MDPI

Article

Modeling Syntactic Change under Contact: The Case of Italiot Greek

Cristina Guardiano [1,*] and Melita Stavrou [2]

[1] Dipartimento di Comunicazione ed Economia, Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, 42121 Reggio Emilia, Italy

[2] Department of Linguistics, Aristotle University Thessaloniki, 54124 Thessaloniki, Greece; staurou@lit.auth.gr

* Correspondence: cristina.guardiano@unimore.it

Abstract: In this paper, we investigate patterns of persistence and change affecting the syntax of nominal structures in Italiot Greek in comparison to Modern (and Ancient) Greek, and we explore the role of Southern Italo-Romance as a potential source of interference. Our aim is to highlight the dynamics that favor syntactic contact in this domain: we provide an overview of the social context where these dynamics have taken place and of the linguistic structures involved.

Keywords: Greek; Romance; Southern Italy; syntactic contact; horizontal transmission; nominal structures; parameter resetting; adjectives; demonstratives; adnominal genitive; possessives

1. Introduction

The relation between Greek and Romance in Southern Italy represents an ideal setting to explore syntactic microvariation and to investigate the impact of horizontal transmission[1] on syntactic change: in fact, these communities are a "natural laboratory" (Katsoyannou 1999) to observe the mechanisms of language change under contact.

Our research in this area focuses on nominal structures, with two main purposes:

1.
   a. Explore, describe and represent syntactic microvariation in this domain.
   b. Define the role of horizontal transmission in triggering language change.

To examine these points, in this paper we summarize the findings of our previous work[2], we combine them with novel evidence, and we tentatively identify the structural factors which favor or hamper horizontal change.

With respect to 1a, we raise the following questions:

2.
   a. Does microvariation manifest itself in nominal structures?
   b. If yes, is it possible to single out specific (sub)domains exhibiting a higher degree of variation (or, vice versa, stronger resistance)?

In previous works, we suggested that: (a) the patterns of divergence between Italiot Greek and other (ancient and contemporary) varieties of Greek are mostly due to innovations introduced in Italiot Greek under the pressure of contact with Romance; (b) in certain domains, these innovations have been more pervasive than in others, and (c) Calabria Greek has been more impermeable to changes than Salento Greek. These aspects are discussed in Section 2, where we present the sociolinguistic settings of the two communities, in Section 3, where we summarize the relevant data, and in Section 4, where we propose an explanation for such unbalanced effects.

As far as 1b is concerned, we focus on the following questions:

3. a.   What is the impact of horizontal transmission on syntactic diversity?
    b.   Is syntactic borrowing sensitive to structural similarity?[3]

In the domains we focused on so far, a condition that seems to trigger the processes of reanalysis inducing structural change is the availability of overlapping linear strings[4] (even if they emerged from different structural sources) between the source (Romance) and the target (Greek) language. The phenomena we investigate in this paper suggest that this condition is not sufficient: more precisely, it is their combination with specific aspects of the internal configuration of each given domain that triggers (or blocks) structural change.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Background: Syntactic Contact and Structural Borrowing

Our work is launched in the framework of the generative approaches to dialectal variation[5]. Dialectal varieties are often "in a constant interaction with one or more standard languages and with other dialects" (Barbiers and Cornips 2000, p. 3); hence, they offer a helpful testing ground for exploring the role of contact in language change[6]. Furthermore, the study of microvariation is a powerful tool for understanding the mechanisms that underlie diversity of the language faculty (Kayne 1996, 2005; Manzini and Savoia 2005, 2019, a.o.). Under this view, a major goal is to devise a model able to detect, describe and explain microscopic diversity accounting for both the "external" impulses acting on it (i.e., the dynamics of interaction between speakers and/or speaking communities and their consequences on the E-languages[7] available to the speakers) and the "internal" structures that determine it (i.e., the speakers' grammatical competence).

The role played by contact in the dynamics of language change was first systematically acknowledged by Weinreich (1953) and subsequently modeled by Thomason and Kaufman (1988). Since then, contact has been regarded as a "bridge" between variation and change: "the implications of contact are pervasive and fundamental to language change, whether the contact be between speakers of different languages or between those of different varieties of the same language" (Bowern 2009, p. 187)[8].

An important issue associated with contact is borrowing, defined as "the incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers' native language" (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, p. 21). Specifically, *syntactic* borrowing has been defined as a transfer of syntactic rules (Thomason 2004) not induced by lexical or other kinds of transfer, and has been shown to be less conscious, massive and dependent on the physical context as compared to other contact-induced changes (Thomason 2001).

As stressed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), two classes of potential *stimuli* operate on the mechanisms of structural borrowing: social factors[9] and the internal structure of

---

[1] In the phylogenetic literature, the term horizontal transmission is used to refer to changes/innovations transmitted from one language to another when these languages are in geographical contact (though not necessarily genetically related).

[2] Guardiano (2014a); Guardiano and Stavrou (2014, 2019a, 2019b, 2020); Guardiano et al. (2016, 2018, 2020).

[3] The conjectures about structural contact that we discuss here have been inspired by Weinreich (1953) and by some aspects of the models proposed in Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Heine and Kuteva (2005; with particular reference to the notion of "equivalence": chp. 1, 6).

[4] By "overlapping linear strings" we mean sequences that are (superficially) identical in the source and in the target language.

[5] Black and Motapayane (1996); Cornips (1998); Auer et al. (2005); Barbiers and Cornips (2000); Adger and Trousdale (2007), a.o.

[6] Thomason and Kaufman (1988); Bowern (2009); Thomason (2001); Heine and Kuteva (2005); Hickey (2010), a.o. The understanding of the impact of contact in determining structural changes is fruitful for both historical reconstruction (Noonan 2010) and the analysis of language transmission (Corrigan 2010). As far as the reconstruction of historical relatedness is concerned, "linguists [. . .] need to engage with the central question of whether linguistic features which owe their existence to descent from an ancestral variety or protolanguage within a family can be distinguished from those which have been borrowed or remodeled on the basis of another language" (McMahn 2010, p. 128; see also, among many others, Corrigan 2010).

[7] Chomsky (1986).

[8] Thomason (2001); Heine and Kuteva (2005); see also the papers collected in Hickey (2010), among many others.

[9] "Long-term contact with widespread bilingualism among borrowing-language speakers is a prerequisite for extensive structural borrowing" (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, p. 67). See also Smith and Veenstra (2001); Matras and Bakker (2003); Pountain (2006); Aikhenvald and Dixon (2007); Matras (2009) a.o.

the source and the target language[10]. As a matter of fact, in their model, social factors are assigned a primary role[11]: "it is the social context [. . .] that determines the direction and the degree of interference" (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, p. 19)[12]. They identify three major social factors as triggers for structural borrowing:[13]

4. a. "long-term cultural pressure from source-language speakers on the borrowing-language speaker group";
   b. "a history of several hundred years of intimate contact";
   c. Extensive bilingualism[14].

Concerning structural similarity, it must be remarked that we are dealing with two language groups (Greek and Romance) genealogically very close and typologically quite similar to one another[15]; hence, in order to explore instances of convergence/divergence, we must first identify a set of domains exhibiting variation between the two groups. This is done in Section 3.

To investigate the role of structural similarity in triggering syntactic change under contact, we adopt as a starting point a hypothesis first proposed by Guardiano et al. (2016) and further developed in Guardiano et al. (2020), labeled "Resistance Principle". The Resistance Principle submits that syntactic borrowing "is likely to be the result of some intrinsic resistance by language's most internally structured systems (such as syntax) to accept changes even when they are motivated by external pressures (like contact)" (Guardiano et al. 2016, pp. 147–48)[16]. Therefore, in order for syntactic change to occur, it must be triggered by interference data already available ("familiar", Sitaridou 2014) in the interfered language.

5. Resistance principle: "Resetting of parameter α from value X to Y in language A as triggered by interference of language B only takes place if a subset of the strings that contribute to constituting a trigger or value Y of parameter α in language B already exists in language A". (Guardiano et al. 2016, p. 148)[17].

2.2. Sociolinguistic Factors: Greek and Romance in Southern Italy

The relation between Greek and Romance in Southern Italy displays all the conditions that are assumed to favor structural borrowing, in terms of both social factors and structural

---

[10] As pertinently observed by (De Angelis 2021, p. 1), the hypothesis that structural contact requires some "structural similarity" between interfered systems was first formulated by Antoine Meillet (1914): "[. . .] borrowing can operate only between similar systems". See also, for further discussion on these issues: Weinreich (1953), Harris and Campbell (1995); Aikhenvald (2002); Winford (2003, 2010); Berruto (2005); Cornips and Corrigan (2005); Heine and Kuteva (2005); Baptista and Gueron (2007); Ansaldo (2009), among several others. See also, for a recent summary of the debate on these topics, Poplack and Levey (2010) and literature therein.

[11] "It is the sociolinguistic history of the speakers, and not the structure of their language, that is the primary determinant of the linguistic outcome of language contact" (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, p. 35).

