L'Italia dialettale

Direzione Scientifica

Franco FANCIULLO, Università di Pisa

Comitato Scientifico

Michele LOPORCARO, Università di Zurigo
Martin MAIDEN, Università di Oxford
Giovanna MAROTTA, Università di Pisa
Max PFISTER, Università di Saarbrücken
Alfredo STUSSI, Università di Pisa

L'Italia dialettale può essere acquistata al prezzo di € 65.00 (estero € 80.00) presso le Edizioni ETS, Pisa, Piazza Carrara 16-19, 56126 Pisa.
È possibile abbonarsi alla rivista *Italia dialettale* tramite versamento della cifra sopra indicata sul conto corrente postale 14721567, intestato a: Edizioni ETS Pisa, Piazza Carrara 16-19, 56126 Pisa

– tel. 050 29544; 503868
– fax 050 20158
– info@edizioniets.com
– www.edizioniets.com

L'ITALIA DIALETTALE

RIVISTA DI DIALETTOLOGIA ITALIANA

FONDATA DA CLEMENTE MERLO

DIRETTA DA FRANCO FANCIULLO

VOLUME LXXV

(*Serie Terza, XI*)

2014

EDIZIONI ETS
PISA

RISERVATO OGNI DIRITTO DI PROPRIETÀ
E DI TRADUZIONE

Registrazione Tribunale di Pisa 1/1961 in data 31 Gennaio 1961
Direttore responsabile: Alessandra Borghini

L'ITALIA DIALETTALE

SOMMARIO DEL VOLUME LXXV
(*Serie Terza, XI*)

Roberta D'Alessandro, Claudio Di Felice, Irene Franco e Adam Ledgeway, *Approcci diversi alla dialettologia italiana contemporanea* Pag. 7

Birgit Alber, *Obstruent Systems of Northern Italy* » 13

Mariachiara Berizzi, *La preposizione* ma *nei dialetti dell'Italia centrale* » 37

Silvio Cruschina, *Existential and Locative Constructions in Italo-Romance* » 55

Franco Fanciullo, *I vocalismi (tonici) romanzi: siamo davvero così sicuri di quello che è successo? Un caso "transizionale"* » 81

Chiara Fedriani - Emanuele Miola, *Percorsi di soggettificazione di MANU AD MANU(M) in alcuni dialetti del nord Italia* » 103

Cristina Guardiano - Melita Stavrou, *Greek and Romance in Southern Italy. History and contact in nominal structures* » 121

Rosangela Lai, *Positional Factors in the Evolution of Sardinian* Muta cum Liquida*: A Case Study* » 149

Carla Marcato, *Toponomastica e storia del dialetto* » 161

Francisco Ordóñez - Lori Repetti, *On the morphological restrictions of hosting clitics in Italian and Sardinian dialects* » 173

Mair Parry, *Language tutorial: The dialect of Cairo Montenotte* » 201

Diego Pescarini, *La distribuzione dei clitici soggetto espletivi: tipologia e prospettive parametriche* » 229

Giuseppe Torcolacci, *Il Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico e la codifica di tratti morfosintattici. Il caso dei dialetti italiani meridionali* » 247

Dieter Vermandere - Claire Meul, *La variazione morfologica nei dialetti dell'Italia settentrionale: una causalità multifattoriale* » 273

Cristina Guardiano - Melita Stavrou

Greek and Romance in Southern Italy. History and contact in nominal structures

1. *Domain of research*[1]

This work investigates aspects of nominal structures in the two Greek varieties spoken in Southern Italy, i.e. *Grico* (Salento, GR) and *Bovese* (Southern Calabria, BO), which we compare to three Romance dialects spoken in the same area, viz. *Sicilian* (SI), *Salentino* (SA) and *Northern Calabrese* (NC), along with (standard) Modern Greek (MG) and (standard) Italian (IT).

In particular, patterns of adjectival modification will be explored. It will be shown that the behavior of adjectives in the varieties under analysis derives from the interaction of genealogical transmission and contact-induced variation.

The motivation for this study comes from two independent facts. First, there are no studies which we are aware of explicitly addressing the syntax of the nominal domain in the above varieties. Second, the phenomena inspected here are likely to reveal interesting facets of language contact, comparable to similar phenomena described in the literature.

The paper is placed in the framework of the *generative* approaches to dialectal variation (Black & Motapanyane 1996; Cornips 1998; Auer, Hinskens, Kerswill 2005; Barbiers & Cornips 2000; Adger & Trousdale 2007, a.o.). Dialectal varieties, which are often «in a constant interaction with one or more standard languages and with other dialects» (Barbiers & Cornips 2000: 3), are consistently exposed to language contact (Thomason & Kaufmann 1988; Bowern 2006; Thomason 2001; Heine & Kuteva 2005; Hickey 2010, a.o.); hence, they offer a convenient testing ground of the role that contact plays in syntactic change.

In Italy, various research projects, such as the ASIt (Benincà & Poletto

[1] We are indebted to all the informants who provided us with data from their languages. In particular, we want to thank here Rocco and Marcello Aprile (GR), Franco Fanciullo (SA), Giusy Silvestri (NC). We are also indebted to Gaetano Berruto, Paola Crisma, Silvia Dal Negro and Romano Lazzeroni for comments and advice on a previous version of this paper, to the audiences of the *Italian Dialects Meeting* (Leiden, May 23-26, 2012), of the *SyntaxLab* at the University of Cambridge and of *MGDLT5* (Gent, September 20-22, 2012), and to two anonymous referees.

2007, a.o.), or the works by M.R. Manzini and L. Savoia (Manzini & Savoia 2005, 2007 a.o.), R. D'Alessandro and A. Ledgeway, along with many others, have stimulated an increasing interest in dialectal variability from the formal syntactic perspective, with particular focus on the Central and Southern varieties of the peninsula. In these studies, most of the data come from Romance; the analysis is often focused on the structure of the clausal domain; finally, such analyses are rarely complemented with an examination of the effects of sociolinguistic factors.

Among the minority languages spoken in Italy, GR and BO are of particular interest because the long-lasting unbalanced contact with the neighboring Romance dialects has had effects on language change. For this reason, these communities constitute an ideal "natural laboratory" (Katsoyannou 1999a) for the exploration of language change in progress.

Our study reveals that the nominal domain displays instances of contact-induced change, which testify that contact with Romance has played a decisive role in the development, both in GR and BO, of patterns of adjectival modification aberrant from those attested in MG but also in older stages of it.

2. *Setting the scene: some sociolinguistic notes*

2.1. *Romance*

Romance speakers in Southern Italy exhibit heterogeneous linguistic repertoires, where at least three main classes of varieties combine, resulting in different levels of prestige: speakers exhibit disparate degrees of competence, conditioned by various variables[2].

(1) a. *Standard/neostandard* Italian (formal, official, mostly written);
b. *Regional* (Southern) varieties of Italian (informal, mostly spoken);
c. Local *dialects*. Two groups (Pellegrini 1977): *extreme* and *intermediate* Southern Italian (informal, familiar, predominantly spoken).

