

Salentino Dialect, Griko and Regional Italian: Linguistic Diversity of Salento

Ekaterina Golovko

The University of Bologna, Italy

katia.golovko@gmail.com, ekaterina.golovko4@unibo.it

Vladimir Panov¹

The Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

panovmeister@gmail.com

This paper is a first attempt at presenting the complete linguistic situation of contemporary Salento (Italy), where three different languages are spoken: Italian (in its regional variety), Salentino dialect and Griko. Though it has a limited diffusion in present day Salento, Griko has been widely analysed in literature since dialects of the extreme south of Italy are structurally very divergent from other Italian dialects, supposedly due to the influence of Greek. This paper briefly introduces the Italian linguistic context and the multitude of co-existing varieties and linguistic systems. The main aim of this research is to present the non-standard and minority languages of Salento, and to describe the grammatical systems of the area from a perspective of contact. The authors discuss this major phenomenon in Salentino and Griko and reflect on the origins of the latter. Regional Italian is yet another variety taken into consideration since, as shown in this paper, it presents structural differences from Standard Italian also on a morphosyntactic level.

Keywords: Salento; Salentino; Griko; grammatical description; languages contact.

1 Introduction

This paper focuses on Salento, an area in the extreme south of Italy characterized by the presence of three language systems: Italian (in its regional variety), Salentino (an Italo-Romance dialect), and Griko (a Greek dialect spoken in eight villages of central Salento). Thus, the language situation in Salento makes it an interesting area to study on both a sociolinguistic and a linguistic level. The vitality of the dialect, the linguistic diversity within a restricted geographical area, and the social prestige of language make this a region rich for research. In part due to the popularity of a number of contemporary music bands from

¹ The paper results from the close collaboration of both authors; however, for academic purposes, Ekaterina Golovko is responsible for Sections 2 and 3, Vladimir Panov for Sections 4 and 5. Both authors are responsible for Section 1.

Salento, the region has obtained its own recognizable linguistic profile. The Italian spoken in Salento has become emblematic of youth subcultures; the accent and pronunciation are now considered stylish and socially prestigious. Due to this particularity of the Salentino linguistic context leads, the authors believe that Regional Italian is a phenomenon that matters and should be considered for study. This paper will examine phenomena caused by language contact, and specifically those differentiating Salento from the rest of Italy, resulting in a unique linguistic profile.

Southern Italy presents two rather distinct dialectal zones. The term “southern” is usually applied to the dialects of northern Apulia, northern Calabria, Basilicata, and the regions located further north. This group is distinct from the so-called “Sicilian” group, which includes – aside from Sicilian itself – the varieties of southern Apulia (non-officially named Salento) and southern Calabria. One can also find the term “Sicilian language” applied to the entire area. The corresponding Italian labels are *Dialetti meridionali estremi*, *Dialetti del tipo siciliano*, *Lingua siciliana*. Two distinct lines separate the southern dialects from Sicilian-type dialects: Nicastro – Crotona in Calabria and Taranto – Brindisi in Apulia.

The dialectal border of the two zones is rather clear-cut, thus transitional forms are almost absent (the dialect of Taranto presents a possible exception, combining a number of features from both areas). The characteristics of the entire Sicilian-type zone are as follows.

Beginning with phonetics, the vocalic system is based on five vowels (with their possible development into diphthongs in particular varieties) in contrast with the seven-vowel system of the dialects north of the area. The “reduced” number of vocalic elements is due to the transition of the Latin <ī>, <ē> into <i> and of the Latin <ŭ>, <ō> into <u>, which further transformed into the closed <e> and <o> respectively in southern and central dialects of Italy; a transformation which occurred in the majority of Western Romance languages. The consonantal system is characterized by the presence of the so-called cacuminal sound *ll* > *ɖɖ*. This Sicilian phoneme exists in various forms in different dialects with varying degrees of cacuminalization and can also be pronounced as the simple non-cacuminal [dd] geminate. The common Italian <rr> geminate, the initial <[r]> and the group <tr> may also have a cacuminal pronunciation (as a voiced retroflex sibilant [ʒ] and [tʃ] respectively) in many dialects of the zone: Sic. *terra* [teʒa] ‘land’, *riccu* [ʒik:u] ‘rich’, *travagghiu* [tʃjavagʷ:u] ‘work’.

Moving on to morphology and syntax, first, restricted use of the past perfect (it. *passato prossimo*), or a complete lack of one, to different degrees in various dialects of the zone, for example in Sic. *Come manciasti?* ‘How have you eaten?’ where the simple past is used in a typically perfect context. Second, restricted use of the infinitive and its substitution with subordinating clauses introduced by modal conjunctions that vary from dialect to dialect or within serial constructions. The constructions follow more or less common patterns across the Sicilian-like dialects though they use different language material (Cal.

mo, mi, Sal. cu) (Chillà 2009). Third, diffusion of SOV basic word order (cf. ex. 32, 33 of the present paper), and finally use of two semantically distinct copulas: ‘*essere*’ and ‘*stare*’ (see the section 3.3).

The dialects undeniably have common features on all linguistic levels while occupying a peculiar geographic territory. Two factors lead us to consider the nature of this astonishing homogeneity: i) Sicilian-type dialects are not a part of the dialectal continuum of Southern Italy. The border separating them from other southern dialects is clear-cut with the lack of natural borders such as mountains as is the case of the defined border between Gallo-Romance dialects and the dialects of Tuscany, and ii) The “continental” part of the zone, namely Salento and southern Calabria, is not united, but rather separated in two parts by the Lucanian dialect. The Lucanian dialect, though containing a number of archaic features and particularities, belongs to the group of southern dialects and not to the Sicilian group. At the same time, the dialects of Salento and southern Calabria seem to be relatively mutually comprehensible.

