MicroContact

ERC Consolidator Grant 2015 Research proposal [Part B1]¹ (Part B1 is evaluated both in Step 1 and Step 2 Part B2 is evaluated in Step 2 only)

Microcontact. Language variation and change from the Italian heritage perspective.

MicroContact

Cover Page:

- Roberta Anna Grazia D'Alessandro
- Leiden University
- 60

This project aims to add an important tile to syntactic theory, by developing new theoretical tools to account for microvariation and change. The central idea is that change and microvariation are necessary parts of grammar, and that they are in fact constrained by Universal Grammar (Chomsky 1957 ff.); in order to understand them we need not focus on the starting point and endpoint of change only, but also on the process itself. Observing change in progress can offer insights into its causes and the mechanisms underlying it. We aim at getting snapshots of change in progress by examining endogenous, diachronic change and change in contact for a number of genetically and typologically related varieties.

Between the end of the 19th c. and the 1920s, many Italians migrated to the Americas. After World War II, a third wave of migration took place: around 400.000 people left Italy between 1950-1960. Interestingly, most of these Italians did not speak Italian as their native language: they all spoke some "dialect". With this term we traditionally refer to those Romance languages spoken in Italy that evolved from Latin, and are sister languages to standard Italian. When these immigrants moved across the Atlantic, their languages entered in contact with other Romance varieties, like Argentinian Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, or Québécois French, as well as with English.

The languages spoken by these 1st generation immigrants, who are now very old, are extremely important, as they potentially give a unique window into the mechanisms of language change in general, and of syntactic change in particular.

Explain and justify the cross-panel or cross domain nature of your proposal, if a secondary panel is indicated in the online proposal submission forms. There is a limit of 1000 characters, spaces and line breaks included.

¹ Instructions for completing Part B1 can be found in the 'Information for Applicants to the Starting and Consolidator Grant 2015 Calls'.

Section a: *Extended Synopsis of the scientific proposal (max. 5 pages)*

1. *Introducing the problem*. Between the end of the 19th c. and the 1920s, many Italians migrated to the Americas. In doing so, they created one of the largest real-life laboratories for linguistic research. In this project, we will use this hitherto unexplored laboratory to understand how languages change.

Italian emigration was a massive phenomenon. In 1916, the year of the largest migration, 872.598 Italians left Italy (source: *ISTAT*, Italian National Institute for Statistics). After World War II, another wave of migration took place: according to the ISTAT, around 400.000 people left Italy between 1950-1960. Interestingly, most of these Italians did not speak Italian as their native language, but some "dialect". With this term we traditionally refer to those Romance languages spoken in Italy that evolved from Latin, and are sister languages to standard Italian. Many of them, like Neapolitan (Campanian), Florentine (Tuscan) or Venetian (Venetan), were official languages of some important trade, cultural or political center for centuries, and as such have a venerable written tradition. Although they are referred to as dialects, they are full-fledged (Romance) languages, with their own grammar and their own lexicon.

When these Italian emigrants moved across the Atlantic, their languages entered in contact with other Romance varieties, like Argentinian Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, or Québécois French, as well as with English. Meanwhile, Italian in Italy started expanding and being learnt by all social classes, and hence after World War II these languages came to a more extensive contact with Italian as well: an important part of the laboratory can be found on Italian land.

The languages spoken by all of these first-generation emigrants potentially provides a unique window into the mechanisms of language change in general, and of syntactic change in particular. We will refer to these languages as "heritage" in a broad sense, and referring in particular first-generation speakers (we are aware of the debate on this definition, but we do not need to address this here). There are very few other cases of speakers getting into intensive contact with such an assortment of closely (and sometimes less closely) related languages. We know that languages tend to change, when in contact with other languages. Unfortunately, aside for some sporadic collection of data, mainly performed for cultural studies, we do not have any systematic documentation of what happened to Italian heritage languages in contact. According to some studies, first generation emigrants (i.e. those emigrants who moved to the Americas after WWII and are still alive) present significant attrition (i.e. decline of L1 competence and proficiency, Lambert & Freed 1982) and shift (i.e. decline in usage of L1 and increased use of L2) (Di Pietro 1960, 1976, Saltarelli 1986, Simone 1988, Haller 1993 a.o. for Italian languages).

These studies mainly focus on the sociolinguistic situation of contact, and on lexical borrowing, but not on changes in the grammar. Grammatical change is one of the most complex linguistic phenomena: there is no apparent reason why languages should change. Yet, they do, sometimes even despite systematic sociopolitical efforts to prevent this change.

It is usually assumed that language change can happen in two ways: first of all, it can be spontaneous, that is ENDOGENOUS in linguistic terms (EC henceforth). EC occurs when something in a grammar changes without any external cause. Alternatively, change can be CONTACT-INDUCED (CIC), when it is caused by contact of a language with another language. One of the main problems when dealing with language change is that it is almost impossible to ascertain what has caused it at a given stage (Weinreich, Labov & Herzog's 1968 ACTUATION problem). We have some reasonable hints in some cases, but in most cases identifying its cause is extremely difficult, if not impossible. Also, even if a language A is in contact with a language B, it is not obvious that any change occurring in A is due to the influence of B.

2.What we want to find out. In this project, we aim to develop a theory of syntactic change in contact, by observing how specific syntactic structures react to both EC and CIC. Italian heritage languages offer a unique combination of wide diachronic written documentation and multiple contact with other, minimally different, languages, which will allow us to investigate EC and CIC and integrate syntactic theory with the tools that are necessary for their analysis.

The study of EC and CIC usually examines two stages of a language: Stage1- before the change -, and Stage 2- after the change-. This project introduces a third observation point: the "in between" stage, which will be provided by MICROCONTACT. With microcontact here we mean contact between two minimally different syntactic systems (grammars). While microvariation will make parts of grammars comparable and will make it possible to have "snapshots" of languages while change is happening, genetic and typological similarity between the languages in contact will allow us to control for one element at a time: the languages in contact do not differ very much since they are genetically related.

The Italo-Romance heritage varieties thus constitute an exceptional lab for this study. We will examine first-generation speakers, i.e. those that moved to the Americas between the 1940s and the 1960 (as well as their peers who stayed behind at the time and came into extensive contact with Italian). All in the same period, each language came in contact with all the others.

The documentation of these heritage languages is scarce, and quite fragmented. We know very little of the language of the first-generation emigrants. We therefore need to conduct a large-scale documentation effort before we can start our analysis. For this task, we will make use of a *crowdsourcing software*, addressed to speakers of heritage languages, who will be involved for the first time in active scientific research about their own language.

Specifically, we will look at 4 Italian dialect groups (2 languages per group) in diachrony and in contact, as illustrated in Figure 1.



This project aims to give an answer to the following major research questions:

1. How does contact-induced syntactic change (CIC) happen?

2. What are the main differences between EC and CIC?

3. Are there elements in the grammar that are more prone to contact-induced change, and are there elements that are more prone to spontaneous change?

3. Theoretical issues (Principal Investigator, Subproject 5) Our main hypothesis is that EC and CIC are different in at least two ways. Roughly, speaking, when languages are just left on their own (in situations of EC), they follow very specific paths leading from one type of grammatical construction to another. This path is however disrupted in CIC, where 'jumps' can occur in the change. These jumps may also lead to instabilities elsewhere in the grammar.

In order to identify the mechanisms of change in progress, we will focus on optional structures. With optional we mean here two perfectly interchangeable syntactic structures within one language. The term optionality is quite problematic in a deterministic theory like generative grammar, because in this view a grammar will give you precisely one way in which to express a given meaning, and not two or more. According to Kroch (1994), syntactic doublets should be categorically excluded from stable grammars, although they can be attested in systems that can be viewed as unstable for one reason or another, e.g. developing and interlanguage systems, dying varieties and those undergoing change more generally. These doublets are exactly those that we will be searching for, in order to observe change in progress. Optionality will hence refer to syntactic doublets in systems undergoing change, be it EC or CIC.

In addition to optionality, also the notion of MARKEDNESS plays a crucial role in our theoretical investigations. Marked structures, we assume, are structures that specify the same information more than once. For example, sentence (2), where the subject is expressed twice (with *Maria* and with la), is more marked than sentence (3), where it is expressed only once.

(2) <u>La Maria</u> <u>la</u>	magna [Venetan]	(3) <u>Maria</u>	mangia	[Italian]
the Mary-SUBJ she-SUBJ	eats	Mary-SUB	J eats	
'Mary eats'		' Mary eats	,	

We can establish hierarchies of markedness, because different forms can express more and more information. (For example, in the examples above, the subject is still partly expressed on the verbal ending -a; it would be even less marked to leave this out.)

This hierarchy can be expressed in different ways, and on different elements (syntactic structures, syntactic features, etc). One attempt to create a markedness feature hierarchy is for instance that proposed within the ERC funded *Rethinking Comparative Syntax* Project directed by Ian Roberts in Cambridge.

Our hypothesis is that EC will follow a path from more marked to less marked, or from less marked to more marked, one step at a time. CIC will be able to tackle any point of the hierarchy instead: it just depends on how the 'other' language is. For heavily marked constructions, this means it will be possible for them to become simpler, or disappear, or skip one or more steps in the hierarchy.

4. Empirical issues (3 PhDs, 1 postdoc, PI). As an example (out of the several we study in this project), consider 'auxiliary selection'. In English, the perfect tense of verbs is always made with the same auxiliary HAVE: I have come, I have eaten. However, in many languages in the world, different verbs use different auxiliaries, often either BE or HAVE. For instance, in Italian, one says Sono venuto 'I have come' (lit. 'I am come') and Ho mangiato 'I have eaten'. Many upper southern Italian dialects present a very interesting system of auxiliary verbs, whereby the choice of subject of the sentence determines the choice of the auxiliary. We exemplify the problem through Abruzzese, but a similar phenomenon is found in several varieties of Neapolitan:

(4) 1st and 2nd person singular and plural: BE 3rd person singular and plural: HAVE

(5) a. So, si, seme, sete	liggiute nu libbre/	durmite/	partite	[Abruzzese]
$BE-1^{ST}.SG, 2^{ND}.SG, 1^{ST}.PL, 2^{ND}.PL$	read a book	slept	left	
'I, you, we, you have read a book	:/slept/left'			

b. <i>A</i>	liggiute	e nu libbre/	durmite/	partite
HAVE-3 RD .SG=3 RD .PL	read	a book	slept	left
'S/he, they have read a bo	ot, left'	_		

(4) and (5) show that in these languages not only is the ending of the auxiliary different depending on the subject, but also the root is. We can define this as a sort of subject doubling phenomenon: the information that we are dealing with a second person is expressed both on the s (=BE) in the auxiliary part and in the second person singular ending -i. According to our definition, this is therefore a marked structure. The auxiliary has agreed with the subject twice, as it were.