Here, we consider two varieties belonging to the *extreme* Southern group, i.e. Salentino (data from Cellino San Marco, BR) and Sicilian (data from Ragusa)[3], and one variety belonging to the *intermediate* Southern

[2] Berruto (1987); Sobrero (1993); Grassi, Sobrero, Telmon (1998); Sobrero-Miglietta (2006), a.o.
[3] The label "Sicilian" covers the varieties spoken in Sicily and Southern Calabria (roughly

group, i.e. Northern Calabrese (data from Verbicaro, CS). The data were collected in on-purpose interviews with native speakers, and integrated, when needed, to the evidence provided in the literature.

2.2. *Greek*

The two enclaves of Greek speakers in Southern Italy are found in Salento (various villages in the area of Lecce) and Southern Calabria (various villages in the area of Reggio Calabria)[4]. The impact of the Greek substratum in Southern Italy is massive (the area was Greek-speaking before the spread of Latin: Rohlfs 1972; Fanciullo 2001, a.o), and has influenced the local Romance varieties in various respects (cf. Ledgeway 2013 for a discussion and for relevant literature). Yet, as pointed out by Fanciullo (2001: 76), the relation of GR and BO with the original Greek element is unbalanced: «whereas Bovese (Calabrian Greek) is directly connected to the Greek of Graecia Magna (an indication of this can be precisely the large number of Doric items Bovese preserves), Grico (Apulia Greek) could originate in the Hellenization of Southern Apulia during the (late) Roman empire».

Greek in Southern Italy is associated to a low social prestige, to small, poor and rural communities[5]. Concerning the attitude of the Greek speakers, there is no strong identity perception or political/ideological presumptions. Finally, no privileged relation connects the communities to the mainland. Thus, it comes as no surprise that their language is in regression/

provinces of Reggio Calabria and Catanzaro). Though many differences are visible in this area (Ruffino 2001; Bigalke 1997), no significant dissimilarity has emerged so far concerning the properties explored here. The Gallo-Italic varieties spoken in Sicily, as well as the Arberesh communities, are not considered in the present work.

[4] For the controversy about their origin, see at least: Rohlfs (1924, 1933, 1972, 1980, 1985); Karanastasis (1974); Minniti (1992); Morosi (1870); Parlangeli (1953, 1960); Spano (1965); Falcone (1973); for recent summaries: Fanciullo (2001); Campolo (2002); Morgante (2004); Manolessou (2005).

[5] In Salento, they are more compact and associated with villages or specific regions in the area; they live in better financial conditions than in Calabria, so they enjoy a slightly higher prestige. In Calabria, between 1970 and 1980, a massive diaspora from the rural poor villages in the Aspromonte to the villages on the coast or to Reggio Calabria took place: most villages, which were almost completely isolated before that time, were left abandoned. Therefore, nowadays speakers do not identify themselves with any specific social community: as soon as they left their villages they almost abandoned the language as well. Cf., among other pieces of relevant literature, Karanastasis (1974, 1984, 1992); Katsoyannou (1992a/b, 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999a/b, 2001); Katsoyannou & Nucera (1986); Manolessou (2005); Morgante (2004); Parlangeli (1960); Profili (1983, 1985, 1999); Ralli (2006); Troiano (1982), a.o.

obsolescence[6]: "true" native speakers disappear (these varieties are no longer acquired as first languages); no Greek speaker is monolingual (they all speak some variety of IT, and often a Romance dialect); Romance varieties are obviously preferred, because they cover a greater range of communicative needs.

Crucially, while traces of "resistance" are visible in Salento (Miglietta & Sobrero 2007), in Bovesìa Greek is nowadays «practically extinguished» (Martino 2009: 251). This means that collections of data from BO in particular cannot rely on actual speakers (only): indeed, most are no longer able to provide sharp grammaticality judgments, like "true" native speakers do. Therefore, the data relevant for this analysis have been mainly collected from selected written texts.

3. *Adjectives in Romance and in Greek: a brief survey*

Within the generative framework, it is argued by many linguists that prenominal adjectives occupy universally fixed positions in the nominal structure[7] and are ordered according to a hierarchy, first proposed by Sproat & Shih (1987), and taken up by all the linguists addressing the issue of adjective ordering within the noun phrase (see the literature discussed in Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou 2007, Part III, Ch. 1). In particular, within a series of adnominal adjectives, the ones denoting more subjective properties are farther away from the noun than those denoting objective properties. An instantiation of such a hierarchy is: *quantification* < *quality* < *size* < *shape/color* < *provenance*, as manifested in the English noun phrase *three beautiful big grey Persian cats*, and in Greek *polés ómorfes megáles persikés gátes,* 'many beautiful big white Persian cats' (Alexiadou *et al.* 2007).

An issue related to the relative ordering of noun and adjectives, admittedly controversial today, is that, in some languages, the noun can move higher, thus disturbing this universal order (Longobardi 2001: 580)[8]. More

[6] Sobrero & Romanello (1977); Gruppo di Lecce (1980); Miglietta & Sobrero (2006, 2007); Romano & Marra (2008), a.o.

[7] From now on, we will refer to nominal structures using the label "DP" (Determiner Phrase).

[8] An alternative to noun movement proposed by many linguists today is noun phrase movement, often combined with remnant movement (Shlonsky 2004; Laenzlinger 2005; Cinque 2010, a.o.). For space limitations in this paper, we will not be able to explore this alternative, so we will be adopting the noun movement approach, also because this issue is orthogonal with the data and analysis presented in this paper.

specifically, while in Germanic (Crisma 1993, 1995), the noun does not move (and this is why, in the English example above, all adjectives come before the noun), in the Romance group, it moves to higher functional projections, leaving behind one, two or more adjectives[9]. For instance, in (2), the noun *macchina* 'car' has moved leftwards, crossing two functional projections. The effect is that the adjectives that have been crossed over by the noun (i.e. *blu* 'blue', and *tedesche,* 'German') surface postnominally. In fact, in IT, only quantification, quality and size adjectives can be prenominal.

(2) *the three nice new blue German cars*
a. le tre belle nuove macchine blu tedesche
the three beautiful new cars blue German
b. *le tre belle nuove blu tedesche macchine

At the same time, in Romance, the postnominal position of some adjectives may be due to their function as part of a reduced relative clause and thus merged originally in a postnominal position[10] (Alexiadou 2001 a.o., *contra* Cinque 2010).

According to some recent analyses of the Greek nominal phrase[11], adnominal adjectives are unexceptionally prenominal in all types of noun phrases (3a and 3b), so the common assumption is that the noun does not move.

(3) a. to kaló pedí
the good child
b. (ena) kaló pedí
one good child

However, in Greek, postnominal adjectives do occur in certain cases. First, in definite DPs, adjectives can occur postnominally, though only if accompanied by the definite article (4a vs. 4b). This pattern is called "determiner or definiteness spreading" (DS), and the noun phrase in (4)a is dubbed "polydefinite" (Kolliakou 2004; see Alexiadou *et al.* 2007 for discussion and references).

[9] Bernstein (1991, 1993); Crisma (1993, 1995); Cinque (1994, 2005, 2010); Longobardi (2001); Laenzlinger (2005); a.o.

[10] The postnominal position was available in Latin as well; here, adjectives are attested both prenominally (constrained by the aforementioned hierarchy) and postnominally (Crisma & Gianollo 2006; Iovino & Giusti 2013).

