

PROGETTO PRIN 2017

Models of language variation and change: new evidence from language contact

Reports on major dialectal areas in Southern Italy

The Italiot Greek enclaves

Vincenzo Stalfieri

0. In a nutshell

Italiot Greek dialects are few dialectal varieties which represent the relics of a once deeply widespread Greek-speaking community in Southern Italy. However, as we will see in the next chapters, these varieties are today strongly endangered.

1. Areal distribution

Nowadays (Martino 1980, Katsoyannou 1999), in Italy there are two small areas where a Greek variety is still spoken: Southern Calabria and Salento.

In Calabria, Greek-speaking villages are located on the slopes of Aspromonte: Amendolea, Bova Sup., Galliciano, Condofuri, Roghudi, Roccaforte, Chorio di Roccaforte and Chorio di Roghudi (see Map 1).

In Salento, Greek-speaking villages are: Calimera, Castrignano dei Greci, Corigliano d'Otranto, Martano, Martignano, (Melpignano, Soleto), Sternatia and Zollino (see Map 2).

Calabria Greek is also known as *Bovese* (from *Bova*, the biggest village where Greek is spoken) or *Greko*, whereas Salento Greek is commonly known as *Griko* (Rohlf's 1972a, 1972b). We will use *Bovese* and *Griko* as perfect synonyms of Calabria Greek and Salento Greek, respectively.

Therefore, Greek is increasingly confined either to family use or it is associated with cryptolalic functions, so much so that griko-speaking people in Salento have been stigmatized as "people of two languages" by the nearby romance-speaking communities (see Schifano and Silvestri 2017).

Moreover, a psychological motivation, the "fear of bilingualism", has played a major role in leading its speaker to abandon Griko. As a matter of fact, bilingualism «non era [...] considerato una condizione cognitiva possibile e addirittura auspicabile tra i non addetti ai lavori, come rivelano le parole del parroco di Sternatia intervistato dal Gruppo di Lecce (1980:370), il quale sembra profilare uno scenario in cui grico e salentino/italiano non possano convivere» ("was not [...] considered a possible and even desirable cognitive condition among non-experts, as revealed by the words of the parish priest of Sternatia, when he was interviewed by the Gruppo di Lecce (1980:370), who seems to outline a scenario where Griko and Romance cannot live together") (cf. Schifano and Silvestri 2017:282-283).

3. Historical notes

3.1 Middle Ages and Modern Age

Greek language has always been spoken in a great part of Southern Italy since the antiquity to Middle Ages. The first signs of a crisis can be detected clearly in the 14th century when, after the political and cultural decline of Byzantium, the Latin liturgy rapidly spread even among speakers who had always been speaking Greek. The Greek liturgy survived longer in the whole area of Reggio Calabria, at least until the 16th century. However, there are wide chronological gaps along these centuries, that show a gradual but never-ceasing downgrading of Greek variety towards a lower register (see Martino 1980).

3.2. Contemporary Age and the decline of Greek

In 1820, the Greek-speaking population was composed mainly of shepherds and peasants living in twelve villages of Aspromonte: Bova, Montebello, Roccaforte, Condofuri, Gallicianò, Roghudi, Chorìo di Roghudi, Amendolea, Campo di Amendolea, S. Pantaleone, Ghorio and Cardeto (Rohlf's 1972a, Martino 1980, Katsoyannou 1999). By the end of the 19th century, we find only seven villages. From the end of the 19th century onwards, an increasing sense of inferiority led poor shepherds and farmers of Aspromonte to abandon their native Greek, which was perceived as the language of the illiterates and as a true obstacle to social promotion. In 20th century, the decline of the Greek-speaking world went even faster. The economic consequences of the earthquake in 1908 led many people to move away from the slopes of Aspromonte. Moreover, the fascist hostility towards non-Italo-Romance linguistic traditions and cultures on Italian soil played an important role. However, this isolated area had been keeping the Greek language alive, albeit in a progressively reduced area, until the 1930s. Things worsened rapidly after the World War II. In fact, already Rohlf's (1974) claimed that Greek as a living language had disappeared in villages like Bova, Condofuri, Roccaforte and Amendolea. The massive emigration in the post-war period and several harsh floods that occurred in the early 70s, gave the *coup de grace* to villages such as Roghudi, Chorìo di Roghudi and Roccaforte. The inhabitants from Gallicianò moved further towards the valleys near Reggio (Gallicianò

Nuova), but they had not linked their Greek-identity to the new site. Rather, they acquired a *koine*-like Romance based on Reggino variety (Martino 2009).

To sum up, Greek has been increasingly associated with a lower social status, so much so that the nearby Romance-speaking communities created many derogatory names (such as *Paddechi*¹) by which Greek speakers were epithetized. Therefore, we cannot speak of death of language, but more precisely of linguistic suicide: that is, speakers voluntarily decide to abandon their native language by no longer transmitting it to their children, because they think it would be unsuitable in new social context.

4. The debate on the origins

The origins of the Greek-speaking enclaves outlined above has given rise to a heated debate in the 20th century. Do these Greek enclaves date back to *Magna Graecia* or do they date back to the Middle Ages, at the time of Byzantine conquest? The first hypothesis has been supported by Rohlfs from the 1920s onwards and subsequently by many Greek scholars (Tsopanakis 1968, Karanastasis 1984), whereas the second hypothesis has been supported by most of Italian scholars (Parlangèli 1953, G. Falcone 1973, among many others). In support of one or the other thesis, many pieces of evidence have been pointed out, which can be grouped under the perspective of more recent and neutral works, such as Manolissou (2005) and Fanciullo (1996, 2001).

4.1. Alleged archaic elements of Italo-Greek dialects

Greek dialects of Southern Italy, which are peripheral to the development of modern Greek, preserve characteristics which might, or might not, date back to Old Greek:

4.1.1. Preservation of geminate consonants

As in Cyprus and the Dodecanese and unlike modern Greek, geminate consonants in Italiot Greek enclave are preserved. Thus, this preservation has always been considered a proof of the antiquity of the dialects spoken in these enclaves. But things are a little bit more complex than that. In fact, several texts from Calabria dating back to 10th-12th century show that degeminates can be found in alternative with the expected geminates, such as in (1). Moreover, we have cases of non-etymological hyper-corrected geminates (such as in (2), see Fanciullo 1996:31-39) which show that, by the end of the first millennium, even in Italiot Greek dialects there was a confusion between geminate ~ degeminate realization.:

- (1) i. tesara ‘four’
ii. tessara ‘four’
- (2) i. appidi ‘pear’ bov., gr.sal.
ii. apidi ‘pear’ Mod. Greek

¹ The term means ‘boy’ in Italo-Greek dialects, but it is used by the nearby Romance-speaking communities in a negative sense to designate people who do not speak an intelligible language (Martino 1980).