The same varieties (with some exceptions) put the preposition *a* before the direct object of a sentence, but this happens only if the object is (animate and) 1^{st} or 2^{nd} person. This process is called Differential Object Marking (DOM). Note that in Romance this preposition *a* usually marks animate objects only, thus persondriven marking of the object is also some sort of doubling, marking both animacy (because the speaker and addressee are of course animate) and first or second person. An example of DOM is in (6):

(6) So viste a mme/ a tte/ a nu/ a vu / *a jisse/*a Marije/*a esse am seen to me / to you/to us/ to you/ to them/ to Mary/ to her 'I saw myself, you, us, you, them, Maru, her' [Abruzzese]

We will investigate what happens when each of the two phenomena get in contact with:

- Argentinian Spanish no auxiliary selection (no use of the present perfect, thus no auxiliary for the past tense) / animacy-driven DOM
- French and Italian– argument structure driven auxiliary selection / no DOM
- Portuguese argument structure-driven auxiliary selection, but different auxiliary (*ter* instead of *have/haber*) partial DOM
- English no auxiliary selection (only HAVEhave used for the present perfect) / no DOM.

Furthermore, we know from previous research (D'Alessandro 2014) that in Italy the Abruzzese auxiliary selection system is changing, in the direction of an expansion of HAVE. Without more data, we cannot ascertain whether it is a spontaneous change or it is induced by the contact with Italian. Furthermore, we need to investigate whether the person-driven system of auxiliation and of DOM is an innovation, as we think. This would mean that some new information was introduced at some point in the history of these languages: the person-driven selection, and hence that the construction became more marked. By observing Abruzzese in contact with French, Spanish, English and Portuguese, we expect the following:

- if change is EC, heritage Abruzzese in contact with French, Portuguese, Spanish and English will most likely go in the direction of extending HAVE, as has happened in other Italian languages, like Sicilian, i.e. towards markedness reduction (no reference to the subject of the sentence in the root, but only in the ending). The structure of the contact languages will have no impact. As for DOM, it will remain as is.
- if change is CIC: there will be a different behavior depending on the contact languages; there could be a total drop of auxiliary selection in heritage Abruzzese varieties in contact with English and Spanish, for instance, while the extension of HAVE could only be found in contact with French. The contact with Portuguese, which has auxiliary selection but with different auxiliaries, will be the most telling. One possibility is that aux selection will be reinforced, with the adaption of new auxiliaries; another that it will be dropped. The same applies to DOM: different contact languages should have a different impact on person-sensitive DOM. The contact with Spanish might induce the loss of the person-driven specification, to leave only the animacy DOM.

Person-driven auxiliary selection and DOM are of the phenomena that can tell us about change, and that we wish to investigate within this research. Others are deictic adverbs, adjectives and pronouns in southern Italian languages and subject clitics (and possibly negation) in northern Italian ones. All these structures are heavily marked, and will allow us to obtain a detailed picture of the mechanisms of change by looking at their evolution as EC (in diachrony) and CIC (in microcontact). Again, each pair in contact alone won't tell us much: it is all pairs together that compose the picture of change, like tiles of a gigantic puzzle.

5.How we are going to proceed. This project involves a part of diachronic microvariation, which serves to assess whether the phenomenon has been relatively stable during the last 5-600 years, and a part of synchronic microvariation in contact. The languages investigated are illustrated in Figure 2.

The project includes 3 Phd subprojects (one for person-driven auxiliary selection and differential object marking in contact; one for deixis in contact; one for subject clitics in contact), and one postdoc working on the diachrony of these constructions. The principal investigator is responsible for the synthesis of the theoretical and empirical findings, as well as for developing a theory of contact-induced (micro-)change. The project will target four main Italian linguistic dialectal areas:



phenomenon we will address, subject clitics, is common to both); Florentine and Sienese for the Tuscan group; Neapolitan and Abruzzese/Teatino for the Upper southern group; Palermitan and Salentino for the extreme southern group. The choice of Florentine is obviously linked to the fact that this vernacular

was the basis of modern standard Italian, and as such it was used in most written documents of the Italian peninsula. While all other varieties have had some formal status and are largely documented historically, coastal Abruzzese does not have a long literary tradition. However, a large number of studies has been dedicated to this language at Leiden University. We know much about this language, which was the object of

² The map is taken from http://cle.ens-lyon.fr/ and based on Pellegrini's (1966) classification of Italian dialects.

investigation of two Leiden projects: one Marie Curie on *Documenting old Abruzzese* and one NWO *Vidi* on ergativity patterns in Abruzzese.

Each of these 4 groups mentioned above will be checked in contact with the following varieties: Argentinian Spanish; Brazilian Portuguese; Québécois French, and US English (as a control variety). Furthermore, contact with Italian in Italy in the last 60 years will also be addressed. Ideally, it should be possible to check three or four contact points for each variety. These contact points will be selected based on the availability of speakers who will agree to participate in the project, as well as depending on the phenomena at issue. Giving the vastness of the research areas, each team member will be responsible for one area. The data collected via crowdsourcing as well as via fieldwork will be available to all team members. We will make use of the Virtual Research Environment *Italian Dialect Archive* platform, developed in cooperation between the VIDI research team and Leiden University Library, which is a repository for fieldwork data, as well as a virtual research environment for our group. This platform is already in use and will not add additional costs.

6. Data crowdsourcing. Given the large amount of data needed, we will make use of a web-based, crowdsourcing system which is currently being developed within the KNAW-funded project *Abruzzese data crowdsourcing*, which will soon be online at the address <u>www.abruzzesemolisano.it</u>, in collaboration with the Technical University of Eindhoven. People will receive instructions on what to record (for the Abruzzese/Molisano data crowdsourcing project we are starting with 10 minutes of speech about the past – which for the heritage speakers could be "when I arrived in Argentina/Brazil/America"). They will be asked to upload an audio file (or perhaps video, but not necessarily) which will be sent to a buffer, checked and edited by the research group members, and made public on the website. This will serve two aims: to document some linguistic varieties that are on the verge of extinction, and to provide a first scan of the people who could participate in the second round of fieldwork, where the researchers will go to the areas where these languages are spoken.

The website and the project will be extensively advertised. The places where we intend to start, thanks to the large presence of Italian immigration, are:

- Argentina: Buenos Aires, Cordoba and Mendoza (and possibly Rio Cuarto)

- Brazil: Saõ Paulo, Espirito Santo state, Rio Grande so Sul state (where Talian, a local variety of Venetan Italian, has recently been recognized as an official language): Serafina Correa, Nova Venezia)

- Canada (Québec): Montréal (Petite Italie)
- USA: Boston area, New York

These areas host a very high percentage of native Italian speakers, also in the form of entire villages. This crowdsourcing database method will help us reach many more language communities that we could reach in a "traditionally-performed" fieldwork exercise. The research will then continue as a combination of fieldwork and scientific inquiry, for which the methodology of generative grammar (questionnaires, instruction of local speakers to help data collection, as thoroughly described by Cornips & Poletto 2005) will serve as a basis. For the diachronic part, we will consult available databases (OVI, *Ancient Abruzzese*, etc.) as well as archives and libraries. Note that many historical writings and documents are not classified, which means that we will need a postdoc who is an expert not only on historical linguistics but also in archive research.

7. **Innovation and Impact.** This project will develop integrated theoretical tools, which will make it possible to bring several different approaches on the same page. It will provide us with crucial insights on how languages evolve, which in turn will dramatically increase our understanding of how mind designs language. The project can have a big impact on linguistic disciplines, as it can open the ground to cross-feeding and integrated approaches, and re-unify parts of the discipline that seem to have irremediably drifted from each other. Empirically, a large amount of raw data will be collected and made freely available to anyone working on heritage, from any perspective. Methodologically, this project is very innovative in that it includes speakers/citizens (as for EU *Science 2.0* program) in active research. Following simple instructions, the participants will be able to document their own language, and for the first time linguistics will not need to rely exclusively on the experience of the fieldworker. The crowdsourcing methodology can be standardized and used in other large-scale data collections in countries in which people are rich enough to possess

smartphones, having a large impact on the costs of linguistic documentation. It is also our intention to use mass media and social media to reach participants, as well as to report popularized versions of our findings.

8. Research team. The project will be carried out by a Principal Investigator, one postdoc with a diachronic linguistics background, also expert in archive research, and three PhDs. Our group will be helped by experts in language contact from LUCL (dr Maarten Kossmann, prof. Marian Klamer and prof. Willem Adelaar) and expert in diachronic linguistics (prof. Sasha Lubotsky) and in Romance linguistics (prof. Johan Rooryck), as well as theoretical syntax (prof. Lisa Cheng). Experts in various fields will join our research group, most notably prof. Michela Cennamo (Naples, Federico II), expert in diachronic linguistics; prof. Adam Ledgeway, prof. Ian Roberts and dr. Theresa Biberauer (University of Cambridge), prof. Rita Manzini and prof. Leonardo Savoia (experts in microvariation and diachronic change), prof. Delia Bentley (University of Manchester, expert is extensive fieldwork research for syntactic inquiry), and prof. Anna Maria Di Sciullo (morphosyntactic variation).

Section b: Curriculum Vitae (max. 2 pages)

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Family name, First name: D'Alessandro, Roberta

Researcher unique identifier(s): academia.edu: https://leidenuniv.academia.edu/RobertaDAlessandro

Date of birth: 29/07/1973

Nationality: Italian

URL for web site: http://www.robertadalessandro.it/

• EDUCATION

2004 PhD in Linguistics, *Summa cum Laude* Graduate school, University of Stuttgart, Germany. Supervisor: Prof. Artemis Alexiadou.
 2000 *Laurea* (BA) *cum laude* in Foreign Languages and Literatures (Majors: Russian and Linguistics); University of L'Aquila, Italy.

• CURRENT POSITION(S)

2013 - 2015	International officer and board member of the Young Academy of the KNAW
2012 – today	Chair of the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) Advisory Board
2007 – today	Professor and Chair of Italian language and culture, Leiden University, The Netherlands

• **PREVIOUS POSITIONS**

- 2007 Visiting Research Associate, LAD (Research Laboratory on Interface Asymmetries), UQAM, Montreal, Canada
- 2005 2007 Marie Curie Intra-European Research Fellow, Department of Italian, University of Cambridge, UK
- 2004 2005 Research Assistant, Microsoft-Butler Hill, Redmond, Seattle, WA, USA

• FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS

- 2014 ICREA Research Professorship, Government of Catalunya declined
- 2014- today Member of the *Global Young Academy* (IAP)
- 2011- today Member of the *Young Academy* of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Science (KNAW)
- 2010-2015 NWO (Netherlands Research Organisation) *VIDI* research grant on *Splitting and clustering grammatical information* (http://hum.leiden.edu/lucl/splits)
- 2014 KNAW small grant for the Abruzzese Crowdsourcing project (with B. Speckmann, TUE)
- 2005-2007 *Marie Curie Intra-European Research Fellowship*, FP7 (University of Cambridge)
- 2014-2018 *NWO Free Competition* grant on Maps and Grammar (co-applicant. PI Sjef Barbiers, Meertens Instituut)
- 2012-2014 PTDC/MHCLIN/4564/2012 Grant on Subordination in Medieval Portuguese (co-applicant.