[12] "Though it is true that some kinds of features are more easily transferred than others, [. . .] social factors can and very often do overcome structural resistance to interference at all levels" (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, p. 15).

[13] Quotations are from page 41. Italics are ours.

[14] In contrast, lexical borrowing (i.e., borrowing of words and stems) can take place in situations of more desultory contact (Thomason and Kaufman 1988, chp. 3).

[15] See Ralli (2019) for a detailed overview of the different contexts in which Greek has historically been in contact with Romance.

[16] The idea that languages exhibit "complex resistance to interference" is inspired by (Weinreich 1953, p. 44) and also by the inertial view of (diachronic) syntactic change exploited by Keenan (1994, 2009) and Longobardi (2001).

[17] This intuition had actually been put on the table in the past by several studies about the relation between contact and syntactic change. For instance, among many others, Jakobson (1962, p. 241; also quoted by Thomason 2004) argues that "a language accepts foreign structural elements only if they correspond to its own tendency of development"; similarly, Vogt (1954, p. 372) suggests that, in order to be incorporated in a target language, foreign elements must correspond to "innovation possibilities offered by the received system". Thomason and Kaufman (1988, p. 97), in turn, admit that sometimes borrowing can be favored "thanks to a close typological fit between source-language and borrowing-language structures. The classic cases of this type are those of dialect borrowing, where the typological fit is close for all grammatical subsystem. [. . .] borrowing between closely related languages, where again both lexicon and typological structure match to a great extent".

similarity. As far as social factors are concerned, the sociolinguistic settings of the Greek-speaking areas are compatible with the components listed in 4:

6.   a.   Romance is the dominant group (*intense pressure*);
     b.   The two groups have been in contact for centuries (*intimate contact*);
     c.   Currently, no Greek speaker is monolingual (all the speakers of Greek also speak at least a regional variety of Italian, and often a Romance dialect) (*bilingualism*).

As is well known[18], there are two Greek-speaking communities in Southern Italy, one in Salento (*Grecia salentina*) and one in Calabria (*Bovesia*). In terms of social prestige, Romance has been the dominant language in both areas: especially in recent history, the Greek communities have had very low social prestige in Southern Italy. Particularly in Calabria, they are traditionally associated to poor and rural populations. Additionally, until very recently, speakers have not shown any positive attitude towards their own language and have made no effort towards preserving their cultural identity and language. Thus, despite attempts of "revitalizing" the language in both areas, Greek is currently in a state of regression/obsolescence: native speakers have almost disappeared (these varieties are no longer acquired as first languages) and Romance varieties are massively adopted in everyday use.

Concerning bilingualism, there is an intricate debate about whether and how the languages that have been spoken in the area since ancient times have interacted to one another and how this interaction has affected the current structure of Greek and Romance dialects (see Fanciullo 2001 for a summary). As far as more recent times are concerned, there are differences between Salento and Calabria[19]. In Salento, bilingualism has been the rule for much longer than in Calabria, where Greek-speaking villages were generally isolated and had little contact with the Romance-speaking communities; as a consequence, until recent times, Greek speakers in Calabria were mostly monolingual. In previous work, we suggested that the different pace at which Salento and Calabria have integrated innovations induced by contact with Romance is connected to this condition. We will return to this issue in Section 4.

To sum up, the sociolinguistic conditions of Greek and Romance in Southern Italy are compatible with Thomason and Kaufman (1988, pp. 74–75) definition of "(very) strong cultural pressure", typically associated to "moderate-to-heavy" structural borrowing. Romance acts as the source language, with Greek acting as the target one. According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988, p. 63) "the identification of a source language requires the establishment of present or past contact of sufficient intensity between the proposed source language and the recipient language"; in turn, the existence of some degree of "intensity of contact" between a source language and a recipient language is deducible from the presence, in the recipient language, of "innovations that may reasonably be attributed to that source language". As we see in Section 3, this is precisely the situation we observe in Southern Italy. Our previous work on Italiot Greek has revealed that the differences detected between Italiot Greek and standard Greek[20] can be attributed to innovations induced by contact with the Romance dialects of the area[21]. In addition, as already mentioned, the differences

---

18   See Guardiano and Stavrou (2014) for a partial overview of the literature concerning the history and structure of the Greek speaking communities in Southern Italy, and Silvestri and Schifano (2017); Squillaci (2017); Remberger (2018) for recent surveys.

19   Chilà (2021); Chilà and De Angelis (2021) and the literature therein.

20   The term "standard Greek" (often comprising also the adjective Modern—"Standard Modern Greek") is uniformly employed to denote the standardized contemporary Greek language (both spoken and written/literary) that is used in the big urban centers and is distinguished from the local (geographical) varieties, both inside and outside Greece, traits of which it has absorbed. In this sense standard Greek is an idealization/abstraction reflecting forms of the Greek language all of which derive from the Koine. In this paper we chose to take standard Greek as a reference language for our study because this is somehow the default Greek language of our times. Moreover, standard Greek in its idealization (and/or abstraction) remains (more) immune to contact with other languages Our choice does not imply any evaluation or bias in favor or against standard Greek (or any of its dialects). In fact, it would be interesting to compare Italiot Greek with some other Greek variety, as far as the structures explored here are concerned, and detect differences and similarities.

21   See also, outside of the nominal domain, Ledgeway (2013, 2016); Ledgeway et al. (2018) a.o.

between Salento and Calabria in terms of intensity of contact with Romance explain why such innovations were introduced in the two communities at a different pace. However, horizontal transmission has not obscured the genealogical connection between Italiot Greek and the rest of Greek: in all the taxonomic experiments performed so far using as an input syntactic (parametric) data from the nominal domain (Guardiano et al. 2016; Ceolin et al. 2020), the two Italiot Greek varieties are systematically identified as members of the Greek group.

2.3. Collection of Data

The Italiot Greek data discussed in this paper originate from native speakers' judgments and from a selection of written records. By "written records" we refer to collections of texts originally transmitted orally, which were gathered and put down in written form by local experts around the middle of the 20th century. Since these texts offer, apparently, a (partial) window to the language as it was when it was more productive and used for everyday needs, we included them in our research data, in combination with the speakers' judgments (and the grammars), in order to obtain a more complete view of the language. The comparison between these two types of sources reveals important differences that allowed us to identify different steps of changes in progress.[22]

As far as Romance is concerned, we focus on the dialects spoken in the same areas as Italiot Greek, Salentino and Southern Calabrese in particular, both belonging to the "extreme Southern" group (Pellegrini 1977). The data emerged from on-purpose interviews with native speakers, and were subsequently combined, when needed, with the evidence provided in the literature. The extreme Southern Romance dialects of Italy do not significantly differ from one another in the domains under investigation in this paper.

All the examples, where not otherwise specified, have been tested in argument (i.e., subject/object) position.

3. Results

We start with the domains that are known to display differences between Greek and Romance outside of the geographic area under investigation; we observe whether, in these domains, Italiot Greek converges or diverges from Greek and, in the latter case, whether it converges or not with Romance. They are listed in 7.

7.   a.   Adjectives[23];
       b.   Adnominal demonstratives[24];
       c.   Adnominal genitives[25];
       d.   Pronominal possessives[26].

Concerning 7a and b (adjectives and demonstratives), we explore two major aspects:

8.   a.   Linearization with respect to other constituents;
       b.   Co-occurrence with the definite article.

As far as 8a (linearization) is concerned, in standard Greek (and also Ancient Greek), demonstratives have by and large the same distribution as (postnominal) adjectives[27]. In contrast, in Italiot Greek, the distribution of demonstratives is incompatible with that of

---

[22] We refer to Guardiano and Stavrou (2019a, 2019b, 2020) for an extensive list of these sources.

[23] Stavrou (2012, 2013), Guardiano and Stavrou (2014, 2019a, 2019b).

[24] Horrocks and Stavrou (1987); Stavrou and Horrocks (1989); Guardiano (2012, 2014b); Guardiano and Michelioudakis (2019); Guardiano and Stavrou (2020).

[25] Guardiano (2011); Guardiano and Longobardi (2018); Crisma et al. (2020); Guardiano et al. (2020).

[26] Guardiano et al. (2016, 2018); Mertyris (2014).

[27] See also Horrocks and Stavrou (1987); Stavrou and Horrocks (1989); Alexiadou et al. (2007); Manolessou and Panagiotidis (1999); Panagiotidis (2000); Grohmann and Panagiotidis (2004); Alexiadou (2014) a.o.

adjectives, which display the same linearization patterns as the Romance dialects of the area. A first difference between Italiot Greek and standard Greek is that, in Italiot Greek, the unmarked (even the only possible) position for most adjectives (as in the Romance dialects of the area) is the postnominal one (as shown in 9a). Like the neighboring Romance dialects[28], only a very restricted group of (speaker-oriented) adjectives is found after determiners/numerals[29] and before the noun (see 9b); by contrast, in standard Greek almost all types of adjectives can be prenominal. Additionally, in Italiot Greek, adjectives are never found to the left of numerals (see the ungrammaticality of 9c), again unlike standard Greek[30]. As far as demonstratives are concerned, they are linked to a DP-initial position (see 10a; like in the Romance dialects of the area):[31] all other linear orders are ungrammatical (see 10b,c).