Although gemination is preserved today, this medieval fluctuation shown in (1) and (2) lead us to consider that Italo-Greek, for a certain period of its diachrony, has undergone the same process of degemination that affected homeland Greek. However, this process might have been blocked thanks to contact with the nearby southern romance dialects, which have been preserving geminates throughout their history (Fanciullo *ibidem*). However, the fact that Italo-Greek has probably undergone degemination might prove that relationships with homeland Greece were not yet cut off in the Middle Ages, but it cannot prove itself that Greek spoken in Italy has ancient or medieval origin. Thus, we can now turn to consider other elements.

4.1.2. *Phonetic realization of gr. < ζ > as [dz]*

In Salento and part of Calabria (see 3i) (Roghudi, Gallicianò), gr. < ζ > is pronounced as [dz] and not as [z], with the latter being the pronounce of Modern Greek (3ii):

- (3) i. [ridza]
 ii. gr. [riza] ‘root’

However, Caracausi (1975) claimed that [dz] is a further evolution from [z], as it happened in the Dodecanese. So, only an in-depth analysis of medieval documents could define the probative value of this data.

4.1.3. *Absence of post-nasal voicing*

In Modern Greek (4i and 5i) and bovese (4ii and 5ii), post-nasal unvoiced occlusives become voiced (/nt, mp, nk/ → [nd, mb, ng]) while in Salento (4iii and 5iii) this does not happen (Rohlf's 1977:40-41):

- (4) i. pende ‘five’
 ii. pende
 iii. pente
- (5) i. kàmbia ‘caterpillar’
 ii. kamba
 iii. kampia

Rohlf's claimed that this lack of voicing in Salento is a clear sign of continuity with old Greek, for the sonorization in Greek seems to be documented with reasonable certainty already in the 4th century. (Rohlf's, 1972b:67).

4.1.4. *Partial substitution of infinitival subordinates*

Rohlf's (1972a, 1972b, 1977) claimed that, by the first centuries of our era, in homeland Greece subordinates with the infinitive had been totally replaced by a coordinate construction introduced by the complementizer *na*. In this context, Italo-Greek dialects might reveal an archaic stage, because some infinitival subordinates can still be found (in alternative with the coordinate construction) when introduced by verbs meaning 'doing' (6), *to be able to* (7) *seeing* (8), *hearing* (9). The infinitival subordinate, instead, is the only possible alternative for *can* (10):

- (6) i. me kànni pethàni
me do.2s die.inf
- ii. me kanèis na pethàno
me do.2s that die.1s
'You make me die'
- (7) i. en essèri gràssi
not knows write.Inf
- ii. den borò na gràfso
not knows that writes
'He can't write'
- (8) i. ton ìkua erti
him heard.1s come.Inf
- ii. ton akousa na erkhetai
him heard.1s that came.1s
'I heard him coming'
- (9) i. on ida klàssi
him saw.1s cry.Inf
- ii. ton eida na klaiei
him saw.1s that cried.3s
'I saw him crying'
- (10) i. sònnome mini
can.1.Pl wait.Inf
- ii. boroume na perimenoume
can.1.Pl that wait.1.Pl
'We can wait'

However, Manolessou (2005) points out that in modern Greek infinitival subordinates are attested until the 14th century and they were introduced by the same verbs shown in the examples (6-10). Therefore, the only partial loss of infinitival subordinates in Italo-Greek dialects proves the fact that contacts between the two varieties of Greek broke down from the late Middle Ages onwards, rather than proving a more conservative stage of the Italo-Greek enclaves.

4.1.5. *Lack of a future tense in Italiot Greek dialects*

The synthetic future has already become extinct by the first centuries A.D., whereas the periphrastic one (i.e., the one formed with the futural particle *tha* + infinitive) arose only in the XIII century in homeland Greece (Rohlf's 1972b:83-85). In Italo-Greek dialects, only present tense is used to convey future tense meanings: no periphrastic form arose:

- | | | |
|---------|------------------|---------------|
| (11) i. | em brexi | Italiot Greek |
| | not rains | |
| ii. | den tha vrexai | Modern Greek |
| | not FUT rain.Inf | |
| | 'It won't rain' | |

However, as we have already seen for the partial substitution of the infinitive, this future does not prove itself the antiquity of the Italo-Greek dialects. More realistically, it can be just considered as a further evidence showing that Italo-Greek has split from modern Greek in the late Middle Ages.

4.2. Comparison between Ancient Greek and modern Greek dialects.

The non-identifiability with a specific neo-Greek dialect has been considered as another evidence for the continuity with a more archaic stage and, straightforwardly, with Ancient Greek. In fact, no other modern Greek varieties present jointly the afore mentioned phenomena. For example, the preservation of geminates is found only in some south-eastern modern Greek dialects, whereas the only partial loss of the infinitive is found in Pontic and Cypriot. Moreover, other single characteristics are found only in Italo-Greek dialects but not in other modern Greek dialects. For example, it might be worth a mention that the term *griko*, by which Italo-Greek speaking communities design their language, is not found anywhere else in homeland Greece. In Calabria², Rohlfs (1972b:124) tells us that some people, when asked about their language, they answered something like *platòme grika* ‘we speak Greek’. The same holds for Salento, even though with a slightly different form (*omilume grika*, ‘we speak Greek’).

4.3. Greek influence on Southern Italian Romance

Like modern Greek, Italo-Greek dialects show a pentavocalic vowel system (/i/, /ε/, /a/, /ɔ/, /u/):

Table 1

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|---|-----|---|
| Ī | Ī Ē | Ĕ | Ǻ | Ŏ | Ō Ū | Ū |
| I | e | ε | a | ɔ | o | u |
| I | | ε | a | ɔ | u | |

According to Fanciullo (1984, 1996, 2001), this pentavocalic system arose in the Romance dialects that underwent the effect of a Greek substratum. Thus, the so-called Sicilian vowel system characterizing the extreme Southern Romance dialects can be considered a further evolution of the common Romance system under the influence of Greek. In fact, it is reasonable to assume that this evolution started from several lexemes shared by both varieties, that bilingual speakers made probably no effort to switch when needed.

Let us see some examples:

(12) ‘candle’

- i. Gr. *χανδήλιον* (with <ή> and <ί> both melted into /i/)
- ii. Ital. *cand[e]la*
- iii. Sicil. *kannila*

(13) ‘halter’

- i. Gr. *χαπίστριον*
- ii. Ital. *cap[e]stro*
- iii. Sicil. *kapistru*

(14) ‘oven’

- i. *φουρνος* (with <ou> = /u/)
- ii. *f[o]rno*
- iii. Sicil. *furnu*

² Actually, this denomination, though widespread in Salento, was not very common in Calabria. Martino (1980) claims that *grika* was commonly used in Roghudi and Chorio di Roghudi, the most isolated villages. This shows that speakers did not always have an actual self-awareness of their affinity with Greek spoken in homeland Greece.