[11] Alexiadou *et al.* (2007); Guardiano (2006).

(4) a. to pedí to kaló
the child the good
b. * to pedí kaló

Polydefinite noun phrases consist of a noun and an adjective, each accompanied by its own definite article, in any order (i.e. *Art Noun Art Adjective* and *Art Adjective Art Noun*); they display a number of syntactic and interpretative properties not found in "monadic" DPs (Kolliakou 2004; Campos & Stavrou 2004, a.o.): adjectives in polydefinite DPs are interpreted restrictively, intersectively and usually as stage-level predicates. For these reasons, polydefinite DPs have been claimed to correspond to nominals with postnominal adjectives in Romance (Alexiadou 2001; Stavrou 2012). In fact, some linguists have gone even further in claiming that polydefiniteness is a phenomenon distinct from modification of nouns by prenominal adjectives (Alexiadou *et al.* 2007; Stavrou 2012).

Second, in indefinite DPs, postnominal adjectives are regular and always occur unarticulated (5). The interpretation of the postnominal adjective in indefinite DPs is shown to be parallel to that of the adjective in polydefinites (cf. Kolliakou 2004; Alexiadou 2006; Stavrou 2012, 2013).

(5) (ena) pedí kaló
one child good

These patterns are genealogically stable. In the ancient varieties of Greek[12], all classes of adjectives occur prenominally, in both definite and indefinite DPs (6a and 6b).

(6) a. *Symp 189 d 5-6*
τῆν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν
the human nature
b. *Symp 187 d 3-4*
ἀγαθοῦ δημιουργοῦ δεῖ
good craftsman is required

Like in MG, in definite DPs, adjectives occur postnominally only if accompanied by a definite article (7a vs. 7b).

[12] Starting at least from Classical Attic: Guardiano (2006); see also the data cited in Manolessou (2000); Guardiano (2003); Bakker (2009).

(7) a. *Symp 191 d 3*
τῆν φύσιν τῆν ἀνθρωπίνην
the nature the human

b. * τῆν φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην[13]

In indefinite DPs, again like in MG, adjectives follow the noun without any visible marking (8).

(8) *Ap 41 c 9 – d 2*
ὅτι ὀυκ ἔστιν ἀνδρί ἀγαθῷ κακόν οὐδέν
that not exists for a man good bad anything

As mentioned, in MG, polydefinite constructions are also grammatical with pre-article adjectives (*to kaló to pedí*): these are usually associated with marked (focus) interpretation (Campos & Stavrou 2004). This ordering seems to be very rare in Ancient Greek[14]: it is only found when the noun is modified by one more adjective (9). Probably, the prenominal articulated adjective is given informational prominence.

(9) *Crat 398 b 7*
καὶ ἔν γε τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ φωνῇ
and in the ancient the our language

4. *Data*

4.1. *Romance in Southern Italy*

In the Southern Italian dialects we consider (SI, SA and NC), the adjectives which can occur prenominally are restricted to a rather small subclass (adjectives with the meaning *nice/beautiful*, *good/bad*, *big/small*, *other*, *only*); all other adjectives (with the exception of numerals) are postnominal (Guardiano 2013).

[13] Attested in structures with copulative interpretation only. Data from Guardiano (2003).

[14] The corpus collected in Guardiano (2003) contains just one instance (over 174 cases of definite DPs with at least one adjective), and the literature available for Ancient Greek lists just a few more cases.

a/the new blu German car[1]		
SA	SI	NC
nna/la màkina bblu tetèska nòa[2] (a/the car blu German new) nna/la màkina tetèska bblu nòa * nna/la tetèska màkina * nna/la bblu màkina * nna/la nòa màkina	na/a màkina nòva bblu tetèska (a/the car new blu German) na/a màkina nòva tetèska bblu[3] *na/a nòva màkina *na/a bblu màkina *na/a tetèska màkina	na/a màkêna tedèska blu, nòva[4] (a/the car Gernan blu new) na/a màkêna blu tedèska, nòva na/a màkêna nòva blu tedèska na/a màkêna tedèska nòva, blu na/a màkêna nòva tedèska blu na/a màkêna blu nòva tedèska * na/a nòva màkêna * na/a blu màkêna * na/a tedèska màkêna

Table 1: postnominal adjectives in the three Romance dialects of Southern Italy

4.1.2. *Salentino*

Only numerals (10), *ùniko/a* 'only' (11)[15], *bèllu/bèddu* 'nice/beautiful' (12a) and *bwènu* 'good' (13a) occur prenominally.

(10) a. i. àggiu lètti (?li/<u>dd</u>i) cìnkwe lìbbri
I have readM.PL (the/those) five books
ii. *àggiu lètti (li/<u>dd</u>i) lìbbri cìnkwe

b. i. la/<u>dd</u>a kwìnta sinfonìa
the/that fifth symphony
ii. *la/<u>dd</u>a sinfonìa kwìnta

(11) a. l'ùnika vagnùna ka è vvinùta alla fèsta èra la Marìa
the onlyF.SG girl that is come to-the party was the Maria

b. * la vagnùna ùnika ka è vvinùta alla fèsta èra la Marìa

When postnominal, *bèllu/bèddu* (12b) and *bwènu* (13b) usually have a predicative interpretation (*na kàsa bbèlla* is normally interpreted as 'a house [that is] beautiful').

(12) a. àggiu vìštu nu/<u>dd</u>u bbèllu vagnòne
I have seen a the beautiful boy

b. àggiu vìštu nu/<u>dd</u>u vagnòne (pròpriu) bè<u>dd</u>u[16]
I have seen a the boy [who is] (really) beautiful

[15] *Uniko/a* etymologically derives from *unus*, hence its prenominal position.
[16] *Bèllu* and *bèddu* are phonological variants. *Pròpriu* means 'very', and is inflected for gender.

(13) a. ògghju (ku) mbìu nnu bbwènu mjèru
I want (that) I drink a good wine

b. ògghju (ku) mbìu nnu mjèru (propriu) bbwènu
I want (that) I drink a wine [that is] (really) good (tasteful)

Under certain conditions (absence of an overt determiner, 14), *bwènu* exhibits variation in meaning depending on its pre- or postnominal position (cf. 14a vs. 14b).

(14) a. ògghju (ku) mbìu mjèru bbwènu
I want (that) I drink wine good

b. ògghju (ku) mbìu bbwènu mjèru

(14) b. is better accepted with the meaning 'a big quantity of wine', much less as 'good wine'.

4.1.3. *Sicilian*

Àutru 'other' (15) and numerals (16) are systematically prenominal.

(15) a. n'àutra màkina/piccjòtta
one other car/girl

b. * na màkina/piccjòtta àutra

(16) a. i. mi ligghìj ru/tri/kwàttru lìbbra
to me I read two/three/four books

ii. *mi ligghìj lìbbra ru/tri/kwàttru

b. i. mi ligghìj u sekùnnu lìbbru ka skrìssi Ggjovànni
to me I read the second book that wrote Ggjovànni

ii. *mi ligghìj u lìbbru sekùnnu ka skrìssi Ggiovànni.

Bèllu/bèdu 'beautiful/nice' (17) and *sùlu* 'only' (18) can either be prenominal or postnominal, with some meaning differences.