	Main applicant and PI Alexandra Fieis, Universidade Nova de Lisboa)
2010	LUCL PhD student grant for the project Dialects entangled: language contact between
	Albanian and Southern Italian dialects (with M. de Vaan and M. van Oostendorp)
2009	NWO visiting grant for dr. Claudio Di Felice on the diachrony of Abruzzese
2000 - 2003	Deutsche Forschungsgemeischaft (DFG) grant for attending the Graduate School
	'Linguistic Representations and their Interpretation' at the University of Stuttgart.

• SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS

2007 – today 2 Postdocs/ 7 PhDs / 6 Research Master, 6 MA (+2 visiting MA) students (LUCL, Leiden University, The Netherlands) + 1 external PhD student (University of Cyprus, Greece)

• TEACHING ACTIVITIES

- 2007– today Yearly: 1 ResMa course on syntax, 1 MA course on Italian linguistics or Microvariation, Leiden University Centre for Linguistics
- 2007 2011 Yearly: 3 BA courses in Italian linguistics; 2 joint courses on Romance linguistics; 2 joint courses on Italian culture; Italian department, Leiden University (while working on the VIDI project: 1 yearly MA course/1 ResMa course/1 BA course)

2005-2007 Yearly: 2 BA courses in Italian linguistic, Italian Department, Cambridge University

• ORGANISATION OF SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS

- 2006 yearly *Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax Meeting*. Co-founder, steering committee member and organizer, one year in Cambridge, one year in a host institution
- 2009- today *Italian Dialect Meeting*, Founder and organizer; it takes place every other year in Leiden.
- 2014 *Little v* workshop Selected papers under contract for *The verbal domain*, Oxford UP.

• INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

- 2007 –today Chair of the Italian Department and Director of the BA and MA Italian (since 2012: coordinator of the MA Italian track), Leiden University
- 2014 today National coordinator of the joint master in Italian, The Netherlands
- 2013 today International officer (board member) of the Young Academy of the KNAW
- 2011 today Chair of the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics Advisory Board
- 2011-2012 NWO Rubicon: member of the GW/MaGW selection committee
- 2010-2011 Chair of the LUCL committee for PhD admissions
- 2010-2011 LUCL internal committee for workload (committee member)

• COMMISSIONS OF TRUST

Editorial Boards: Grammars and sketches of the World's Languages- Romance subseries; Brill Publishing Company– Editor in chief [from April 2015]

Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory series; John Benjamins: editorial board Isogloss journal; advisory board member

Scientific societies: GLOW (*Generative Grammar in the Old World*); board member Going Romance; board member

- Scientific advisory board/external reviewer for: IRCHSS Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellowships; Swiss National Science Foundation; University of Venice; Endangered Languages Documentation Programme, SOAS, London; Slovenian Research Agency; Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)
- Reviewer for: Journals: Studia Linguistica, Linguistic Inquiry, Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics (JCGL), The Linguistic Review, CORPUS, Lingua, Brazilian Journal of Linguistics; Journal of Catalan Linguistics; Yearly conferences: NELS (North Eastern Linguistic Society); GLOW; LSRL (Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages); Going Romance; IGG (Incontro di grammatica generativa); CGG (Colóquio de gramática generativa); Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax Meeting; Publishers: Mouton de Gruyter; Cambridge University Press; Oxford University Press; Routledge

• MEMBERSHIPS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES

Board member of: GLOW, Going Romance, CISDID, Centro Internazionale per lo Studio e la Didattica dell'Italiano e dei Dialetti

Fellow/member of: Marie Curie Fellow Association, Philological Society of Great Britain, LAGB, AcademiaNet

Honorary Fellow: Fondazione Giammarco

• MAJOR COLLABORATIONS

Adam Ledgeway, Italian Dialect Syntax, co-author and co-supervisor, University of Cambridge João Costa, Maria Lobo, Alexandra Fieis, project on Old Portuguese, U. Nova de Lisboa Diego Pescarini, University of Zürich, co-author.

Maria Rita Manzini, Leonardo Savoia, University of Florence, ASIT network Silvio Cruschina, University of Vienna, ASIT network

Appendix: All on-going and submitted grants and funding of the PI (Funding ID) <u>Mandatory information</u> (does not count towards page limits)

On-going Grants

Project Title	Funding source	Amount (Euros)	Period	Role of the PI	Relation to current ERC proposal ³
Splitting and clustering grammatical information	NWO Vidi	800 000	August 2010- July 2015	PI; supevisor of 2 PhD students	None. Neither the aim nor the linguistic varieties studied overlap.
Maps and Grammars	NWO Free Competition	750 000	September 2013- August 2018	co-supervisor of 1 PhD student	None. Neither the aim nor the linguistic issues studied overlap.

Grant applications

Project Title	Funding source	Amount (Euros)	Period	Role of the PI	Relation to current ERC proposal ²

³ Describe clearly any scientific overlap between your ERC application and the current research grant or on-going grant application.

Section c: Early achievements track-record (max. 2 pages)

1. **Publications** in major international peer-reviewed multi-disciplinary scientific journals and/or in the leading international peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed conferences proceedings and/or monographs

- 1. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Tobias Scheer. Accepted for publication. Modular PIC. Linguistic Inquiry.
- 2. D'Alessandro, Roberta. In press. The Null Subject Parameter. In: Antonio Fábregas, Jaume Mateu and Michael Putnam (eds), *The Handbook of Parameters*. London: Bloomsbury Press.
- 3. D'Alessandro, Roberta. 2014. Death and contact-induced rebirth of impersonal pronouns. A case study. *Probus* 26.2., 249-274.
- 4. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Tobias Scheer. 2013. Phase-head marking *Linguistic Analysis* 38:4, 305-330.
- 5. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Ian Roberts. 2010. Past participle agreement in Abruzzese: Split auxiliary selection and the null-subject parameter. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28: 41-72.
- 6. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Adam Ledgeway. 2010. At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120/8: 2040-2060.
- 7. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Adam Ledgeway. 2010. The Abruzzese T-v system: feature spreading and the double auxiliary construction. In: Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway, and Ian Roberts, (eds), *Syntactic Variation. The dialects of Italy*. Cambridge University Press, 201-210.
- 8. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Anna Maria Di Sciullo. 2009. Proper Subset Relation and Concord: agreement in Abruzzese Possessive Copular Constructions. *Proceedings of NELS 38*, 217-230.
- 9. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Ian Roberts. 2008. Movement and agreement in Italian past participles and defective phases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39/3: 477-491.
- 10. D'Alessandro, Roberta and Theresa Biberauer. 2006. Syntactic doubling and the encoding of Voice in Eastern Abruzzese. *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 25)*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project: 87-95.

2. Research monographs

- 1. D'Alessandro, Roberta. 2007. *Impersonal si constructions. Agreement and Interpretation*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 2. D'Alessandro, Roberta. Under contract [Forthcoming in 2016]. *Syntactic Agreement*. Cambridge University Press.

4. Invited presentations to peer-reviewed, internationally established conferences and/or international advanced schools.

Keynote lectures:

- 1. 'When imperfections are perfect. Narrow Syntax from the point of view of Italian varieties'. Keynote presentation. *Going Romance* 2014, University of Lisbon, December 2014.
- 2. 'Narrowing down Narrow Syntax: Italo-Romance varieties compared'. Keynote presentation. *Current Issues in Syntactic Variation* conference, University of Bucharest, November 2014.
- 3. 'Microvariation and Syntactic theory'. Keynote presentation, Workshop on the *Syntactic variation of Catalan and Spanish dialects*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 26-28 June 2013.
- 4. 'An external look at ergativity'. *1st Cambridge Comparative Syntax Workshop*. Cambridge University, 18-19 May 2012.
- 5. 'Non-Romance features in Italo-Romance. A look into Southern Italian dialects'. *Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax Meeting 5*. University of Cambridge. June 2011.
- 6. 'Impersonal se constructions' *Generative Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* Workshop, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany. 2004.

Invited lectures:

- 7. 'Dati dialettali e teoria linguistica'. Graduate school, University of Palermo, April 2015.
- 8. 'Syntactic feature mapping to PF: Phonology for ϕ , prosody for discourse'. UilOTS Graduate school. Utrecht University, 6 May 2013.

- 9. 'Phi features for syntax, edge features for prosody. Insights into the Syntax-PF interface'. With Marc van Oostendorp. *GLUEII Workshop on Complement(ation)*. Rome3 University, Rome, 29 April 2013.
- 10. 'Merging Probes and the locus of syntactic variation'. *MIT LingLunch*, 25 October 2012.
- 11. 'Subject clitics and person-driven auxiliary selection: two faces of the same coin'. *Yale Linguistic Colloquium*. 22 October 2012.
- 12. 'Chunk definition and PIC à la carte' (with Tobias Scheer). Workshop on Exploring the Interfaces 1: word structure, **McGill University** 6-8 May 2012.
- 13. 'Vocative morphology at the syntax-phonology interface' (with Marc van Oostendorp). Essex, Linguistic circle, March 3 2012.
- 14. 'Death and contact-induced rebirth of impersonal pronouns in Abruzzese. The case of nome and anne'. University of Nijmegen, 22 November 2011.
- 15. 'What agreement can tell us about the complexity of v'. Invited lecture, Syntax Uil-OTS Interface meeting. Utrecht University.
- 16. 'Eccentric agreement in Italo-Romance and parameterized v'. UQAM, Montreal.
- 17. 'Eccentric agreement in Italo-Romance. A closer look into feature-bundles'. Syntax Lab. Cambridge University. February 2010.
- 18. 'Probe-Goal, Spec-head, Cyclic Agree? Agreement in Italo-Romance varieties'. Syntax Circle, Meertens Institute Amsterdam. December 2008.
- 19. 'Movement and agreement in Italian past participles and defective phases' (with Ian Roberts) University of Oxford, February 2007.
- 20. 'Past participle agreement in Abruzzese: split auxiliary selection and the null-subject parameter'. University of Newcastle, UK (with Ian Roberts)2006.
- 21. 'Syntax-semantics-pragmatics of impersonal si in Italian'. Universidade Nova, Lisbon. 2004.
- 22. 'Null subjects, weak pronouns, and open DPs: how Abruzzese expresses arbitrariness'. *3rd Workshop on Null subjects*, University of Cambridge, UK.2004.

Invited courses:

- 23. 'Die ewige Wiederkunft des Gleichen'. Syntactic agreement'. Lecture series held at the University of Cambridge, June 2011.
- 24. PhD course 'Parameters of microvariation'. LOT summer school, Leiden University. 2009
- 25. MA/PhD course 'Parameters'. EGG Summer School, Costanta University, 2009.
- 26. Ma/PhD 'Syntactic Agreement', EGG Summer School, Constanta University, 2009.