It is common practice in Romance linguistics to ascribe the homogeneity of the aforementioned dialects to a certain linguistic substrate, Greek usually being the first candidate. Others are the Italic and non-Italic proto-Latin languages that are far from being known to us. In the case of Sicily, these are the Sikel and Sicanian languages, while in Salento, there is probably a Messapic substrate (Baldi, 2002). Due to the lack of reliable knowledge of these languages, tracing the common features from proto-Latin languages seems to be quite a speculative attempt. However, the Greek substrate theory, being the most commonly accepted, deserves more detailed consideration. Though it is a known fact different types of Greek have been present in Southern Italy since ancient times (~8th c. BC), accurate knowledge as to the spread of Greek among the populations of this region over different epochs remains unclear. Historical questions concerning the extension of Greek speakers throughout Salento are discussed in detail by Aprile (1994).

In contrast, small Greek-speaking communities are still present in Calabria (province of Reggio Calabria) and in Salento (province of Lecce). In both varieties, the name of the language is “Griko”. The origins of Griko-speaking communities are still debated; the following are the main two points.

First, modern Griko-speaking communities can be traced back to the ancient population of *Magna Grecia* (perhaps they were later subject to some Byzantine influence). This position is generally accepted by Greek linguists (Καραναστάσης, 1997) and was supported by the great German linguist and researcher of Griko, Gerhard Rohlfs.

Second, modern Griko-speaking communities have no relation to *Magna Grecia* and can be traced back to the High Middle Ages. Therefore they derive from a Byzantine population. This theory is supported, among others, by the previously mentioned historian, Rocco Aprile.

As Aprile (1994) demonstrated, it is extremely difficult to establish a factual history of the region’s rural populations, including the language change

process, on the basis of written sources and archeological data. Therefore, in our case, the language itself is the most important historical source.

The goal of this study is to examine the parallel phenomena in the language structures of the Salentino dialect and the Griko of Salento in order to reach a conclusion on the language contact behind their similarities and differences, as well as understanding from when this contact may date. Thus, this study aims to explain the facts of both languages through a comparison between them and with other modern Greek and Italian dialects.

Before moving to detailed descriptions of Salentino and Griko in sections 3 and 4, respectively, we wish to first present some data concerning the Italian linguistic situation, including Italian dialects and the linguistic repertoire of their speakers.

2 General information on the Italian language situation

2.1 Italian dialects and Standard Italian

The treatment of local dialects as independent linguistic systems, and not as varieties of Italian, has already gained firm ground in Italian dialectology. Berruto states, “Italo-romance dialects have their own history, many of them have a (notable) literary tradition” (Berruto, 2005, 82). Italian dialects, according to the scheme proposed by Coseriu (1980 cited by Berruto, 2005), “belong to primary dialects.” Nevertheless, the linguistic repertoire (*lingua cum dialectis*) is characterized by the presence of tertiary dialects, i.e. regional varieties of Italian. “Regional Italian is a variety of Italian, essentially oral, spoken by well-educated persons in a determined geographical area, and is characterized by its distance from the varieties of other areas, on the one hand, and from [Standard Italian], on the other” (Tempesta, 2005, our translation). It is worth noting that there is a certain structural distance separating Regional Italian (RI) from both Salentino and Italian (RI is a variety of Italian). As a consequence of this strict distinction between the two systems, we have:

“a continuum with two subcontinua; one on the side of the dialect and the other on the side of Italian. In certain cases, this continuum can resemble well-known creole repertoires with an *acrolect* and many *basilects*, whereas in other cases, it appears quite like a *gradatum* with fairly clear-cut borders between the different varieties” (Berruto, 1989, p. 8).

The ‘standard’ Italian may be identified as an ideal form of Italian, legitimized by grammar reference books and mainly with no (or very few) native speakers. We chose to consider regular prescribed norms of Italian that are accepted throughout the entire country as the standard. Following the scheme proposed by Auer (2005, 22), we can state that the present situation in Salento is similar to *diaglossia* or repertoire Type C.

Variation in Italy is traditionally referred to in four dimensions: social (diastratia), situational (diaphasia), geographical (diatopia), and means of communication (diamesia). We will observe features that can be classified as diatopical in the RI of Salento, and will not refer to the other three dimensions.

RI is a geographical variety of the standard in which several innovations and ‘simplification’² of Italian are represented, as are “fossilized dialect interferences” (Cerruti, 2011, 15). Most authors agree on the extremes of the continuum or gradatum, but as Berruto underlines, “there appears to be a remarkable amount of uncertainty concerning its intermediate zone” (1989, p. 11).

2.2 Historical account of the Italian linguistic situation: internal migration

The Italian situation is characterized by a relatively new bilingualism due to the recent co-existence of two languages (local dialect and Italian language) in speakers’ repertoire. It is fair to assume that the escalation of national language use was spurred by the massive northbound internal migration. “The so-called internal migration... is... the moving, especially in the period after World War II, of millions of people from all over Italy toward the northwestern area known as the ‘industrial triangle’” (Berruto, 1989, p. 13). This process corresponded with the state policy for the promotion of education and the elimination of illiteracy. Salento had only an outward-bound migration. This permitted the region to maintain a rural and marginal linguistic landscape and not lose its dialect as a primary means of communication (as was the case of most southern Italian areas) (Dal Negro and Vietti, 2011, p. 73).