(17) a. na bbèlla (bbèda) màkina / piccjòtta
one beautiful car girl

b. na màkina/piccjòtta bbèlla (bbèda)

(18) a. arristàu na sùla màkina bblu tedèska
was left one onlyS.F. car blue German

b. arristàu na màkina sùla bblu tedèska

The meaning of prenominal *bèllu/bèdu* (19a) is ambiguous between 'nice/beautiful' and 'appropriate/good/satisfactory/rich/useful'. When postnominal (19b), the meaning is always 'nice, beautiful' (like in IT).

(19) a. mi vulìssi mancjàri na bbèlla kassàta/pizza / nu bbèllu pjàttu ri rravjòli
to me would eat one tasteful cassata/pizza / one tasteful plate of ravjoli

b. i. ?? mi vulìssi mancjàri na kassàta/pizza bbèlla[17]
to me would eat one cassata / pizza beautiful

ii. ?? mi vulissi mancjari nu pjattu ri rravjoli bellu
to me would eat one plate of ravjoli beautiful

As for *sùlu*, only the postnominal position is associated with the meaning 'alone'[18] (20b).

(20) a. a sùla piccjòtta ka vìnni o bbar fu Marìa
the onlyF.SG girl who came to-the bar was Maria

b. a piccjòtta sùla ka vìnni o bbar fu Marìa
the girl aloneF.SG who came to-the bar was Maria

4.1.3. *Northern Calabrese*

Numerals (21), *bèllê* 'nice/beautiful' (22), *bràvê* 'good' (23), *màlê* 'bad' (24) are prenominal.

(21) a. i. hajê lêggjutê dujê/tre/kwattrê libber
I have read two/three/four books

b. i. hajê lêggjutê u sêkunnê lwibbrê ka ha skrittê Gjanninê
I have read the second book that has written John

ii. * hajê lêggjutê u lwibbrê sêkunnê ka ha skrittê Gjanninê

(22) na bbèlla makəna
one beautiful car

(23) ha bbênutê nu brwavê guagljun
has come one nice/good boy

(24) ha bbênutê nu malê guagljun
has come one bad guy

[17] (19)b. i. and ii. are accepted only with a strong emphasis on *bbèlla*.

[18] For such differences in interpretation in IT see Cinque (2010) a.o., in French see Bouchard (2002).

Bèllê/a, when prenominal, usually has the meaning 'of a good quality, big, physically prominent'. All other adjectives are postnominal only (25).

(25) a. hajê mbruntwatê u pruvêssurê gjughênê adavêtê
I have met the professor young tall

b. hajê mbruntwatê u pruvêssurê adavêtê gjughênê

c. * hajê mbruntwatê u gjughênê pruvêssurê adavêtê

d. * hajê mbruntwatê u adavêtê pruvêssurê gjughênê

4.1.4. *Summary*

In our Southern Italian dialects, only a very restricted subclass of adjectives (including numerals and a small subset of quality-denoting adjectives) can be prenominal; this sets apart these dialects from IT, where more subclasses of adjectives are accepted prenominally. These data strongly suggest that in SA, SI and NC the noun moves at least one step higher than in IT.

In all three dialects, most prenominal adjectives are grammatical also postnominally, but with meaning differences between the two positions, as in IT[19].

At the present stage of our research, we leave open the possibility of postnominal adjectives, in these three varieties, originating in a reduced relative clause, as they do in IT (and other Romance languages, see Section 3 above).

4.2. *Greek*

The data from GR were provided by native speakers and checked against the available grammars and collections of texts: no divergence from native judgments has been detected so far. The data from BO come from written sources only: Falcone (1973), Caracausi & Rossi Taibi (1959), Condemi (1995), Crupi (1980).

4.2.1. *Grico*

In GR, only numerals (26), *òrrio* 'nice/beautiful' (27), *àscimi* 'bad' (28), *kkèccia* 'small' (29), *mòno* 'only' (30) and sometimes *mèa* 'big' (31) appear prenominally.

[19] With minor differences which are not going to occupy us here.

(26) a. melètisa diu/fri/tèssari lìbbru
I read two/three/four books
b. *melètisa lìbbru diu/fri/tèssari

(27) melètisa ton òrrio lìbbro
I read the beautiful book

(28) mian àscimi pràtina
one ugly sheep

(29) mia kkèccia mùscia
one small cat

(30) o mòno ppedì pu èmine sti Calimèra ene o Antònio
the onlyM.S. boy who remained in.the Calimera is the Antonio

(31) a. ?melètisa ton mèa lìbbro
I read the big book
b. ena mèa spìtin
one big house

Òrrio 'beautiful' (32), *àscimi* 'bad' (33), *kkèccia* 'small' (34), appear marginally postnominally.

(32) (?) melètisa ton lìbbro òrrio

(33) (?) mian pràtina àscimi

(34) (?) mia mùscia kkèccia

Mèa 'big' normally goes postnominally (35); as mentioned, it is marginally attested in prenominal position as well (31).

(35) a. melètisa ton lìbbro mèa
I read the book big
b. ? ena spìtin mèa
one house big

All other adjectives are unexceptionally postnominal (as *ròdino*, 'red' in 36).

(36) a. melètisa ton lìbbro ròdino
I read the book red
b. *melètisa ton ròdino lìbbro

Finally, in definite DPs, when the adjective is postnominal, it systematically rejects the definite article, as revealed by the ungrammaticality of the examples in (37).

(37) a. *melètisa ton lìbbro ton òrrio
b. * melètisa ton lìbbro ton mèa
c. *melètisa ton lìbbro ton ròdino

4.2.2. *Bovese*

In BO, only a few adjectives are attested prenominally. Cardinal numerals are always prenominal: (38)a. Ordinals occur both prenominally (38b) and postnominally (38c).

(38) a. i. ðìo leððìγa
two brothers
ii. ton ðìo peðìo
the two children

b. i protinì čerì ene àx̌ari
the first bad weathers are hard

c. to peðì to protinò ti ððihateò-mmu
the child the first (of) the daughter-mine

Numeral-like adjectives, such as *monò, manaxò* and *diplò,* are attested only prenominally (39).

(39) ena manaxò pràgma
one sole thing

The equivalent of 'nice/bad' (i.e. *galò/kalò*, *màño*[20] and *brutto*, 40), 'poor' (i.e. *pòvero* or *bòvero*, 41) and 'big' (*megàlo, màño*, 42)/'small' (*ccèddo*, 43) occur more often prenominally than postnominally.

(40) a. sas afìnno tin galìn iyìa
to you I leave the good health

[20] In prenominal position, this adjective has various meanings, ranging from 'beautiful' to 'big', like *bèddu* in the Romance dialects of the same area. It is the adjective most frequently attested in the entire corpus.

b. mu ìrte mia màñi micédda
to me came one beautiful young lady

c. kànni brùte vrondàδe
they make bad thunders

(41) ce èspase tom bòvero kòrako
and killed the poor crow

(42) a. miam meγàli x̌onìa
one big snowfall

b. èx̌i na màño spìti
there is one big house

(43) thorì èna ccèddi lùstro
(he) saw one small light

Concerning interpretive differences between pre-and post-nominal occurrences of the same adjective, we found one such case in Caracausi & Rossi Taibi (1959): *o pòvero lìko* 'the pitiable wolf', and *to lleddèndu tom bòvero* 'the poor brother'; this meaning is inferred from the contrast with 'rich' in cases like *o lèddese o plùso* and *tu lèddetu tu plùsu* in the same text. The difference between prenominal 'pitiable' and postnominal 'poor' is attested in the MG polydefinite construction too, as well as in IT with the same adjective in pre- and in postnominal position (Alexiadou *et al.* 2007; Alexiadou 2001; Cinque 2010).