Other invited lectures:

- 1. Successful ways of communicating science. KAST-ASM-IAP International Workshop on Science Literacy: science communication and science outreach, Korean Academy of Science and Technology, Seoul, Korea, 12-13 June 2014.
- 2. Shaping the EU research area, talk given at the European Young Academies Working Group on Europe, Brussels, Flemish Academy of Science, 4-5 October 2013.
- 3. Evaluating science, *Workshop on Science Academies in Central and Eastern Europe and their role in knowledge-based societies*, Belarus Academy of Science, Minsk, 11-12 June 2012.
- 4. Open Access. Pros and cons. *Workshop on Open Access publishing*. Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies (NIAS), November 2012.

5. Prizes and Awards

- Knight of the Italian Republic, Order of the Star (since 2 June 2014)
- Member of the *Global Young Academy* (155 top scientists worldwide partner to the World Economic Forum and to the IAP for science policy and early scientific career policy) (2014-2019)
- Member of the *Young Academy of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences* (50 most prominent young scientists in the Netherlands). Now member of the board/international officer (1 April 2013-1 April 2015)
- Member of *AcademiaNet*, a network of excellent women researchers (Robert Bosch Stiftung, Spektrum, Nature)
- *Arcolaio d'Argento* prize for outstanding women from Abruzzo. 2014.

- Marie Curie Fellow
- Featured interview on *New Scientist* Netherlands, October 2014.

ERC Consolidator Grant 2015 Research proposal [Part B2)]

Part B2: *The scientific proposal*

Section a. State-of-the-art

This project aims to add an important block to syntactic theory, by developing new theoretical tools to account for linguistic microvariation and change. The central idea is that change and microvariation are necessary parts of grammar, and that they are in fact constrained by Universal Grammar (Chomsky 1957 ff.); in order to understand them we need not focus on the starting point and endpoint of language change only, but also on the process itself: observing change in progress can offer insights into its causes and the mechanisms underlying it. We aim at getting snapshots of change in progress by examining spontaneous, diachronic change and change in contact for a number of genetically and typologically related varieties: the Italian heritage languages in America.

Between the end of the 19th c. and the 1920s, many Italians migrated to the Americas in two big waves. In 1916, the year of the largest migration, 872.598 Italians left Italy, mainly to move to north and south America (source: *ISTAT*, Italian National Institute for Statistics). After World War II, a third wave of migration took place: around 400.000 people left Italy between 1950-1960⁴. Interestingly, most of these Italians did not speak Italian as their native language: they all spoke some "dialect". With this term we traditionally refer to those Romance languages spoken in Italy that evolved from Latin, and are sister languages to standard Italian. Many of them, like Neapolitan, Florentine or Venetian, were official languages of important trade, cultural or political centers for centuries, and as such have a venerable written tradition. Despite being referred to as dialects, they are thus full-fledged Romance languages, with their own grammar and their own lexicon. For our purposes, we will refer to those languages as Italian heritage languages, when spoken in America. We use the term **heritage** in a broad sense, not necessarily referring only to 2nd /new generation speakers, but also to 1st generation speakers after their emigration.

When these Italian emigrants moved across the Atlantic, their languages entered in contact with other Romance varieties, like Argentinian Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, or Québécois French, as well as with English. Meanwhile, Italian in Italy started expanding and being learnt by all social classes, and hence after World War II these languages came to a more extensive contact with Italian as well.

The language spoken by these 1st generation emigrants is extremely important, as it potentially gives a unique window into the mechanisms of language change in general, and of syntactic change in particular. There are very few other examples where speakers got into intensive contact with such a variety of closely, and sometimes less closely, related languages (see Håkansson 1995 and Platzack 1998 for similar considerations on Swedish heritage, and Benmamoun, Montrul & Polinsky 2013 on the crucial role of heritage languages for linguistic inquiry).

We know that languages tend to change, when in contact with other languages. Unfortunately, aside for some sporadic collection of data, mainly performed for cultural studies, we do not have any systematic documentation of what happened to these Italian heritage languages in contact. Meanwhile, first generation speakers (i.e. those emigrants who moved to the Americas during and after WWII) are becoming very old, and many of them have already died. According to some studies, mainly focusing on the sociolinguistic situation of contact and on lexical borrowing, first generation emigrants present significant attrition (i.e. decline of L1 competence and proficiency, Lambert & Freed 1982) and shift (i.e. decline in usage of L1 and increased use of L2) (Di Pietro 1960, 1976, Saltarelli 1986, Simone 1988, Haller 1993 a.o. for Italian heritage). Their languages are hence perfect instances of change in progress.

Objectives

⁴ There are no exact numbers for the migration that took place during and right after World War II (source: ISTAT).

It is usually assumed that language change can happen in two ways: first of all, it can be spontaneous, that is **endogenous** in linguistic terms (EC henceforth). EC occurs when something in a grammar changes without any external cause. Alternatively, change can be **contact-induced** (CIC), when it is caused by contact of a language with another language. One of the main problems when dealing with language change is that it is almost impossible to ascertain what has caused it at a given stage (Weinreich, Labov & Herzog's 1968 ACTUATION problem). We have some reasonable hints in some cases, but in most cases identifying its cause is extremely difficult, if not impossible. Furthermore, even if a language A is in contact with a language B, it is not obvious that any change occurring in A is due to the influence of B.

In this project, we aim at understanding change in progress, and at drawing a theory of **syntactic change in contact**, by observing the reaction of a number of given syntactic structures undergoing EC and/or CIC. Italian heritage languages offer a unique combination of wide diachronic documentation and multiple contact with other, minimally different, languages, which will allow us to investigate EC and CIC and integrate syntactic theory with the tools that are necessary for their analysis.

The study of EC and CIC usually examines two stages of a language: Stage1- before the change-, and Stage 2- after the change-. This project introduces a third point of examination: the "in between" stage, which is provided by **MICROCONTACT**. With microcontact here we mean contact between two minimally different syntactic systems (grammars). Genetic and typological similarity between the languages in contact will allow us to control for one element at a time.

The Italian heritage varieties mentioned above constitute an exceptional laboratory for this study. We will examine first generation speakers, i.e. those speakers that moved to the Americas between the $1940s^5$ and the 1960. All in the same period, each language came in contact with all the others. These speakers can provide us with precious examples of change in progress, which needs to be documented now, before it is too late.

The documentation of these languages is scarce, and quite fragmented. We need hence to conduct a large-scale documentation effort before we can start our analysis. For this task, we will make use of a **crowdsourcing software**, addressed to speakers of heritage languages, who will be involved for the first time in active scientific research about their own language. Specifically, we will look at 4 Italian dialect groups (2 languages per group) in diachrony and in contact, as illustrated in Figure 1 (see Methodology for further details).



This project aims to give an answer to the following major research questions:

1. How does contact-induced syntactic change (CIC) happen?

^{2.} What are the main differences between EC and CIC?

⁵ According to governmental sources and ISTAT, the number of people who moved to America during WWII and right after it is unknown.

3. Are there elements that are more prone to contact-induced change, and are there elements that are more prone to spontaneous change?

Our research will be embedded in the Minimalist framework (Chomsky 1995 ff). It will investigate syntax.

In order to identify the mechanisms of change in progress, we will focus on optional structures. With optional we mean here two perfectly interchangeable syntactic structures within one language. The term optionality is quite problematic in a deterministic theory like generative grammar, because in this view a grammar will give you precisely one way in which to express a given meaning, and not two or more. According to Kroch (1994), syntactic doublets should be categorically excluded from stable grammars, although they can be attested in systems that can be viewed as unstable for one reason or another, e.g. developing and interlanguage systems, dying varieties and those undergoing change more generally. These doublets are exactly those that we will investigate, in order to observe change in progress. Optionality will hence refer to syntactic doublets in systems undergoing change, be it EC or CIC.

The structures we will examine while undergoing change will be marked structures, i.e. structures that specify the same information more than once (like doubling, for instance). We are aware that also for **markedness** there are many working definitions in the literature. Starting from Jakobson (1932) and Trubeckoj (1939), every school has developed its own concept of markedness. In this project, we will use a working definition of markedness as a process which singles out an element with respect to its class because it contains more morpho-syntactic information. We assume that this element is more specified then the rest of its class, and that there are several degrees of markedness, depending on the reference set. Specifically, an auxiliary with a (morphological) specification for person, for instance, is more marked than an auxiliary with no specification for person. Syntactically, a structure expressing agreement between a subject and an auxiliary twice (once on the ending, once on the root of the auxiliary; or once on the auxiliary and once on the clitic) is more marked than a construction expressing this relationship once. In general, all argument doubling (and participant doubling) structures are marked. For instance, sentence (1), where the subject is expressed twice, is more marked than sentence (2), where it is expressed only once.

(1)	<u>La </u> Maria	la	magna [Venetan]	(2)	Maria	mangia	[Italian]
	the Mary-subj	she-su	ıbj eats		Mary-SUBJ	eats	
	'Mary eats'				'Mary eats'		

We can establish hierarchies of markedness, because different forms can express more and more information. For example, in the examples above, the subject is still partly expressed on the verbal ending *-a*; it would be even less marked to leave this out. These hierarchies can be expressed in different ways, and on different elements (syntactic structures, syntactic features, etc). One attempt to create a markedness feature hierarchy is that proposed within the ERC-funded *Rethinking Comparative Syntax* Project directed by Ian Roberts in Cambridge). An example of one such hierarchy is in (3).

(3) PARAMETER HIERARCHY

Grammaticalisation of individual-denoting features (ϕ)?



Research Hypotheses

Following Kiparsky (2008), we assume that change is constrained by UG. Our hypothesis is that UG permits reopening of a parameter, re-setting of a parametric value, under specific conditions, namely extensive contact with another grammar. When contact forces the reopening of a parameter, this brings about the possible co-existence of many equivalent (optional) structures. The speaker must set the parameter again, hence CIC must happen within one generation, because parameters should not be unset. In exceptional cases, the parameter value can be left open, and this optionality can be resolved by the next generation speakers.

The situation for EC is radically different: EC will follow a path from more marked to less marked, or from less marked to more marked, one step at a time, along a hierarchy like that illustrated in (3). Our hypothesis is that EC will only allow one featural specification to move up or down the hierarchy. For very marked structures (which in terms of parameter hierarchy means they are at the very bottom, see (3)), this means that EG will very likely target them only for simplification. They will thus possibly lose their markedness but only one step at a time.

EC will happen through the competition of two optional structures, but optionality between them can only be resolved by the new language learners, given that no reopening of parameters is involved, but just an alternation between two hierarchically adjacent parameter values.

CIC will be able to tackle any point of the hierarchy instead. It will happen more randomly. For marked constructions, this means it will be possible for them to become simpler, or disappear, or skip one or more steps in the hierarchy. Change is hence due to optionality between two structures, but we can only discriminate between the two forms of change because of the directionality of change: while EC is directional, CIC is not.