In the 1950s and 1960s, many young Italians learned the national language in school, while the only language spoken out of school was the local dialect. The following generations were raised understanding the necessity of the national language – notions of which had already been passed down by their parents. The first generation of varieties induced by contact between dialects and the Italian language included those spoken by immigrants from areas of the south of Italy in the industrial areas of the north. The result is something referred to as *italiano popolare* – a variety of Italian strongly influenced by dialects – defined by Cortelazzo (1972) as a “type of Italian imperfectly acquired by people who have dialect as their L1.” At the present moment, as attested by national census, bilingualism “has considerably increased in the last 20 years, especially at the expense of dialect monolingualism” (Dal Negro and Vietti, 2011, p. 72). In Salento, most are bilingual and use both varieties in everyday life. It can be concluded that the spoken language, alongside the local dialect, is RI. This

² We place the term simplification in quotation marks in order to convey its relative significance, not to express the ‘wrong or deviant construction’, but a new construction ‘born’ from the contact of two varieties.

observation is valid not only for Salento but also for the rest of the country (see Cerruti, 2011, and Dal Negro and Vietti, 2011).

The widespread consideration of the interaction between Italian and local dialects is that Italian is influencing local dialects, and as a consequence, their system undergoes so-called Italianization, i.e. convergence towards the dominant system. For example, in Salento, more detailed observation of interaction of Italian, Salentino, and Griko showed that Regional Italian is influenced both by dialectal and standard Italian features and as a consequence native speakers of Regional Italian transmit them to future generations (see for discussion Golovko, 2012).

The next section will present data on Salentino and Regional Italian, paying particular attention to phenomenon as verbal periphrasis, copula selection and general overview of verbal system.

3 Salentino dialect

3.1 Brief overview of literature on Salentino

Research on Salentino began with the definition of and distinction between northern Apulian and southern Apulian dialects. Ribezzo (1911) was one of the first to identify the borders of the Salentino area. His work is significant as it presents the earliest description of particular features of Salentino compared with Barese. Parlangei (1960) and D'Elia (1957) followed, providing very significant analyses. In the 1970s we saw a decade of active research on Italian dialects and their systematic description. In that time several still-relevant works were published, including Mancarella (1975), and various studies by Rohlfs (1933, 1972, 1980), who conducted a series of research of fundamental importance concerning the extreme-southern dialects of Italy. Rohlfs penned the Salentino dictionary (1956) which remains the only substantial and systematic work on the lexicon of Salento (1956). Despite substantial attention to the area, no grammar of Salentino has been produced. Mainly panoramic descriptions exist as separate volumes (Sobrero & Tempesta 2002), or as part of broader dialectological aerial studies (Maiden, 1997; Ledgeway, 2000). Over the last decades, substantial studies were dedicated primarily to the absence of infinite clauses (Calabrese, 1991 and Miglietta, 2002), and the distribution of the subjunctive mood (Bertocci, Damonte, 2007). These two areas of interest led authors to discuss systems of complementation in Salentino and the distribution of *cu* and *ca* complementizers (Ledgeway, 2003). Due to a rich bibliography on the subjunctive and the complementizer system, this paper will not discuss these, but rather will attempt to shed light on lesser studied aspects of Salentino grammar.

3.2 Description of the verbal systems of Salentino and Italian

This paragraph briefly describes the structural divergences between Italian and dialectal verbal systems. It is important to underline certain differences as they

are subsequently reflected in the regional varieties of Italian and thus change the grammatical system of spoken Italian. Examples of such features are the absence of future tense forms (to be discussed in the present section), divergent uses of past tenses and the conditional mood.

In the **present** tense, the most frequent phenomena that merit mentioning are the various verbal periphrases discussed in a separate section. The progressive periphrasis is often used in speech, not only to express progressive actions, but also durative and sometimes even habitual ones (see 3.4).

The **simple past** is formed by an auxiliary verb and a past participle of a lexical verb. There are two auxiliaries, “be” and “have”, as in Italian and unlike the dialects of the Brindisi border area between Salento and northern Apulia, where only one auxiliary verb, “have”, is used. In Salento “have” is used as the auxiliary of the verb “have” and other transitive verbs:

- (1) Aggiu pijatu sulu nu libru e na penna
Have-AUX take-PTCP only one book and one pen
 ‘I took only one book and one pen’

The verb “to be” is used as the auxiliary of itself and of motion verbs:

- (2) Su ssutu lu pane?
Be-AUX come.out-PTCP the bread?
 ‘Did the bread come out of oven?’

- (3) Su ssuti li cornetti?
Be-AUX the croissants?
 ‘Did the croissants come out?’

- (4) Su statu a mmare
Be-AUX be-PTCP on sea
 ‘I was at the sea side’

In Salentino, “have” is more widely used, for example, with reflexive verbs, which in Italian are accompanied by the auxiliary *essere*:

- (5) S’ia cangiata
REFL-have-AUX change-PTCP
 ‘She changed her dress’

- (6) M’agghiu custipatu
REFL-have-AUX sick-PTCP
 ‘I caught a cold’

This use is different from other southern dialects such as Neapolitan and Barese which use *essere* more extensively.

The simple past is not common in the extreme south of Italy, where past events are dominantly expressed using the absolute past (*passato remoto*), which extends to cover even very close events. In Standard Italian, the absolute past is found mainly in written texts and to indicate singular events in the distant past that do not have any link with the present. Northern Italy is characterized by the predominant use of the simple past and the total lack of the absolute past in speech. Instead, the south is characterized by the predominant use of the absolute past, thus diverging structurally from Italian. This characteristic of the dialectal system also causes interferences that can be noted in the regional Italians of the extreme south of Italy. The absolute past is predominantly used in central and southern Salento, in Sicily and in Calabria, even for events that took place the very same morning, and it is often present as the only dialectal means for expressing perfective actions:

- (7) Stamane cantai
 This morning sing- AOR
 ‘I sang this morning’
- (8) Tornasti
 Return-AOR
 ‘I returned’
- (9) Scisti
 Go.out -AOR.
 ‘I went out’