9. a. o   antrepo/athropo gioveno   *Salento/Calabria Greek*
       the man   young
       'the young man'
    b. i. pente   kalì   antrepi/athropi
          five   good   men
          'five good men'
       ii. pente   orriu   libbru
          five   nice   books
          'five nice books'
    c. i. * i   gioveni   i   pente antrepi/athropi
           the   young   the five   men
           'the five young men'
       ii. * orriu   pente   libbru
           nice   five   books
           'five nice books'

10. a. i. (t)usi pente   antrepi/athropi   *Salento/Calabria Greek*
          these five   men
          'these five men'
       ii. (t)uttu(s) pente libbru
          these   five   books
          'these five books'
    b. * o   antrepo/athropo tuso/(e)cino
        the man   this/that
        'this/that man'
    c. i. * pente (t)usi antrepi/athropi
           five   these men
           'these five men'
       ii. * pente (t)uttu(s) libbru
           five   these   books
           'these five books'

---

28 Which in turn differ from (standard) Italian. The postnominal position of prenominally merged (=structured) adjectives depends on noun movement. The hypothesis we suggested is that there is a difference between Italian and the Romance dialects of Southern Italy concerning the landing site of noun movement.

29 Reference to numerals in the present context is due to the fact that they are the leftmost modifiers in the DP. This holds both when there is no article present and when D is occupied by the definite article. In the former case it may be assumed that numerals act as determiners (Crisma and Longobardi 2020); in the latter they are on a par with (weak) quantifiers. Therefore, numerals provide a solid reference point for determining the position of adjectives (and other modifiers).

30 In standard Greek, only demonstratives and the quantificational adverb *olos* ("all") may appear to the left of numerals, more correctly before the definite article, which is itself the leftmost element of the DP. Notice however that, in standard Greek, both demonstratives and (articulated) adjectives can occur to the left of determiners: *afto to vivlio* (lit. "this the book"), *to oreo to vivlio* (lit. "the nice the book").

31 Salentino: *šti/ddi tri krištjani* (lit. "these/those three men"); * *tri šti/ddi krištjani*; * *i (tri) krištjani šti/ddi*.

Tables 1–3 sum up and compare the patterns of linearization of adjectives and demonstratives in Italiot Greek, standard Greek and Romance of Southern Italy.[32]

Table 1. *Num N X.*

	Italiot Greek	Standard Greek	Romance of Southern Italy
X = Demonstrative	NO	YES	NO
X = Adjective	YES	YES *	YES

* Adjectives have their own article if the DP is definite.

Table 2. *X Num N.*

	Italiot Greek	Standard Greek	Romance of Southern Italy
X = Demonstrative	YES	YES	YES
X = Adjective	NO	YES *	NO

* Only articulated adjectives can be fronted DP-initially.

Table 3. *Num X N.*

	Italiot Greek	Standard Greek	Romance of Southern Italy
X = Demonstrative	NO	YES	NO
X = Adjective	YES *	YES **	YES *

* Only few selected adjectives are possible in this position. ** All adjectives are possible in this position.

To round up the discussion so far, concerning linearization of adjectives and demonstratives, we make the following observations:

11. a. Italiot Greek systematically goes with the Romance dialects of Southern Italy and against standard Greek.
  b. Concerning adjectives, there are overlapping strings between Greek and Romance: [Num N A] and [Num A N] (Tables 1 and 3 respectively).
  c. Concerning demonstratives, DP-initial ones are found in all the three groups.

Turning to 8b (co-occurrence with the definite article), in standard Greek, demonstratives systematically co-occur with the definite article, no matter of their position, as shown in 12. Similarly, adjectives originally merged in postnominal predicative structures (Stavrou 2012, 2013, 2019) systematically take a copy of the definite article in definite DPs, a phenomenon known as "polydefiniteness", shown in 13.

12. a. to   vivlio   afto   *Standard Greek*
        the   book   this
        'this book'
  b. afto to vivlio
  c. * afto vivlio
  d. * vivlio afto

13. a. to   vivlio   to   kokino
        the   book   the   red
        'the red book'
  b. to kokino to vivlio
  c. * kokino to vivlio
  d. * to vivlio kokino

---

[32] Articles are not included in these tables. The co-occurrence of articles with demonstratives and adjectives is discussed right below.

In the currently spoken varieties of Italiot Greek, polydefinite DPs are unattested (see 14 and 15,[33] from Guardiano and Stavrou 2020, p. 126). The written sources provide evidence that the phenomenon was active in the past and disappeared only recently. In particular, Calabria Greek apparently retained it until very recent times: in most texts (e.g., those collected in Caracausi and Rossi-Taibi 1959), postnominal adjectives are regularly articulated in definite DPs and demonstratives often co-occur with articles. By contrast, we found only residual instances of polydefinite DPs in the written sources of Salento Greek we checked. This suggests that Calabria Greek, until very recently, had remained much more impervious to changes than Salento Greek. We will come back to this issue in Section 4.

14. a. ton libbro rodino   *Salento Greek*
      the book red
      'the red book'
  b. i daskali cinuri iendonnusi tus daskalu paleu   *Calabria Greek*
      the teachers young imitate   the teachers old
      'young professors imitate old teachers'

15. a. ecini γineka   tuti θθiγaθera   *Calabria Greek*
      that woman   this daughter
      'that woman'   'this daughter'
  b. ecinde δio γinecese   tundi θθiγaθera
      these.ART two women   this.ART daughter
      'these two women'   'this daughter'
  c. ecini ti γineka   tutese e δio monakese
      that the woman   these the two nuns
      'that woman'   'these two nuns'

There are no instances of polydefinite DPs, or of co-occurrence of demonstratives and articles, in the Romance dialects of Southern Italy: hence, concerning 8b, the currently spoken varieties of Italiot Greek go, again, with Romance rather than with standard Greek, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Co-occurrence of demonstratives/adjectives and definite articles.

Italiot Greek (Current Varieties)	Italiot Greek (Written Sources)	Standard Greek	Romance of Southern Italy
NO	YES	YES	NO

The third domain that we observe is the realization of nominal arguments, primarily genitive DPs (7c). In Greek, since the earliest stages of the language, genitive DPs are morphologically marked, because the noun denoting the possessor, or an argument (agent or theme) of the head noun, bears genitive case.

The loss of morphological case distinctions is described as a major diachronic change in the history of Greek: it has variously affected all the areas where the language has been spoken and almost all its dialects across space and time. We refer to Mertyris (2014) for an extensive discussion of the relevant facts and literature.

Several authors[34] discuss cases of paradigm gaps due to the weakening/loss of inflectional (case) morphology in Italiot Greek. Yet, despite diachronic weakening/recession, "the genitive is largely maintained in the varieties of Southern Italy, according to the most prominent grammatical description of the dialect which was conducted by the German

---

[33] As far as demonstratives are concerned, sometimes speakers use contracted forms obtained from morphophonological fusion with the definite article. Such forms seem to freely alternate with non-contracted (non-articulated) ones.

[34] Including, e.g., Katsoyannou (1995); Nucera (1993); Minuto et al. (1988); and also Rohlfs (1977), a.o.

linguist Gerhard Rohlfs (1977, pp. 182–83), who disputes earlier claims that it had been lost (cf. Morosi 1870). [. . .] The higher distributional potential of the genitive in Italiot helps the preservation of its morphological productivity [. . .]. Most grammatical descriptions (cf. Rohlfs 1977; Karanastasis 1997) provide full paradigms without genitive gaps" (Mertyris 2014, pp. 269–70). In short, in spite of evidence of inflectional reduction, the genitive system of Italiot Greek displays "high functionality" and "relative paradigmatic productivity" (Mertyris 2014, p. 271). Morphologically, genitive case distinctions are visible on the definite article, while they appear weakened on other categories (e.g., noun and adjectives), depending on various constraints (cf. the discussion in Mertyris 2014, pp. 272–75, and literature therein).

As far as the syntactic realization of genitive DPs is concerned (Longobardi 2001), in Italiot Greek, nominal arguments are realized as non-prepositional DPs, morphologically marked with genitive case (where available), as in standard Greek. They further display two properties (see the examples in 17): first, they are postnominal and, second, they cannot be iterated (a head noun bears only one genitive argument). This strategy for realizing adnominal genitives has been typical of Greek since ancient times (Guardiano 2011; Guardiano and Longobardi 2018): some examples from standard Greek are given in 18. Structurally, this strategy shares the major properties of a specific structural configuration called "GenO" by Longobardi and Silvestri (2013; "GenL" in Crisma et al. 2020) listed in 16. Note that, in Greek, nominal genitive arguments always appear postnominally.