Background. What we know

THE ROLE OF MORPHOLOGY IN SYNTACTIC CHANGE. It is safe to state that there is no general consensus on anything regarding change and its mechanisms. From an internalist perspective, once a grammar is acquired it will not change. Phonology and morphology can change, but syntax should not. There is no way to pass from E-language to I-language once the I-language is fixed (Chomsky 1957 ff). In fact, according to Longobardi's recent work, syntactic change always happens together with some other change, be it phonological, morphological or semantic (inertia, originally proposed by Keenan 2002, Longobardi 2001).

One tacit assumption on syntactic change, be it spontaneous or contact-induced, is that it takes place after morphological change, usually for repairing a system (according to a very Saussurean way of conceiving language). For instance, one classical, if not completely correct, example of change, is that from Latin to Romance: vulgar Latin speakers started dropping word-final consonants \rightarrow word-final consonants in Latin nouns were case suffixes \rightarrow case was lost \rightarrow word order got fixed, so that it would be still clear what the subject and what the object were, in a clause (Meillet 1928, Malkiel 1974, 1977, Wright 1983, and more recently Maiden, Smith and Ledgeway 2011, Ledgeway 2012, and many more). In one of the seminal papers on change, though, Owens (1996) shows exactly the opposite of what we have just mentioned: inflectional morphology is less prone to change than syntax, so syntactic change precedes inflectional/morphological change. That syntactic change "follows" morphological change is also argued in a recent article by Reintges (2015), who entertains the possibility that morphological change follows syntactic change.

According to a slightly different generative view, change is simply "a set of differences between two grammars" (Hale 1998:2-3). These perspectives are less straightforward on a model of syntax that places much if not all variation at the PF interface (see i.a. Berwick & Chomsky 2011).

THE DIRECTION OF CHANGE Research on language change and language contact has proceeded along parallel tracks, which have rarely met. Language change scholars have mostly been preoccupied with the direction of change (Kiparsky 1968, Hopper 1990, 1991, Keller 1994, and more recently Newmeyer 1998, Campbell 2001, Traugott 2001, Haspelmath 1999, 2004 and many others) or with the causes and mechanisms of change (Roberts & Roussou 2003, Roberts 2007, Roeper 1993ff, Lightfoot 1991, Kroch 1994). EC is usually believed to be directional, from a more complex form to a simpler one; from a lexical form to a grammatical one; along a grammaticalization path which is described in various ways by various linguists. The problem of identifying the direction and the cause of language change has been addressed in several ways. The generative literature postulates a "path" of change (from one grammar to another), which brings XPs to become heads higher in the structure (Roberts 1997, Roberts & Roussou, 2003, Van Gelderen 2004), or that is a result of a resetting of a parameter along a hierarchy (Biberauer and Roberts 2008). Recently, an ERC project led by Ian Roberts at the University of Cambridge has hypothesised a parametric restructuring for language change. According to this research line, language change follows a path which can be represented as microparametric options: from more detailed to wider parameters, along a hierarchy, or vice versa.

According to yet another formal approach, language changes in sequences of bursts (Lightfoot 1991), or in some kind of sudden revolution of the system, which requires an adaptation of the pre-existing system. In typology, some attempts have been made to find universals of language change, often called

grammaticalization paths (Lehman 1993, Hopper & Traugott 1993, Haspelmath 1999). Traditional historical studies all postulate some sort of direction for language change (Meillet 1912 ff).

Furthermore, many diachronic studies of language change formulate specific analyses to address specific changes. One of the key topics of language change within the generative framework is language acquisition: very often change is the result of some sort of reanalysis by the language learners (usually, the children, but sometimes also 2nd language learners). For reasons of feasibility and relevance, given that contact-induced change is not specifically due to 1st language acquisition mechanisms, this project will not be concerned with acquisition problems. We will instead concentrate on those insights that the language change literature can provide in order to be able to tease apart mechanisms of EC from mechanisms of CIC.

One important attempt in the direction of unifying change and developing a theory of CIC has been put forward by Heine & Kuteva (2003, 2005, ff), according to whom language change always follows a grammaticalization path, be it contact-induced or spontaneous. Degrammaticalization, i.e. a phenomenon by which an element becomes more lexical, less grammatical, is rare (Norde 2009, Willis 2010). This theory is mainly focused on morphological and lexical change.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC AND GRAMMATICAL FACTORS. 2^{nd} language acquisition studies, bilingualism, contact linguistics studies usually take a radically different view, for instance that change happens of subset of structures associated to a given interaction context (see for instance Matras's several decade-long work on the Romani language, in contact with all European languages). Sociolinguistics plays a big role in this kind of studies.

Sociolinguistic factors, such as the attitude of the speaker, the prestige of the contact language, and the desire to preserve one's own identity have a huge impact on the results of language contact (Ross 2001, Andersen 1988, Aikhenvald & Dixon 2001, and many others), and are largely unpredictable. We also know (Aikhenvald & Dixon 2001, Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Heine & Kuteva 2005 a.o.) that the situation in which the languages enter contact plays a role: the duration of contact, the degree of mastery of the contact language (diglossia, bilingualism, or dilalia, Ferguson 1964, Berruto 1987, Appel & Muysken 1987, and many others) can make a big difference on the results of contact.

Formal studies on bilingualism mainly focus on ATTRITION (De Bot, Clyne & van Els 1989), the degree of exposure, and learnability instead (Platzak 1998, Montrul 2002, Tsimpli *et al.* 2004, all work by Sorace, etc).

Finally, several grammatical factors can (but do not always, contra Weinreich 1953) facilitate "diffusion" of some linguistic feature: pragmatic salience; matching genres; tendency to achieve word-for word and morpheme-per-morpheme intertranslatability; frequency; existence of a perceivable gap, and many others. In addition to all this, sociohistorical factors can also block language change from happening even if the conditions are all there to favor it. Controlling for all these factors is a titanic enterprise.

The project. A theory of contact-induced language change.

From what we have just seen, we have a large amount of knowledge both on CIC and on EC, and we have a quite clear idea of the factors that determine (or have an influence on) them. We also have some general theories of CIC, which maintain the "unique" nature of change, modulo the accidental factors. These factors are too many to be controlled, hence drawing a coherent theory, including syntax, has proven a hard enterprise so far. A theoretical synthesis of the findings in these fields has not been achieved yet, because the methodological procedures and research questions are put in different ways. There is no denying that the insights coming from CIC could instruct internalist theories of change, but the enterprise has not been attempted because the two lines of research are not currently comparable. In order to put them both on the same scale and focusing on the same object of study, we need to add an extra ingredient: microvariation.

MICROCONTACT. Change usually happens in small steps, but studies on language change rarely have access to all these micro-steps. To identify the cause (external or internal) of change, one would need to zoom into very short periods, and examine the microchange that happened between two stages of a language within very short bits of time. This situation is almost impossible to find in natural languages: very few languages have a thorough documentation tracking all their evolution. We can rarely see "snapshots" of crucial points in the development.

In order to factor out as many external, not strictly grammatical, elements influencing change, a language A with a feature X should be studied in contact with a set of languages: B,C, D, and F, which all have an identical feature X and they are almost equivalent grammatically BUT for the features Y and Z,

strictly related to X. If the feature X in [A|B] (read, A in contact with B) undergoes exactly the same change as [A|C], and [A|D] and [A|F], despite Y and Z are different, we can conclude that the change of X is spontaneous, and that B,C,D,F did not have any impact on A. If, instead, for instance X_B (X in language B) and X_D are identical, while X_C and X_F are completely different, and we see that X_A changes in the direction of $X_B=X_D$ but not of X_C or X_F , we can conclude that this change is contact-induced, and that possibly Y and Z have a role in this change (depending on how similar they are in B, D).

Genetically-related languages in contact are quite tricky: if we observe a change happening to two such languages in contact, for instance, we would not know whether this change has emerged spontaneously or because of contact. As Aikhenvald (2006:9) puts it: "if languages are genetically related, we expect them to develop similar structures, no matter whether they are in contact or not. And if genetically related languages are in contact, trying to prove that a shared feature is contact-induced and not a chance result of Sapir's drift may be next to impossible".

This is certainly true when looking at two or three grammars in contact. The situation gets much better if we have one language in contact with a number of genetically related languages in more than one place: in this way, sociolinguistic, historical, cultural and random causes can be factored out, and in fact genetic relatedness, as in the case of Romance, is an advantage rather than a disadvantage, because we can expect to have grammars that are equal except for the element we wish to check. At a macrolevel this is certainly difficult, because even genetically-related languages are quite different, but at a microlevel (for instance, by looking at the auxiliary system only) we can certainly isolate one element of variation against otherwise identical systems.

The project will address both theoretical and empirical issues. It will be organized in 5 subprojects (SP henceforth).

THEORETICAL ISSUES (*Principal investigator, SP5*). The questions that the project intends to find an answer to are repeated here:

1. How does contact-induced syntactic change (CIC) happen?

2. What are the main differences between EC and CIC?

3. Are there elements that are more prone to contact-induced change, and are there elements that are more prone to spontaneous change?

We can safely assume that we can only specify an element if we have it in the grammar. If a grammar does not have an element in the first place, no spontaneus change will happen introducing a specification for it. For example, if a grammar does not have auxiliary selection in the first place, there won't be EC introducing a person-driven auxiliary selection system. It will of course be possible to borrow one auxiliary (say, for the 3rd person plural, not necessarily in the function of an auxiliary, see D'Alessandro 2014), and then extend this system, because of contact, but it will be impossible to develop a whole system of person-driven auxiliation at once into a language that does not have auxiliaries to start with.

If some elements are more subject to one or the other form of change, we can conclude that the two mechanisms of change are separate.

Language change debates often focus on the so-called internalization problem, i.e. how "external" changes in the language (E-language) become part of our grammatical knowledge (I-language). The issue of passing from E-language to I-language has been approached in different ways, the most common being the 1st language acquisition one. Recently, Charles Yang has tried to design model of language change which considers both acquisition of L1 and UG constraints, and their dynamic interaction. Yang's model also starts from the assumption of multiple grammars in mature speakers during change and formulates a model of grammar competition as language acquisition in the learner's mind, mirroring that of diachronic grammar competitions in historical texts. His study crucially observes some changes in the syntax of Old English: the loss of V2, while they were happening, and in their syntactic context, by attaching statistical weigh to each of the syntactic/grammatical factors that have interacted with the phenomenon. Such an approach is, for us, on the right track in weighing all factors that reinforce and/or weaken some syntactic phenomenon. The internalization problem will also be considered in this research, although the project will focus on change rather than on its acquisition.

The task of the principal investigator will be then to provide a synthesis of the results coming from all other projects, and the development of a theory of syntactic change in contact.

EMPIRICAL ISSUES (1PhD student - SP1; 1postdoc - SP4; PI- SP5). We will consider marked structures in diachrony and in contact. Given that syntax is grammatical by definition, it does not make too much sense to think that one kind of auxiliary selection is more grammaticalized than another, for instance. We will start from the assumption that some syntactic structures or relations are more marked than others. For instance, a sentence where the information about the subject is expressed twice: once on the ending of the auxiliary and once on its root, is more marked than one in which this information is given only once.