This phenomenon is widely considered of Greek influence and is common in those areas of the south where Greek was previously spoken and the aorist was the only form of the past prior to the latinization of the area. This consideration can be found in Rohlfs (1969, 45), but it must be remembered that the analytic perfect forms are innovations for both Greek and Romance languages. Therefore, restrictions of their use in Salentino is an archaism and not an innovation. Moreover, Griko possesses a parallel construction absent in other Greek dialects, thus suggesting its possible Romance origins. This implies that the use of the simple past in given examples is not innovative, but rather an archaism, possibly supported through language contact (Aikhenvald, 2002, Breu, 2011). This transfer of the verbal form is reproduced in Regional Italian, and the simple past is still less frequent in the Salento area. Nonetheless, some features demonstrating the Italianization of the dialect were found through the distributed questionnaires. A speaker with a very high level of education, and residing in the north of Italy, constantly used the past simple in the dialect - a consequence of continued exposure to northern varieties of Italian:

- (10) Aggiu lettu sulemente na fiata ddhr' articulu.
Have-AUX read-PTCP only one time this article.
 'I read this article only one time'

The **imperfect** in Salentino is used, as in Italian, to describe past events in the imperfective aspect which do not emphasize the start or the end of the action or process. There are no particular functional differences between Salentino and the Italian language concerning the use of the imperfect tense.

In Salentino, a separate verbal form for **future tense** is absent. Frequently the present tense is used in reference to the future:

- (11) Ti lu tau
To.you it give
 'I will give it to you'

In romance languages, and particularly in Italian, futures derive from the Latin construction *habeo* + *infinitive*. Late Latin and vulgar Latin began substituting the original synthetic form (*amābo* «amerò», *amābis* «amerai»), while the common Italian future originates from the form in which the infinitive preceded the verb *avere* (capirò < *capire ho). The opposite order of elements can be found in Southern Italy, particularly in Salento. Rohlfs (1968, 335) also describes the future construction **habeo ad cantare*, where a preposition is added before the infinitive. In Salentino, the preposition has disappeared and its presence is reflected in the doubling of the first consonant or vowel of the verb:

- (12) Aggiu ffare
Have do
 'I will do'
- (13) Aggiu ppurtare
Have bring
 'I will bring'
- (14) Aggiu amare
Have love
 'I will love'

In such constructions, the preposition can be omitted and absorbed by the first consonant of the lexical verb.

Furthermore, another means for expressing the future is the periphrastic construction of intention, applying the verbs *voiu*, *pozzu* + lexical verb, as in “Lu pozzu kkattare krai” (Calabrese, p. 30).

- (15) *voiu*³ (ku) *ddormu*
want-1SG *sleep-1SG*
 ‘I want to sleep’
- (16) *Voiu* *fazzu* *sta* *cosa*
Want-1SG do-1SG this thing
 ‘I want to do this’
- (17) *Oju* *cu* *la* *finisci*
Want-IND that it finish-IND
 ‘I want you to stop’
- (18) *Te* *tissi* *cu* *bbieni*
You tell-AOR that come-2SG
 ‘I told you to come’
- (19) *Iddu* *ulia* *cu* *llu* *ddicu*
He want-IPF that to.him say-1SG
 ‘He wanted me to tell him’

Some traces of the subjunctive mood can be found throughout the territory of Salento:

- (20) *Tocca* *cu* *bbiscia*
Need that see-SBJV
 ‘(that) I need to see it’

This can be compared with:

- (21) *Bisogna* *che* *veda*
Need that see-SBJV
 ‘(that) I need to see it’

Though the subjunctive mood in the final clauses is not rare in Salento and other areas of Southern Italy, the indicative mood is normally used after the conjunction *cu*, and only in rare cases and when it exists the subjunctive form is used. Few forms of the subjunctive mood exist in Salentino: *Avere* (have): *Aggi*,

³ There are no unified orthographical rules in Salentino. In this paper we quote examples as speakers wrote them. So different spellings of the same word can be encountered in the text. For example, *oiu* or *vogghiu* ‘want’ etc.

aggia; dare (give): descia; stare (stay): stescia; potere (can): pozza. In the area of Lecce, forms like *eggia*, *bbesu* exist and are the subjunctive of “be”:

- (22) Ulia cu bbessu
Want-IPF that be-SBJV
 ‘I wished you were there’

The imperative mood is not structurally different from Italian and thus does not present particular interest for this paper.

The conditional mood is totally lacking in Salentino. The Greek influence generally considered the cause of this lack. The imperfective indicative tense is used to express the conditional:

- (23) Ieu te lu dava
I you it give-IPF
 ‘I would give it to you’

In conditional sentences throughout Salento, we find both in apodosis and protasis imperfective indicative mood. This feature was described by Rohlfs (1969, 146) and was attributed to the Greek influence (see discussion in 4.2.3.):

- (24) Manciavi ci te tenia fame
Eat-IPF if you have-IPF hunger
 ‘You could eat if you were hungry’

- (25) Ci tinia fame mangiava
If have-IPF hunger eat-IPF
 ‘If you were hungry, you could eat’

This use is reflected in the regional Italian of the area and was particularly frequent in *italiano popolare*. However, with the change of the linguistic situation and the growing number of Italian L1 speakers, this form has become more socially marked, used by the non-educated population with a dialect as their dominant language.

