola kleftants eš   aðaka oloera.   (NPG)
          believe.1SG like many thieves   have.3SG here everywhere
          'I believe that the people everywhere around here are real thieves.'
      b. Eθaro   to tšimiði = s   pola koft!   (NPG)
          believe.1SG the mind = your   very cut.3SG
          'I think your mind is very sharp!'

However, the same class of predicates in SMG select *oti*-complements, as shown in (35):

(35) Nomizo   oti i   anθropi   eðo ine   poli kleftes.   (SMG)
      believe.1SG that the people.NOM here are.3PL very thieves
      'I believe that the people here are real thieves.'

Fourth, in Romeyka, null complementisers are selected by verbs of saying (36) – note that the *na* in (36b and c) functions as a future particle, not as a complementiser:

(36) a. Tin patsi = m   ipa   epero = se   ɣalemi.   (ROf)
          the daughter.ACC = my tell.PP.1SG take.1SG = you pencil.ACC
          'I told my daughter that I would buy her a pencil.'
      b. Tin patsi = m   ipa = tin   na   pero = tin   ena ɣalemi. (ROf)
          the daughter.ACC = my tell.PP.1SG-her PRT.FUT   take.1SG = her a   pencil.ACC
          'I told my daughter that I will buy her a pencil.'
      c. O Mehmetis ipe   ta ɣarðelæ (n')   epero = sas   ɣalemi.   (ROf)
          the Mehmet say.PP.3SG the kids.ACC (PRT.FUT)   take.1SG = you pencil.ACC
          'Mehmet said to the kids that he would buy them a pencil.'

NPG behaves on a par with Romeyka, as shown in (37):

(37) a. O Kostikas   ipen   sa peðia = t θa   pero = sas   molivia.   (NPG)
          the kostas.NOM tell.PP.1SG to.the children = his PRT.FUT take.1SG = you pencils.ACC
          'Kostas told his children that he would buy them pencils.'
      b. O Kostikas   ipen   sa peðia = t epera = sas   molivia.   (NPG)
          the Kostas.NOM tell.PP.1SG to.the children = his take.PP.1SG = you pencils.ACC
          'Kostas told his children that he bought them pencils.'

As before, these predicates select *oti*-complements in SMG:

(38) a. Ipa   stin   kori   mu oti θa   tis aɣoraso   ena molivi. (SMG)
          tell.PP.1SG to.the daughter my that PRT.FUT her buy.PNP.1SG a   pencil.ACC
          'I told my daughter that I will buy her a pen.'

b. *Ipa   stin   kori   mu   na   tis   aɣoraso   ena   molivi.   (SMG)
   tell.PP.1SG   to.the daughter my   PRT.SUBJ her   buy.PNP.1SG a   pencil.ACC
   'I told my daughter that I will buy her a pen.'

To sum up: (i) in Romeyka there is omission not only of *oti*, the 'high ranking' complementiser (in the sense of Rizzi, 1997), but also of *na*, the 'low ranking' one (cf. Roussou, 2000) which is never omitted in SMG; (ii) although *na*-complements may alternate with *oti*-complements in SMG, in Romeyka such an alternation does not exist since these indicative complements are rendered with a null complementiser; (iii) NPG seems to share affinities with both Romeyka and SMG; and (iv) Romeyka (but also NPG) seems to have shifted indexicals ('monsters' according to Schlenker, 2003), for instance *sas* 'you' in (37), whose existence may be typologically linked to the availability of embedded imperatives, as we will show immediately next.

3.4. Embedded imperatives in Romeyka

Romeyka seems to allow for embedded imperatives which are rare cross-linguistically (but cf. Sadock and Zwicky, 1985; Palmer, 1986; Han, 1998; Platzack and Rosengren, 1998). Consider the embedded imperatives under verbs of saying in Romeyka:

(39) a. Ti nifi = m   ipa   almekson.   (ROf)
        the daughter-in-law = my tell.PP.1SG   milk.IMPER.2SG
        'I told my daughter-in-law to milk (the cows).'
     b. Tin patsi = m   ipa   pison   xapsia   na   troɣume.   (ROf)
        the daughter = my tell.PP.1SG make.IMPER.2SG whitebait.ACC   PRT.SUBJ eat.2PL
        'I told my daughter to fry whitebait to eat.'
     c. Ta ɣarðela ipa   pola pria ɣriɣora elate.   (ROf)
        the children tell.PP.1SG very fast   come.IMPER.2PL
        'I told the children to come at once.'

However, on the basis of (39) we cannot exclude that these embedded imperatives are any different from indirect speech – consider SMG (40) which is the equivalent of Romeyka (39c):

(40) Ipa   sta   peðia   elate   ke   vlepume   apo ki   ke   pera.   (SMG)
     tell.PP.1SG to.the kids.ACC   come.IMPER.2PL   and see.1PL   from here and after
     'I told them to come and we shall take it from there.'

Romeyka also allows embedded imperatives in (41), along with NPG in (43), which however SMG in (42) does not allow:

(41) O Alis   esenan ɣrapson   ipen.[4]   (ROf)
     the Alis.NOM   you   write.IMPER.2SG   tell.PP.3S
     'Alis ordered you to write.'

(42) *O Janis   se   dietakse   ɣrapse.   (SMG)
      the John.NOM you order.PP.3SG   write.IMPER.2SG
      'Jannis ordered you to write.'
      (adapted from Han, 2000)

(43) I Parθena   esenan ipen   almekson.   (NPG)
     the Parθena.NOM   you   tell.PP.3SG milk.IMPER.2SG
     'Parthena ordered you to milk (the cows).'

---

[4] Romeyka does not have a separate verb for the verb 'to order' – they use 'to say'. Also, there seems to be variation among speakers with regards to the ordering of the of the imperative verb and the matrix one.

Although the issue awaits further investigation, on the strength of (41) and given the ungrammaticality of its SMG equivalent in (42), we conclude that Romeyka allows for embedded imperatives.

3.5. Nominalisations in Romeyka

Romeyka employs two types of nominalisation strategies: nominalised infinitives and deverbal nouns – the latter are also found in both SMG and NPG.

Let us start by establishing that the Romeyka infinitive is distinct from deverbal nouns. In order to do so, we consider the verbal properties of the Romeyka infinitive. First, the Romeyka infinitive root derives from the aorist stem and it can also bear the passive voice marker *-θ-*. Moreover, the Romeyka infinitive may have a distinct nominative subject – in other words, it can admit a personal infinitive (see Sitaridou, 2014 for the inflected and personal infinitives in different varieties of Romeyka; Sitaridou, 2000, 2006, 2007a,b, 2009, for the Romance personal infinitive), as shown in (44):

(44)   Prin   ðosini   ton paran   Aiše   eɣo = pa   tši   pao.   (ROf)
        before give.INFIN   the money.ACC   Aise.NOM I.NOM = PRT   not go.1SG
        'I am not leaving before Aise gives back the money.'

Additionally, the Romeyka infinitive can take either a predicate (45a) or a DP (45b) as a complement:

(45)   a.   Utš eporesa   aɣapisini   almeksini.   (ROf)
             not can.PP.1SG   love.INFIN   milk.INFIN
             'I couldn't bring myself to liking milking the cows.'
        b.   Utš eporesa   evrini   ta   za.   (ROf)
             not can.PP.1SG   find.INFIN   the animals.ACC
             'I couldn't find the animals.'

Furthermore, the Romeyka infinitive may be modified by adverbs (46):

(46)   Utš eporesa   tšimiθini   aɣliɣora.   (ROf)
        not can.PP.1SG   sleep.INFIN   early
        'I did not manage to sleep early.'

Finally, the Romeyka infinitive can be co-ordinated (47):

(47)   Utš eporesa   tšimiθini   tše ton ipnon   xortasini.   (ROf)
        not can.PP.1SG   sleep.INFIN   and the sleep.ACC   sate.INFIN
        'I did not manage to sleep and have enough of sleep.'