As an example, consider auxiliary selection in diachrony (according to a recent attempt put forward by Torcolacci 2014 and Ledgeway 2015): we can think that markedness, for the auxiliary to form the past tense, proceeds along the lines outlined in (4):

(4)No auxiliary > one auxiliary for all verbs > auxiliary depending on the verb class > auxiliary depending on verb class AND subject specification > auxiliary depending on subject specification only

There is no obvious correspondence between the scheme in (4) and a grammaticalization path. On the one hand, an auxiliary pattern only based on person is somehow more "grammaticalized" than one considering also argument structure. On the other hand, the introduction of a person-based auxiliary selection system corresponds to the introduction of syntactic doubling, and as such it is more marked, and perhaps less grammaticalized.

Talking about grammaticalization for syntactic structures is quite difficult, as example (4) shows. Rather than with grammaticalization, the project will be concerned with "marked" phenomena, in the sense that they are both quite rare in Romance and that they involve some sort of doubling. The assumption is that a structure which is maximally marked (because, for instance, it features doubling or tripling even) tends to spontaneously undergo some sort of simplification, or "syntactic degrammaticalization", or it will stay stable. If exposed to microcontact, CIC will result in more radical changes, and no path/hierarchy will be followed.

Observe furthermore that, very conveniently for our project, each of the steps outlined in (4) is instantiated in a Romance grammar:

No auxiliary (Argentinian Spanish) > one auxiliary for all verbs (Iberian Spanish)> auxiliary (5) depending on the verb class (Italian and French) > auxiliary depending on verb class AND subject specification (Minervino Murge, Altamura) > auxiliary depending on subject specification only (Ariellese, Tufillo, and many others)

The marked phenomena that we will consider are:

- Person-driven auxiliary selection and Differential Object Marking (DOM)
- Subject clitics _
- Deictic determiners, adverbs and pronouns

The general questions that we will ask, based on the investigation of these phenomena in contact and in diachrony, are:

- Is there an influence on the system of the dialect in contact with the different languages?
- Is there a mutual influence, or is the influence only monodirectional (from superstratum to substratum)?

PERSON-DRIVEN AUXILIARIES AND DIFFERENTIAL OBJECT MARKING IN CONTACT AND IN DIACHRONY (1PhD student – SP1; 1postdoc – SP4; PI- SP5)

Many upper southern Italian dialects present a very interesting auxiliary selection system, whereby the subject of the sentence determines the choice of the auxiliary. We exemplify the problem through Abruzzese, but a similar phenomenon is found in several varieties of Neapolitan (Cennamo 2001, 2003). The most commonly found pattern (Loporcaro 1998, D'Alessandro & Roberts 2010, D'Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Torcolacci 2014) is the following:

 1^{st} and 2^{nd} person singular and plural: BE 3^{rd} person singular and plural: HAVE (6)

The BE/BE/HAVE pattern applies to all verb classes: transitives, unaccusative intransitives, and unergative intransitives: they all select their auxiliary in this way (see example (7).

(7)	a. So, si, seme, sete	liggiu	te nu libbre/	durmite/	partite [Abruzzese]
	$BE-1^{ST}.SG, 2^{ND}.SG, 1^{ST}.PL, 2^{ND}$.PL read	a book	slept	left
	'I, you, we, you have read a	book/sle	pt/left'		

b. <i>A</i>	liggiute nu libbre/	durmite/	partite
HAVE-3 rd .sg=3 rd .pl	read a book	slept	left
S/he, they have read a	i book, slept, left'		

This simply means that not only is the ending of the auxiliary "selected" depending on the subject, but also the root (BE or HAVE) is. We can define this as a sort of subject doubling phenomenon.

The same varieties often present person-oriented DOM, i.e. marking of the object with the preposition *a* only if the object is (animate and) 1^{st} or 2^{nd} person (Loporcaro 1988, Manzini & Savoia 2005, D'Alessandro 2014). Note that DOM in Romance usually marks animate objects only, thus person-driven DOM is also some sort of doubling, marking both animacy (redundantly, because the speaker and addressee are obviously animate) and speaker or addressee. An example of person-driven DOM:

(8) So viste a mme/ a tte/ a nu/ a vu / *a jisse/*a Marije/*a esse [Abruzzese] am seen to me / to you/to us/ to you/ to them/ to Mary/ to her'
'I saw myself, you, us, you, them, Mary, her'

We will investigate what happens when the two phenomena get in contact with:

- Argentinian Spanish no auxiliary selection (no use of the present perfect, thus no auxiliary for the past tense) / animacy-driven DOM
- French and Italian– argument structure driven auxiliary selection / no DOM
- Portuguese argument structure-driven auxiliary selection, but different auxiliary (*ter* instead of *have/haber*) / partial DOM
- English no auxiliary selection (only HAVE used for the present perfect) / no DOM.

We know from previous research (D'Alessandro 2014) that in Italy the Abruzzese auxiliary selection system is changing, in the direction of an expansion of HAVE. However, we cannot ascertain whether this is a spontaneous change or it is induced by the contact with Italian. Furthermore, we need to check whether the person-driven system of auxiliation and of DOM is an innovation, as we think. This would mean that some new information was introduced at some point in the history of these languages: the person-driven selection, and hence that the construction became more marked. By observing Abruzzese in contact with French, Spanish, English and Portuguese, we expect the following:

- if change is EC, Abruzzese heritage in contact with French, Portuguese, Spanish and English will most likely go in the direction of extending HAVE, as has happened in other Italian languages, like Sicilian, i.e. in a slight reduction of markedness. The structure of the contact languages will have no impact. As for person-driven DOM, it will remain as is or it will reduce its markedness to simple animacy marking.
- - if change is CIC: there will be a different behavior depending on the contact languages; there could be a total drop of auxiliary selection in heritage Abruzzese varieties in contact with English and Spanish, for instance, while the extension of HAVE could only be found in contact with French (and Italian). The contact with Portuguese, which has aux selection but with different auxiliaries, will be the most telling. One possibility is that aux selection will be reinforced, with the adoption of new auxiliaries; another that it will be dropped. The same applies to DOM: different contact languages should have a different impact on person-sensitive DOM. The contact with Spanish might induce the loss of the person-driven specification, to leave only the animacy DOM.

Again, each pair in contact won't tell us much. All pairs in contact will give us a decent picture of the mechanisms underlying it.

The specific questions that auxiliary selection and DOM in contact and in diachrony will help answer are:

- Are some φ -features (i.e. those features referring to speaker and addressee) more subject to change than others? Why?
- If change is directional, does it penetrate the language from the core (argument structure, in argument structure driven auxiliary selection, which should be then more prone to change) or from the periphery (encoding of discourse-related information on auxiliaries)?

THE ENCODING OF DEIXIS IN PRONOUNS, DETERMINERS, ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS (1Phd student- SP 3; 1 postdoc- SP4; PI- SP5)

Both Neapolitan and Abruzzese, as well as Tuscan, and the extreme southern varieties, display some deictic encoding of information about the speaker and addressee in the determiner, demonstrative (both for adjectives and pronouns) and adverbial system. A deictic demonstrative is for instance a demonstrative pronoun or adjective which encodes specification regarding the position with respect to the speaker or the addressee, like in (9) (see Stavinschi 2009, 2012 for an overview of these systems):

(9) *Questo*, *codesto*, *quello* [Tuscan] This-close to the speaker that-close to the addressee that-far from speaker and addressee

When was this deixis introduced in the language? The basic hypothesis is that these systems have moved diachronically in the direction of higher markedness. If markedness is at the highest degree, we expect these elements to move in the direction of gradually losing their markedness, in EC. If we find some sort of gradual decreasing of the information regarding the speaker/addressee, this is an indication that contact does follow a path (although not exactly a grammaticalization one). The theoretical questions that this empirical data will help addressing are:

- Are some features more prone to contact-induced change than others? For instance, is the codification of "close to the speaker" more resilient than the "close to the addressee" one, or viceversa?
- Is there a prototypical, neuter deictic, and which one is it?
- How does contact-induced language change penetrate the determiner system?

SUBJECT CLITICS (1Phd student –SP2; 1 postdoc, SP 4; PI-SP5)

The third empirical domain examined in contact and in diachrony will be that of subject clitics. Northern Italian dialects, like Venetan and Piedmontese, have subject clitics (Rohlfs 1969), like in example (1). French is the only other Romance language that has them, though of a slightly different nature: the subject clitics of northern Italian varieties are not fully pronominal, but rather inflectional (Rizzi 1982, Poletto 2000, Roberts 2010, and many others), i.e. they are the most grammaticalized form of "pronominal" elements. Syntactically, subject clitics serve as doublers of the subject, hence we are in the presence of marked structures. Observing the development and the contact of subject clitic/argumental systems, we will be able to determine the conditions under which EC on these elements happens spontaneously, and the conditions that determine CIC.

Subject clitic systems in northern Italian dialects come in different forms: they can be fully fledged paradigms, and highly defective ones. Also in this project, we are interested in understanding whether contact-induced language change is directional (e.g. it starts from one clitic and extends to the rest of the paradigm) or catastrophic (deletion of all subject clitics at once, in contact with language varieties that do not have them, like Spanish). The specific issues related to subject clitics are:

- Is there an influence of languages without subject clitics on languages with subject clitics?
- When did they emerge, and what was their function?
- Are some features more prone to contact-induced change than others? For instance, is the codification of "speaker" more resilient than the "addressee" one for clitics, or vice versa?

Section b. Methodology

DIACHRONIC MICROCHANGE. The general methodology we choose to answer these questions is according to the following steps:

1. We take a marked element X of the grammar of language A, we observe its evolution to investigate whether it is the result of EC, and so we control for the directionality of EC.

2. We observe the element X of the grammar of language A in contact with grammars that: a. have exactly the same system but don't have X; b. have exactly the same system as A but this element is expressed slightly differently; c. have a totally different way of codifying this element than A; d: have X but the system is completely or partially different.

2. is repeated for A in contact with at least four instantiations of each of the contact situations (see Figure 2). Depending on how the element X changes, we can conclude whether this element has been subjected to contact-induced change or not.

This project involves a part of diachronic microvariation (*SP 4- 1 postdoc*), which serves to assess whether the phenomenon has been relatively stable during the last 5-600 years, and a part of synchronic microvariation in contact.



various principalities, realms, republics. Two languages per group will be addressed, both micro-diachronically and in a micro-contact situation: Venetan (possibly, Venetian) and Piedmontese for the northern group (which, as you can see from the map, is rather varied; the phenomenon we will address, subject clitics, is

(which, as you can see from the map, is rather varied; the phenomenon we will address, subject clitics, is common to both); Florentine and Sienese for the Tuscan group; Neapolitan and Abruzzese/Teatino for the Upper southern group; Palermitan and Salentino for the extreme southern group. The choice of Tuscan/Florentine is obviously linked to the fact that this vernacular was the basis of modern standard Italian, and as such it was used in most written documents of the Italian peninsula. Its diachronic microvariation is extremely well documented, and we can use it to factor out the Tuscan features on written texts in other vernaculars (which were always present, as Tuscan was the reference model). While all other varieties have had some formal status and are largely documented historically, coastal Abruzzese does not have a long literary tradition. However, a large number of studies has been dedicated to this language throughout the years at Leiden University. Its microsyntax has been addressed thoroughly. Despite its scarce documentation between the XVI and XVII century, we know much about this dialect, which was the object of investigation of two Leiden projects: one on Documenting old Abruzzese, which did return many written attestations of Abruzzese (*http://ataa.ullet.net/login.php*), and another one, which lasted 5 years, on auxiliary selection in upper southern varieties.