3.3 Copula selection in Salentino, Regional Italian and Standard Italian

Salentino and other southern dialects have a double copula system. Two verbs, present in Italian can be selected as the copula: “to be” *essere* and “to stay” *stare*. This double copula system can also be found in Spanish and Portuguese, but not in the Standard Italian or northern Italian dialects. The principle of copula selection is semantic and is based on the type of nominal predicate that follows the copula: Individual-level (IL) or Stage-level predicates (SL). IL predicates express constant quality and, consequently, cannot take temporal or spatial modifiers. These predicates are introduced by the verb *essere* in Salentino. On

the contrary, SL predicates indicate temporal qualities of the subjects and thus are modified by spatial and/or temporal adverbs. These predicates are introduced by *stare* in Salentino. Though Italian does not share this characteristic, in the Regional variety of Italian of Southern Italy, we can normally observe the double copula system, which will later be illustrated.

Individual-level predicates:

- (26) Suntu salentino
Be-1SG salentino
 'I am Salentino'
- (27) Iddhru è ertu basciu siccu
He be-3SG high short skinny
 'He is tall, short, skinny'
- (28) Iddha ete de Cutrufianu
She be-3SG from Cutrofiano
 'She is from Cutrofiano'

The conjugation of the verb *essere* is particular as it presents long and contracted forms:

- (29) Singular Plural
 ieu suntu (su') nui simu
 tie sinti (si') ui siti
 iddhu/iddha ete (è) iddhi suntu (su')

Only a contracted form can be used as the auxiliary:

- (30) Su' statu a mmare
Be-AUX be-PRCP on sea
 'I was at the seaside'

As a copula verb, often the contracted and long form can be used interchangeably:

- (31) Su'/suntu salentino
Be-AUX/Be-1SG salentino
 'I am Salentino'

In the preliminary research on the distribution of contracted and long forms, some pragmatic constraints emerged. In the final position the long form is

found more often, as in (32) below, while in the first position, we can find both the contracted and full forms, as shown in (31).

- (32) De Lecce suntu
From Lecce be-1SG
 'I am from Lecce'

The same effect can be produced in the Regional Italian typical of Southern Italy:

- (32) Francesco sono
Francesco be-1SG
 'I am Francesco'

The verb in the final position is typical of the Latin construction with the verb in the postnominal position:

- (33) Marcus sum
Marcus be-1SG
 'I am Marco'

In Salentino, the Latin SOV order is maintained, in contrast to the Italian SVO word order:

- (34) Sono Marco
Be-1SG Marco
 'I am Marco'

This structure is preserved in Salentino even if in other Romance languages, particularly Italian, it no longer exists. The last position of the verb changes the typical unmarked information structure and increases the focus on the verb. Especially when used in Italian, this kind of construction is highly marked as a 'southern' feature.

In the unmarked sentence structure, the verb "to be" is often used in its contracted forms, when available (1sg, 2sg, 3sg, 3pl), in the typical copular position:

- (35) È chiu ertu de mie
Be-3SG more tall than me
 'He is taller than me'

Furthermore, in exclamatory and interrogative sentences, a particular form of the verb "to be" is normally used, *gghe*, which can also be conjugated in the imperfect:

(36) Ce gghè beddu
what be-3SG beautiful
 ‘How beautiful!’

(37) Ce ghera beddu
what be-IPF beautiful
 ‘How beautiful!’

In central Salento, for example, Gallipoli and Galatina, this form can be found only in the third person, both in the present and the imperfective. Bertocci and Damonte (2007) advanced the hypothesis that this form derives from the amalgam of the locative/oblique clitic node, widespread in the area of central Salento and also in Calabria. This clitic derives from the Latin *inde*, in which the dental became a retroflex consonant, similar to the shifts in the common sounds *ll* > *dd*.

Another very restricted form of the verb “to be” is *bbè* (Lecce and north of Lecce) which is used after the conjunction *e*:

(38) E bbè cuntente
And be-3SG happy
 ‘And he was happy’

This form can be used in the imperfect as well:

(39) E bbèra lu rre
And be-IPF the king
 ‘And he was the king’

This form can be explained by the rule, introduced by Rohlfs, that the words starting with the letter “b” are preserved in Northern Italy and Tuscany. In the south, the passage *b* > *v* can be observed. In Salentino, as in some dialects of Calabria, there is the *bb-* type in the initial position instead of the *v-*, which can be found in Sicily, northern Calabria and Naples (Rohlfs, I, p. 195): *cchiu bbautu*, *bbeccu* etc.

The second copula, the verb *stare*, is used in contexts related to transitional states, positions or qualities:

(40) Osci stau mutu contentu (presciatu)
Today stay-1SG very content
 ‘I am very happy today’

(41) Iddhri stannu a Lecce
They stay-3PL in Lecce
 ‘They are in Lecce’

- (42) *Moi stau a casa*
Now stay-1SG in home
 ‘Now I am at home’
- (43) *De dumineca stau sempre a mare*
Sunday stay-1SG always on sea
 ‘I always spend Sundays at the seaside’

Even when the action is habitual and presents a temporal restriction, the copula *stare* will be selected. The same distribution is typical of Regional Italian in Salento:

- (44) *Mo’ sto al mare*
Now stay-1SG on sea
 ‘Now I am at the seaside’
- (45) *Oggi ci sta Rai3 a Otranto*
Today there stay-3SG Rai3 in Otranto
 ‘Today Rai3 is in Otranto’
- (46) *Stiamo ancora in viaggio*
Stay-1PL still in travel
 ‘We are still travelling’

In Standard Italian, the verb *stare* is used to express location or position:

- (47) *Il negozio sta in via Indipendenza 3*
The shop stay-3SG in street Indipendenza 3
 ‘The shop is at number 3 via Indipendenza’
- (48) *Lui le sta sempre vicino*
He to.her stay-3SG always close
 ‘He is always next to her’

This feature of Regional Italian is widespread in Salento and the rest of Southern Italy and can be explained as deriving from contact between two systems. In this case, the dialectal feature is transferred to Regional Italian and dominates there. Hence, this case is important for the analysis of language change in the repertoire of speakers, since this feature shows that the influence is not only unilateral – from the dominant variety to the less diffused and less prestigious – but also moves from the dialect to the dominant variety.