Lìga, 'few' and *boddù/poddù* 'many' are systematically prenominal (44), more often visible in indefinite DPs. They are never attested in polydefinite constructions.

(44) a. ti emise su dònnome lìga dinèrya
that we to you give a few money

b. ce tu ito kàmonda poddà kunàka
and to him she made many small pigs

Àddo (other) is also systematically prenominal (45).

(45) a. tus àddhu mmìnu
the other months

b. ce àddha pràmata varìa
and other things heavy

c. ena àddho paìsi
one other village

Analytic comparatives/superlatives are placed prenominally, usually with high adjectives (46).

(46) a. to plèn gàto fìddo
the most low leaf

b. ta plè mboddhà fità
the most numerous trees

Postnominal adjectives, in contrast with GR, tend to be always articulated in definite DPs (47), just as in MG.

(47) a. i. to peðì to protinò ti ððihateò-mmu
the child the first (of) the daughter-mine

ii. * to peðì protinò

b. i. ta cèrata ta makrìa
the horns the long

ii. *ta cèrata makrìa

c. i. to x̌irìdi t(o) agrikò
the pig the wild

iii. * to x̌irìdi agrikò

Postnominal unarticulated adjectives, in definite DPs, are attested normally as predicates in small clause structures only (48)-(49), just as in MG. Exceptions are very rare.

(48) a. ìx̌e tin imèra makrìa tu kalocerìu, tin imèra
there was the day long of the summer the day

kùnduri tu x̌imòna
short of the winter

b. an èx̌ete tin akoìn galì, kùnnete
if you have the hearing good listen

(49) a. sèrri [...] to èma brùtto
it removes the blood bad

b. ulla ta x̆oràfia kalà ìssa spermèna àsce sitàri
all the lands good[21] were planted with wheat

No construction with prenominal articulated adjectives is attested in our corpus.

Postnominal unarticulated adjectives must be regular in indefinite DPs (50), as in MG, although very few of them were attested in our corpus.

(50) a. mia fràfti megàli
one hedge big

b. ena bastimènto šèno
one ship foreigner

One instance of multiple adjectives was attested in Caracausi & Rossi Taibi (1959: 100): *ena spìti mèga spilò* (lit. 'one house big high'). This particular ordering is the default one also in the neighboring Romance dialects (e.g. SI *na kàsa ràn̓ni jàwta*).

4.2.3. *Summary*

In both GR and BO, only a very restricted class of adjectives (including numerals and a subset of quality-denoting adjectives) are prenominal; all other adjectives are systematically postnominal. So, both varieties differ from MG, where all adjectives are placed prenominally, while at the same time they pattern with the Romance varieties they are in contact with. The difference between GR and BO is that in BO postnominal adjectives are articulated in definite DPs (with very few exceptions), just as in MG, in contrast with GR, where they are never articulated, like in Romance.

In both GR and BO, restrictions on prenominal adjectives are possibly due to the movement of the noun to higher positions, like in the three neighboring Romance varieties explored above, and in contrast to mainland and Ancient Greek, where the noun is not supposed to move. The very restricted occurrence of prenominal adjectives is probably due either to the movement of the noun or, as in Greek (cf. section 3), to base-generation in a relative or a small clause.

[21] Condemi (1995: 202): in the MG version of the same text (207) the adjective is prenominal: όλα τα καλά χωράφια (all the good fields). Similarly, 'ta scìla x̆rondà' (lit. the woods big, 186) is translated as τα χοντρά ξύλα (187), with the adjective in prenominal position, while 'to tirì kòtto' (lit. the cheese strong, 186) is transalated as a polydefinite DP: το τυρί το ξερό (189).

5. *Discussion*

The three Romance varieties explored here display patterns which are very similar to those exhibited by the rest of Romance and described in the relevant literature (i.e. movement of the noun to higher projections in the DP and/or the possibility for adjectives to originate inside a clausal structure (DP-internally)). For many Romance languages and dialects, variability in the distance of noun movement has been observed, as reported in Cinque (2010: 72-73). The dialects we focus our analysis on, where the noun moves at least one step higher than in IT, reveal one more instance of such a variation.

Compared to Greek, GR displays at least two distinctive properties. First, adjectives that appear prenominally are limited, i.e. only a restricted subset of adjectives is allowed in prenominal position, when this position is the rule for (mainland and Ancient) Greek; this pattern parallels that attested in the Romance dialects spoken in the same area as GR. Second, postnominal adjectives are never articulated, again like Romance and unlike Greek. As far as we know, in the rest of the Greek-speaking world, the system of adjectival modification is homogeneous, also diachronically (cf. Section 3 above). Thus, it is reasonable to hypothesize that GR introduced the observed patterns as innovations under the pressure of contact with the surrounding Romance varieties.

It has been pointed out (Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Thomason 2001 a.o.[22]) that situations of unbalanced contact involving intense "cultural pressure" by the dominant language and a strong bilingualism in the minority community tend to favor heavy structural borrowing, following massive lexical borrowing. When lexemes from the majority language are massively imported in the minority code, further morphosyntactic phenomena, more often involving nouns, adjectives and verbs, take place[23]. As far as adjectives are concerned, their positioning may be variable, i.e. sometimes it does not conform to the constraints on word order operating on the target language,

[22] See also, at least: Berruto (2005); Cornips & Corrigan (2005 a/b); Heine & Kuteva (2005) and the papers collected in Hickey (2010), a.o.

[23] Muysken (1981); Poplack, Sankoff & Miller (1988); Myers-Scotton (1993); Giacalone-Ramat (1995); Auer (1999); Thomason (2001), McCormick (2002); Clyne (2003); Backus (2005); Savoia (2009), a.o. As far as adjectives are concerned, borrowed lexemes take up the morphology of the target language: cf. Treffers-Daller (1994); Aikhenvald & Dixon (2007); Savoia (2009); Dal Negro (p.c.), a.o. Exceptions are normally attested when the target language has a less complex inflectional morphology than the donor: e.g. Hualde & De Urbina (2003: 137) mention the case of some Basque adjectives imported from Spanish, which display number and gender inflection (Basque adjectives are not inflected for number/gender).

as has been observed for several other minority languages of Italy (Dal Negro 2002, 2009; Savoia 2009; Alber, Rabanus & Tomaselli 2012, a.o.).

In the case of the varieties considered in this paper, three main facts lend empirical support to the above observations. First, massive borrowing of lexemes (including adjectives) from Romance into GR is attested[24]. Second, in the (assumed) donor Romance varieties, adjectives are regularly postnominal and always without determiner spreading. Third, in GR, adjectives tend to be put postnominally and always without determiner spreading.