16. a.   Inflected (non prepositional);
    b.   Non iterable (i.e., a DP cannot contain multiple nominal genitives modifying one and the same head noun);
    c.   Linearized after prenominal adjectives.

17. a. i   ikoni/fotografia   tu   Ianni   *Italiot Greek*
       the portrait/picture the.GEN Ianni
       'Ianni's portrait/picture'
    b. * i   ikoni/fotografia   tu   Ianni   ti(s)   Maria (/ti Mmaria)
         the portrait/picture the.GEN Ianni   the.GEN Maria
    c. to   orrio   spiti tu   sindiku
       the beautiful house the.GEN major
       'the beautiful house of the major'

18. a. to   vivlio tu   agoriu   *Standard Greek*
       the book the.GEN boy.GEN
       'the boy's book'

    b. * to   vivlio tu   Ianni tu   agoriu
         the book the.GEN Ianni the.GEN boy.GEN
    c. i. to   kokino vivlio tu   agoriu
         the red   book the.GEN boy.GEN
         'the boy's red book'
      ii. to vivlio to kokino tu agoriu
     iii. to vivlio tu agoriu to kokino
      iv. * to (kokino) tu agoriu (kokino) vivlio

In contrast, the Romance dialects of Southern Italy (with limited exceptions, Silvestri 2003; Massaro 2019) use a different type of genitive realization, namely prepositional genitives. Crosslinguistically, prepositional genitives are postnominal and can be freely ordered with respect to other postnominal modifiers. Additionally, DPs containing multiple prepositional genitives modifying one and the same head noun are possible. These properties are typical of a further strategy crosslinguistically adopted to realize nominal

arguments, labeled "Free genitive" by Longobardi and Silvestri (2013). An exemplification of prepositional genitives in the Romance dialects of Southern Italy is given in 19 and 20.

19. a. lu/nnu ritrattu te lu Ggiuanni   *Salentino*
        the/a   picture of the Ggiuanni
        'John's picture/a picture of John'
     b. lu   ritrattu ngrazziatu te lu   Ggiuanni
        the picture nice   of the Ggiuanni
        'John's nice picture'
     c. lu   ritrattu te lu Ggiuanni te la   Maria[35]
        the picture of the Ggiuanni of the Maria
        'John's picture of Mary'

20. a. la   kasa di lu sinniku   *Southern Calabria*
        the house of the major
        'the major's house'
     b. i. la   bbella kasa di lu sinniku
           the nice   house of the major
           'the nice house of the major'
        ii. la kasa bbella di lu sìnniku
        iii. la kasa di lu sinniku bella

A phenomenon that has drawn the linguists' attention concerning Italiot Greek genitives[36] is the (adnominal) possessive use of a prepositional construction headed by "the ablative preposition *atse/aʃe* 'from' (<AG ἐξ, "out of")" (Mertyris 2014, p. 275).[37] This construction is sometimes used to realize adnominal genitives; yet, when used in this function, it is subject to constraints. As shown by the contrast between 21a and b, it is usually accepted when the head noun is indefinite, while being disliked by most speakers in DPs headed by a definite article. Also, it is dispreferred when the genitive is a definite DP (21c) or a proper name (21d).[38] Finally, in terms of usage, the prepositional construction with *atse* is quite marginal according to the speakers (especially in Salento) and is not frequent in the written sources.

21. a. mia (megali) ikoni/fotografia (megali) (a)tse   ena athropo/gineka (megali)
        a   big   portrait/picture big   ATSE a   man/woman   big
        'a big picture of a man/woman'
     b. ? i   (megali) ikoni/fotografia (megali) (a)tse ena athropo/gineka (megali)
          the big   portrait/picture big   ATSE a   man/woman   big
          'the big portrait/picture of a man/woman'
     c. * mia ikoni/fotografia atse to(n) athropo
     d. * mia ikoni/fotografia atse to Ianni

With the exception of Karanastasis (1997, p. 53),[39] the literature uniformly agrees that these structures are a consequence of contact with Romance. There is also agreement that they are recent: "their starting point should be placed at a time when pressure from

---

[35] Although speakers tend to avoid two genitives, the possibility of more than one genitive argument of the noun is not excluded.
[36] E.g., Karanastasis (1997); Rohlfs (1977); Katsoyannou (1995); Profili (1985), a.o.
[37] The prepositional construction with atse is also found in sequences resembling partitive constructions with di in Romance (Alexiadou and Stavrou 2019) and ablative constructions with *da*, as shown for instance in Profili (1985) and reported in Mertyris (2014, p. 276).
[38] The judgments of the speakers are variable; at the present stage we cannot provide any more detailed data.
[39] From Mertyris (2014, p. 276): "Karanastasis (1997, p. 53) does not accept the effect of Italian influence, as opposed to Rohlfs (1977, p. 69), and claims that the possessive use of this preposition was an internal development in the dialect". It is also worthwhile pointing out that the replacement of inflected genitive complements with prepositional constructions is a phenomenon attested in several varieties of Greek, including standard Greek, and has been described as a language-internal one, i.e., not (necessarily) induced by contact with non-Greek languages.

Romance heavily increased. As the Greek-speaking areas decreased in number of speakers and size during the last three centuries, it would be logical to claim that these analytic phenomena are related to such sociolinguistic factors and that these phenomena are not older than that" (Mertyris 2014, p. 278; cf. also Alexiadou 2017; De Angelis 2021).

What is relevant for the purposes of the present discussion is that, in Italiot Greek, prepositional constructions are very marginal as a strategy of adnominal genitive realization: according to the speakers, and also as attested in the written sources, the actually productive strategy is GenO, like in standard Greek (cf. also the discussion in Mertyris 2014, pp. 275–77).

Table 5 sums up the main points made so far: concerning the realization of adnominal genitives, there is convergence between Italiot Greek and standard Greek, both being different from Romance.

Table 5. Adnominal genitives.

	Italiot Greek	Standard Greek	Romance of Southern Italy
Inflected, GenO	YES	YES	NO *
Prepositional, Free	NO *	NO	YES

* with exceptions.

As far as pronominal arguments of the noun (henceforth "possessives", 7d) are concerned, Italiot Greek features the same strategies as standard Greek[40]. Possessives are realized as phonologically enclitic items. Such items do not exhibit feature agreement with the head noun (unlike Romance) and co-occur with articles (see example 22 from Salento Greek). Etymologically, they emerged from the genitive of the weak form of personal pronouns[41].

22. o   orrio libbro-(m)mu / -(s)su   / -(t)tu   / -(m)ma(s) / -(s)sa(s) / -(t)tu(s)
    the nice book-1SG.GEN 2SG.GEN 3SG.GEN 1PL.GEN 2PL.GEN 3PL.GEN
    'my/your/his/our/your/their beautiful book'

Another type of possessive in Italiot Greek is *dikommu/dikossu/dikottu*, which corresponds to standard Greek [*dikos*+enclitic genitive pronoun]. In standard Greek, this cluster agrees with the head noun as regards its linearly first item and has the same distribution as adjectives; it is semantically equivalent to the simplex possessive mentioned hitherto but it is more emphatic—even contrastive—than that (*to diko mu vivlio* = "the book that is mine and not anybody's else"). In Italiot Greek, it is mostly found postnominally (see example 23 from Salento Greek), although some speakers marginally accept it in prenominal position. In the written sources of Calabria Greek, where postnominal adjectives are articulated in definite DPs, it is usually articulated, too. According to traditional descriptions of Italiot Greek, the item *diko(s)* displays agreement with the head noun (see for instance the paradigm given in Condemi 1995, pp. 156–58), like in standard Greek. Finally, again like in standard Greek, *diko-* is only used in combination with the enclitic possessive.

23. o   (orrio) libbro dikommu   *Salento Greek*
    the nice   book proper.1SG.GEN
    'my beautiful book'

---

40   Alexiadou and Stavrou (2000, 2019), Giusti and Stavrou (2008), Horrocks and Stavrou (1989), Kiparsky (1985), Kolliakou (1997), a.o.
41   The full paradigm of (tonic and clitic) personal pronouns of Italiot Greek is given in Appendix A.

Finally, it is worthwhile observing that there seems to be no trace, in Italiot Greek, of "adjectival" possessives, which by contrast are available in Ancient Greek.[42] These items agree with the head noun in gender, number and case and have the same distribution as adjectives. They have not been preserved in standard Greek either. In contrast, possessive items with analogous properties are found in Asia Minor Greek (e.g., in Romeyka Pontic, [Guardiano et al. 2016](#), pp. 134–35). Detailed investigation of their diachronic distribution would probably shed light on their structure and nature, but we have to leave this to future work.

Possessives display high internal variability across the Romance dialects of Southern Italy. One finds tonic possessives that agree with the head noun in (gender and) number and have the same distribution as adjectives[43]. As remarked above, in the dialects of Southern Italy, adjectives are mostly postnominal: thus, expectedly, the unmarked position for such "adjectival" possessives is the postnominal one[44].