- (15) ‘grape must’
- i. μουστός
 - ii. *m[o]sto*
 - iii. Sicil. *mustu*

(Fanciullo 2001:72).

This vowel system characterizes not only the Italo-Greek area, but also many other southern areas such as Sicily, southern Salento, central and southern Calabria, southern Cilento. Thus, such a deep and widespread influence cannot be explained by scattered migrations from the VI to the X century, as argued by Parlangèli (1953). During the Middle Ages, other non-Greek people (Albanians and Croatians above all) moved towards Italy, especially after the fall of Byzantium, but these migrations have never affected the general linguistic asset of Southern Italy. In support of the validity of a deep and long-lasting Greek influence, we can notice that some traces of the yet-to-come Byzantine Greek vowel system were already *in nuce* in Old Greek. For example, the passage of η > [i] can be traced back to Pericles’ age (see Lazzeroni 1999, cited in Fanciullo 2001:75). Moreover, in Medieval Byzantine domains that had not been previously in contact with Greece, such as the Exarchate of Ravenna and Sardinia, Greek influence is almost absent. This clearly shows that the time span producing such a deep influence, as we have seen in Southern Italy, is much broader than just a century or two.

4.4. Bilingualism

A sharp contrast between the ancient and the medieval origin of Greek in Southern Italy has been almost totally rejected in the last two decades. After all, we must consider that this *querelle* blew out in the 1920s, when the concept of bilingualism had not yet been fully accepted in literature. For this reason, Rohlfs had to postulate necessarily that, since Greek has been spoken without interruption since Magna Graecia till now, then Latinization had not been complete. Unfortunately, in the 20s nationalisms became increasingly stronger and we must not exclude that this cultural environment influenced, consciously or not, Italian scholars. If Rohlfs had not been too neat in claiming that Latinization had not affected Southern Italy, perhaps he would have not raised such a harsh criticism. At that time, Italian scholars could not accept the idea that Rome had conquered and latinized the entire world but not one of his closest parts, Southern Italy. The harshness of this debate lays on the fact that linguists were more incline to believe that to each population corresponded only one language. Studies on bilingual population were far to come. In fact, the first fully-fledged work on linguistic contact, Weinreich’s *Languages in contact*, was firstly published only in 1953.

5. Noun Morphology

Even though Italiot Greek dialects are on the brink of extinction, nouns and determiners still display a robust case morphology, together with gender and number distinctions:

TABLE 1 based on Rohlfs (1977:66f.) Italo-Greek definite nominal paradigms

| Bovese | | | | Griko | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Masculine (<i>lik-</i> ‘wolf’, <i>min-</i> ‘month’) | | | | | | | | |
| | Sg | Pl | Sg | Pl | Sg | Pl | Sg | Pl |
| Nom | <i>o liko</i> | <i>i liki</i> | <i>o mina</i> | <i>i mini</i> | <i>o liko</i> | <i>i/e liki</i> | <i>o mina</i> | <i>i/e mini</i> |
| Acc | <i>to lliko</i> | <i>tu lliku</i> | <i>to mmina</i> | <i>tu mminu</i> | <i>(t)o lliko</i> | <i>(t)u lliku</i> | <i>(t)o mmina</i> | <i>(t)u mminu</i> |
| Gen | <i>tu liku</i> | <i>to lliko</i> | <i>tu minu/-a</i> | <i>to mmino</i> | <i>(t)u liku</i> | <i>(t)o lliko</i> | <i>(t)u minu/-a</i> | <i>(t)o mminò/ mmino</i> |
| Feminine (<i>alé-</i> ‘olive’, <i>man-</i> ‘mother’) | | | | | | | | |
| Nom | <i>i alèa</i> | <i>i alè</i> | <i>i mana</i> | <i>i mane</i> | <i>e alèa</i> | <i>i alè</i> | <i>i mana</i> | <i>i mane</i> |
| Acc | <i>tin alèa</i> | <i>tes alè</i> | <i>tim mana</i> | <i>te mmane</i> | <i>(t)in alèa</i> | <i>(t)es alè</i> | <i>(t)i mmana</i> | <i>(t)es mane/ (t)e mmane</i> |
| Gen | <i>tis alèa</i> | <i>tos alèo</i> | <i>ti mmanò</i> | <i>to mmanò/ mmano</i> | <i>(t)is alèa</i> | <i>(t)os alèo</i> | <i>(t)is mana/ (t)i mmana</i> | <i>(t)os manò/ mano/ (t)o mmanò/ mmano</i> |
| Neuter (<i>krea(-)</i> ‘meat’, <i>peð-</i> ‘child’) | | | | | | | | |
| Nom | <i>to krea</i> | <i>ta krèata</i> | <i>to peðì</i> | <i>ta peðì</i> | <i>(t)o krea</i> | <i>(t)a krèata</i> | <i>(t)o peðì</i> | <i>(t)a peðìa</i> |
| Acc | | | | | | | | |
| Gen | <i>tu kreatu</i> | <i>to kkrèato</i> | <i>tu peðiu</i> | <i>tos peðio</i> | <i>(t)u kreatu</i> | <i>(t)os krèato/ (t)o kkrèatu</i> | <i>(t)u peðiu</i> | <i>(t)u peðio</i> |

However, like Modern Greek, Italo-Grek dialects show a general loss of some case morphology. One of the most striking phenomena is the melting into one single case of genitive and dative, which can be traced back to the third century AD (Rohlfs 1977:184).

5.1. Case syncretism: an issue of contact-induced variation in Romance of Southern Calabria

The collapse of genitive and dative morphemes into one single marking has no dramatic consequences in Italo-Greek dialects, but it might trigger some substratum effect on the Romance dialects of the area where Greek varieties have been spoken until recently. An example of this substratum action is the so-called "Greek dative" (= recipient or receiver codified by the genitival preposition *di*), which can be found in some Romance varieties in Southern Calabria, along the Ionian shore. This "Greek dative" has not replaced the Romance one (introduced by preposition *a*), but it seems to have polarized its functions:

(16) *La machina, nci la vindu a nu studenti*
 the car to.him it sell.1s to a student
 ‘As for the car, I’ll sell it to a student’

(17) *La machina, nci la vindu di nu studenti.*
 the car to.him it sell.1s of a student

‘As for the car, I’ll sell it to a student’ (Ledgeway Schifano Silvestri 2018: 102).

The sentences in (16) and (17) are not mutually interchangeable, for there is a subtle pragmatic distinction between the two. In (16), the recipient is a generic student that is unknown to the speaker, whereas in (17) the student is known to the speaker, who simply chooses not to mention him.

6. Some other instances of contact-induced variation in the Noun Phrase

6.1. Adjectives

6.1.1. Adjectives in Standard Modern Greek

In Standard Modern Greek, all adjectives can be pre-nominal and follow the order *quantification* < *quality* < *size* < *shape/color* < *provenance*, which is very widespread cross-linguistically (Sproat and Shih 1991):

- (18) polés ómorfes megáles persikés gátes
 'many beautiful big Persian cats' (Guardiano and Stavrou 2014: 124).