In the light of these facts, the development of the patterns of adjectival modification in GR may have started precisely from those adjectives (like *gjòveno*) that were borrowed from the neighboring Romance varieties. Such adjectives, postnominal in the donor variety, presumably were placed postnominally in GR as well. Once this pattern of postnominal modification was introduced, it expanded to the etymologically Greek adjectives, with the result that postnominal adjectives became the rule, while prenominal occurrences were progressively reduced, precisely as in the neighboring Romance varieties.

Turning to BO, effects of contact with Romance are visible in both lexicon and syntax[25], so apparently the situation is (almost) identical to GR. However, BO appears to have preserved a Greek pattern not attested in GR: postnominal adjectives tend to be systematically articulated, as in Greek (cf. Section 4.2.2).

It seems to us that a viable hypothesis is that both Greek dialects had the polydefinite pattern, found in Ancient Greek and continuing to be a distinctive pattern of MG, but in GR it was lost under the pressure of Romance, whereas in BO it was retained. A likely explanation could be that the situation of BO is similar to the situation of Tsakonian in Mainland Greece[26]: in both, speakers used to live in geographically very isolated areas. Surely, further research is needed in order for such a hypothesis to be either confirmed or refuted.

If this line of reasoning is correct, then BO ends up as more conservative

[24] Falcone (1973); Morosi (1870); Profili (1983, 1985); Rohlfs, (1930, 1932, 1933, 1950, 1966, 1977) a.o. In a tentative lexicostatistic experiment based on the comparison of the meanings contained in a 207-items Swadesh list in GR and SA, Guardiano & Longobardi (2007) showed that 27 out of the 207 lexical items of the list (13%) are borrowed from Romance into the Greek variety of Salento (i.e. GR), without touching Greek.

[25] Katsoyannou (1992 a/b, 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999 a/b, 2001).

[26] Cf. Charalambopoulos (1980), and Ralli (2006), for a summary of the literature.

and less prone to contact than GR (see also the discussion in Section 2.2., as regards the preservation of ancient patterns in BO). Further support for this comes from the fact that sequences of articulated adjectives preceding the articulated noun are not found in the texts we searched, consequently we assume that, even if they existed, they must have been very rare. This draws a line between BO and all the other varieties of Greek, where this ordering is very common (Campos & Stavrou 2004), and is reminiscent of Ancient Greek, where prenominal polydefinite adjectives are very rare (cf. Section 3).

The facts regarding postnominal adjectives in both GR and BO suggest that an innovation was introduced, presumably under the Romance influence; namely noun movement to a functional layer above the lexical projection, in contrast with (the rest of) Greek, where no noun movement is assumed[27]. For some adjectives, however, the postnominal position, as mentioned in Section 3, may originate from their position in a relative clause.

6. *Conclusions*

In this paper we investigated the consequences on the nominal domain of the contact between three Romance varieties spoken in Southern Italy and the two Greek varieties spoken in the same area.

Despite limited access to information directly from native speakers from BO, the evidence we collected points rather clearly to the following facts:

(51) a. Prenominal adjectives are reduced to a very restricted class, according to Romance and in contrast with Greek; we assumed that this stems from the introduction of noun movement in these varieties.

b. There is a difference between GR and BO as regards the realization of postnominal adjectives; only the latter variety exhibits the polydefinite pattern found in standard Greek. To explain this difference, we further assumed that BO is more conservative than GR.

[27] Having said all this, we want to point out that the facts we presented here in terms of noun movement could equally well be explained in terms of noun phrase movement (Cinque 2010).

References

Adger, D., G. Trousdale, 2007: "Variation in English syntax: theoretical implications", *English Language and Linguistics 11*, pp. 261-278.

Aikhenvald, A., RMW. Dixon, 2007: *Grammars in contact. A crosslinguistic typology,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Alber, B., S. Rabanus, A. Tomaselli, 2012: "Contatto linguistico nell'area alpina centro-meridionale", in L. Colombo, M. Dal Corso, P. Frassi, S. Genetti, R. Gorris Camos, P. Ligas, P. Perazzolo (eds.), *La sensibilità della Ragione. Studi in omaggio a Franco Piva, Verona, Edizioni Fiorini*.

Alexiadou, A., 2001: "Adjective syntax and noun raising: word order asymmetries in the DP as the result of adjective distribution", *Studia Linguistica* 55, pp. 217-248.

Alexiadou, A., 2006, "On the Cross-Linguistic Distribution of (In)definiteness Spreading", paper presented at ÖLT Syntax Workshop. Univ. Klangenfurt.

Alexiadou, A., L. Haegeman, M. Stavrou, 2007: *The noun phrase in the generative perspective*, Berlin, De Gruyter.

Auer, P., 1999: *Code-switching in Conversation*, London, Routledge.

Auer, P., F. Hinskens, P. Kerswill (eds.), 2005: *Dialect change: convergence and divergence in European languages*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Backus, A., 2005: "Codeswitching and language change: one thing leads to another?" *International Journal of Bilinguialism* 3.4, pp. 309-332.

Bakker, S., 2009: *The noun phrase in Ancient Greek. A functional analysis of the order and articulation of NP constituents in Herodotus*, Leiden, Brill.

Barbiers, S., L. Cornips, 2000: "Introducion to syntactic microvariation" http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/books/synmic/introduction.pdf

Benincà, P., C. Poletto, 2007: "The ASIS enterprise: a view on the construction of a syntactic atlas for the Northern Italian dialects", *Nordlyd 34*, pp. 35-52 [*Scandinavian Dialect Syntax 2005, w*d. by K. Bentzen and Ø. Vangsnes, Tromsø, CASTL, http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd].

Bernstein, J., 1991: "DPs in French and Walloon, Evidence for Parametric Variation in Nominal Head Movement", *Probus* 3.2, pp. 101-126.

Bernstein, J., 1993: *Topics in the Syntax of Nominal Structure Across Romance*, Doctoral Dissertation, CUNY.

Berruto, G., 1987: *Sociolinguitica dell'Italiano contemporaneo*, Roma, Carocci.

Berruto, G., 2005: "Dialect/standard convergence, mixing, and models of language contact: the case of Italy", in Auer, P., F. Hinskens, P. Kerswill (eds.) *Dialect change: convergence and divergence in European languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 81-95.

Bigalke, R., 1997: *Siciliano*, Munchen, Lincom.

Black, J., V. Motapanyane (eds.), 1996: *Microparametric syntax and dialect variation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Bouchard, D., 2002: *Adjectives, number and interfaces. Why Languages vary*, Amsterdam, Elsevier.

Bowern, C., 2006: "Syntactic change and syntactic borrowing in generative grammar", http://yale.academia.edu/ClaireBowern/Papers/1002427/Syntactic_change_and_syntactic_borrowing_in_generative_grammar.

Campolo, I., 2002: *Storia linguistica della romaicità bovese. Consuntivo e prospettive*, Bova, Apodiafazzi.

Campos, H., M. Stavrou, 2004: "Polydefinites in Greek and Aromanian", in Tomic, O. (ed.) *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 137-173.

Caracausi, G., G. Rossi-Taibi, 1959: *Testi neogreci di Calabria*, Palermo, Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici.