24. a. i. na makina soa / toa   *Southern Calabrese*
                a.F.SG car F.SG 3F.SG 2F.SG
                'a car of his/yours'
         ii. tri makini soi / toi
                three car.F.PL 3PL 2PL
                'three cars of his/yours'
     b. i. na makina nova
                a.F.SG car.F.SG new.F.SG
                'a new car'
         ii. tri makini novi
                three car.F.PL new.F.PL
                'three new cars'

Besides adjectival possessives, Salentino features clitic possessives not agreeing with the head noun, albeit they have a very limited distribution and are subject to the following constraints: the noun must be a kinship/relational noun[45] and must be in the singular, the possessive can only cliticize on a noun (not on an adjective or any other modifier) and never co-occurs with an article.

---

[42] From [Guardiano](#) ([2003](#); cf. also [Guardiano and Stavrou 2019b](#)):
1. a. ἡ ἐμὴ διαβολὴ   Plato, Apology 19 b 1
            the.F.SG.NOM my.F.SG.NOM prejudice.F.SG.NOM
            'the prejudice against me'
    b. ἡ διαβολὴ ἡ ἐμὴ   Plato, Apology 24 a 8
            the.F.SG.NOM prejudice.F.SG.NOM the.F.SG.NOM my.F.SG.NOM
            'the prejudice against me'
2. καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο ἢ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς ἐμῆς δέοιο
        and if something other than the.F.SG.GEN belonging.F.SG.GEN the.F.SG.GEN my.F.SG.GEN need.1SG
        ἢ τῶν φίλων τῶν ἐμῶν   Plato, Symposium 218 c 10–d 1
        or the.PL.GEN friend.PL.GEN the.PL.GEN my.PL.GEN
        'and if you would need anything else than my belongings or my friends'
3. τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους   Mark 8, 38
        the.M.PL.ACC my.M.PL.ACC word.M.PL.ACC
        'my words'

[43] In Salentino, possessives are invariable for gender but non for number: *mia* = my (masc., fem. sg.); *toa* = your (masc., fem. sg.); *soa* = his, her, its; *mei* = my (pl.); *toi* = your (pl.); *soi* = his, her, its (pl.).

[44] Unlike Italian, where possessives are prenominal as a rule (like most adjectives): when occurring postnominally, possessives receive marked interpretation.

[45] Enclitic possessives are grammatical only with nouns denoting a person in a strict relationship with the "possessor": kinship nouns and similar expressions, like *cumpari* (godfather/sponsor), *meššu* (master), etc.

25. a. i. sir-ma   meššu-ma   cumpari-ma   *Salentino*
         father.1SG   master-1SG   godfather-1SG
         'my father'   'my master'   'my godfather'
      ii. lu   sire mia   lu meššu mia   lu cumpari mia
         the father my.SG the master my.SG the godfather my.SG
   b. i. * lu sirma   * lu meššu-ma   * lu cumpari-ma
      ii. * sire mia   * meššu mia   * cumpari mia
   c. i. lu sire mia fessa lu meššu mia fessa lu cumpari mia fessa
      ii. * sir-ma fessa   * meššu-ma fessa   * cumpari-ma fessa
      iii. * cumpari fessa-ma * meššu fessa-ma * cumpari fessa-ma

In Southern Calabria (and in Sicily), a further type is found, with the following properties: it occurs prenominally, it is uninflected, and it systematically attaches to articles; because of their distribution, these possessives have been dubbed "Wackernagel" in Guardiano et al. (2018, pp. 118–24).

26. a. na   so   /   to   makina   *Southern Calabrese*
        a.F.SG POSS.3SG   POSS.2SG car.F.SG
        'a car of his/yours'
   b. na   so   /   to   bella   makina
        a.F.SG POSS.3SG   POSS.2SG nice.F.SG car.F.SG
        'today I saw a nice car of his/yours'
   c. * na   bella   so   /   to   makina[46]
          a.F.SG nice.F.SG POSS.3SG   POSS.2SG car.F.SG
          'today I saw a nice car of his/yours'

Table 6 sums up the distribution of possessives in Italiot Greek, Ancient Greek, standard Greek and Romance of Southern Italy: Italiot Greek does not have any of the possessives found in the neighboring Romance dialects.

Table 6. Possessives.

	Italiot Greek	Ancient Greek	Standard Greek	Romance of S. Italy
Adjectival	NO	YES	NO	YES
Enclitic, co-occurring with articles	YES	YES	YES	NO
Enclitic, incompatible with articles	NO	NO	NO	YES *
Wackernagel	NO	NO	NO	YES **

* Available in Salento but not in Southern Calabria. ** Available in Calabria but not in Salento.

4. Discussion

The data presented in Section 3 support the hypothesis that the current structure of Italiot Greek DPs has been shaped by different concurrent factors, crucially including both social factors (as for instance the pressure of Romance as the dominant language and the prolonged coexistence of the two groups) and structural similarity with Romance. The differences in terms of sociolinguistic settings between Salento and Calabria (see Section 2) are probably responsible for the different pace at which the two communities have stabilized their innovations. This is in line with Thomason and Kaufman (1988) predictions about the impact of social factors on structural horizontal change. However, there are differences in the impact that the pressure of Romance had on specific structural domains: our data suggest that some domains have almost completely embraced the Romance patterns, while others have remained more immune to massive change/full substitution. These domain-specific differences cannot be explained with appeal to the

---

46 Some speakers accept this sequence with a strong focus intonation on *bella*.

intervention of sociolinguistic forces (which are assumed to have acted uniformly on all domains): therefore, we make the hypothesis that they depend on the internal structure of each domain.

We start from adjectives. In this domain, two major changes have taken place in Italiot Greek: the introduction of overt movement of the noun across prenominally merged adjectives (which are consequently linearized postnominally) and the loss of polydefiniteness. Guardiano and Stavrou (2019a) made the hypothesis that these two phenomena are connected to one another, because they are triggered by the same interrelated factors, as we discuss immediately below. First of all, postnominal articleless adjectives are not ungrammatical in Greek: they are actually the rule in indefinite DPs. Hence, both Greek and Romance produce [N A] strings that are linearly identical but structurally different. In Greek, adjectives linearized postnominally originate in a position that is different from that where prenominal ones are merged. In contrast, in Romance, adjectives linearized postnominally are generated from two different sources: the prenominal one (that appears postnominally as a consequence of noun movement) and a predicative-like position similar to that where postnominal adjectives are merged in Greek. According to Guardiano and Stavrou (2019a), a potential trigger for the increase in the amount of postnominal adjectives in Italiot Greek and the disappearance of prenominal ones is that, in the Romance dialects of Southern Italy, prenominal adjectives are very rare: hence, adjectives borrowed from Romance are systematically realized in postnominal position (as for instance in *antrepo/athropo gioveno* in 9a: the adjective *gioveno* occurs in prenominal position in Italian but not in the Romance dialects of Southern Italy; in Italiot Greek it is systematically realized postnominally)[47]. A further trigger for the realization of postnominal adjectives as articleless in Italiot Greek is the weakening of the conditions that generate polydefinite DPs, namely the weakening of case exponence on nouns and adjectives. According to Stavrou (2012, 2013, 2019), the article that appears before postnominal adjectives in polydefinite DPs in Greek is the spell-out of a functional head (Pred) that realizes case agreement between the noun and the adjectives originally merged postnominally. According to Guardiano and Stavrou (2019a), the weakening of case morphology on nouns and adjectives makes case agreement dispensable; as a consequence, the overt realization of Pred is no longer required, and polydefiniteness disappears. In turn, the effect of the loss of the structural configuration that generates polydefinite DPs induced structural reanalysis of the linear strings originally emerged from it.

Guardiano and Stavrou (2020) suggest that the loss of polydefiniteness is also responsible for the changes that took place in the domain of demonstratives. In what follows, we sum up their arguments. In Greek, demonstratives are generated in the same structure as postnominal adjectives; unlike adjectives, they are able to spell out Pred: thus, no additional copy of the definite article is required. Hence, [Art N Dem] sequences correspond to polydefinite DPs like [Art N Art A]. In Greek, the [Art A] cluster can be fronted DP-initially (usually generating informationally marked DPs), thus giving rise to [Art A Art N] sequences; similarly, Dem can be fronted from the postnominal position, generating [Dem Art N] sequences, which are often associated to deictic interpretation (Manolessou and Panagiotidis 1999). Additionally, in some non-standard Greek dialects, it is often the case that, under certain phonological conditions (Guardiano and Michelioudakis 2019), the (fronted) demonstrative and the definite article are fused into a single item. In Italiot Greek, this process was generalized, to the point that the demonstrative and the article, when fused, were no more perceived as two separate elements, and [Dem-art N] sequences were reanalysed as [Dem N]. Thus, as in the case of postnominal adjectives, [Dem N] strings became available in both Greek and Romance (although originally stemming from two different sources). In Italiot Greek, when the original source of demonstratives disappeared as a consequence of the loss of polydefiniteness, the reanalysis of DP-initial demonstratives

---

47 For recent investigation of the mechanisms of lexical borrowing and morphological integration in the Greek of Southern Italy, see at least Melissaropoulou (2013, 2017); Ralli (2019) and Manolessou and Ralli (2020).

as demonstratives of the Romance type (see Guardiano and Stavrou 2020 for a detailed analysis) started precisely from these strings.