DIALECTS IN CONTACT As we said, in order to control for sociolinguistic factors, we propose to examine different communities of speakers of each language (call it A) in contact with different communities of any of the B,C,D, E, F languages. This means that, for instance, we take Venetian immigrants from the 1960s in contact with Argentinian Spanish in Buenos Aires, in Mendoza, in Rosario, and in Córdoba.

We will check each of the languages listed above in contact with the following varieties: Argentinian Spanish; Brazilian Portuguese; Québécois French, and US English (as a control variety). Furthermore, contact with Italian in Italy in the last 60 years will also be addressed. Ideally, it should be possible to check three or four contact situations for each variety. These contact points will be selected based on the availability of speakers who will agree to participate in the project, as well as depending on the phenomena at issue. Giving the vastness of the research areas, each team member will be responsible for one area. The data collected via crowdsourcing as well as via fieldwork will be available to all team members. We will make use of the **Virtual Research Environment** *Italian Dialect Archive* platform, developed in cooperation between the VIDI research team and Leiden University Library, which is a repository for fieldwork data, as well as a virtual research environment for our group. **This platform is already in use and will not add additional costs**. It is at the moment only accessible to the VIDI project participants.

⁶ The map is taken from <u>http://cle.ens-lyon.fr/</u> and based on Pellegrini's (1966) classification of Italian dialects.

FIRST STAGE. DATA CROWDSOURCING For the first stage of the data collection, given the large amount of data needed, we will make use of a web-based, **crowdsourcing system** which is currently being developed in Leiden within the KNAW-funded project "Abruzzese data crowdsourcing", which will soon be online at the address <u>www.abruzzesemolisano.it</u>, in collaboration with the Technical University of Eindhoven. This software consists in a web platform with input points, to which speakers can upload audio and/or video recordings of their speech. Through a data recording app, which will be freely downloadable from the website, participants will be able to record older speakers with a certain degree of accuracy (Notice that while phonological and phonetic research still requires dedicated equipment aimed at reproducing sounds with high accuracy, for syntax this is not needed).

Nowadays, technology is advanced enough so that everyone in the target areas will possess some sort of smartphone/tablet/computer with a microphone. The contemporary situation is quite exceptional, given that freely available, low-cost technology is a concrete possibility, and speakers of the old heritage varieties are still alive, although quite old. The project needs to be performed now. It could not have been performed earlier, because the costs for even the first round of documentation would have been too high, since they would have involved extensive linguistic fieldwork over a long period. It cannot be performed in 10 years time, because the first generation of speakers, who left Italy or were raised monolingually to speak the dialect, is very old. The second and third generations will also be asked, in order to check the evolution of language change (and to make the recordings), but the first generation of immigrants is crucial, for this project.

Participants will receive instructions on what to record (for the Abruzzese/Molisano data crowdsourcing project we are starting with 10 minutes of speech about the past – which for the heritage people could be "when I arrived in Argentina/Brazil/America"). They will be asked to upload an audio or video file that will be collected in a buffer, checked and edited by the research group members, and made public on the website. This will serve two aims: document these linguistic varieties that are on the verge of extinction, and identify the people who are willing/apt to participate in the second round of fieldwork, where the researchers will go to the areas where these languages are spoken.

The website and the project will be extensively advertised through the network of the Istituti Italiani di Cultura, with many of which we are already in contact, and the Scuola Dante Alighieri. We will also contact Italian embassies and consulates in Argentina, Brazil, Canada, and USA. These centers will be asked to contact their members through their boards/teachers/mailing lists, and the data will be uploaded this way. Furthermore, we will contact as many associations of Italian heritage speakers that are active in the Americas (there are many of them, in the thousands. We are already in touch with some). Last, we will cooperate with local universities , where some scholars have expertise on Italian heritage. A fieldworker will be sent to two or three centers, explain the project to the locals, and give some pre-training to local people for data collection. The places where we intend to start, thanks to the large presence of Italian immigrants, are: - Argentina: Buenos Aires, Cordoba and Mendoza (and possibly Rio Cuarto)

- Brazil: Saõ Paulo, Espirito Santo state, Rio Grande so Sul state (where Talian, a local variety of Venetan Italian, has recently been recognized as an official language): Serafina Correa, Nova Venezia)

- Canada (Québec): Montréal (Petite Italie)

- USA: Boston area, New York

These areas host a very high percentage of native Italian speakers, also in the form of entire villages.

Ideally, this research should also involve Italian communities in Germany and Belgium, but their linguistic characteristics are very different from those of Italians in the Americas, especially because of the continuous contact with Italy and Italian, which is much more frequent in European countries, of course. For reasons of prominence, isolation, and urgency of documentation, we will give precedence to Italians in the Americas. From this research "expats" will also be excluded, i.e. people who migrate to the US/Canada, and to some extent South America, who are educated and with Standard Italian as their native language.

This crowdsourcing database method will help us reach many more language communities than we could reach in a "traditionally-performed" fieldwork exercise.

The research will then continue as a combination of fieldwork and scientific inquiry, for which the methodology of generative grammar (questionnaires, instruction of local speakers to help data collection, as thoroughly described by Cornips & Poletto 2005) will serve as a basis. For the diachronic part, we will consult available databases (OVI, *Ancient Abruzzese*, etc) as well as archives and libraries. Note that many historical writings and documents are not classified, which means that we will need a postdoc who is an expert not only in historical linguistics but also in archive consulting.

Impact and Innovation

This project is innovative in several ways: first, it will develop integrated theoretical tools, which will be based on so far conflicting approaches. Adding a new, micro-change perspective, to these very debated issues will make it possible to bring several different viewpoints on the same page. The project will provide us with crucial insights on how languages evolve, which in turn will dramatically increase our understanding of how mind designs language. The project can have a big impact on linguistic disciplines, and potentially also on related disciplines in the cognitive and social sciences, as it can open the ground to cross-feeding and integrated approaches, and re-unify parts of the discipline that seem to have irremediably drifted from each other. **Empirically**, a large amount of raw data will be collected, which will be freely available to anyone working on heritage, from any point of view: cultural, anthropological, historical, as well as linguistic. It is urgent to record the production of the first generation immigrants right now, because their language is dying with them, and nothing similar will be found anywhere else, at least for Romance. Methodologically, this project is very innovative, in that it includes speakers in active research. Following simple instructions, the participants will be able to document their own language or the language of their fathers/grandfathers, and for the first time linguistics will not need to rely exclusively on the experience of the fieldworker. Involving citizens in science is one of the objectives of EU Science 2.0/Science in transition, to which this project can give an important contribution. The crowdsourcing methodology can be standardized and used in other largescale data collections in countries in which people are rich enough to possess smartphones, having a large impact on the costs of linguistic documentation as well as on citizen participation in scientific research. It is also our intention to use mass media and social media to reach participants, as well as to report popularized versions of our findings.

Section c. Resources (including project costs)

This project includes 5 subprojects. The research areas being so vast, each team member will be responsible for one area. The data collected via crowdsourcing as well as via fieldwork will be available to all team members.

- SP1 (1 PHD): auxiliary selection and DOM in contact - research area: Argentina

- SP2 (1 PHD): on deixis in contact – research area: Brazil

- SP3 (1PHD): subject clitics in contact – research area: Québec

- SP4 (1 POSTDOC): auxiliary selection, DOM, deixis and subject clitics in diachrony

- SP5 (PI -75%): the theory of contact-induced microchange; - research areas: Italy and USA. The PI will devote to the project 75% of her working time.

- TECHNICIAN: in charge of the crowdsourcing web page and of the VRE platform, as well as the fieldwork data.

The three PhD students will deliver a dissertation each. They will each submit at least one paper in an Ajournal, and will give several research papers at conferences (see work plan). The postdoc will submit at least three main journal articles in top journals, like *Language, Diachronica, Language Variation and Change, Linguistic Variation*, but also *Natural Language and Linguistic* Theory or *Lingua*, as well as several conference papers. The PI will publish at least 4 main journal articles, as well as a monograph on contactinduced microchange, possibly together with the postdoc. The team will organize at least three between conferences and workshops (see the timeplan for more details). A volume of selected papers from one of the conferences will be published with a major publisher.

The data will be collected through crowdsourcing as well as fieldwork. Each researcher will be responsible for one area, and share the data with the rest of the team.

The web-based crowdsourcing data as well as the fieldwork data will be collected in the Leiden UB repository within the VRE; the software is already available. No further resources are needed for the IT part. The data will be freely available on the web, following to the ERC guidelines for Open Access. All publications will be also Open Access.

The project members will meet every two weeks to discuss progress and problems.

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE The project will take place within the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics. The research team will be helped by experts in language contact from LUCL (dr Maarten Kossmann, prof. Marian Klamer and prof. Willem Adelaar) and expert in diachronic linguistics (prof. Sasha Lubotsky) and in

Part B1+ Part B2

Romance linguistics (prof. Johan Rooryck), as well as theoretical syntax (prof. Lisa Cheng, prof. Rint Sybesma). Worldwide renowned experts in various fields will support our research, most notably prof. Michela Cennamo (Naples, Federico II), expert in diachronic linguistics; prof. Adam Ledgeway prof. Ian Roberts and dr Theresa Biberauer (University of Cambridge), prof. Rita Manzini and prof. Leonardo Savoia (experts in microvariation and diachronic change); prof. Delia Bentley (University of Manchester, expert is extensive fieldwork research for syntactic inquiry); prof. Anna Maria Di Sciullo (Université du Québec à Montréal, expert in microvariation and morphosyntax).