Having established that the infinitive is distinct from deverbal nouns, let us now discuss the nominalisation of the infinitive. First, in Romeyka, nominalised infinitive forms occur as complements to aspectuals such as *epiturepsa* 'I finished' (48a), whereas another aspectual such as *epašlaepsa* 'I started' selects a deverbal noun introduced by the preposition *so* 'to the', as in (48b):

(48)   a.   To   tšimiθin = emuneθe   epiturepsa.   (ROf)
             the sleep.INFIN = our.its finish.PP.1SG
             'I finished sleeping (=I woke up).'
        b.   Epašlaepsa   pola   so   ðipsasimo.   (ROf)
             start.PP.1SG lot   to.the   drinking
             'I started to get very thirsty.'

It is worth noting here that in Romeyka the nominalised infinitive form is used with a complex possessive, *-(e)muneθe*, which seems to be a necessary condition for this use of the infinitive (cf. NPG forms *-(e)mun* 'our' *eθe* 'its' in Papadopoulos (1955:59); this complex possessive could well be a calque from Turkish, for instance *oku-ma-sın-ı* 'read-vn-3sg.poss-acc').

Unsurprisingly, this strategy is absent from SMG and NPG given that they do not have an infinitive in the first place; instead, we find either *na*-clauses (49a–d) or deverbal nouns (49b–e).

(49)   a.   Stamatisa   na   dipsao   poli.   (SMG)
            stop.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   get-thirsty.INP.1SG   very
            'I stopped getting very thirsty.'
       b.   Stamatisa   to   majirema.   (SMG)
            finish.PP.1SG   the   cooking
            'I finished cooking.'
       c.   *Stamatisa   to   na   kimame.   (SMG)
            finish.PP.1SG   the   PRT.SUBJ   sleep.INP.1SG
            'I finished sleeping.' (='I woke up')
       d.   Erxinesa   na   ðipso   pola.   (NPG)
            started.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   get-thirsty.1SG   lot
            'I started to get very thirsty.'
       e.   Epesosa   to   maireman.   (NPG)
            finish.PP.1SG   the   cooking
            'I finished cooking.'

Second, in Romeyka, infinitive nominalisation may occur as a complement to verbs of mental perception, such as *enespala* 'I forgot' (50a). It is important to note that *na*-clauses are not excluded from this context as we have seen in (20a) – repeated here for convenience as (50b). However, the two complementation strategies are not equivalent; the difference being that nominalised infinitives are selected on the subject control interpretation (50a):

(50)   a.   To   tšimiθin = emuneθe   enespala.   (ROf)
            the   sleep.INFIN = our.its   forget.PP.1SG
            'I forgot to sleep.'
       b.   Enespala   na   leγo   ti   mami   ta   xaberæ.   (ROf)
            forget.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   say.1SG   the   grandmother.ACC   the   news.ACC
            'I forgot to tell the news to grandmother.'

As before, this strategy is absent from SMG (51a) and NPG (51b) which only allow for *na*-clauses:

(51)   a.   Ksexasa   na   kimiθo!   (SMG)
            forget.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   sleep.PNP.1SG
            'I forgot to sleep!'
       b.   Mose   enespala   na   kimume!   (NPG)
            PRT.ENUN   forget.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   sleep.1SG
            'I forgot to sleep!'

Third, in Romeyka, deverbal nouns occur as complements to volitionals, such as *θelo* 'I want' on the NOC interpretation (52a) – in this context no infinitive nominalisation obtains, as shown in (52b):

(52)   a.   To   peði = m   to   panimon   aso   xorion   θelo.   (ROf)
            the   kid = my   the   going   from.the   village   want.1SG
       b.   *To   peði = m   to   pan(ini)   aso   xorion   θelo.   (ROf)
            the   kid = my   the   go.INFIN   from.the   village   want.1SG
            'I want my kid to leave the village.'

As before, the only strategy available in SMG (53a) and NPG (53b) are *na*-clauses:

(53)   a.   To   peði   mu   θelo   na   fiji   apo   (SMG)
            the   kid   my   want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   go.PNP.3SG   from
            to   xorio.
            the   village
            'I want my kid to leave the village.'
       b.   To   peði = m   θelo   na   skute   fev   aso   xorion.   (NPG)
            the   kid = my   want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   get-up.3SG   leave.3SG   from.the   village
            'I want my kid to get up and leave the village.'

To sum up: (i) Romeyka employs nominalisation of infinitive forms; (ii) in Romeyka the nominalised infinitive form is used with a possessive, which seems to be a necessary condition for the use of the nominalised infinitive; (iii) in Romeyka, deverbal nouns are also found in contexts where SMG would exclude them (e.g., volitionals); (iv) although nominalisation of *na*-clauses as the subject of impersonal expressions is very frequent in SMG, in Romeyka no nominalisation of *na*-clauses is ever permitted.

4. The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item

In this section we present our proposal according to which the Romeyka infinitive is an NPI.

4.1. Negated past tense modals and volitionals

As we have already seen in section 3.2, the Romeyka infinitive appears as a complement to a negated past tense modal verb, as shown in (54):

(54) a. Utš eporesa   almeksini.   (ROf)
          not can.PP.1SG milk.INFIN
          'I couldn't milk (the cows).'
      b. Ta ɣandžia = m ponun,   utš eporesa   porpatesini tše pan   sa   stalia.   (ROf)
          the legs = my   hurt.3PL not can.PP.1SG walk.INFIN and go.INFIN to.the stables
          'My legs are hurting; I couldn't walk and go to the stables.'

It is crucial to clarify that the infinitive here is not optional since a subjunctive version with *na* is impossible (55a) and that without negation, the infinitive, and therefore the sentence, becomes ungrammatical (55b). This restriction shows a typical NPI, an issue we return to in section 5.2.

(55) a. *Utš eporesa   n'   almeɣo.   (ROf)
          not can.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ milk.1SG
          'I could not milk (the cows).'
      b. *Eporesa   almeksini.   (ROf)
          can.PP.1SG   milk.INFIN
          'I was able to milk (the cows).'

Despite negation, if the interpretation is future then the infinitive is banned (56):

(56) a. Sapalæ   tši poro   na   porpato tše pao   sa   stalia.   (ROf)
          tomorrow not can.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.1SG and go.1SG to.the stables
          'Tommorow I cannot walk in order to get to the stables.'
      b. *Sapalæ tši poro   porpatesini.   (ROf)
          tomorrow not can.1SG walk.INFIN
          'I cannot walk tomorrow.'

Ungrammaticality also arises with negated present tense modals where a *na*-clause is again the only option:

(57) a. Panda tši porume na   plekume. Exume   eteron ðulia.   (ROf)
          always not can.3PL PRT.SUBJ knit.3PL   have.3PL other job.ACC
          'We cannot knit all the time. We have other things to do as well.'
      b. *Tši poro   pleksini.   (ROf)
          not can.1SG knit.INFIN
          'I cannot knit.'

Likewise, when the negated modal verb is in imperfect tense, thus providing a habitual/generic reading, grammaticality only derives from the surfacing of a *na*-clause (note here a possible *consecutio temporum*):

(58) a. Utš eporena   n'   emaireva.   (ROf)
          not can.IP.1SG PRT.SUBJ cook.IP.1SG
          'I could not cook.'

b.   *Utš   eporena   mairepsini.   (ROf)
         not   can.IP.1SG   cook.INFIN
         'I could not cook.'

Therefore, for future, present and imperfective negated modals *na*-complements are the only option. Although this aligns Romeyka with SMG (59), the latter distinguishes between perfective nonpasts (59a) and imperfective nonpasts (59b), as we have seen in section 2.1:

(59)   a.   ðen   boro   na   armekso.   (SMG)
               not   can.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   milk.PNP.1SG
               'I cannot milk.'
        b.   ðen   boro   na   armeɣo.   (SMG)
               not   can.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   milk.INP.1SG
               'I cannot milk.'