3.4 Verbal periphrasis in Salentino, Regional Italian and Standard Italian

The best known and widely used periphrasis in Salentino is used to express the progressive aspect and can also be extended to future actions. The Romance future is not known in Southern Italy (Rohlf's, 1968, 333), as mentioned in (3.2.). In Salentino, the present tense can be used to express the future:

- (49) Ègnu quannu scapula
 Come-1SG when finish-1SG
 'I will come when I finish working'

Or the progressive periphrasis:

- (50) Crai sta bbau a Roma
 Tomorrow stay go-1SG to Rome
 'Tomorrow I will go to Rome'

Durative periphrasis in Salento is expressed with the Latin form *sto ac bibo, stamus ac cantamus*, where the preposition is lost and the only feature suggesting its past presence is the doubling of the first consonant. In Salento, the auxiliary *sta* is presented as an invariable form and "has even been grammaticalized as an obligatory marker of imperfectivity" (Bertinetto, 2000). This form is present in the areas of Taranto, Ostuni and all of Salento, where the first verbal element became invariable and mechanical or, as Rohlf's called it, obligatory. Thus, we can see that, in Salentino, *sta* is a verbal element that can be proposed before almost any lexical verb:

- (51) Sta bbau a lu cinema sabatu
 Stay go-1SG to the cinema Saturday
 'I will go to the cinema on Saturday'.

- (52) Sta pparlu
 Stay speak
 'I am speaking/I speak'.

It can signify progressive periphrasis or the present indicative. Insofar as this periphrasis is expressed with the gerund in Standard Italian, interference between two constructions is obvious. In Salentino, we can often find Regional Italian constructions involving the gerund, that is, progressive constructions referring to the future:

- (53) Sabato sto andando al cinema
 Saturday go-GER stay-1SG to.the cinema
 'I will go to the cinema on Saturday'.

This kind of interference is a transfer of the construction and use of the grammatical means of the target language.

Rohlf's illustrated a widely used inchoative periphrasis in Southern Italy: *vado ac dico*. Sornicola distinguishes between this periphrasis and its variant *vado a + infinite*. The second is very frequent in the Regional Italian of Salento and in this corpus:

- (54) Probabile che vado a finire un' ora dopo
Probable that go-1SG to finish one hour later
 'It is probable that I will finish one hour later'.

In standard Italian, the future tense would be used in this case:

- (55) Probabile che finirò un' ora dopo
Probable that finish-FUT one hour later
 'It is probable that I will finish one hour later'

We can see that, in Salento, even speakers with L1 Italian tend to use more periphrastic constructions to express future actions rather than the synthetic form widely used in Standard Italian. This is further evidence of language contact and influence on the national language by the local variety.

3.5 Transitive and intransitive verbs in Salentino, Regional Italian and Italian

The change of subcategorization properties of some verbs, particularly verbs of motion, is one of the most salient and best known traits characterizing 'southernness' throughout Italy. This type of change represents the insertion of the dialectal verb (replication of the dialectal construction) into the Italian utterance and the consequent modification.

We would like to examine the verb *'ssire* "exit", which is of central interest for dialectologists and linguists working on Southern Italy and dealing with the use of monorhematic verbs rather than syntagmatic verbs. This verb alters transitivity properties in Sicily (Amenta, 2007) and in northern Puglia, but not in Salento.

The following examples express the utterance "I take the dog out [for a walk]" in Standard Italian:

- (56) Porto fuori il cane
Bring-1SG out the dog
 'I take the dog out'

In this case, we have a syntagmatic construction following Talmy's scheme presenting verb + satellite construction (2000).

- (57) Cacciu lu cane
Take.out-1SG the dog
 ‘I take the dog out’

In Salento, contrary to other southern areas, the verb *uscire* is not transitive. In the RI of Salento, the typical construction would use the verb *cacciare*, meaning “take out” or “take away”. This is a case of replication of the dialectal verb, while the same verb exists but carries a different meaning in Italian. It is interesting to note that some native speakers of Salentino affirmed that expressions such as (57) and (58) are equally grammatical and possible:

- (58) sta portu ddra fore lu cane
stay-1SG bring-1SG out the dog
 ‘I take the dog out’

This example shows the reconstruction and replication of the SI construction in the dialect, along with the Italian language-influenced change from the monorhematic verb *cacciare* – typical of the dialect – to the syntagmatic verb widely used throughout Italy, especially in the north (Masini and Jacobini, 2009). The informants who deemed this example both possible and grammatically correct are young with high levels of education and ample mobility opportunities. Thus, this may present one of the possible directions of change occurring in the dialect and may be widespread among the younger generations under the influence of SI.

A ‘classical’ case of transitivity change, equally common in RI, is the substitution of the verb, that is, the use of a monorhematic verb instead of a syntagmatic construction typical of SI:

- (59) Io scendo la valigia
I descend-1SG the bag
 ‘I bring the bag down’ (RI)

- (60) Scindu la valigia
Descend-1SG the bag
 ‘I bring the bag down’ (Salentino)

- (61) Io porto giù la valigia
I bring-1SG down the bag
 ‘I bring the bag down’ (SI)

The phenomenon observed is the transfer of the more economical dialectal verb to the Italian structure. This is the case when the dialectal verb is monorhematic and is preferred to the dialectal Italian structure using syntagmatic verbs. It can usually be found in semantic couples, such as ‘enter – exit’ and ‘climb – descend’. Let the data in (62) illustrate this.