Charalambopoulos, A, 1980: *Φωνολογική Ανάλυση της Τσακωνικής Διαλέκτου* [A Phonological Analysis of the Tsakonian Dialect]. PhD Dissertation, University of Thessaloniki.

Cinque, G., 1994: "On the evidence for partial N-movement in the Romance DP", in Cinque, G., J. Koster, JY Pollock, L. Rizzi, R. Zanuttini (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne: Paths towards Universal Grammar*. Washington DC, Georgetown University Press, pp. 85-110.

Cinque, G., 2005: *The Dual Sources of Adjectives and XP vs. N-raising in the Romance DP,* Manuscript, Venice, Univ. Venice.

Cinque, G., 2010: *The Syntax of adjectives. A Comparative Study*, Boston, The MIT press.

Clyne, M., 2003: *Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Condemi, F., 1995: *La grammatica grecanica*, Cumelca, Editrice ellenofoni di Calabria.

Cornips, L., 1998: "Syntactic variation, parameters and their social ditribution", *Language Variation and Change* 10.1, pp. 1-21.

Cornips, L., K. Corrigan, 2005a: "Convergence and divergence in grammar", in Auer, P., F. Hinskens, P. Kerswill (eds.) *Dialect change: convergence and divergence in European languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 96-134.

Cornips, L., K. Corrigan (eds), 2005b: *Syntax and variation: reconciling the biological and the social*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Crisma, P., 1993: "On Adjective Placement in Romance and in Germanic Event Nominals", *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa 18*, pp. 61-100.

Crisma, P., 1995: "On the Configurational Nature of Adjectival Modification", in Zagona, K. (ed.) *Grammatical Theory and Romance Languages*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 58-72.

Crisma, P., C. Gianollo, 2006: "Where did Romance N-raising come from? A parallel study of parameter resetting in Latin and English", in Doetjes, J., P. Gonzalez (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2004*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 71-93.

Crupi, G. A., 1980: *La 'glossa' di Bova; cento favole esopiche in greco calabro; schema grammaticale; lessico*, Rocella Ionica, Associazione Culturale Ionica.

Dal Negro, S., 2002: "Repertori plurilingui in contesto minoritario", in Dal Negro, S., P. Molinelli (eds.), *Comunicare nella Torre di Babele*, Roma, Carocci, pp. 23-42.

Dal Negro, S., 2009: "Fenomeni di contatto fra discorso e sistema", in Consani, C., P. Desideri, F. Guazzelli, C. Perta (eds.), *Alloglossie e comunità alloglotte nell'Italia contemporanea*, Roma, Bulzoni, pp. 81-94.

Falcone, G., 1973: *Il dialetto romaico della bovesia*, Milano, Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere.

Fanciullo, F., 2001: "On the origins of Modern Greek in Southern Italy", in Ralli, A., 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.

Giacalone-Ramat, A., 1995: "Code-switching in the context of dialect-standard language relations", in Milroy, L., P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 45-67.

Grassi C., A.A. Sobrero, T. Telmon, 1998: *Fondamenti di dialettologia italiana*, Bari, Laterza.

Gruppo di Lecce, 1980: "Il caso Grecìa", in Albano Leoni, F. (ed.), *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano*, Roma, Bulzoni, pp. 343-403.

Guardiano, C., 2003: *Struttura e storia del sintagma nominale nel Greco Antico. Ipotesi parametriche*. Tesi di Dottorato, Università di Pisa.

Guardiano, C., 2006: "The diachronic evolution of the Greek article: parametric hypotheses", in Janse, M., B. Joseph, A.Ralli (eds.) *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, Partras, University of Patras, pp. 99-114.

Guardiano, C., 2013: "DPs in Southern Italy: a comparative perspective". Manuscript, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia.

Guardiano, C., G. Longobardi, 2007: "Greek, Italian and their Dialects: a Quantitative Taxonomy". Paper presented at MGDLT3, Nicosia, June 14-16, 2007.

Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2005: *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hickey, R. (ed.), 2010: *The Handbook of Language Contact*, Chichester, Wiley.

Hualde, I., J. De Urbina, 2003: *A grammar of Basque*, Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter.

Iovino, R. and G. Giusti, 2013: "Latin as an articleless DP language". Talk given at IGG39, Modena and Reggio Emilia, February 21-23, 2013.

Karanastasis, A., 1974: "I fattori che hanno contribuito al regresso dei dialetti neogreci dell'Italia meridionale", in *Dal dialetto alla lingua*, Pisa, Pacini, pp. 5-18.

Karanastasis, A., 1984-1992: *Ιστορικό λεξικό των νεοελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας*, Αθήνα, Ακαδημία Αθηνών.

Karanastasis, A., 1992: "Origine e sviluppo dei dialetti italogreci", in Fasino, M., G. Ruffino (eds.) *Studi filologici offerti a Girolamo Caracausi*, Palermo, Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, pp. 177-183.

Katsoyannou, M., 1992a: "Voix et conjugaison verbale en gréco. Pour aborder le diasystème", *Lectures et perspectives 1*, pp. 89-104.

Katsoyannou, M., 1992b: "Mort des langues et locuteurs terminaux: le cas de la minorité grécophone de la Calabre, Italie", *Plurilinguismes IV*, pp. 84-111.

Katsoyannou, M., 1995: *Le parler Grico del Gallicianò (Italie): description d'une langue en voie de disparition*. Phd dissertation, Universitè Paris VII.

Katsoyannou, M., 1997: "Interventi simbiotici tra greco e romanzo nell'area linguistica calabrese", in Banfi, E. (ed.), *Atti del 2° incontro internazionale di lingua greca*, pp. 513-531.

Katsoyannou, M., 1998: "Aspects grecs: le cas d'une variété méridionale", *Actances 9*, pp. 43-62.

Katsoyannou, M., 1999a: "Το ιδίωμα της Καλαβρίας / The idiom of Calabria", in *στο Διαλεκτικοί θύλακοι της ελληνικής γλώσσας / Dialect enclaves of the Greek language,* Αθήνα: Κέντρο Ελληνικής Γλώσσας, pp. 39-45 / 113-119.

Katsoyannou, M., 1999b: "Ελληνικά της Κάτω Ιταλίας: η κοινωνιογλωσσολογική άποψη", in *Ελληνική Γλωσσολογία '97: Πρακτικά του Γ΄ Διεθνούς Γλωσσολογικού Συνεδρίου για την ελληνική γλώσσα*, Αθήνα, Ελληνικά Γράμματα, pp. 605-613.

Katsoyannou, M., 2001: "Le parler grec de Calabre, situation linguistique et sociolinguistique", *Lalies 21*, pp. 7-59.

Katsoyannou, M., E. Nucera, 1986: "Il caso Gallicianò: aspetti sociolinguistici della grecità calabrese". *Calabria sconosciuta IV/6*, pp. 47-51.

Kolliakou, D., 2004: "Monadic definites and polydefinites. Their form, meaning and use", *Journal of Linguistics* 40, pp. 263-323.

Laenzingler, C., 2005: "French adjective ordering: perspectives on DP-inetrnal movement types", *Lingua 115*, pp. 645-689.

Ledgeway, A., 2013: Greek disguised as Romance? The case of Southern Italy. Ms. University of Cambridge.