Crucially, such an alternation between the perfective nonpast (59a) and the imperfective nonpast (59b) is not found in Romeyka. So, at this point one could argue that the Romeyka infinitive behaves like a perfective nonpast. Proof that the Romeyka infinitive does not behave in the same way as the perfective nonpast in SMG stems from the lack of alternations between (60a) and (60b) – only the latter is grammatical:

(60)   a.   *Utš   eporesa   na   porpato.   (ROf)
               not   can.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   walk.1SG
               'I cannot walk.'
        b.   Utš   eporesa   porpatesini.   (ROf)
               not   can.PP.1SG   walk.INFIN
               'I cannot walk.'

Additionally, as we have already seen in section 3.2, infinitives are not found solely with negated ability modality, but also with negated past tense volitionals (26). Similarly, the Romeyka infinitive does not surface with negated present tense (61a) or negated imperfect tense voiltionals (61b) since these select *na*-clauses:

(61)   a.   U   θelo   na   porpato.   (ROf)
               not   want.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   walk.1SG
               'I do not want to walk.'
        b.   Utš   eθel(e)na   n'   eftao   ðulias.   (ROf)
               not   want.IP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   do.1SG   tasks
               'I didn't want to work.'

Importantly, the infinitive does not obtain with any other negated volitional, such as *utš aɣapesa* 'I didn't love/like' (62a), which, interestingly, selects a subjunctive (62b):

(62)   a.   *Utš   aɣapesa   mairepsini.   (ROf)
               not   love.PP.1SG   cook.INFIN
               'I didn't want to cook.'
        b.   Utš   aɣapesa   na   mairevo.   (ROf)
               not   love.PP.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   cook.1SG
               'I didn't want to cook.'

Unlike negated ability, negated volition by itself does not entail *not p*; for instance, from *I didn't want to cook*, one cannot infer *I didn't cook* as the continuation, whereas *but I did* is fine. If the hypothesis of the paper is correct, namely that the infinitive is licensed by antiveridicality, then a continuation like *ama epsesa* 'but I cooked' should not be accepted thus (63a) should be ungrammatical:

(63)   a.   *Utš   eθelesa   psesin   fain   ama   epsesa.   (ROf)
               not   want.PP.1SG   cook.INF   food   but   cook.PP.1SG
               'I didn't want to cook food, but I did.'

b. Utš ethelna n' epsena fain ama epsesa. (ROf)
    not want.IP.1SG PRT.SUBJ cook.IP.1SG food but cook.PP.1SG
    'I didn't want to cook but I cooked (in the end).'

The prediction is borne out (with (63b) being the only acceptable option featuring an imperfect), thus indicating that it is the infinitive itself, to a certain extent, which triggers the counterfactuality in the environment. Again, NPIs have similar effects in the context (Giannakidou, 2007 *et seq.*). In (64), the NPIs trigger a negativity in that there was no expectation of getting any tickets:

(64) I'm glad we got any tickets at all!

Still there are two puzzling issues: First, why different classes of nonveridical predicates behave differently vis-à-vis infinitive selection whilst the prediction is that they should behave uniformly in selecting an infinitive. As we have seen in sections 3.1 and 3.2, whilst some nonveridical predicates (e.g., modals) select an infinitive, others (e.g., directives) select a *na*-clause. The explanation is that, historically, infinitive loss in Greek progresses from more biclausal domains to more monoclausal ones with just one T-category (for restructuring/clause-union/monoclausality phenomena cf. Aissen and Perlmutter, 1983; Rizzi, 1976; Wurmbrand, 2001; Roussou, 2009; Sitaridou, 2002). Thus the infinitive as complement in Romeyka is now selected only by modals which is the stage last found in Medieval Greek (cf. Mackridge, 1987; Sitaridou, 2014).[5]

Second, let us consider why there are different selectional requirements by members of the same class of nonveridical predicates; in particular, the selectional difference between *aχapo* 'I like' and *θelo* 'I want'. Despite both being volitionals the former selects a *na*-clause, whereas the latter selects an infinitive – consider Table 4 which summarises the pattern:

Table 4
Selectional properties of volitional predicates in Romeyka.

Contexts			θelo 'I want'		aχapo 'I love'	
Tense	NEG	Obligatory control	*na*-clause	Infinitive	*na*-clause	Infinitive
Present	*	Ok	*	*	Ok	*
Present	*	*	Ok	*	Ok	*
Present	Ok	Ok	*	*	Ok	*
Present	Ok	*	Ok	*	Ok	*
Past	*	Ok	*	*	Ok	*
Past	*	*	*	*	Ok	*
Past	Ok	Ok	*	Ok	Ok	*
Past	Ok	*	Ok	*	Ok	*

The explanation to be pursued is along the lines of Rizzi (1982), according to which volitionals in Romance do not necessarily all fall in the class of restructuring verbs (cf. also Cinque, 2004; Cardinaletti and Shlonksy, 2004; Wurmbrand, 2001). Essentially, the claim is that restructuring in Romeyka is a lexical property that is assigned arbitrarily to certain verbs: while *θelo* 'I want' is a restructuring verb, *aχapo* 'I love' is not; this correctly predicts that the former will select an infinitive while the latter selects a *na*-clause.[6] A parallel can be drawn with Old Neapolitan where the verb *vuláre* 'to want', which is the prototypical volitional verb, is consistently excluded from an inflected infinitive construction. On the other hand, *desiderare* 'to desire' is a volitional verb from a semantic point of view, but, from a syntactic point of view, behaves like a control verb (unlike *vuláre*) and, therefore, allows for an inflected infinitive (Sitaridou, 2002:296).

Further evidence as to why *θelo* 'I want' is modal-like in Romeyka derives from impersonal uses of *θeli* 'must' in SMG:

(65) θeli na peraso ki apo ton jatro. (SMG)
      want PRT.SUBJ go.PNP.1SG and from the physician
      'I also need to go to the doctor.'

Therefore, *θelo* 'I want' is modal-like in Romeyka and, therefore, selects an infinitive, whereas *aχapo* 'I love' is not, and, for this reason, selects a *na*-clause. In section 5.1 we will also see that *θelo* 'I want' behaves like a modal in another way, namely by not having a positive expression.

---

[5] This change must have happened in Romeyka prior to the reanalysis of the infinitive as an NPI (see Sitaridou, 2014).
[6] Restructuring tests such as the clitic climbing test cannot be performed because Romeyka has strict enclisis.

However, the Romeyka infinitive is not merely selected by nonveridical predicates; but is, in fact, licensed as a negative polarity item in the contexts in which it is selected (see section 4.4). Nevertheless, as one reviewer points out, NPIs are not strictly speaking selected and therefore this property may bring the Romeyka infinitive out of line from the rest of the NPIs. Still however, NPIs are not entirely optional either, as shown by the contrast between *some, any, a* and *one* in (66):

(66)   a.   I went to the bookstore this morning, but I didn't buy any books.
       b.   I went to the bookstore this morning, but I didn't buy some books.
       c.   I went to the bookstore this morning, but I didn't buy a book.
       d.   I went to the bookstore this morning, but I didn't buy one book.

For the logical form 'it is not the case that there is an x such that x is a book and I bought x', (66a) is natural, whereas (66b–d) are more marked. Therefore, in NPI-contexts, there is blocking or markedness of other forms, and though the NPI is not selected, nor is it completely optional. Since (66a) is the unmarked option, it is preferred. Likewise with NPIs of the MUST type (*hoeven/brauchen/need*), as in (67):

(67)   a.   You must NOT go there.   (only wide scope *must*)
       b.   You need not   go there.   (only narrow scope *must*)

In the unmarked case in (67a) *moeten/mussen/must* scope above negation; however, if we have a negative sentence and *must* must take narrow scope, we have to use the NPI *need*; so, there is no optionality here at all.