- (62) a. *Nchianame* la posta
 ‘Climb-me the mail’ (Salentino)
- b. *Sali* la posta
 ‘Climb the mail’ (RI)
- c. *Porta su* la posta
 ‘Bring the mail up’ (SI)

In these cases, the speaker uses a more ‘suitable’ verb with a corresponding translation in the Italian language, yet the semantic and syntactic characteristics remain those of the dialect. This is one of the examples where bilingual speakers attempt ‘to align the structures’ (Matras and Sakel, 2007, p. 834), resulting in “the syncretization of processing operations in the two languages, allowing speakers to apply similar mental organization procedures to propositions in both languages of their repertoire” (ibid, 835). In our example of RI, we can see that the speakers take lemmas from the dialect and apply them in actual Italian, maintaining properties of the dialectal verbs. This choice may be accounted for by factors such as sentence economy and ‘simplification’ of the structure in RI compared with the Italian sentence. Winford’s (2008, 140) example explains that in such a situation, “the subcategorization properties of substrate motion or transfer verbs [...] are imposed on superstrate lexical items”. In Salento we are dealing with the introduction of the change (imposition or replication of L1 lemma to L2 item) and its gradual diffusion and acceptance among speakers.

4 Griko in Salento

4.1 Greek dialects in Italy

Salento Greek is one of the two varieties of Greek spoken in Southern Italy (the other variety can be found in the province of Reggio Calabria). These two enclaves present the only Greek-speaking communities on the Italian peninsula whose historical origins are not clear (unlike other Greek-speaking groups, for example, Venetian Greeks, a community formed over recent centuries). Thus, they can be called “autochthone” Greeks in the broadest sense of the term.

The people of both enclaves call their language Griko and refer to themselves as *griki* (Nom.pl.). The other term applied to the language and culture is ‘grecanico’ which is more frequently used in Italian and in Modern Greek (τα Γκρακάνικα). The origin of the word Griko is slightly obscure: if there is any relation to the Latin root *graec-*, the transition *ae>i* cannot be explained either within the framework of the historical phonetics of the Salento dialect or the historical phonetics of Griko itself (in both cases we would expect an **e* and not an *i*).

Scientific interest in Griko surfaced during the second part of the nineteenth century and is clearly related to the development of the Italian school of historical linguistics. The two earliest works devoted to Greek dialects of Southern Italy are (Comparetti 1866) and (Morosi 1870). The former concerns both the varieties of Calabria and Salento, while the latter limits itself to the dialect of Salento (Terra d'Otranto). Both books contain a number of folk texts, comments on them and grammatical sketches.

The rediscovery and detailed elaboration of grammatical descriptions, as well as the creation of a lexicon, is credited to the German scholar Gerhard Rohlfs, also known for his research in historical Romance linguistics and Italian dialectology. His pioneering work (Rohlfs 1977), multiple articles on different concrete topics devoted to the questions of historical linguistics and multilingualism in Southern Italy, provide rich and reliable images of Griko and still can be considered a source of primary importance. However, despite the obvious value, Rohlfs work should be recognized as somewhat antiquated, firstly due to the methods of his fieldwork – he never used audio recordings, but rather collected all the data exclusively in written form (the process of his fieldwork is presented in a TV film by RAI 3 channel, 1977) – and secondly, some of his data, especially concerning the phonetics and morphonology of Griko, requires revision.

Also worthy of note is Karanastasis who created a comprehensive grammar of both varieties (Καραναστάσης, 1997) – which is, however, highly influenced by Rohlfs, as well as the ample lexicon (Καραναστάσης, 1984-1992), containing the greatest number of lexical items of all the dialects of the area, marking the exact location where each item is found, and providing etymological information.

The two above mentioned linguists share an equal number of presuppositions: firstly, they consider the Greek dialect of Salento and that of Calabria as one, without any serious discussion as to the possibility of observing them as separate and without attempting to evaluate the degree of similarity or difference between them. The solution to this problem is not obvious.

Greek dialects of Southern Italy are still of relatively small interest to scholars studying modern Greek dialectology. The two most important works, aimed at creating a general perspective of modern Greek dialects, were produced by Kondosopoulos (Κοντοσόπουλος, 2001), and Newton (Newton, 1972a). Kondosopoulos examines Griko, though very briefly and relying entirely on Rohlfs and Karanastasis, while Newton does not consider Griko at all.

4.2 Overview of Griko in Salento and literature on the subject

This study will concentrate exclusively on the Griko of Salento and will consider some of its important characteristics in the aerial contexts. The authors will rely on existing sources as well as on their own data collected during fieldwork in Calimera and other small towns (it. *paesi*) where Griko is still spoken.

In the area of Salento we find a number of towns with different levels of Griko-speaking populations (mostly people over sixty). Since the 1970s, the towns have come together in an official cultural union called *Grecìa Salentina*. Twelve towns now take part in this union, though not all of them are still Griko-speaking and some may never have been. According to our own data, Griko is still commonly spoken among the older generation in the following towns: Calimera, Martano, Martignano, Sternatìa, Castrignano-dei-Greci, Corigliano d'Otranto, Zollino. All members of the Griko-speaking population, including the oldest informants, are bilingual or trilingual, able to communicate in the Salentino dialect and, in the majority of cases, Italian. Many of the informants say that their parents' generation, that is the generation raised before the Second World War, was predominantly monolingual, particularly the women who were not accustomed to leaving their hometowns. The men often left in order to work beyond the Griko-speaking zone. Until the Second World War, the town most open to the external world was Calimera, which was a local trade center, while the rest of the communities were exclusively agricultural (producing olives and tobacco).