Prenominal adjectives can be interpreted as either indirect or direct modifiers and, when co-occurring, the adjectives interpreted as direct modifiers are always closer to the noun than those displaying the interpretive properties of indirect modifiers (in *ta aorata orata asteria*, lit. 'the invisible visible stars', the first adjective, *aorata*, can only be interpreted as stage-level—'the stars which are not visible right now'—while the second adjective, *orata*, can only be interpreted as individual-level—'the stars which are normally visible'). (Guardiano and Stavrou 2019: 15). As for postnominal adjectives in Standard Modern Greek, they surface only under specific conditions. First, they can only have restricted and stage-level interpretation (Guardiano and Stavrou 2019: 16):

- (19) mia ekilisa palia
 a church old
 'an church in bad condition (*a former church)'

Moreover, in definite nominals, postnominal adjectives can surface only if the adjective is introduced by an additional definite article (20) - a phenomenon often referred to as "polydefiniteness" or "determiner spreading" (Stavrou 2012, 2013, 2019; Guardiano and Stavrou 2014, 2019, 2021):

- (20) to pedí to kaló
 the child the beautiful
 'The beautiful child'

(Guardiano and Stavrou 2019: 16).

It is assumed that in Standard modern Greek postnominal adjectives are indirect modifiers (Stavrou 2012) which, according to Campos and Stavrou (2004), have a DP-internal predicative structure the head of which encodes the predication relation, i.e. is paraphrasable by a copulative clause (*to pedi to kalo*, lit. 'the child the nice', can be paraphrased as 'the child is nice'). Moreover, the morpheme that precedes the adjective in polydefinite DPs is the spell-out of definiteness and case: its role is purely morphological or grammatical. Therefore, it neither encodes any definiteness meaning nor contributes to the direct or indirect interpretation of the adjective (Guardiano and Stavrou 2019: 35). The other distinctive feature of polydefinite structures is the obligatory "definiteness agreement" between the noun and the modifier (i.e., both nouns and adjectives must be preceded by a "definite article"). Therefore, Guardiano and Stavrou (2019: 37) assume that the

feature that is spelled out as the definite article, which they label [+def], is found not only in D, but also in the head Pred of the PredP, although this is not semantically an article:

- (21) [DP D [PredP [NP amaksi] Pred [[+N] akrivo]]
 [+def] [+def]
 to amaksi to akrivo
 the car the expensive
 ‘The expensive car’

Being a nominal head, Pred carries all the relevant features of nominals (phi features, case, definiteness). In Standard Modern Greek, within a single noun phrase, nouns and modifying adjectives agree in phi-features and case. Laying on this agreement, Guardiano and Stavrou (2019) make the following hypothesis: if the adjective is merged prenominal, agreement is realized straightforwardly. If the adjective is merged postnominally this straightforward concord is not available, so the presence of the article is obligatory. Therefore, the Pred head mediates concord in “definiteness”, phi-features and case between noun and adjective. In the final spell-out of (21), *to amaksi to akrivo*, the noun and the adjective concord in definiteness, case, and phi-features. In Standard Modern Greek, this concord has overt morphological exponence, because the noun and its adjectival modifier(s) bear overt case morphology. There are also cases where articulated adjectives can occur before the noun, but only under specific pragmatic conditions, i. e. when they encode a focalized expression (*fronting*). Therefore, in cases such as *to akrivo to amaksi*, the adjective *akrivo* is fronted and «stands for the new information conveyed by the entire nominal phrase, whereas the denotation of the noun represents old or background knowledge» (Guardiano and Stavrou 2019: 19). On this topic, see also Campos and Stavrou 2004.

6.1.2. Adjectives in Italo-Greek

As well as in most Southern Italo-Romance dialects (22), in Salento Greek only a restricted class of speaker-oriented adjectives (the equivalents of *nice/beautiful*, *good/bad*, *big/small*) can be prenominal (23). All other adjectives are postnominal and occur without the doubling of the article (24, 25):

- (22) Siciliano
- | | | | | | |
|----|----|-------------------------|--------|------|---------|
| a. | na | beda | makina | | |
| | a | beautiful | car | | |
| | | ‘a beautiful car’ | | | |
| b. | na | makina | ranni | bblu | tedeska |
| | a | car | big | blue | German |
| | | ‘a big blue German car’ | | | |

(Guardiano and Stavrou 2019: 24)

- (23) meletisa ena òrrio libro
 Read.1PST a beautiful book
 ‘I read a good book’

- (24) meletisa ena libro rodino
 Read.1PST a book red
 ‘I read a red book’

- (34) Calabria Greek – written sources
- a. to lleddendu tom bovero
 the brother the poor
 ‘the poor brother’
- b. ta cerata ta makria
 the horns the long
 ‘the long horns’

- (35) Salento Greek – folk song
- a. ti gunedda ti khali ci to mantili to matassoto
 the gown the beautiful and the apron the silk
 ‘the beautiful gown and the silk apron’

Guardiano and Stavrou (2019: 30-33)

So, why did Italiot Greek lose polydefiniteness? Guardiano and Stavrou (2019) assume that, originally, in Italiot Greek, as in Standard Modern Greek, direct modification adjectives were merged in prenominal position and were not crossed over by the noun, and that postnominal adjectives were only interpreted as indirect modifiers, generated postnominally in a polydefinite structure of the type shown in (21), at least as far as definite DPs are concerned. In indefinite DPs, instead, postnominal indirect adjectives are allowed. According to Guardiano & Stavrou (2014) and Guardiano et al. (2016), it was precisely the availability of such Noun-Adjective sequences, superficially identical to those of Romance, that triggered, in Italiot Greek, the reanalysis of postnominal adjectives as originally merged prenominally and crossed over by N/NP. Besides this, Guardiano and Stavrou (2019: 43) argue that a further element that might have conspired to the loss of polydefinite constructions is a morphological one, i.e. the restructuring of the nominal declensional system. In Italiot Greek dialects, the case syncretism shown in the section 5.1 brought about a considerable blurring or even a loss of case distinctions on both adjectives and nouns (with the consequence that the nominal declensional system is getting closer to that of Southern Italo-Romance). Therefore, since case became scarcely visible, the case-concord mediator was no more necessary and the head PredP had not necessarily to be visible. At this point, we might wonder the reason why in the traditional texts of Italiot Greek polydefinite structures are still there. The answer might be that they attest an intermediate diachronic stage where the similarity with the structure seen in (21) is more superficial than actual. Indeed, if the polydefinite structures of the written texts still had a Greek-like syntax, we would expect that the crossed-over adjectives should not have received the doubled article, since polydefinite articles appear only in indirect post-nominally merged modifiers. Nevertheless, both direct and indirect modifiers are introduced by an article. Therefore, it is possible that at the stage attested in the written texts the N/NP movement had already occurred and the article in the polydefinite structure was relegated to a mere definiteness agreement morpheme that was attached to every postnominal adjective, rather than the actual spell-out of Pred. A further difference with respect to Greek is that even in the written texts there are no fronted adjectives. For instance, as seen above, polydefinite DPs with prenominal articulated adjectives (of the type *to akrivo to amaksi* ‘the expensive the car’), which are quite productive in Standard Modern Greek, are not attested in the written sources.