	Jan-June/2016	July-Dec/2016	Jan-	July-Dec	Jan-June	July-Dec 2018	Jan-June	July-Dec /2019
			June/2017	/2017	/2018		/2019	
	START OF THE DATA CROWDSOURCING			CONFERENCE ON CONTACT PHENOMENA				CONFERENCE ON MICROCONTACT AND CHANGE
P1		literature review	checkup of data for N Abruzzese i JOINT CONFE	crowdsourcing Neapolitan and in contact ERENCE PAPER	fieldwork+ analysis + crossfeeding and discussion of results	Discussion of the data and analysis of the aux selection and DOM in contact JOURNAL ARTICLE	(2 nd fieldwork) data analysis	Analysis of the results CONFERENCE PAPER
P2		literature review	checkup of data for F	crowdsourcing Palermitan and	fieldwork+ analysis +	CONFERENCE PAPER Discussion of the data and analysis of	(2 nd fieldwork)	ARTICLE Analysis of the results
			Salentino in	RENCE PAPER	crossfeeding and discussion of results	deixis in contact JOURNAL ARTICLE CONFERENCE PAPER	data analysis	CONFERENCE PAPER
Р3		literature review	checkup of crowdsourcing data for Venetan and Piedmontese in contact		fieldwork+ analysis + crossfeeding	Discussion of the data and analysis of SCL in contact	(2 nd fieldwork)	Analysis of the results
			IOINT CONFERENCE PAPER		and discussion of results	JOURNAL ARTICLE CONFERENCE PAPER	data analysis	CONFERENCE PAPER ARTICLE
P4		Venetan and H in diachrony (th of subject clitics JOURNAL ARTICL	Piedmontese Neapolitan and Al e evolution diachrony (the ev) auxiliary E IOURNAL ARTICLE		Abruzzese in e evolution of election and	Palermitan and Salentino deictic demonstratives in diachrony and contact JOURNAL ARTICLE		Analysis of the results EDITED VOLUME
P5	lit review/ contactwith IIC/embassies/ setup of webpage	Data collection via crowdsourcing	Overview of contact situations, including	fieldwork in Italy + study of contact	fieldwork in Italy + study of contact	Discussion of the data and analysis of dialects in contact JOURNAL ARTICLE +	Fieldwork in the US on microcontact with English	Analysis of the results
		CONFERENCE PAPER	Tuscan and contact in Italy	JOURNAL ARTICLE + CONFERENCE PAPERS	JOURNAL ARTICLE + CONFERENCE P.	CONFERENCE PAPERS/PROCEEDINGS		EDITED VOLUME

TIMELINE AND DELIVERABLES

D'Alessandro Part B1+F	Part B2	MicroCont	act	
		in the come		01/01/2016
				30/06/2017
Cost Category		Sal.anc	FTE	month 1-18
Prof. Dr. R. D'Alessar	udro (1-1-2016 t/m 31-12-2020)	H1.9	0,75	€ 154.847
PI				€ 154.847
Postdoc (1-7-2016 t/m	30-6-2020), 4 jaar	11.0	1,0	€ 60.919
Total Postdocs				€ 60.919
			1.0	0.00.045
PhD 1, (1-7-2016 t/m 3	30-6-2020)		1,0	€ 38.945
PhD 2, (1-7-2016 t/m 3	30-6-2020)		1,0	€ 38.945
PhD 3, (1-7-2016 t/m 3	30-6-2020)		1,0	€ 38.945
Total Students				€ 116.835
IT assistant (1, 1, 2016	t/m 21 12 2010)	7.2	0.2	€ 12 227
0th ar	0111 31-12-2019)	1.2	0,2	£ 12.327
i Total Direct costs for Demonral (in Fund)			6 2 4 4 0 2 7
Troval (including fieldwork in D2 and D2 ke) S 15)			£ 344.927
Consumption (including fieldwork in F2 and F3 kt	(15)			£ 10.000
	ig equipment)			£ 8.000
Other goods and services Conference organization Publications (including journals)	g Open Access fees for books and			
Other (audit costs)				
ii. Total Other Direct Costs (in Euro)				€ 18.000
A – Total Direct Costs (i + ii) (in Euro)				€ 362.927
B – Indirect Costs (overheads) 25% of Direct Costs ⁴ (in	n Euro)			€ 90.732
C1 – Subcontracting Costs (no overheads) (in Euro)				
C2 – Other Direct Costs with no overheads ⁵ (in Euro)				
Total Estimated Eligible Costs (A + B + C) (in Euro) ⁶				€ 453.659
Total Requested EU Contribution (in Euro) ⁶				€ 453.659

For the above cost table, please indicate the duration of the project in months: ⁷	60
For the above cost table, please indicate the % of working time the PI dedicates to the project over the period of the grant:	75%

Selected References

[Andersen, H. 1988]. Centre and periphery adoption, diffusion and spread. In J. Fisiak (ed.), Historical dialectology. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 39-85. [Benmamoun E, S. Montrul & M. Polinsky 2013]. Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. Theoretical Linguistics. 2013;39:129-181. [Biberauer, T. & I. Roberts. 2008. Cascading parameter changes: internally driven change in Middle and Early Modern English. In P. Eythórsson (ed.), Grammatical change and linguistic theory: the Rosendal papers. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 79–113. [Campbell, L. 2001]. What's Wrong with Grammaticalization?. Language Sciences 23, 113-161. [Cennamo, M. 2001]. L'inaccusatività in alcune varietà campane: teorie e dati a confronto. In F. Albano Leoni et al. (eds) Dati Empirici e Teorie Linguistiche, Roma: Bulzoni. [Cornips, L. & C. Poletto 2005]. On standardising syntactic elicitation techniques. PART I. Lingua 115: 939-957. [D'Alessandro, R. 2014]. Death and contact-induced rebirth of impersonal pronouns. A case study. Probus 26-2: 249-274. [D'Alessandro, R. & A. Ledgeway. 2010]. The Abruzzese T-v system: feature spreading and the double auxiliary construction. In R. D'Alessandro, A. Ledgeway & I. Roberts. 2010. Syntactic variation. The dialects of Italy. CUP: 201-209. [D'Alessandro, R. & I. Roberts. 2010]. Past participle agreement in Abruzzese: split auxiliary selection and the null-subject parameter. Natural Language and Linguistics Theory 28: 41-72. [De Bot, K., M Clyne & T. van Els, T. 1989]. Dimensions of language attrition. ITL-Review 1-4: 83/84. [Di Pietro, R. 1960]. The structural description of an Alcamese Sicilian dialect in America. Phd diss: Cornell University [Ferguson, C.A. 1964]. Diglossia. In D. Hymes (ed.) Language in culture and society. NY: Harper International, 425-439. [Gelderen, E. van 2004]. Grammaticalization as economy. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [Håkansson, G. 1995]. Syntax and morphology in language attrition: A study of five bilingual expatriate Swedes. International Journal of Applied Linguistics 5.2, 153-171. [Haller, H. 1993]. Una lingua perduta e ritrovata. L'italiano degli italoamericani. Florence: La Nuova Italia. [Haspelmath, M. 1999]. Are there Principles of Grammatical Change? A Review Article of [Lightfoot, David (1999). The development of language: Acquisition, change, and evolution. Oxford: Blackwell.]. Journal of Linguistics 35, 579-595. [Haspelmath, M. 2004]. On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In: O. Fischer, M. Norde & H. Perridon (eds), Up and down the Cline - The Nature of Grammaticalization. 17-44. [Heine, B. & T. Kuteva. 2003]. On contact-induced grammaticalization. Studies in Language 27, 3: 529-572. [Hopper, P. 1991] On some principles of grammaticization. In E. Traugott, & B. Heine (eds.), Approaches to Grammaticalization: Volume I. Theoretical and methodological issues, 17 ff. [Keenan, E. 2002]. Explaining the creation of reflexive pronouns in English. In: Minkova, D. & R. Stockwell (eds), Studies in the history of the English language: a millennial perspective. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 325–354. [Keller, R. 1994], Language Change: The Invisible Hand in Language. London: Routledge. [Kiparsky, P. 1968]. Linguistic Universals and Linguistic Change. In E. Bach & R. Harms (eds.), Universals in Linguistic Theory, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. [Kroch, A. 1994]. Morphosyntactic variation. Papers from the 30th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 180-201. [Lambert, R. & B. Freed. 1982] The loss of language skills. Rowley: Mass. Newbury House. [Ledgeway, A. 2012]. From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology & Change. OUP. [Lehmann, C. 1993]. Theoretical Implications of Processes of Grammaticalization. In W. A. Foley (ed.), The role of Theory in Language Description. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 315–340. [Lightfoot, D. 1991]. How to set parameters: arguments from language change. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [Longobardi, G. 2001]. Formal syntax, diachronic Minimalism, and etymology: the history of French chez. Linguistic Inquiry 32: 275-302. [Loporcaro, M. 1988]. Grammatica storica del dialetto di Altamura. Pisa: Pacini. [Malkiel, Y. 1974]. Distinctive traits of Romance linguistics. In D. Hymes (ed.) Language in culture and society. A reader in Linguistics and Anthropology. New York: Harper and Row, 671-688. [Malkiel, Y. 1977]. On Hierarchizing the Components of Multiple Causation. Studies in Language 1:1, 81 ff. [Manzini, M.R. & L. Savoia. 2005]. I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso. [Montrul, S. 2002]. Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense/aspect distinctions in adult bilinguals. Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 5.1, 39-68. [Newmeyer, F. 1998] 998. Language Form and Language Function. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [Norde, M. 2009]. Degrammaticalization. Oxford: OUP. [Owens, J. 1996]. Grammatisierung, Semantisierung und Sprachkontakt: Arabisch im Tschad-See-Gebiet. In: Haase, M. & N. Nau. Sprachkontakt und Grammatikalisierung, 79-85. [Platzack, C. 1998]. The initial hypothesis of syntax: a minimalist perspective on language acquisition and attrition. In H. Clahsen (ed.), Generative Perspectives on Language Acquisition. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 369-414. [Poletto, C. 2000]. The higher functional field. OUP.[Reintges, C. 2015]. Increasing morphological complexity, and how syntax drives morphological change. In Biberauer, T. & G. Walkden (eds). Syntax over time. OUP, 125-145. [Roberts, I. 2007]. Diachronic Syntax. OUP. [Roberts, I. 2015]. Incorporation. Lecture, University of Cambridge. [Roeper, Tom 1993]. The 'Least Effort' Principle in Child Grammar: Choosing a Marked Parameter. In E. Reuland & W. Abraham (eds), Knowledge and Language. Volume I: From Orwell's Problem to Plato's Problem, 71-104. [Saltarelli, M. 1986]. Italian in the USA: stratification and cohesion. APIA, 105-112. [Simone, R. 1988] "Fragilità" della morfologia e "contesti turbati". In A. Giacalone Ramat (ed.), L'italiano tra le altre lingue: strategie di acquisizione. Bologna: Il Mulino: 91-98 [Torcolacci, G. 2014]. Marking the default. Auxiliary selection in southern Italian dialects. Phd diss, Leiden University. [Traugott, E. 2001]. Legitimate Counterexamples to Unidirectionality. Paper presented at the University of Freiburg, 17 October 2001. (http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/Freiburg.Unidirect.pdf). [Tsimpli, I., A. Sorace, C. Heyckock & F. Filiaci, F. 2004]. First language attrition and syntactic subjects: A study of Greek and Italian near-native speakers of English. International Journal of Bilingualism 8.3: 257-277. [Willis, D. 2010]. Degrammaticalization and obsolescent morphology: Evidence from Slavonic. In K.Stathi, E. Gehweiler & E. König (eds), Grammaticalization: Current views and issues. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 151-77. [Wright, R. 1983]. Unity and diversity among the Romance languages. Transactions of the philological society 1-22.