4.2. prin ('before')-clauses

The Romeyka infinitive also appears in a *prin* 'before'-adjunct, as shown in (68):

(68)   Prin   pisini   fain, prin   spudžisini   so   mandrin, tši pao.   (ROf)
       before   make.INFIN   food before clean.INFIN   at.the barn   not go.1SG
       'I am not leaving before I cook and clean the barn.'

The *prin* 'before'-clause (68) is especially striking because it is a continuation of the '*prin cum* Aorist infinitive' construction of Classical Greek (Sitaridou, 2014). Crucially, the infinitive does not occur with other prepositions, for instance *os* 'until' (see Giannakidou, 2002), as a *na*-clause is obtained instead:

(69)   Os   na   'rte   o   Mehmetis   na   permeno = se.   (ROf)
       until   PRT.SUBJ   come.3SG   the   Mehmet.NOM PRT.FUT   wait.1SG = you
       'I'll wait for you until Mehmet comes.'

The English temporal connective 'before', and likewise SMG *prin*, are considered in the literature as antiveridical (see Giannakidou, 1998; Giannakidou and Zwarts, 1999 for *prin*; see Beaver and Condoravdi, 2003; Krifka, 2010 for *before*):

(70)   a.   Mozart died before he finished the Requiem.
       b.   If Mozart had not died when he in fact did, he might/would have finished the Requiem.
            (Beaver and Condoravdi, 2003:12)

Therefore, the occurrence of the Romeyka infinitive in *prin* clauses appears to be sensitive to antiveridicality. A question to pose at this stage is whether the infinitive can appear under any other antiveridical elements such as *aθiɣon* 'without' – the prediction being that it should be able to. Consider (71):

(71)   a.   Aθiɣon tšalisema, paraðes tši porume   na   ftæme.   (ROf)
            without work   money   not can.1PL   PRT.SUBJ   make.1PL
            'We cannot make any money without working.'
       b.   *Aθiɣon na   tšalisevo,   paraðes tši porume na   ftæme.   (ROf)
            without PRT.SUBJ   work.1SG   money.ACC not can.1PL PRT.SUBJ make.1PL
            'We cannot make any money without working.'

The prediction is not borne out since in this context we find a deverbal noun; however, this may well be selectional. Strong counterevidence to the Romeyka infinitive being licensed by antiveridicality would have occurred if a *na*-clause was found in (71b) – crucially, this is not the case.[7]

4.3. Counterfactuals

Another context in which an infinitive is found is in wishes and exclamatives, as shown in (72):

(72)   a.   As   išen   porpatesini sa   rašia!   (ROf)
            PRT.OPT   have.PP.3SG   walk.INFIN to.the mountains
            'S/He should have walked in the mountains.'
       b.   Na   ixame   panini   xtisini   to   spit   so   parxar!   (ROf)
            PRT.SUBJ   have.PP.3PL   go.INFIN   build.INFIN the house in.the pastures
            'I wish we had gone to build the house in the highland pastures.'

Crucially, the examples in (72): (i) are all counterfactual optatives; (ii) show that the infinitive is a complement of 'have'.
Consistent with what we have observed for wishes and exclamatives is the use of the infinitive in conditionals in (73):

(73)   a.   N'   ixa   mairepsini, n'   etroɣame.   (ROf)
            PRT.SUBJ   have.PP.1SG   cook.INFIN PRT.SUBJ   eat.IP.1PL
            'If I had cooked we would have eaten.'
       b.   An   ixa   mairepsini, ixame   fanini.   (ROf)
            PRT have.PP.1SG   cook.INFIN have.PP.1PL   eat.INFIN
            'If I had cooked we would have eaten.'

In (73), we observe that *I had* + infinitive surfaces in counterfactuals in both the protasis – headed by either *na* or *an* – as well as in the apodosis of counterfactual conditionals. These environments aside, the complex infinitival predicate is never attested. Crucially, all these environments which express the counterfactual are also antiveridical, given the general reasoning schema of counterfactuals in (74) (see Lewis, 1973; Stalnaker, 1968; Ernst, 2009):

(74)   If P, (then) Q implicates ∼P

However, both (72) and (73) show the infinitive as a complement of the verb 'have'. In other words antiveridicality does not merely license the infinitive but also requires the verb 'have' which prompts the question why this is the case. Could it be, therefore, that the infinitive here functions as a participle? Given that there is no active participle in Romeyka, it is possible that the use of the infinitive may be simply incidental or selectional. Although clearly selectional at some point in the diachrony, contemporaneously, it is licensed by antiveridicality. This question is linked to a broader question, namely why is it that the pluperfect, systematically, is the vehicle of counterfactuality in many languages. As a reviewer points out the use of perfect, and, therefore, *have*, for counterfactuals may be due to the fact that we need an additional layer of tense (cf. Ippolito, 2003) to create a 'remote' counterfactual tense. Furthermore, there is a need for a locus for the AGR features. If the infinitive surfaced without the *have*-support, there would be PRO in both the protasis and apodosis which would leave the EPP unchecked, and, in turn, cause the derivation to crash.

4.4. Antiveridicality as a licensor, not morphological negation

Consider Table 5 which summarises the distribution of the infinitive:

Table 5
Summary of the licensing contexts for the Romeyka infinitive.

Contexts		Antiveridical
Prin 'before'		Ok
Negated past modals		Ok
Counterfactual	Optatives	Ok
	Conditionals	Ok

---

[7] In fact, a few speakers, when asked about 'without' clauses, produced a *prin*-clause instead.

On the basis of these findings, we put forward the proposal that the Romeyka infinitive is a negative polarity item – given the definition of a polarity item by Giannakidou (2001) in (75):

(75)   A linguistic expression α is a polarity item if:
    (i)   The distribution of α is limited by sensitivity to some semantic property β of the context of appearance; and
    (ii)   α is (non)veridicality, or a subproperty thereof: {veridicality, nonveridicality, antiveridicality, modality, intensionality, extensionality, episodicity, downward entailingness}.

Moreover, the licensor of the NPI-infinitive is not the specification of a negative morpheme, but antiveridicality, namely the implication that *not p*. *Prin* clauses, counterfactual conditionals, and counterfactual optatives are all antiveridical, but do not contain negation. Therefore, there is evidence that NPI licensing is not neg-agreement, and that negation and antiveridicality are not the same thing – rather the former is morphological exponence of the latter.

Having answered the licensor question (in the sense of Ladusaw, 1996), we can now understand why the Romeyka infinitive cannot be licensed by nonveridicals such as negated present or imperfect tense modals. Consider (76):

(76)   a.   O   Mehmetis   utš   eporese   almeksini   (# but in the end he did).   (ROf)
              the   Mehmet.NOM   not   can.PP.3SG   milk.INF
              'Mehmet {could not/was unable to} milk the cows' (# but in the end he did).
        b.   O   Memetis   utš   eporne   n'   almeje   (but in the end he did).   (ROf)
              the   Mehmet.NOM   not   can.IP.3SG   PRT.SUBJ   milk.IP.3SG
              'Mehmet {could not/was unable to} escape' (but in the end he did).
        c.   O   Memetis   tši   pori   n'   almeji sa paxta (but tomorrow he may succeed).   (ROf)
              the   Mehmet.NOM   not   can.3SG   PRT.SUBJ   milk.3SG to.the morning
              'Mehmet cannot milk the cows in the morning' (but tomorrow he may succeed).
              (adapted from Giannakidou and Staraki, 2010)

In (76a), where we have a negated past tense modal, the entailment that 'he didn't milk the cows' is part of the assertion of (76a) and therefore, the entailment is strongly antiveridical. On the other hand, no such entailment is part of either (76b), where we have a negated imperfect modal, or (76c), where we have a negated present tense modal, since they can both be compatible with a situation of the type 'but in the end/tomorrow he did/may succeed'. In other words, although all examples under (76) are nonveridical, the only strongly antiveridical one is (76a) where there is a negated past tense modal. It is precisely this context and this context alone in which the Romeyka infinitive can be licensed, thus suggesting that antiveridicality, and not mere nonveridicality, is the licensor.