6.2. Demonstratives

Demonstratives are complex items that convey at least two features: location and definiteness (Leu 2008, Guardiano 2012, 2014). There are languages, where [+def] must be spelled out obligatorily. Since [+def] is also traditionally encoded on D, if a DP contains a demonstrative, it also contains the feature [+def]. Crosslinguistically, there are two types of languages: those where the feature [+def] of D is overtly spelled out obligatorily (like English, Italian, or Greek) and those in which it is not (such as for instance Latin or Russian). The feature [+def] is by default spelt out in D: hence, languages of the former type have a definite article, while those of the latter type don't. Languages where [+def] must be obligatorily visible on D display two possibilities concerning demonstratives: either demonstratives are able to check overtly the [+def] feature on D or they are not. We label the former "D-checking". When a demonstrative is D-checking, no further item which overtly spells out the feature [+def] on D, e.g., the definite article, is required: hence, the two do not co-occur.

In the Southern Italo-Romance dialects, demonstratives are D-checking. Therefore, they always surface DP-initially and do not co-occur with articles (adapted from Guardiano 2014: 82):

- (36) kanuscimmu a kistu sindaku Reggio Calabria
 Met.1PL DOM this mayor
 'We met this mayor'
- (37) aggiu nkuntratu štu krištjanu Cellino San Marco
 have.1SG met this man
 'I met this man'

Different patterns are attested for Greek. As for adnominal demonstratives, in Standard Modern Greek the features of localization (proximal or distal) and definiteness are not collapsed into one single lexical item – localization is expressed by demonstratives *stricto sensu*, whereas definiteness is conveyed by an article. Therefore, unlike Romance, Greek demonstratives co-occur with the article and can surface in different linear positions. Indeed, they can be found in the area of D (38)³, but also in other lower positions, such as in post-nominal position (39) and following prenominal adjectives (40) (Guardiano and Stavrou 2020: 131-132):

- (38) aftò to vivlio⁴
 this the book
 'this book'
- (39) to vivlio aftò
 the book this
 'this book'
- (40) to akrivo afto kokino vivlio
 the expensive this red book
 'this expensive red book'

According to Guardiano and Stavrou (2020: 137), «the [+loc] feature of the demonstrative is assigned

³ Movement to the area of D usually happens when the demonstrative has deictic/emphatic/contrastive interpretation (Manolessou and Panagiotidis 1999).

⁴ The example in (38) is not equivalent to the one in (39), since «This position is associated with a strongly (usually deictic, or contrastive) context-bound interpretation. Prosodically, it is stressed» (Guardiano and Stavrou 2020: 138)

some sort of “adjectival” nature and is assumed to be merged in the same type of postnominal position where adjectives are generated, namely in the complement of Pred». To support this claim, the authors propose an analysis that compares Greek “adjectival” demonstratives to polydefinite constructions that we observed in (21). Like adjectives, demonstratives display overt morphological agreement with the head noun and have a declensional system which is actually very similar to that of adjectives. Since demonstratives are intrinsically [+def] elements, the head of a DP containing a demonstrative necessarily has [+def], that is spelt-out by the definite article. A copy of [+def] must in turn be contained in Pred: this gives rise to a “polydefinite” DP where the feature [+def] on D is realized by the definite article, while its copy on Pred is realized by the demonstrative. To sum up, in Standard Modern Greek, adnominal demonstratives are not D-checking: they are much more flexible in terms of their position and do not have to be realized in the D-area. Finally, most of the positions where demonstratives are found in Standard Modern Greek (pre-article, postnominal) overlap with those of (originally) postnominal adjectives. Therefore, Guardiano and Stavrou (2020: 147) tentatively propose that, in Standard Modern Greek, demonstratives have the same structural source as postnominal “polydefinite” adjectives.

6.2.1. *Demonstratives in Italiot Greek*

In Italiot Greek, both in Salento and Calabria, demonstratives are D-checking. Therefore, they do not co-occur with articles and cannot surface in post-nominal position, just like the other Southern Italo-Romance dialects (41). Thus, their superficial pattern recalls very closely the Romance pattern rather than the Greek one (42) – (43):

(41) Salentino

- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|------|------|-----------|
| a. | stu | / | ddu | kristjanu |
| | this | | that | man |
| b. | *kristjanu | stu | / | ddu |
| | man | this | | that |
| | ‘This/that man’ | | | |

(Guardiano and Stavrou 2020: 129)

- | | | | | | |
|------|------------------|--------------|--------|---------|---------------|
| (42) | ida | (t)utto/cino | (*ton) | àntrepo | Salento Greek |
| | saw.1S | this/that | the | man | |
| | ‘I saw this man’ | | | | |

- | | | | | |
|------|--------------|---------|-------|----------------|
| (43) | tuta/(e)cina | tessera | peðia | Calabria Greek |
| | these/those | four | boys | |

‘these/those four boys’ (Guardiano and Stavrou 2020: 122-123)

Notwithstanding this distributional similarity, demonstratives in Italiot Greek differ from Romance as for their morphology. In the traditional literature (see Karanastasis 1984, a. o.) it is shown that both in Salento Greek and in Calabria Greek the current forms of the demonstratives result from the morpho-phonological “fusion” of the demonstrative and the definite article. Here we provide the whole paradigm of demonstratives in Italiot Greek, adapted from Guardiano and Stavrou (2020: 130):