Longobardi, G., 2001: "The Structure of DPs: principles, parameters and problems", in Baltin, M., C. Collins (eds.), *Handbook of Syntactic Theory*, Cambridge, Mass. & Oxford, Eng., Blackwell, pp. 562-603.

Manolessou, I., 2000: *Greek noun phrase structure: a study in syntactic evolution*. PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Manolessou, I., 2005: "The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: an overview", *KAMPOS: Cambridge papers in Modern Greek 13*, pp. 103-125.

Manzini R., L. Savoia, 2005: *I dialetti italiani e Romanci, Morfosintassi generativa*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini R., L. Savoia, 2007: *A unification of morphology and syntax. Studies in Romance and Albanian dialects*, London, Routledge.

Martino, P., 2009: "L'affaire Bovesìa. Un singolare irredentismo", in Consani, C., P. Desideri, F. Guazzelli, C. Perta (eds.), *Alloglossie e comunità alloglotte nell'Italia contemporanea*, Roma, Bulzoni, pp. 251-275.

McCormick, K., 2002: "Code switching, mixing and convergence in Cape Town", in Mesthrie, R. (ed.) *Language in South Africa*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 216-234.

Miglietta, A., A. Sobrero, 2006: "Politica linguistica e presenza del grico in Salento oggi", in Guardiano, C., E. Calaresu, A. Carli, C. Robustelli (eds.), *Lingue, istituzioni, territori*. Roma, Bulzoni, pp. 209-226.

Miglietta, A., A. Sobrero, 2007: "Spie morfologiche della resistenza del grico in Salento", *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia 31*, pp. 19-28.

Minniti, D., 1992: "Les théories sur l'origine du dialecte grec de Calabria", *Parousia 8*, pp. 117-124.

Morgante, L., 2004: *La minoranza ellenofona nell'Aspromonte calabrese*. Tesi di Laurea. Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia.

Morosi, G., 1870: *Studi sui dialetti greci della terra d'Otranto*, Lecce, Editrice Salentina.

Muysken, P., 1981: "Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: the case for relexification", in Highfield, A., A. Valdman (eds.), *Historicity and variation in creole studies*, Ann Arbor, Karoma, pp. 52-78.

Myers-Scotton, C., 1993: *Dueling languages: grammatical structure in code-switching*, Oxford, Clarendon.

Parlangeli, O., 1953: "Sui dialetti romanzi e romaici del Salento", *Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere 25-26*, pp. 93-198.

Parlangeli, O., 1960: *Storia linguistica e storia politica nell'Italia meridionale*, Firenze, Felice Le Monnier.

Pellegrini, G.B., 1977: *Carta dei dialetti d'Italia*, Pisa, Pacini.

Poplack, S., D. Sankoff, C. Miller, 1988: "The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation", *Linguistics 26*, pp. 47-104.

Profili, O., 1983: *Le parler grico del Corigliano d'Otranto (province de Lecce, Italie). Problémes d'interférence entre ce parler grec et les parlers romans environnants, ainsi q'avec l'italien*. Phd Dissertation, Université des langues et lettres, Grenoble.

Profili, O., 1985: "La romanisation d'un parler grec de l'Italie du Sud par les parlers romans environants", in *Actes du XVIIe Congrès International de linguistique et de philologie romanes*, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, pp. 129-139.

Profili, O., 1999: "The Greek language in Southern Italy", in Christidis, A-Ph. (ed.), *Dialects enclaves of the Greek language*, Athens, Centre for the Greek Language, pp. 107-112.

Ralli, A., 2006: "Syntactic and morpho-syntactic phenomena in Modern Greek dialects: the state of the art", *Journal of Greek Linguistics 7*, pp. 121-159.

Rohlfs, G., 1924: *Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien*, Genève, L.S. Olschki.

Rohlfs G., 1930: *Lexicon graecanicum Italiae inferioris. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der unteritalienischen Gräzität*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer.

Rohlfs, G., 1932: *Dizionario dialettale delle tre Calabrie con note etimologiche e un'introduzione sulla storia dei dialetti calabresi*, Halle, Max Niemeyer - MI, Hoepli.

Rohlfs, G., 1933: *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Graecia*, Halle, Niemeyer / Roma, Collez. Meridionale.

Rohlfs, G., 1950: *Historische Grammatik der unteritalienischen Graezitaet*, Munich, Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Rohlfs, G., 1966: *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, Einaudi, Torino.

Rohlfs, G., 1972: *Nuovi scavi linguistici nell'antica Magna Graecia*, Palermo, istituto siciliano di studi bizantini e neoellenici.

Rohlfs, G., 1977: *Nuovo dizionario dialettale della Calabria (con repertorio italo-calabro)* Ravenna, Longo.

Rohlfs, G., 1980: *Calabria e Salento. Saggi di storia linguistica (studi e ricerche)*, Ravenna, Longo.

Rohlfs, G., 1985: *Latinità et ellenismo nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia. Studi e ricerche (dalla Magna Grecia alla Grecìa italica)*. Chiaravalle, Frama Sud.

Romano, A., P. Marra, 2008: *Il griko nel terzo millennio: 'speculazioni' su una lingua in agonia*, Parabita, Il laboratorio.

Ruffino, G., 2001: *Sicilia*, Bari, Laterza.

Savoia, L., 2009: "Mescolanza linguistica nei sistemi arbereshe: prestiti e code-mixing". Paper presented at the meeting *Parola: il lessico come strumento per organizzare e trasmettere gli eurosaperi*, Arcavacata (CS).

Shlonsky, U., 2004: "The form of the Semitic noun phrase. An antisymmetric non-N-movement account", *Lingua 114*, pp. 1465-1526.

Sobrero, A.A., 1993: *Introduzione all'Italiano contemporaneo*, Bari, Laterza.

Sobrero, A.A., A. Miglietta, 2006: *Lingua e Dialetto nell'Italia del Duemila*, Galatina, Congedo.

Sobrero, A.A., M.T. Romanello, 1977: "Una ricerca sociolinguistica in Salento. Linee d'indagine e primi risultati", in Simone, R., G. Ruggiero (eds.), *Aspetti sociolinguistici dell'Italia contemporanea*, Roma, Bulzoni, pp. 373-384.

Spano, B., 1965. *La grecità bizantina e i suoi riflessi geografici nell'Italia meridionale e insulare*, Pisa, Libreria Goliardica.

Sproat, R., C. Shih, 1987: "Prenominal adjectival ordering in English and Mandarin", *NELS 18*, pp. 465-489.

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.

Stavrou, M., 2013: "The fine(r) ingredients of adjectival modification in Greek; the Romance connection". Paper presented at IGG39, Modena e Reggio Emilia, February 21-23, 2013.

Thomason, S., T. Kaufman, 1988: *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, Berkeley/Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Thomason, S., 2001: *Language contact: an introduction*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Treffers-Daller, J., 1994: *Mixing two languages: French-Dutch contact in a comparative perspective*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

Troiano, R., 1982: "Le comunità etnico-linguistiche in Calabria", *Calabria Sconosciuta VI/22-2*, pp. 49-52.

Edizioni ETS
Piazza Carrara, 16-19, I-56126 Pisa
info@edizioniets.com - www.edizioniets.com
Finito di stampare nel mese di luglio 2014