To support this claim further, consider evidence from the conditionals (see Table 3). If all conditionals, including non-counterfactual ones, contain negation in either clause, should we not expect NPIs to appear in nonveridical conditionals (implying *uncertainty that p*)? Here however we argue that the correct prediction for the licensing of the infinitive is, in fact, an antiveridical environment, such as the one that only antiveridical conditionals (counterfactual) provide. Thus, in present wishes, which constitute a nonveridical ('in the end I may go') but not an antiveridical environment infinitives cannot surface (77b); we observe a *na*-clause (77a) instead:

(77)   a.   Inšalah   na   pao!   (ROf)
              hopefully   PRT.SUBJ   go.1SG
              'I wish I went.'
        b.   *Inšalah   panini!   (ROf)
              hopefully   go.INFIN
              'I wish I went.'

Additionally, questions which are also nonveridical do not license an infinitive in Romeyka either. Consider (78):

(78)   a.   Eporeses   tš'   emairepses?   (ROf)
              can.PP.2SG   and   cook.PP.2SG
              'Were you able to cook'?
        b.   *Eporeses   mairepsini?   (ROf)
              can.PP.2SG   cook.INFIN
              'Were you able to cook?'

As before, the claim is that questions, albeit nonveridical, do not license the infinitive because the necessary condition, namely antiveridicality, is not met. Therefore, our proposal is that the Romeyka infinitive is an NPI and as a result, the nonveridical contexts in (76b and c), (77) and (78)) cannot license it. A consequence of such an analysis would be that the Romeyka infinitive, by virtue of being an NPI, could not allow for its own negation. Consider (79):

(79)   *Utš eθelesa[8]   tši   mairepsini.   (ROf)
         not   want.PP.1SG not   cook.INFIN
         'I didn't want not to cook.'

The prediction is indeed borne out because the infinitive is an NPI and, therefore, it cannot license its own embedded negation. Crucially, in Italian, in the same type of restructuring context, the infinitive can license its own negation (cf. (80b) and (80c), which is the exact equivalent of (79)):

(80)   a.   Non   ho   voluto   mangiare.   (Italian)
                not   have.1SG want.PART eat.INFIN
                'I didn't want to eat.'
         b.   Ho   voluto   non   mangiare.   (Italian)
                have.1SG want.PART not   eat.INFIN
                'I wanted not to eat.'
         c.   Non   ho   voluto   non   mangiare.   (Italian)
                not   have.1SG want.PART not   eat.INFIN
                'I didn't want not to eat.'

However, some allowances have to be made since the Romeyka infinitive does not have the same broad distribution as the SMG NPI *kanenas* 'no one' (see Giannakidou, 1998:93). This should not be surprising given that (i) 'the process on NPI creation and use must be seen as a dynamic one, as patterns do not remain stable over time, and distributions of the same NPI classes are synchronically rarely completely identical across languages. Nonveridicality is thus a predictor of where NPI could occur, but it is not a rigid precondition that NPIs must occur in all nonveridical environments.' (Giannakidou, 2011:1076); and (ii) the Romeyka infinitive, due to its categorical status, namely nonfinite, cannot generalise as an NPI in contexts where no other EPP-probe is available, see for instance the apodosis of counterfactuals where 'have' needs to be present or there will be no locus for finiteness features.

5. The interaction between modality and negation in Romeyka

We have seen ample evidence that the Romeyka infinitive is a NPI. However, it could be argued that the requirement of antiveridicality for the licensing of the Romeyka infinitive is symptomatic of some particularities of Romeyka, namely: (a) the existence of *poro* as a negated modal meaning 'I cannot' – in sharp contrast to SMG in which *boro* can only mean 'I can' – which, itself, can be argued to be an NPI; (b) the unavailability of the 'positive' expression of modal verbs which would, therefore, also exclude the possibility for an infinitive to surface. In this section, we shall discuss how greatly negation, modality and polarity are intertwined in Romeyka.

5.1. In Romeyka poro is 'I cannot'!

In SMG, as well as in NPG, *boro/poro* 'I can' can only express positive modality (81):

(81)   a.   Boro   na   perpatiso.   (SMG)
                can.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.PNP.1SG
                'I can walk.'
         b.   Poro   na   porpato.   (NPG)
                can.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.1SG
                'I can walk.'

---

[8] We need to negate the matrix verb too otherwise ungrammaticality automatically ensues (see section 5.2) and the test would be nonapplicable.

In Romeyka, however, *poro* can only mean 'I cannot'. To prove this claim, consider (82):

(82) U   poro   n'   almeɣo,   u   poro   na   (ROf)
      not can.1SG PRT.SUBJ milk.1SG not can.1SG PRT.SUBJ
      tšalisevo, u   poro   na   trexo, so   xorafi u   poro
      work.1SG   not can.1SG PRT.SUBJ run.1SG to.the field not can.1SG
      na   paɣo;   ejerasa,   epemina,   poro.
      PRT.SUBJ go.1SG   grew-old.PP.1SG   worn-out.PP.1SG cannot.1SG
      'I cannot milk (the cows), I cannot work, I cannot run, I cannot go to the fields; I have grown old; I am worn out;
      I can't (cope) anymore.'

Curious as it may be, in Romeyka *utši/tši/u poro* (NEG can.1SG) equals *poro* (cannot.1SG), both meaning 'I can't'. On the basis of (82), we conclude that *poro* 'I cannot' appears: (a) when the infinitival complement of the negated modal can be left out; and (b) when the preceding word ends in a vowel (see Sitaridou, 2014 for a historical explanation whereby *poro* 'I cannot' develops out of Medieval Greek *aporo* 'I cannot' through aphaeresis). Albeit rare, cross-linguistically a parallelism can be drawn: (i) between *can~can't* in Northern New Jersey (Labov, 2007:356); (ii) between Romeyka *poro* and American English *squat* – the latter being considered to be associated with a null form of *any* (see Postal, 2004). If the same holds for *poro* 'I cannot', namely association with a null negator, then it can be construed that *poro* 'I cannot' is, in fact, an NPI itself which would explain why the infinitive cannot surface. Further evidence for such an analysis comes from the position of the preverbal element in (83a): *monaxesa* 'alone' is always in first position and this is the only acceptable order since *poro*, when negative, cannot be sentence-initial or sentence-final.

(83) a.   Monaxesa poro   na   paɣo.   (ROf)
           alone   cannot.1SG PRT.SUBJ go.1SG
           'I cannot go on my own.'
      a′. *Poro   na   paɣo   monaxesa.   (ROf)
           cannot.1SG PRT.SUBJ go.1SG   alone
           'I cannot go on my own.'
      a″. *Monaxesa na   paɣo   poro.   (ROf)
           alone   PRT.SUBJ go.1SG   cannot.1SG
           'I cannot go on my own.'

A similar pattern ensues with *panda* 'always' in (84):

(84) a.   Panda porume   na   plekume.   (ROf)
           always cannot.1PL PRT.SUBJ knit.1PL
           'We cannot always knit.'
      a′. *Porume   na   plekume panda.   (ROf)
           cannot.1PL   PRT.SUBJ knit.1PL always
           'We cannot always knit.'
      a″. *Panda na   plekume porume.   (ROf)
           always PRT.SUBJ knit.1PL cannot.1PL
           'We cannot always knit.'

Compare now Romeyka (83) and (84) to SMG (85):

(85) a.   Ute   o   Janis   iðe   kanenan.   (SMG)
           neither the John.NOM see.PP.3SG   no-one
           'John didn't see anyone either.'
      b.   *Iðe   kanenan ute   o   Janis.   (SMG)
           see.PP.3SG   no-one   neither the john.NOM
           'John didn't see anyone either.'