Table 2: Paradigms of demonstratives in Italiot Greek

| | <i>(t)uso</i> (more frequent in Salento), <i>tuto</i> (more frequent in Calabria) | | <i>(e)cino</i> (Salento, Calabria), <i>(c)iso</i> (Salento) | | <i>ettuno</i> | |
|---------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Singular | Plural | Singular | Plural | Singular | Plural |
| No m | <i>(t)uso</i> , <i>(e)tuto(se)</i> (M) <i>(t)usi</i> , <i>e(tuti)</i> (F) <i>tuso</i> , <i>utto</i> , <i>(e)tuto</i> , <i>(e)tundo</i> (N) | <i>(t)usi</i> , <i>tuti</i> (M) <i>(t)use</i> , <i>tute</i> (F) <i>tusa</i> , <i>tuta</i> , <i>tunda</i> (N) | <i>(e)cino(s)</i> , <i>(c)iso</i> (M) <i>(e)cini</i> , <i>(c)isi</i> (F) <i>(e)cino</i> , <i>(e)cindo</i> , <i>citto</i> (N) | <i>(e)cini</i> , <i>citti</i> (M) <i>(e)cine</i> , <i>citti</i> (F) <i>(e)cina</i> , <i>(e)cinda</i> , <i>citta</i> (N) | <i>(e)ttuno(s)</i> (M) <i>(e)ttuni</i> (F) <i>(e)ttuno</i> , <i>(e)ttundo</i> (N) | <i>(e)ttuni</i> (M) <i>(e)ttune</i> (F) <i>(e)ttuna</i> , <i>(e)ttunda</i> (N) |
| Acc | <i>(t)utto(n)</i> , <i>(e)tuto(n)</i> , <i>tundo(n)</i> (M) <i>(t)utti(n)</i> , <i>(e)tuti(n)</i> , <i>tundi(n)</i> (F) <i>(t)utto</i> , <i>(e)tuto</i> , <i>tundo</i> (N) | <i>(t)uttus</i> , <i>tutu(se)</i> , <i>tundu(se)</i> (M) <i>(t)utte(s)</i> , <i>tute(se)</i> , <i>tunde(s)</i> (F) <i>(t)utta</i> , <i>tuta</i> , <i>tunda</i> (N) | <i>(e)cino(n)</i> , <i>(e)cindo(n)</i> (M) <i>(e)cini(n)</i> , <i>(e)cindi(n)</i> , <i>citti(n)</i> (F) <i>(e)cino</i> , <i>(e)cindo</i> , <i>citto</i> (N) | <i>(e)cinus</i> , <i>(e)cindus</i> , <i>cittu</i> (M) <i>(e)cine(s)</i> , <i>(e)cinde(s)</i> , <i>citte(s)</i> (F) <i>(e)cina</i> , <i>(e)cinda</i> , <i>citta</i> (N) | <i>(e)ttuno(n)</i> , <i>ettundo(n)</i> (M) <i>(e)ttuni(n)</i> , <i>ettundi(n)</i> (F) <i>(e)ttuno</i> , <i>(e)ttundo</i> (N) | <i>(e)ttunu(s)</i> , <i>(e)ttundu(s)</i> (M) <i>(e)ttune(s)</i> , <i>(e)ttunde(s)</i> (F) <i>(e)ttuna</i> , <i>(e)ttunda</i> (N) |
| Gen | <i>(t)unù</i> , <i>tutù</i> (M) <i>(t)unì(s)</i> , <i>tutì(s)</i> (F) <i>(t)unù</i> , <i>tutù</i> (N) | <i>tutò</i> , <i>tutòn</i> (M) <i>tutò</i> , <i>tutòn</i> (F) <i>tutò</i> , <i>tutòn</i> (N) | <i>(e)cinù</i> , <i>(c)ittu</i> (M) <i>(e)cinì(s)</i> , <i>(c)itti</i> (F) <i>(e)cinù</i> , <i>(c)ittu</i> (N) | <i>(e)cinò</i> (M) <i>(e)cinò</i> (F) <i>(e)cinò</i> (N) | <i>(e)ttunù</i> (M) <i>(e)ttunì(s)</i> (F) <i>(e)ttunù</i> (N) | <i>(e)ttunòn</i> (M) <i>(e)ttunòn</i> (F) <i>(e)ttunòn</i> (N) |

According to Guardiano and Stavrou (2020), even though in Italiot Greek demonstratives do not co-occur with articles, the forms originally created from the morphophonological fusion between a demonstrative and an article are the residual of a stage in which demonstratives and articles co-occurred. This hypothesis is supported by several examples found in the written sources (Carcausi and Rossi Taibbi 1959, Falcone 1973). In the texts, DPs where the demonstrative and the article appear as two graphically separated (and co-occurring) items are common. Actually, the written sources display all the three possibilities observed so far: absence of the article (44), items where the demonstrative and the article are fused in one single form (45), and co-occurrence of demonstrative and article as two (graphically) separated items (46):

- (44) *ecini gineka*
that woman
'that woman'
- (45) *ecinde dio ginecese*
these.the two women
'these two women'
- (46) *ecino to cendrima*
that the graft
'that graft'

Guardiano and Stavrou 2020: 128

Notwithstanding the different possibilities shown in (44) – (46), the authors point out that the forms like, e.g., *tuto(n)/cino(n)/ettuno(n)* (demonstratives) and *tundo(n)/cindo(n)/ettundo(n)* (demonstratives + article) are perceived by present-day speakers as lexical variants, i.e., speakers do not analyze the forms *tundo(n)*, *cindo(n)* or *ettundo* as the product of a fusion of an etymological demonstrative + an etymological article.

Given the evidence so far, Guardiano and Stavrou (2020) argue that the syntax of the demonstratives in Italiot Greek was very similar to the Greek in the past – demonstratives were not D-checking and they were

realized as “adjectival” modifiers. However, due to contact with Romance, two substantial changes in the syntax of demonstratives occurred: the loss of flexibility in terms of position and the loss of multiple realization of [+def] in one and the same DP, due to the loss of PredP. These two changes are very likely to have happened in parallel to those which took place in the syntax of adjectival modifiers. Guardiano and Stavrou (2020) note that the prenominal position for (articulated) adjectives was the first to disappear when PredP became unproductive. Therefore, the authors argue that when the DP-initial position became inaccessible to adjectives, demonstratives, which were mostly realized DP-initially as in (38)⁵, lost their connection with (postnominal) adjectival modifiers, especially with the position where the latter are generated (i.e., PredP). Moreover, when PredP was lost, the reanalysis of postnominal adjectives as generated prenominally (and crossed over by the noun) was possible due to the availability in Italo-Greek of (few) prenominal adjectives. Albeit scarce, speakers did have evidence that the language was able to generate prenominal adjectives and, using that evidence, were able to reanalyze the postnominal ones as originally prenominal and crossed over by the N(P). By contrast, the same cannot be said when it comes to demonstratives, because their (originally fronted) DP-initial position was incompatible with this type of reanalysis. Since the fronting of adjectives was no more possible, the speakers were prevented to analyze structures with prenominal demonstrative like (38) as fronted. Therefore, at some diachronic stage, the speakers had a superficial pattern where demonstratives co-occurred with the definite article phrase-initially, but they could not immediately associate this co-occurrence to an adjectival syntax, as it was the case for Standard Greek. Therefore, the position of the demonstrative froze in a high position and the contact with Romance demonstratives (and also the morphophonological⁶ fusion we mentioned in 6.2) triggered a reanalysis of demonstratives as D-checking.