As a consequence of these processes, the distribution of adjectives and demonstratives in Italiot Greek ended up identical to that of the neighboring Romance dialects (where adjectives are mostly postnominal and articleless, and demonstratives are DP-initial and never co-occur with definite articles).

Diachronically, the loss of polydefiniteness in Italiot Greek seems to have taken place after the establishment of the postnominal position for adjectives and of the DP-initial position for demonstratives: as shown in Guardiano and Stavrou (2019a), in the written sources of Calabria Greek, adjectives are overwhelmingly postnominal and are systematically articulated in definite DPs; similarly, demonstratives are mostly DP-initial and co-occur with definite articles. The persistence of the polydefinite pattern in Calabria Greek, and more generally the higher degree of conservativism of this variety until recent times, can be explained in terms of the geographic and social isolation of many Greek speaking communities of Calabria.

As far as adnominal genitives are concerned, in Italiot Greek, their syntax, as shown above, has not been affected by major changes and remains very similar to that of Greek. In this domain, in spite of the massive exposure to Romance, where prepositional Free genitives are the productive type, Italiot Greek has kept the Greek inflected postnominal genitive (GenO), thus differring from Romance. Interestingly, as noted in Section 3, Italiot Greek has developed a prepositional structure that is sometimes used to realize nominal possessors. This structure has not evolved into a prepositional Free genitive of the Romance type, in spite of some similarities/overlapping strings.[48] Actually, there are structural differences between the two systems, which might have blocked the reanalysis of prepositional phrases headed by *atse* as prepositional Free genitives and may have acted as barriers against change, thus favoring the persistence of the GenO type. The first is that, in Greek, genitive DPs are inflected: overt genitive morphology is visible, if not always on the noun, at least on definite articles. This feature has remained unchanged since ancient times. In contrast, there is no trace of genitive morphology in Romance. We make the hypothesis that it is precisely the preservation of genitive morphology that acted as a barrier against the spread of prepositional (uninflected) Free genitives, which is also in agreement with those proposals that emphasize the role of morphology in shaping structural contact (cf. for instance the hypothesis recently made by Poletto and Tomaselli 2020 about "resilient" morphosyntax). A further difference between Greek and Romance is that, while more than one genitive modifying the same noun (in one and the same DP) is possible (although quite rare) in Romance, such "multiple" genitives are ungrammatical in Greek. Yet, since multiple genitives are not expected to be frequently found in the E-languages accessible to the speakers, it is unlikely that they are used as triggers (or barriers) for structural reanalysis. Another difference between GenO and prepositional genitives is positional freedom: prepositional genitives can be realized in various different positions with respect, e.g., to (postnominally generated) adjectives, relative clauses and other prepositional modifiers of the noun; by contrast, GenO is linked to a fixed position (after structured adjectives). This aspect is actually less transparent in Italiot Greek, because of noun raising: as already mentioned, in Italiot Greek, the noun raises over GenO and over most prenominal adjectives; as a consequence, adjectives are realized both before (if they are generated prenominally and crossed over by the noun) and after (if they are generated postnominally) GenO.

The realization of possessives as inflected clitics is well-attested in Greek, and remains unchanged in the history of the language. This strategy has been preserved in Italiot Greek as well: Italiot Greek seems not to have been affected, in this domain, by heavy interference effects due to the pressure from Romance, in spite of potential similarities. Greek and

---

[48] Prepositional phrases headed by *atse* are used in structural configurations similar to those where prepositional phrases headed by the genitival preposition *di* are used in Romance.

Romance possessives are superficially similar in at least two respects. First of all, in both Greek and Romance, there are [N Poss] sequences. Second, clitic possessives not agreeing with the head noun are available both in Italiot Greek and in some Romance dialects of Southern Italy. Yet, concerning the latter, the two groups exhibit important differences. First, in Greek, enclitic possessives have genitive morphology, while in Romance they do not. Second, in the Romance dialects where clitic possessives are available, they are incompatible with articles (that is probably the consequence of raising to D of the sequence [kinship noun+enclitic possessive], Giorgi and Longobardi 1991): thus, [Art N-poss] sequences are ungrammatical. By contrast, in Italiot Greek, the article is required. Third, in the Romance dialects where clitic possessives are available, these are accepted only in very limited structural configurations, while in Italiot Greek they can appear in all types of DPs. Finally, "weak" possessives of the Wackernagel type, in Romance, systematically attach to D; by contrast, enclitic possessives in Greek only cliticize on nouns or adjectives. These patterns are summarized in Table 7[49].

Table 7. Possessives: overlapping and non-overlapping strings.

	Italiot Greek	Standard Greek	Romance of Southern Italy
Art poss N	NO	NO	YES
Art N-poss	YES	YES	NO
Art Adj-poss N	YES	YES	NO
N-poss	NO	NO	YES

5. Conclusions

Two major types of structural factors must be considered when analyzing potential instances of syntactic contact. One is the availability, in the empirical evidence accessible to the speakers of the target language, of sequences/items that are superficially identical in the source and in the target language ("overlapping sequences"). This aspect was explored in Guardiano et al. (2016, 2020). The other factor is the internal processes affecting the structure of specific domains in the target language. These processes can either combine with overlapping sequences, thus acting as triggers for structural reanalysis, or block the effect of overlapping sequences, thus acting as barriers against structural change[50]. The scenarios emerged from our data with respect to the interaction of these two types of factors are summarized in Table 8.

If these conjectures are on the right track, further investigation is required in order to measure the amount of overlapping strings necessary for reanalysis, to define the nature of the internal processes interacting with them, and to formalize the dynamics of their interaction. A further important question that should be addressed in future work is whether our findings have broader implications for other already known (or unknown) contact situations.

---

[49] In this domain, one interesting aspect that is worth of deeper investigation is the syntactic nature of *dikommu*, which in Italiot Greek appears less transparent than in standard Greek and whose distribution is partially similar to that of postnominal adjectival (and pronominal) possessives in Romance. In the absence of more detailed data, we leave this issue for future investigation.

[50] Interestingly, a very similar conclusion, in the same "language-contact situation involving South Italian Greek as recipient and Italo-Romance as donor", but on a different domain (i.e. borrowing and integrating of nouns), has been reached by Manolessou and Ralli (2020, pp. 274–75): "the accommodation of loans in a language is not only the product of extra-linguistic factors (e.g., among others, degree of bilingualism [. . .]), but follows specific language-internal constraints which are at work throughout the process."

Table 8. Summary.

	Overlapping Sequences	Internal Processes
Poydefinite structures (adjectives and demonstratives)→ CHANGES	Postnominal articleless adjectives	Weakening of case morphology on N and A → no need of overt agreement between N and A → no need of Pred to be spelled out
Genitives → NO CHANGES	Postnominal genitives DIFFERENCES: 1. Postnominal genitives are prepositional in Romance, (mostly) prepopositionless in Greek 2. Iterable genitives available in Romance but not in Greek	Inflectional genitive case morphology has been preserved (in spite of the weakening of inflectional case system)
Possessives → NO CHANGES	1. Postnominal possessives 2. Clitic possessives DIFFERENCES: 1. Clitic possessives do not co-occur with articles in Romance 2. Agreeing possessives available in Romance (as well in Ancient and Asia Minor Greek) but not in Italiot and standard Greek	Genitive marking on enclitic possessives has been preserved

Appendix A

Table A1. Personal pronouns in Italiot Greek[51].

		Salento	**Calabria**
1st person, singular	Nom	evò, ivò, vo	egò, egòe
	Gen	*mu*	*mu*
	Acc	me, emena, imena, imea	me, emmè, emmena
1st person, plural	Nom	emì, mi	emì, emìse
	Gen	*ma(s)*	emmàs(e), mma, *ma(s)*
	Acc	*ma(s)*	emmàs(e), *ma*
2nd person, singular	Nom	esù, su, isù	esù, su
	Gen	*su*	*su*
	Acc	*se*, esea, sea, isena	*se*, essena, essè
2nd person, plural	Nom	esì, isì	esi(s), esise
	Gen	esà(s), *sa(s)*	essà(s), ssa, *sa(s)*
	Acc	esà(s), *sa*	essà(s), *sa*
3rd person, singular	Nom	cino, cini, cino	ecino, ecini, ecino
	Gen	cinù, cinì, cinù, *tu, tis*	ecinu, ecini, ecinu, *tu, tis*
	Acc	cino, cini, cino, *ton, tin, to*	ecino, ecini, ecino, *ton, tin, to*
3rd person, plural	Nom	cini, cine, cina	ecini, ecine, ecina
	Gen	cinò, *tus*	ecinò, *tus*
	Acc	cinu, cine, cina, *tus/tis, tes, ta*	ecinu, ecine, ecina, *tus/tis, tes, ta*

References

Adger, David, and Graeme Trousdale. 2007. Variation in English syntax: Theoretical implications. *English Language and Linguistics* 11: 261–78. [CrossRef]

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2002. *Language Contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra, and Robert M. W. Dixon. 2007. *Grammars in Contact. A Crosslinguistic Typology*. Oxford: OUP.