This is reminiscent of the analysis proposed in Giannakidou (2007) where the movement of NPI *ute* 'even' to the preverbal position licenses a null negation. *Ute*, itself, licenses the NPI *kanenan* 'no one' in (85a), whereas, when the latter appears above *ute* 'even', its licensing cannot obtain (85b) (see also den Dikken, 2002).

5.2. Unavailability of positive expression for modal verbs

In Romeyka, the positive expression of ability modals is not grammatically expressed:

(86)   a.   *Eporo   na   porpato.   (ROf)
            can.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.1SG
            'I can walk.'
       b.   *Eporesa   porpatesini.   (ROf)
            can.PP.1SG walk.INFIN
            'I could walk.'

Unlike what we find in SMG (87) and NPG (88):

(87)   a.   Boro   na   perpatiso.   (SMG)
            can.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.PNP.1SG
            'I can walk.'
       b.   Boresa   na   perpatiso.   (SMG)
            can.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.PNP.1SG
            'I could walk.'

(88)   a.   Poro   na   porpato.   (NPG)
            can.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.1SG
            'I can walk.'
       b.   Eporesa   na   porpato.   (NPG)
            could.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ walk.1SG
            'I could walk.'

Instead, Romeyka uses present tense to convey abilitative or deontic modality, as shown in (89):

(89)   a.   –Tš' eporis   na   porpatis?   (ROf)
            not can.2SG PRT.SUBJ walk.2SG
            'Can't you walk?'
       b.   –Porpato.   (ROf)
            walk.1SG
            'I can (walk).'
       c.   Eporeses   tš'   eporpateses?   (ROf)
            can.PP.2SG and walk.PP.2SG
            'Were you able to walk'?
       d.   Eporpatesa.   (ROf)
            walk.PP.1SG
            'I was able to walk.'

Although the Romeyka behaviour with regard to the positive expression of modality is *prima facie* odd, (89) shows that the so-called present is really a null modal plus present. This suggests that the imperfective stem, on the basis of which the present tense is formed in both SMG and Romeyka, implies modality (cf. Giannakidou, 2014). A possible extension of this analysis could be that aspect in general is the locus of modality. This seems to gain support from the fact that the same happens with perfective aspect, on the basis of which the past tense is morphologically formed. Notice that *perpatisa* 'I walked' does imply *I was able to walk*, so maybe ability modality is indeed an inference in these cases, from the use of aspect. A similar pattern is demonstrated in English with the modal 'need':

(90)   a.   John need not come.
       b.   *John need come.

Asymmetry with regard to the overt realisation of modals between English (91a) and French (91b) is also well-known:

(91)   a.   Speak louder, I can't hear you.   (English)

          b.   Parle   plus haut, je ne t'   entends   pas.   (French)

                speak.IMPER.2SG more high I   not you hear.1SG   not

                'Speak louder, I can't hear you.'

A similar pattern as that displayed in French above is also found in SMG with general ability modals:

(92)   To peði metrai   mexri to   ðeka.   (SMG)

        the child count.3SG until   the ten

        'The child can count up to ten.'

Interestingly, in Romeyka the only cases where there is an overt realisation of non-negated modals are shown in (93):

(93)   a.   Oson   eporis,   mairepson.   (ROf)

                as-much can.2SG cook.IMPER.2SG

                'As long as you can, cook!'

          b.   An eporo,   mairevo.   (ROf)

                if   can.1SG cook.1SG

                'If I can, I cook.'

          c.   Eporis   tše mairevis?   (ROf)

                can.2SG and cook.2SG

                'Can you cook?'

          d.   Eporeses   tš'   erθes?   (ROf)

                can.PP.2SG and come.PP.2SG

                'Were you able to come?'

          e.   *Eporeses   erθini?   (ROf)

                can.PP.2SG come.INFIN

                'Were you able to come?'

It follows that the only positive expression of modal *eporo* 'I can' is attested: (i) in relatives as a head without a complement (93a); in nonveridical conditionals as a head without a complement (93b); in questions (93a) and (93d). Importantly, in none of the above contexts and infinitive is possible (93e) because these are all nonveridical contexts and the infinitive requires antiveridicality.

    Another modal verb, namely *θelo* 'I want' (94), behaves like 'can' in not having an overt realisation:

(94)   a.   Oti   erotas,   erota.   (ROf)

                whatever ask.2SG ask.IMPER.2SG

                'Whatever you want to ask, ask!'

          b.   Do kraz?   Na   troi,   epinase.   (ROf)

                why scream.3SG PRT.SUBJ eat.3SG got-hungry.PP.3SG

                'Why is it screaming? It wants to eat, it is hungry.'

Native speakers of Romeyka consistently rate the positive expression of OC *θelo* 'I want' as very unacceptable (95a/c/e), and consistently produce utterances with *aɣapo* ('I like, I want') instead (95b/d/f):

(95)   a.   ???θelo   na   mairevo.   (ROf)

                want.1SG PRT.SUBJ cook.1SG

                'I want to cook.'

          b.   Aɣapo   na   mairevo.   (ROf)

                love.1SG PRT.SUBJ cook.1SG

                'I love to cook.'

c.	???Pola	eθelna	etroɣa;	ama u	poro	na	troɣo.	(ROf)

    c.   ???Pola eθelna   etroɣa;   ama u poro   na   troɣo.   (ROf)

very   want.IP.1SG eat.IP.1SG but not can.1SG PRT.SUBJ eat.1SG

'I wanted to eat a lot but I can't.'

    d.   Pola aɣapena   n'   etroɣa.   (ROf)

very love.IP.1SG PRT.SUBJ eat.IP.1SG

'I would love to eat.'

    e.   ???Opse eθelesa   n'   espudžizna.   (ROf)

yesterday want.PP.1SG PRT.SUBJ clean.IP.1SG

'Yesterday I wanted to clean.'

    f.   Opse aɣapena   n'   espudžizna.   (ROf)

yesterday want.IP.1SG PRT.SUBJ clean.IP.1SG

'Yesterday I wanted to clean.'

This is in contrast to what we find in SMG:

(96)   a.   O,ti θelis   na   rotisis,   rota.   (SMG)

whatever want.2SG PRT.SUBJ ask.PNP.2SG ask.IMPER.2SG

'Ask whatever you like.'

    b.   Jati skuzi? θeli   na   fai,   pinase.   (SMG)

why moo.3SG want.3SG PRT.SUBJ eat.PNP.3SG be.hungry.PP.3SG

'Why is it mooing? It (=cow) wants to eat, it is hungry.'

As shown to be the case with 'can', *θelo* 'I want' is positively expressed in contexts similar to the ones attested for *eporo* 'I can' (cf. (93)):

(97)   Kaθais oti   θel,   eftei.   (ROf)

everyone whatever want.3SG do.3SG

'Whatever everyone wants, he does.'

Overall, in Romeyka, modality is grammatically expressed, as shown in Table 6, although the issue clearly awaits further investigation:

Table 6
Expression of modality in Romeyka.

Types of modality	SMG	Romeyka		
		m-expression	Examples in Romeyka	
Deontic	*prepi*	*as* + *present tense*	(98)	As PRT.OPT cook.1SG, i the peθera = m mother-in-mi kruj = me. mi kruj = me. not hit.3SG = me 'I should cook so that my mother-in-law does not hit me.'
		na + *present tense*	(99)	Na PRT.SUBJ mairevo. cook.1SG 'I must cook.' (but may also convey futurity depending on the context)
		Ile + na + *present tense*	(100)	Ile must na PRT.SUBJ porpato. walk.1SG 'I must walk.'
		exo 'I have' + *deverbal noun*	(101)	Exo have.1SG maireman. cooking 'I have cooking to do.'
	boro	*present tense*	(102)	Mairevo. cook.1SG 'I can cook.'
		poro (NEG)	(103)	Poro cannot.1SG na PRT.SUBJ mairevo. cook.1SG 'I cannot cook.'
Epistemic	*bori*	*ja . . . ja* (disjunction)	(104)	Aiše Aise ja or mairevi cook.3SG ja or u not mairevi. cook.3SG 'Aise may cook.'