6.3. Articles and proper names

Languages with definite articles vary according to whether they obligatorily use them also with kind and proper names or not. Longobardi (1994) showed that this follows from a deeper abstract property (named *strong person* in Longobardi and Guardiano 2009) that requires D to be visible in order to obtain a referential (whether *kind* or *object-referring*) interpretation of nouns. Both Greek and Romance are *strong person* languages: kind names require an expletive article (Guardiano et al. 2016: 117):

- (47)
- | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------------|------|-------------|
| i. | *(i) | δinosávri | éxun | eksafanistí |
| | | the dinosaurs | have | vanished |
| ii. | *(i) | dinosauri | sono | estinti |
| | | the dinosaurs | are | extinct |
- ‘Dinosaurs have become extinct’

⁵ Manolessou and Panagiotidis (1999) point out that, in Standard Modern Greek, this is the preferred position in spoken registers. If we consider that «Italo-Greek varieties have traditionally been primarily spoken languages, it is not unlikely that the position connected to deictic interpretation was all that frequent in everyday use» (Guardiano and Stavrou (2020: 149).

⁶ Morphophonological fusion by itself could not account for the reanalysis. Indeed, there are languages such as Cypriot Greek that show such morphophonological fusion between demonstratives and article when occurring prenominally, but they also have adjectival patterns like Standard Modern Greek (see Guardiano and Michelioudakis (2019, pp. 334-335).

Thus, (45) shows that visibility is achieved through merger of a dedicated element in D (an expletive article). However, this is not the only strategy to make D visible. For example, as for proper names in Romance, (44) shows that the N(P) can be raised to D in order to get referential interpretation to D:

(48) Ital. *Mario mio* vs. *il mio Mario*

However, in languages such as Modern Greek, noun-movement is not available and nouns do not have the possibility to raise to D. Therefore, if we want the referential interpretation, an article is needed to fill D (47-49), even with proper names (Guardiano et al. 2016:118):

(49) i María
 (50) o Pétro
 (51) írthe *(o) mikrós Jánis
 came.3S the little Janis
 'little Janis has come'

Italo-Greek seems to behave like Modern Greek (Guardiano 2014), for both kind and proper names require a visible expletive. But this does not derive straightforwardly from the unavailability of N-movement. As we have seen in (20), (24), (30), (31) above, the possibility for adjectives to be crossed shows that the N-movement towards higher positions within the DP is allowed in Italo-Greek dialects, contrary to Modern Greek. Thus, there should be no need for mandatory expletive articles. In other words, Italiot Greek seems to preserve a Greek-like surface pattern even though the structural configuration that motivates it is no longer available. This might explain why expletive articles are found both in Bov. (50, 51) and in Sal. Greek (52, 53) Guardiano (2014: 87):

(52) o Janni emelètie to vivlìo
 the Gianni read.3S the book
 'Gianni read the book'
 (53) epandia ton Vua
 went.1S to-the Bova
 'I went to Bova'
 (54) i Marìa ìtele n' armàsi
 The Mary wants that get.married.3S
 'Mary wants to get married'
 (55) ìda tus Luppìu
 saw.1S the Lecce
 'I visited Lecce'

The examples (50)-(53) seem to show that in Italo-Greek dialects, unlike other Southern Italian varieties, nouns can move higher in the DP but cannot reach D. However, there actually are Southern romance varieties whose proper nouns co-occur with articles: Salentino dialects and some Southern Calabria dialects near Aspromonte, such as the dialect of San Luca (De Angelis 2019). Although proper nouns can move up to higher positions in the DP in Romance, in Salentino and Sanluchese this possibility seems to be precluded for personal proper names. Thus, in this respect, Salentino and Sanluchese are like Italiot Greek: they introduce obligatoriness of expletives with proper names. However, there is still a difference between the

two: in Salentino (54, 55) and Sanluchese (56, 57) it is limited to personal proper names only, whereas in Italiot Greek all proper names require an expletive article, as we can see in (49) (“ton Vua) and (51) (“tus Luppìu”):

- (56) la Maria ete na bbedda carusa
the Mary is a.F beautfiul.F girl.F
'(the) Maria is a beautiful girl'
(57) lu GGiuwanni vinde carne
the John sell.3S meat
'(the) Giovanni sells meat'.

Salentino, Guardiano (2014: 86)

- (58) [ca'maɪ ɔ d'dʒanni]
called.1SG the Gianni
'I called Gianni'
(59) [ɔ lɔ'ɪ:ʃi ca'maɔ ('prɔ:prjɔ) a mmia]
the Luigi called.1SG just DOM me
'Luigi called just me'

San Luca, De Angelis (2019: 62-63)

The expletive article with proper names sets Salentino and San Luchese apart from the rest of Southern Italy, although it is not unusual in other regional varieties of Italian, which in fact exhibit a high degree of variability: for instance, several Northern and various Central varieties of Italian, as well as the corresponding dialects, require expletives with women's proper names, others also with men's proper names or surnames (Manzini and Savoia 2005). Therefore, though it may be tempting to attribute the obligatory occurrence of the expletive with proper names of persons in these two varieties to the contact with Greek (Ledgeway 2013), Guardiano et al. (2016) observe that the mechanisms that trigger the obligatory presence of articles with personal proper names in Salentino and Sanluchese are independently compatible with the internal structure of the Romance system. At best, surface evidence provided by Greek might have indirectly contributed to activation of such processes (Guardiano 2014, Guardiano and Stavrou 2020), as it presumably happened with demonstratives in Salento Greek.

7. Conclusions

The phenomena analyzed in the former chapters have shown that nowadays the most widely accepted idea is that a Greek/Romance bilingualism has lasted many centuries. In Italiot Greek, some phenomena, such the loss of polydefiniteness and the licensing of demonstratives only in D (*D-checking*) might suggest that these changes presumably took place quite recently, especially for Bovese Greek, that seems to be more conservative than Salento Greek; indeed, traces of older stages, that are more similar to Standard Modern Greek, are still visible especially in the written sources, which preserved forms and structures that have become lost in the present-day spoken language. One such trace is the (apparently free) alternation between demonstratives containing an article (but presumably not analyzed as such by the speakers) and forms with no article, as shown in (41)-(44). The second is the presence, in the written sources, of polydefinite adjectives, even though they were quite rare. However, further research is required to ascertain the

relationship between Greek and the Romance that has completely overcome it during the 20th century. For this purpose, a more in-depth scrutiny of further texts of previous diachronic stages as the ones shown in Caracausi and Rossi Taibbi (1959) might shed light on the evolution of some syntactic parameter restructuring that we sketched in the text. At present, as for Italiot Greek, a first attempt of analysis passed under scrutiny three varieties: two varieties of Calabrese Greek (one more conservative, the other more influenced by Romance) and one of Salento Greek. We refer the reader to the following link: <http://www.parametriccomparison.unimore.it/site/home/projects/prin-2017/romance-and-greek-dialects-the-database.html> for further data and an up-to-date list of all the dialects that have been parametrized.