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2014. *Multiple Determiners and the Structure of DPs*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2017. Language variation and change: A case study of the loss of genitive Case in (Heritage) Greek. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 31: 56–75. [CrossRef]

Alexiadou, Artemis, and Melita Stavrou. 2000. Aadjective-clitic combinations in the greek DP. In *Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*. Edited by Birgit Gerlach and Janet Grijenhout. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, pp. 63–84.

Alexiadou, Artemis, and Melita Stavrou. 2019. Possessors, Foci and Topics in the Greek DP. In *Mapping Linguistic Data, Essays in Honour of Liliane Haegeman*. Edited by Metin Bağrıaçık, Anne Breitbarth and Karen De Clercq. Available online: https://www.haegeman.ugent.be/page-1/ (accessed on 20 January 2021).

Alexiadou, Artemis, Liliane Haegeman, and Melita Stavrou. 2007. *The Noun Phrase in the Generative Perspective*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Ansaldo, Umberto. 2009. *Contact Languages: Ecology and Evolution in Asia*. Cambridge: CUP.

Auer, Peter, Frans Hinskens, and Paul Kerswill, eds. 2005. *Dialect Change: Convergence and Divergence in European Languages*. Cambridge: CUP.

Baptista, Marylise, and Jaqueline Gueron. 2007. *Noun Phrase in Creole Languages. A Multi-Faced Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Barbiers, Sjef, and Leonie Cornips. 2000. Introduction to Syntactic Microvariation. In *Syntactic Microvariation*. Edited by Sjef Barbiers, Leonie Cornips and Susanne van der Kleij. Amsterdam: Meertens Institute. Available online: https://www.meertens.knaw.nl/books/synmic/ (accessed on 20 January 2021).

Berruto, Gaetano. 2005. Dialect/standard convergence, mixing, and models of language contact: The case of Italy. In *Dialect Change: Convergence and Divergence in European Languages*. Edited by Peter Auer, Frans Hinskens and Paul Kerswill. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 81–95.

Black, James R., and Virginia Motapayane. 1996. *Microparametric Syntax and Dialect Variation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bowern, Claire. 2009. Syntactic change and syntactic borrowing in generative grammar. In *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*. Edited by Gisella Ferarresi and Maria Goldbach. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 187–216.

Caracausi, Girolamo, and Giuseppe Rossi-Taibi. 1959. *Testi Neogreci di Calabria*. Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici.

Ceolin, Andrea, Cristina Guardiano, Monica Alexandrina Irimia, and Giuseppe Longobardi. 2020. Formal syntax and deep history. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11: 488871. [CrossRef]

Chatzikyriakidis, Stergios. 2010. Clitics in four Dialects of Modern Greek: A Dynamic Account. Ph.D. dissertation, King's College, London, UK.

---

[51] From Karanastasis (1997); see also Chatzikyriakidis (2010, p. 90). Clitic forms are italicized.

Chilà, Annamaria. 2021. Per una ridefinizione tipologica del bilinguismo greco-romanzo. Paper presented at the Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy (webinar), January 29.

Chilà, Annamaria, and Alessandro De Angelis. 2021. Un paradosso sociolinguistico: Il caso Bovesìa. Paper presented at Actes du XXIXe CILPR 29, Copenhague, Denmark. Section 7, forthcoming.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin and Use*. Westport: Praeger.

Condemi, Filippo. 1995. *La grammatica grecanica*. Reggio Calabria: Editrice Ellenofoni di Calabria.

Cornips, Leonie. 1998. Syntactic variation, parameters, and social distribution. *Language Variation and Change* 10: 1–21. [CrossRef]

Cornips, Leonie, and Karen Corrigan, eds. 2005. *Syntax and Variation: Reconciling the Biological and the Social*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 265. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Corrigan, Karen. 2010. Language contact and grammatical theory. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Edited by Raymond Hickey. Chichester: Wiley, pp. 106–27.

Crisma, Paola, and Giuseppe Longobardi. 2020. The parametric space associated with D. In *The Oxford Handbook of Determiners*. Edited by Martina Wiltschko and Solveiga Armoskaite. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crisma, Paola, Cristina Guardiano, and Giuseppe Longobardi. 2020. Toward a unified theory of Case form and Case meaning. In *The Place of Case in Grammar*. Edited by Helena Anagnostopoulou, Dionysos Mertyris and Christina Sevdali. Oxford: OUP.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2021. *There* sentences in extreme southern Italy: On the rise of a "Greek-style" pattern. Paper presented at the Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy (webinar), January 22.

Fanciullo, Franco. 2001. On the origins of Modern Greek in Southern Italy. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Edited by Angela Ralli, Brian Joseph and Mark Janse. Patras: University of Patras, pp. 67–77.

Giusti, Giuliana, and Melita Stavrou. 2008. Possessive clitics in the DP: Doubling or Dislocation? In *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Edited by Dalina Kalluli and Liliane Tasmowski. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, pp. 389–433.

Grohmann, Kleanthes, and Phoevos Panagiotidis. 2004. Demonstrative doubling. Nicosia: University of Cyprus and Cyprus College. unpublished.

Guardiano, Cristina. 2003. Struttura e storia del sintagma nominale nel Greco Antico. Ipotesi parametriche. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy.

Guardiano, Cristina. 2011. Genitives in the Greek nominal domain: Parametric considerations. In *Studies in Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Edited by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, Pavlos Pavlou, Angela Ralli and Spyros Armosti. Nicosia: Research Center of Kykkos Monastery, pp. 123–34.

Guardiano, Cristina. 2012. Parametric changes in the history of the Greek article. In *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*. Edited by Dianne Jonas, John Witman and Andrew Garrett. Oxford: OUP, pp. 179–97.

Guardiano, Cristina. 2014a. Fenomeni di contatto sintattico in Italia meridionale? Alcune note comparative. *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 18: 73–102.

Guardiano, Cristina. 2014b. *Demonstratives within DPs: A Crosslinguistic Description*. Los Angeles: UCLA, unpublished.

Guardiano, Cristina, and Giuseppe Longobardi. 2018. The diachrony of adnominal genitives in Ancient Greek. Paper presented at the Workshop on the Place of Case in Grammar—PlaCiG, Rethymnon, Greece, October 18–20.

Guardiano, Cristina, and Dimistris Michelioudakis. 2019. Syntactic variation across Greek dialects: The case of demonstratives. In *Italian Dialectology at the Interface*. Edited by Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway and Eva Maria Remberger. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 319–55.

Guardiano, Cristina, and Melita Stavrou. 2014. Greek and Romance in Southern Italy: History and contact in nominal structures. *L'Italia dialettale* 75: 121–47.

Guardiano, Cristina, and Melita Stavrou. 2019a. Adjective-noun combination in Romance and Greek of Southern Italy. Polydefiniteness revisited. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 19: 3–57. [CrossRef]

Guardiano, Cristina, and Melita Stavrou. 2019b. Comparing patterns of adjectival modification in Greek: A diachronic approach. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali/Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies* 5: 135–17.

Guardiano, Cristina, and Melita Stavrou. 2020. Dialect syntax between persistence and change. The case of Greek demonstratives. *L'Italia dialettale* 81: 121–58.

Guardiano, Cristina, 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. *L'Italia dialettale* 77: 96–166.

Guardiano, Cristina, Dimitris Michelioudakis, Guido Cordoni, Monica-Alexandrina Irimia, Nina Radkevich, and Ioanna Sitaridou. 2018. Parametric comparison and dialect variation: Insights from Southern Italy. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 14. Selected Papers from the 46th Linguistics Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*. Edited by Lori Repetti and Francisco Ordóñez. Stony Brook and Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 103–33.

Guardiano, Cristina, Giuseppe Longobardi, Paola Crisma, and Melita Stavrou. 2020. Contact and resistance. In *Tra Etimologia Romanza e Dialettologia*. Edited by Patrizia Del Puente, Francesca Guazzelli, Lucia Molinu and Simone Pisano. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 177–88.

Harris, Alice C., and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernard, and Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hickey, Raymond. 2010. Contact and Language Shift. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Edited by Raymond Hickey. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 86–105.

Horrocks, Geoffrey, and Melita Stavrou. 1987. Bounding theory and Greek syntax: Evidence for wh-movement in NP. *Journal of Linguistics* 23: 79–108. [CrossRef]

Horrocks, Geoffrey, and Melita Stavrou. 1989. *'Clitics' in Modern Greek: Against a Head-Movement Analysis of Morphology-Syntax Interaction*. Unpublished Manuscript. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, Heraklion: University of Crete.