Although we may conclude, from the discussion in this section, that infinitives cannot be selected by positive modals simply because the latter are mostly derived through context, when they are realised, for instance in questions, no infinitive is selected. Hence, we can safely conclude that the infinitive is sensitive to the presence of the antiveridicality (for changes in the diachrony of Romeyka which rendered the grammatical expression of positive modality impossible, and which, in turn, may have led to the reanalysis of the infinitive as an NPI, see Sitaridou, 2014).

6. Romance polarity subjunctives: a typological parallel to Romeyka infinitives

It is well-known that in the Romance languages the subjunctive mood is mainly selected by volitional and directive predicates, as exemplified by French in (105), where obviation effects also typically obtain:

(105)   a.   *Je   veux   que   tu   pars.   (French)
             I   want.1SG   that   you   go.2SG
        b.   Je   veux   que   tu   partes.   (French)
             I   want.1SG   that   you   go.SUBJ.2SG
             'I want you to go.'

However, there is another type of subjunctive which is not lexically selected and which Stowell (1993), Kempchinsky (1986), Quer (1998), Giannakidou (2014), Sitaridou (2007b) call a polarity subjunctive, that is, a subjunctive licensed by an operator. First, consider (106) where a negated matrix epistemic licenses a polarity subjunctive in Portuguese (and likewise in Spanish):

(106)   a.   *Creio   que   estejamos   todos   de   acordo.   (Portuguese)
             think.1SG   that   be.SUBJ.1PL   all   in   accord
             'I think that we all agree.'
        b.   Não   creio   que   estejamos   todos   de   acordo.   (Portuguese)
             not   think.1SG   that   be.SUBJ.1PL   all   in   accord
             'I don't think that we all agree.'
             (Sitaridou, 2007b:207)

Second, consider a non-canonical ''triggering'' of the subjunctive, in Spanish restrictive relatives (Quer, 1998) triggered by the non-specificity of *una secretaria* 'any secretary' (107):

(107)   a.   Busco   a   una   secretaria   que   sabe   francés.   (Spanish)
             search.1SG   DOM   a   secretary   that   know.3SG   French.
             'I am looking for a secretary that knows French.'
        b.   Busco   una   secretaria   que   sepa   francés.   (Spanish)
             search.1SG   a   secretary   that   know.SUBJ.3SG   French.
             'I am looking for any secretary that knows French.'

All the above are non-canonical cases where the subjunctive appears to be triggered as a negative polarity item. Interestingly even SMG, which does not have a Romance-like subjunctive, seems to exhibit subjunctive polarity (108b–d) similar to the Romance polarity subjunctive (see Giannakidou, 1995), albeit far more limited since the indicative is not ruled out (108c)–cf. (106a):

(108)   a.   Nomizo   oti   θa   erθi.   (SMG)
             think.1SG   that   PRT.FUT   come.PNP.3SG
             'I think s/he will come.'
        b.   *Nomizo   na   erθi.   (SMG)
             think.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   come.PNP.3SG
             'I think s/he will come.'
        c.   ðen   nomizo   oti   θa   erθi.   (SMG)
             not   think.1SG   that   PRT.FUT   come.PNP.3SG
             'I don't think s/he will come.'
        d.   ðen   nomizo   na   erθi.   (SMG)
             not   think.1SG   PRT.SUBJ   come.PNP.3SG
             'I don't think s/he will come.'

The Romance polarity subjunctive facts demonstrate that a dependent form, namely a subjunctive enters into a dependency relation with an *neg* operator. In that sense, the Romeyka infinitive is no typological *hapax* since it can be aligned with the Romance polarity subjunctive facts in Romance.

Furthermore, in the same way "that subjunctive may be essentially seen as an epiphenomenon derived from syntactic and/or semantic selection by the main predicate and that as such it does not allow us to identify subjunctive clauses as one class" (Quer, 2001:00), the infinitive also seems to be such a case by virtue of the fact that it is nonfinite and needs to enter into a T-C dependency for control (see Landau, 2004) and therefore cannot be one class either. In both the case of the Romeyka infinitive and Romance polarity subjunctive, the neg-dependency seems to have 'encroached' on the existing T-to-C dependency. We leave this issue open to future research.

7. Conclusion

In this article it was shown that the Romeyka infinitive surfaces (i) as a complement to matrix negated past tense modals; (ii) *prin* 'before'-clauses and (iii) counterfactuals. It was argued that the Romeyka infinitive is licensed as an NPI. Antiveridicality as the licensor is what explains the unavailability of the Romeyka infinitive in other nonveridical contexts such as: (i) questions, (ii) wishes expressing the potential, (iii) nonveridical conditionals and (iv) present and imperfect tense negated modals.

More broadly, the polarity path of the Romeyka infinitive postulated here can be used as a window to study the relation between negation and modality: (a) typologically, we have a new type of infinitive, an NPI infinitive, that survives in a variety of Greek, a language family known *not* to have infinitives; (b) the category "NPI-infinitive" is new, and worth exploring contrastively within the family of Romance polarity subjunctives; (c) from the perspective of polarity, the category NPI-infinitive enriches the category of 'modal' NPIs, which are less known cross-linguistically and are not as well understood. At the same time, unlike other modal NPIs (*brauchen*, *hoeven*) the NPI-infinitive of Romeyka is more restricted in distribution, behaving like a strict NPI in accordance with what we observe in Greek generally, i.e. robust cases of strict NPIs (e.g. NPI-even, negative concord NPIs, minimizers, etc., discussed in the cited Giannakidou's work).

Acknowledgements

References

Aissen, J., Perlmutter, D., 1983. Clause reduction in Spanish. In: Perlmutter, D. (Ed.), Studies in Relational Grammar 1. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 360–403.

Beaver, D., Condoravdi, C., 2003. A uniform analysis of before and after. Seman. Linguist. Theory XIII, 37–54.

Cardinaletti, A., Shlonksy, U., 2004. Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian. Linguist. Inq. 35, 519–557.

Chatzopoulou, K., 2012. Negation and Nonveridicality in the History of Greek (Ph.D. thesis). University of Chicago.

Chatzopoulou, K., Sitaridou, I., 2014. Jespersen's cycle for NEG2 and conditional inversion in the history of Greek: Evidence from Romeyka conditionals. In: 16th Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference, Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, 3–5 July.

Cinque, G., 2004. Restructuring and functional structure. In: Belletti, A. (Ed.), Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 3. OUP, Oxford, pp. 132–191.

Dawkins, R.M., 1937. The pontic dialect of Modern Greek in Asia Minor and Russia. Trans. Philol. Soc. 36, 15–52.

Deffner, M., 1878. Die infinitive in den pontischen Dialekten und die zusammengesetzten Zeiten im Neugriechischen. Monatsberichte der Königlich Preussichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Buchdruckerei der KGL. Academie der Wissenschaften, NW. Universitaätsstr 8, Berlin, pp. 191–230.

den Dikken, M., 2002. Direct and indirect polarity item licensing. J. Comp. Ger. Linguist. 5, 35–66.

Drettas, G., 1997. Aspects Pontiques. Association de Recherches Pluridisciplinaires, Paris.

Ernst, T., 2009. Speaker-oriented adverbs. Nat. Lang. Linguist. Theory 27, 497–544.

Giannakidou, A., 1995. Subjunctive, Habituality and Negative Polarity. Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT), vol. V. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, pp. 132–150.

Giannakidou, A., 1997. The Landscape of Polarity Items (Ph.D. thesis). University of Groningen.

Giannakidou, A., 1998. Polarity Sensitivity as (Non) Veridical Dependency. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Philadelphia.

Giannakidou, A., 2001. The meaning of free choice. Linguist. Philos. 24, 659–735.

Giannakidou, A., 2002. Until crosslinguistically, aspect and negation: a novel argument for two untils. In: Jackson, B. (Ed.), Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT), vol. 12. CLC Publications, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, pp. 84–103.