REFERENCES

- Alexiadou, A., 2001. Adjective syntax and noun raising: word order asymmetries in the DP as the result of adjective distribution. *Studia Linguistica* 55: 217-248.
- Alexiadou, A, L. Haegeman and M. Stavrou, 2007. *The Noun Phrase in the generative perspective*. Berlin: de Gruyter
- Campos, H. and Stavrou, M., 2004. Polydefinites in Greek and Aromanian, in O. Tomic (ed.) *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 137-173.
- Caracausi, G., and Rossi-Taibbi, G. 1959. *Testi Neogreci di Calabria*. Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici.
- Caracausi, G., 1975. Il valore del ζ nei documenti medievali italogreci e il problema delle affricate. In *Byzantino-Sicula II. Miscellanea in memoria di G. Rossi Taibbi*. Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di studi bizantini e neoellenici, pp. 107-138.
- Cinque, G., 2010. *The Syntax of adjectives. A Comparative Study*. Cambridge Mass: MIT press.
- Falcone, G., 1973. *Il dialetto romaico della Bovesia*. Milano: Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere.
- Fanciullo, F., 1984. Il siciliano e i dialetti meridionali. In Moreschini Quattordio, A. (ed.) *Tre millenni di storia linguistica della Sicilia*. Pisa: Giardini, pp. 139-159.
- Fanciullo, F., 1996. *Fra Oriente e Occidente*. Pisa: ETS.
- Fanciullo, F., 2001. On the origins of Modern Greek in Southern Italy. In A. Ralli, B. Joseph, M. Janse (eds), *Proceedings of the first international conference of Modern Greek dialects and linguistic theory*. Patras: University of Patras, pp. 67-77.
- Gruppo di Lecce, 1980. Il caso Grecìa. In: F. Albano Leoni (ed.), *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano*. Roma: Bulzoni, pp. 343-403.
- Guardiano, C. 2012. Demonstratives, word order and the DP between syntax and semantics. Crosslinguistic remarks. In D. Papadopoulou, A. Revithiadou, A. Tantos (eds), *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 32, Thessaloniki, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, pp. 100-115.
- Guardiano, C. 2014. Fenomeni di contatto sintattico in Italia meridionale? Alcune note comparative. In *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 18: 73-102.
- Guardiano, C., and Michelioudakis, D., 2019. Syntactic variation across Greek dialects: the case of demonstratives. In S. Cruschina, A. Ledgeway, E.M. Remberger (eds), *Italian Dialectology at the Interface*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 319-355

- Guardiano, C., and Stavrou, M. 2014. Greek and Romance in Southern Italy: History and Contact in Nominal Structures. In *L' Italia dialettale* 75: 121-147.
- Guardiano, C., and Stavrou, M. 2019. Adjective-Noun combinations in Romance and Greek of Southern Italy” in *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 19: 3-57
- Guardiano, C., and Stavrou, M. 2020. Dialect syntax between persistence and change. The case of Greek demonstratives. in *L' Italia dialettale* 81: 121–58.
- Guardiano, C., and Stavrou, M., 2021. Modeling Syntactic Change under Contact: The Case of Italiot Greek. in *Languages*, 6, 74: 1-21
- Guardiano, C., Dimitris Michelioudakis, Andrea Ceolin, Monica Alexandrina Irimia, Giuseppe Longobardi, Nina Radkevich, Giuseppina Silvestri, and Ioanna Sitaridou, 2016. South by South-East. A syntactic approach to Greek and Romance microvariation. In *L' Italia dialettale* 77: 95-166.
- Karanastasis, A. 1984. *Istorikò lexikò ton neoellenikòn idiòmaton tis Kàto Italias*, Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Katsoyannou, M. 2001. Le parler grec de Calabre, situation linguistique et sociolinguistique. In *Lalies* 21: 7-59.
- Ledgeway, A. 2013. Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy. In: M. Janse, B. Joseph, A. Ralli, M. Bagriacik (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory. Patras: Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects*, University of Patras, pp. 184-228.
- Ledgeway, A., Schifano, N., Silvestri, G., 2018. Il contatto tra il Greco e le varietà romanze nell'Italia Meridionale. In *Lingue antiche e moderne* 7: 95-133.
- Leu, T., 2008. The internal syntax of determiners, PhD dissertation, New York University
- Longobardi, G., 1994. Reference and proper names. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609-665.
- Longobardi, G., and Guardiano, C. 2009. Evidence for syntax as a signal of historical relatedness. *Lingua* 119(11): 1679-1706.
- Manolessou, I. and Panagiotidis, P., 1999. “Τα δεικτικά της Ελληνικής και οι σχετικές επιπλοκές” [Greek demonstratives and the relevant complications], in S.L. Tsochatzidis, M. Koutita, A. Haralambopoulos (eds), *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*, Faculty of Philosophy, Thessaloniki, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, pp. 199-212.
- Manolessou, I. 2005. The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: an overview. In *KAMPOS: Cambridge papers in Modern Greek* 13: 103-125.
- Martino, P., 1980. L'isola grecanica dell'Aspromonte. Aspetti sociolinguistici. in F.A. Leoni (ed.), *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano, Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di studi della SLI (Cagliari, 27-30 maggio 1977)*, Roma: Bulzoni, pp. 305-341.
- Martino, P., 2009. L'affaire Bovesia. Un singolare irredentismo. In C. Consani, P. Desideri, F. Guazzelli, C. Perta (eds), *Alloglossie e comunità alloglotte nell'Italia contemporanea*. Roma: Bulzoni, pp. 251-275.
- Parlangèli, O., 1953. *Sui dialetti romanzi e romaici del Salento*. Milano: Hoepli.
- Rohlf, G., 1924. *Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien*. Ginevra: Olschki
- Rohlf, G., 1972a *Studi e ricerche su lingua e dialetti d'Italia*. Firenze: Sansoni.
- Rohlf, G., 1972b *Nuovi scavi linguistici nell'antica Magna Graecia*. Palermo: Istituto siciliano di studi bizantini e neoellenici.
- Rohlf, G., 1977. *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci*. Munchen: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

- Schifano, N, e Silvestri, G., 2017. Nuove indagini linguistiche sulla varietà greca del Salento. In *L'Italia Dialettale* 78: 279-312.
- Squillaci, M. O., 2017. When a language becomes old. The case of Calabria Greek. In *Selected papers from the XV International Conference on Minority Languages*, Beograd: University of Beograd: 143-161.
- Stavrou, M., 2012. Postnominal adjectives in Greek indefinite noun phrases. In Brugé, L., A. Cardinaletti, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, C. Poletto (eds), *Functional Heads*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 379-394.
- Tsopanakis, A., 1968. I dialetti greci dell'Italia meridionale rispetto a quelli neogreci. In *L'Italia Dialettale* 31: 1-21.
- Von Falkenhausen, V., 1982. Magna Grecia Bizantina e tradizione classica. Vicende storiche e situazione politico-sociale. In *Magna Grecia*:61-90.
- Weinreich, U., 1953. *Languages in Contact. Findings and problems*. New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York.