Jakobson, Roman. 1962. Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques entre des langues. In *His Selected Writings*. The Hague: Mouton, vol. 1, pp. 234–46.

Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1997. *Γραμματική των Ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας*. Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών.

Katsoyannou, Marianna. 1995. Le parler Grico del Gallicianò (Italie): Description d' une langue en voie de disparition. Doctoral dissertation, Paris VII, Paris, France.

Katsoyannou, Marianna. 1999. Ελληνικά της Κάτω Ιταλίας: η κοινωνιογλωσσολογική άποψη. In *Ελληνική Γλωσσολογία '97: Πρακτικά του Γ΄Διεθνούς Γλωσσολογικού Συνεδρίου για την ελληνική γλώσσα*. Edited by Amalia Moser. Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα, pp. 605–13.

Kayne, Richard. 1996. *Microparametric Syntax: Some Introductory remarks. Microparametric Syntax and Dialect Variation*. Edited by James R. Black and Virginia Motapanyane. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. ix–xviii.

Kayne, Richard. 2005. Some notes on comparative syntax, with special reference to English and French. In *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Richard Kayne. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–69.

Keenan, Edward. 1994. *Creating Anaphors: An Historical Study of the English Reflexive Pronouns*. Los Angeles: Ms. University of California at Los Angeles.

Keenan, Edward. 2009. Linguistic theory and the historical creation of English reflexives. In *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*. Edited by Paola Crisma and Giuseppe Longobardi. Oxford: OUP, pp. 17–40.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1985. Some Consequences of Lexical Phonology. *Phonology Yearbook* 2: 85–138. [CrossRef]

Kolliakou, Dimitra. 1997. Possessive affixes and complement composition. In *Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands 1996. Papers Presented at the 7th CLIN Meeting Eindhoven, The Netherlands, November 15*. Edited by Jan Landesbergen, Jan Odijk, Keen van Deemter and Gert Veldhuijen van Zanten. Eindhoven: IPO, pp. 69–84.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2013. Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Edited by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, Angela Ralli and Bagriacik Metin. Patras: Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras, pp. 184–228.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. The dialects of southern Italy. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Edited by Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden. Oxford: OUP.

Ledgeway, Adam, Norma Schifano, and Giuseppina Silvestri. 2018. Il contatto tra il greco e le varietà romanze nella Calabria meridionale. *Lingue Antiche e Moderne* 7: 95–133. [CrossRef]

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2001. The Structure of DPs: Principles, parameters and problems. In *Handbook of Syntactic Theory*. Edited by Michael Baltin and Chris Collins. Cambridge and Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 562–603.

Longobardi, Giuseppe, and Giuseppina Silvestri. 2013. The structure of noun phrases. In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Syntax*. Edited by Silvia Luraghi and Cristina Parodi. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 88–117.

Manolessou, Io, and Phoevos Panagiotidis. 1999. Τα δεικτικά της Ελληνικής και οι σχετικές επιπλοκές [Greek demonstratives and the relevant complications]. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*. Edited by Savas L. Tsochatzidis, Myrto Koutita and Agathoklis Haralambopoulos. Thessaloniki: Faculty of Philosophy, Thessaloniki, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, pp. 199–212.

Manolessou, Io, and Angela Ralli. 2020. On borrowing and integrating Italo-Romance nouns in South Italian Greek. In *Tra etimologia romanza e dialettologia*. Edited by Patrizia Del Puente, Francesca Guazzelli, Lucia Molinu and Simone Pisano. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 262–78.

Manzini, Maria Rita, and Leonardo Maria Savoia. 2005. *I Dialetti Italiani e Romanci, Morfosintassi Generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, Maria Rita, and Leonardo Maria Savoia. 2019. *The Morphosyntax of Albanian and Aromanian Varieties*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Massaro, Angelapia. 2019. Some Initial Remarks on Non-Prepositional Genitives in the Apulian Variety of San Marco in Lamis. *Quaderni Di Linguistica E Studi Orientali* 5: 231–54. [CrossRef]

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: CUP.

Matras, Yaron, and Peter Bakker. 2003. *The Mixed Language Debate*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McMahn, April. 2010. Computational Models and Language Contact. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Edited by Raymond Hickey. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 128–48.

Meillet, Antoine. 1914. Le problème de la parenté des langues. *Scientia* 15: 403–25.

Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2013. Lexical borrowing bearing witness to the notions of gender and inflection class: A case study on two contact induced systems of Greek. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 3: 367–77. [CrossRef]

Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2017. On the role of language contact in the reorganization of grammar: A case study on two Modern Greek contact-induced varieties. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 53: 449–85. [CrossRef]

Mertyris, Dionysios. 2014. The Loss of Genitive in Greek: A Diachronic and Dialectological Analysis. Doctoral dissertation, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.

Minuto, Domenico, Salvino Nucera, and Pietro Zavettieri, eds. 1988. *Dialoghi Greci di Calabria*. Reggio Calabria: Laruffa.

Morosi, Giuseppe. 1870. *Studi sui Dialetti Greci Della Terra d'Otranto*. Lecce: Ed. Salentina.

Noonan, Michael. 2010. Genetic classification and language contact. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Edited by Raymond Hickey. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 48–65.

Nucera, S. 1993. *Chalònero. Testo Grecanico con Traduzione a Fronte*. Casazza: Qualecultura.

Panagiotidis, Phoevos. 2000. Demonstrative determiners and operators: The case of Greek. *Lingua* 110: 717–42. [CrossRef]

Pellegrini, Giovan Battista. 1977. *Carta dei Dialetti D'Italia*. Pisa: Pacini.

Poletto, Cecilia, and Alessandra Tomaselli. 2020. Resilient subject agreement morpho-syntax in the Germanic Romance contact area. Paper presented at the Workshop on Contact and the Architecture of Language Faculty, SLE 2020, Bucharest, Romania (online event), August 27–28.

Poplack, Shana, and Stephen Levey. 2010. Contact-induced grammatical change. A cautionary tale. In *Language and Space. An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation. Volume 1: Theories and Methods*. Edited by Peter Auer and Jürgen Eric Schmidt. Berlin: De Gruyter, Mouton, pp. 391–419.

Pountain, Christopher J. 2006. Syntactic borrowing as a function of register. In *Rethinking Languages in Contact. The Case of Italian*. Edited by Anna-Laura Lepsky and Arturo Tosi. Oxford: Legenda.

Profili, Olga. 1985. Συντακτικές επιδράσεις των Ιταλικών και των τοπικών λατινογενών διαλέκτων στο ελληνικό ιδίωμα του Corigliano d' Otranto: η χρήση της πρόθεσης ['ats]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 6: 79–92.

Ralli, Angela. 2019. Greek in contact with Romance. In *The Oxfort Research Encyclopedia, Linguistics (oxfordre.com/linguistics)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [CrossRef]

Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2018. Greek in southern Italy: Morphosyntactic isomorphism and a possible exception. In *Balkan and South Slavic Enclaves in Italy: Languages, Dialects and Identities*. Edited by Thede Kahl, Iliana Krapova and Giuseppina Turano. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 140–57.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1977. *Grammatica storica dei Dialetti Italogreci*. München: Beck.

Silvestri, Giuseppina. 2003. The nature of genitive Case. Ph.D. thesis, Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy.

Silvestri, Giuseppina, and Norma Schifano. 2017. Nuove indagini linguistiche sulla varietà greca del Salento. *L'Italia Dialettale* LXXVIII: 279–312. [CrossRef]

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2014. Modality, antiveridicality, and complementation: The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item. *Lingua* 140: 118–46. [CrossRef]

Smith, Norval, and Tonjes Veenstra. 2001. *Creolization and Contact*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Squillaci, Maria Olimpia. 2017. When Greek meets Romance: A morphosyntactic analysis of language contact in Aspromonte. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

Stavrou, Melita. 2012. Postnominal adjectives in Greek indefinite noun phrases. In *Functional heads*. Edited by Laura Brugé, Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro and Cecilia Poletto. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 379–94.

Stavrou, Melita. 2013. The fine(r) ingredients of adjectival modification in Greek: The Romance connection. Paper presented at IGG39, Modena, Italy, February 21–23.

Stavrou, Melita. 2019. Expected and unexpected agreement patterns in the DP. Paper presented at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy, November 29.

Stavrou, Melita, and Geoffrey Horrocks. 1989. Clitics and demonstratives within the DP. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 19: 225–45.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2004. *Rule Borrowing*. Michigan: Ms, University of Michigan. Available online: http://www-personal.umich.edu/~{}thomason/temp/rulbor04.pdf (accessed on 20 January 2021).

Thomason, Sarah G., and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Vogt, Hans. 1954. Language Contacts. *Word* 10: 365–74. [CrossRef]

Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Winford, Donald. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Winford, Donald. 2010. Contact and borrowing. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Chichester. Edited by Raymond Hickey. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 170–87.