Giannakidou, A., 2007. The landscape of EVEN. Nat. Lang. Linguist. Theory 25, 39–81.

Giannakidou, A., 2009. The dependency of the subjunctive revisited: temporal semantics and polarity. Lingua 120, 1883–1908.

Giannakidou, A., 2011. Nonveridicality and mood choice: subjunctive, polarity, and time. In: Musan, R., Rathert, M. (Eds.), Tense across Languages. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 59–90.

Giannakidou, A., 2014. The modality of the present and the future: a commentary on Broekhuis and Verkuyl. In: Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. Published April 21. Springer online. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11049-014-9234-z.

Giannakidou, A., Staraki, E., 2010. Rethinking ability: ability as modality and ability as action. In: Genericity Conference. ENS, Paris.

Giannakidou, A., Zwarts, F., 1999. Aspectual properties of temporal connectives. In: Mozer, A. (Ed.), Greek Linguistics '97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics. Ellinika Grammata, Athens, pp. 104–113.

Han, C.H., 1998. The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar (Ph.D. dissertation). University of Pennsylvania.

Han, C.H., 2000. The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. Garland, New York.

Iatridou, S., Zeijlstra, H., 2012. Negation, Polarity and Deontic Modals. lingbuzz/001431, pp. 1–82. http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001431.

Ippolito, M., 2003. Implicatures and presuppositions in counterfactuals. Nat. Lang. Semant. 11 (2), 145–186.

Joseph, B., 1983. The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics. CUP, Cambridge.

Kempchinsky, P., 1986. Romance Subjunctive Clauses and Logical Form (Doctoral dissertation). UCLA.

Krifka, M., 2010. *Before* and *after* without coercion. Comment on the article by Cleo Condoravdi. Nat. Lang. Linguist. Theory 28, 911–929.

Labov, W., 2007. Transmission and diffusion. Language 83 (2), 344–387.

Ladusaw, W., 1996. Negation and polarity items. In: Lappin, S. (Ed.), Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 321–341.

Landau, I., 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. Nat. Lang. Linguist. Theory 22, 811–877.

Lekakou, M., Nilsen, Ø., 2008. What aspect can tells us about the future of MUST. In: Proceedings of 8th ICGL. University of Ioannina, Ioannina.

Lewis, D., 1973. Counterfactuals. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Mackridge, P., 1987. Greek-speaking Moslems of North-East Turkey: prolegomena to study of the Ophitic Sub-dialect of Pontic. Byzantine Modern Greek Stud. 11, 115–137.

Mackridge, P., 1995. Τα Ποντιακά στη σημερινή Τουρκία: αρχαία στοιχεία στο ιδίωμα του 'Οφη' Αρχείον Πόντου 46, 153–161.

Mackridge, P., 1996. The Medieval Greek infinitive in the light of modern dialectal evidence. In: Constantinides, C.N., et al. (Eds.), ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝ. Studies in Honour of Robert Browning. Istituto ellenico di studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia, Venice, pp. 191–204.

Michelioudakis, D., Sitaridou, I., 2012. 'Syntactic microvariation: dative constructions in Greek. In: Etxepare, R., Fernández, B. (Eds.), Datives in Variation: A Micro-comparative Perspective. OUP, Oxford, pp. 212–255.

Nicholas, N., 2001. A survey of Modern Greek Dialectal complementation. In: Ralli, A., Joseph, B., Janse, M. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and 27 Linguistic Theory. University of Patras, Patras, pp. 193–206.

Palmer, F.R., 1986. Mood and Modality. CUP, Cambridge.

Parcharidis, I., 1880. Συλλογή ζώντων μνημείων της αρχαίας ελληνικής γλώσσας εν'Οφει. Ο εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος 18(1883–1884), 120–178.

Platzack, C., Rosengren, I., 1998. On the subject of imperatives: a minimalist account of the imperative clause. J. Comp. Ger. Linguist. 1, 177–224.

Postal, P., 2004. The structure of one type of Americal English Vulgar Minimizer. In: Postal, P. (Ed.), Skeptical Linguistic Essays. Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York, pp. 159–172.

Quer, J., 1998. Mood at the Interface. HAG, The Hague.

Quer, J., 2001. Interpreting mood. Probus 13, 81–111.

Ralli, A., 2007. Syntactic and morphosyntactic phenomena in Modern Greek Dialects: the state of the art. J. Greek Linguist. 2006, 121–159.

Rizzi, L., 1976. Ristrutturazione. Riv. Grammat. Generat. 1, 1–54.

Rizzi, L., 1982. Issues in Italian Syntax. Foris Publications, Dordrecht.

Rizzi, L., 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Haegeman, L. (Ed.), Elements of Grammar: A Handbook in Generative Syntax. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281–337.

Roussou, A., 2000. On the left periphery: modal particles and complementisers. J. Greek Linguist. 1, 65–94.

Roussou, A., 2007. Control in Greek and its implications for empty categories. In: Proceedings of the 2007 Workshop in Greek Syntax and Semantics at MIT. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics #57.

Roussou, A., 2009. In the mood for control. In: Quer, J. (Ed.), Special Issue Section, The Distribution and Interpretation of Indicative and Subjunctive. Lingua 119, 1811–1836.

Sadock, J.M., Zwicky, A., 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In: Shopen, T. (Ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schlenker, P., 2003. A plea for monsters. Linguist. Philos. 26, 29–120.

Sitaridou, I., 2000. Non-finiteness in Old Neapolitan and Modern Greek', Μελέτες για την Ελληνικήγλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 21ης ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα Γλωσσολογίας του τμήματος Φιλολογίας, της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Αριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης 700–712.

Sitaridou, I., 2002. The Synchrony and Diachrony of Romance Infinitives with Nominative Subjects (Ph.D. thesis). University of Manchester.

Sitaridou, I., 2006. The (dis)association of tense, phi-features EPP and nominative case: case studies from Romance and Greek. In: Costa, J., Figueiredo Silva, M.C. (Eds.), Studies on Agreement. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 243–260.

Sitaridou, I., 2007a. Infinitives with subjects in Greek and Southern Italian dialects: a Sprachbund effect. In: Bentley, D., Ledgeway, A. (Eds.), Sui dialetti italoromanzi, Saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent, The Italianist, Special Supplement. Maney, London, pp. 221–242.

Sitaridou, I., 2007b. Romance infinitives with subjects, subjunctive obviation and control theory. In: Eguren, L., Soriano, O. (Eds.), Coreference, Modality and Focus. Studies on the Syntax–semantics Interface. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 191–219.

Sitaridou, I., 2009. On the emergence of personal infinitives in the history of Spanish. Diachronica 26 (1), 36–64.

Sitaridou, I., 2011. Non-control in Greek and Ibero-Romance: Lessons to teach each other. In: Paper presented at the University of São Paulo, 24 October.

Sitaridou, I., 2013. Documentation and revitalisation of Romeyka. In: Jones, M., Ogilvie, S. (Eds.), Keeping Languages Alive: Language Endangerment: Documentation, Pedagogy and Revitalisation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 98–112.

Sitaridou, I., 2014. The Romeyka infinitive: continuity, contact and change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus (Romeyka). Diachronica 31.1, 23–73.

Sitaridou, I., Kaltsa, M., 2014. Contrastivity in Pontic Greek. Lingua 146, 1–27.

Stalnaker, R., 1968. A theory of conditionals. In: Rescher, N. (Ed.), Studies in Logical Theory. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 98–112.

Stowell, T., 1993. Syntax of Tense. Manuscript. University of California, Los Angeles.

Van der Wouden, T., 1994. Negative Contexts (Ph.D. dissertation). University of Groningen.

Willmott, J., 2013. In: Willis, D., Lucas, C., Breitbarth, A. (Eds.), The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean. OUP, Oxford, pp. 299–340.

Wurmbrand, S., 2001. Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure. Studies in Generative Grammar, vol. 55. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.