Thus, Calimera can be considered the capital of Griko culture and its literary tradition, today mainly represented by the cultural circle *Ghetonìa* (Neighbourhood), counting some distinguished scholars born and raised in Calimera among its members (for example, the historian, writer and one of the founders of the circle Rocco Aprile, the philologist and poet Franco Corlianò, and the philologist, writer and poet Salvatore Tommasi).

Salvatore Tommasi and Salvatore Sicuro (the Italian translator of Rohlfs' works, born in Martano) also edited and published the manuscripts of the greatest Griko-language writer, poet and scholar Vito Domenico Palumbo (1854(56)-1918). A Dante and a Shakespeare of Griko culture, he made a serious attempt at creating a literary Griko based on the dialect of Calimera and a modified Italian orthography. He was also the author of the lyrics of the most famous Griko song, even beyond *Grecìa Salentina*, "*Kalinifta*").

Scholars from towns other than Calimera, including Antonio Greco from Castrignano dei Greci and Leonardo Tondi from Zollino, have published a number of grammars, dictionaries and texts, in different varieties of Griko. However, these editions, including the works of Vito Domenico Palumbo, are difficult to find beyond *Grecìa Salentina*.

4.3 Characteristics of Griko

4.3.1 General

As mentioned in the introduction and in the first part of this article, some of the characteristics of the romance dialect of Salento have been ascribed to a Greek influence. Since the only object we have at our disposal is present-day spoken Griko and the older, but not very numerous, written documents (dating from the late nineteenth century), it is worth considering the language in greater detail in order to understand if it really may be the linguistic influence that has made Salentino so particular. Let us now consider some aspects of the Griko language system.

Griko grammar is not so distinct from the “typical” modern Greek system, including that of Standard Modern Greek (hereon SMG) which has its base in the Peloponnese variety and its marginality can by no means be compared with dialects such as Tsakonian, Cappadocian or even Pontic. Thus, the order of clitics in Griko is the same as in SMG:

- (63) itela na su po ena prama
would.like-1SG conj you(CL) tell one thing
 ‘I would like to tell you one thing’
 SMG: (θα) ήθελα να σου πω ένα πράγμα

- (64) pemmuo!
tell-me-it
 ‘tell it to me!’
 SMG: πες μου το!

In the above examples, the indirect object clitic precedes the direct object clitic, both precede the verb in the indicative and follow the verb in the imperative. However, this order of clitics is shared with Italian and some other Romance languages, as well as languages of the Balkan Sprachbund:

- (65) dimmelo!
tell me it
 ‘tell it to me’

It is unlike Cypriot, Pontic and Mariupol Greek varieties that have a different order, probably preserving a more archaic order of clitics (for details see Kisilier 2012):

- (66) αυτά είχα να έλεγα **τον**
these had to told him
 ‘I had to tell him this’ (Pontic)
 SMG: έπρεπε να **του** πω αυτά (Kisilier 2012: 357)

According to the work from which the previous example is taken, the order of pronominal clitics is an important innovative isogloss among Greek dialects. Therefore, at least in this aspect, Griko shows its affinity with the dialects of the northern and Peloponnese groups.

4.3.2 Phonology

Nonetheless, Griko remains almost incomprehensible to the speakers of SMG and other Greek dialects. The reasons, as we see it, are as follows: 1) its phonetic system is very distinct from that of common Greek, especially its consonant system. 2) beyond the core lexicon, there is a huge amount of Romance lexical borrowings, including conjunctions and discursive markers.

The characteristics of the Griko phonetic system as compared to SMG are describe in § 4.3.2.1 through to 4.3.2.5.

4.3.2.1

Lack of common Greek consonants /θ/, /ð/, /γ/. They have disappeared or lost their fricative quality: SMG *θέλω* VS Griko *telo*, SMG *ήθελα* VS Griko *itela/isela* ‘I would like’, SMG *μεγάλη* VS Griko *mali* ‘big (f.)’, SMG *βράδυ* VS Griko *vrai* (Calimera, Martano), *vradi* (Sternatia) ‘evening’. Calabrian Greek preserves the fricative dentals and [γ].

4.3.2.2

Presence of the cacuminal *ɗɗ* sound (from the common Greek geminate *ll*): SMG *άλλος* vs Griko *aɗɗo* ‘other’ shared with the Salentino dialect (as well as with other dialects of the extreme south of Italy and the Sardinian language). However, a similar phenomenon can be found in Greek dialects of Dodecanese (Κοντοσόπουλος 2001) though the exact diffusion of such sound transition among Greek dialects is uncertain due to the lack of reliable dialectal descriptions.

4.3.2.3

Disappearance of both final *-s* and *-n*, provoking the development of morphonological germination of the initial consonants of the words coming next:

- (67) i Kalimera (Nom.) < η Καλημέρα
 i Kkalimera (Gen.) < την Καλημέρα(v)
 i Kkalimera (Dat.) < της Καλημέρας

A phenomenon almost equal in form is to be found in the dialect of Cyprus and Dodecanese. The example below is from Dodecanese.

- (68) *tol lao* (Acc.) < *τον λαό*
o lao (Nom.) < *ο λαός* (Κοντοσόπουλος 2001: 43)

It is not clear whether we can consider the following transition an exact Griko-Cypriote isogloss or an independent parallel development (such doubts are among the greatest problems of modern Greek dialectology, especially when we are speaking about dialects that are geographically absolutely isolated from one another, modern Greek being for the most part a language of enclaves and exclaves).

4.3.2.4

Preservation of ancient Greek geminated consonants. This is another similarity with the Cypriote dialect, facing the same problem as that of the previous paragraph. In any case, the preservation of a common archaism may not be considered sufficient proof of language affinity.

4.3.2.5

Reflection of the Ancient Greek koine *v* [ü] as [u] with the palatalization of the following consonant in some cases, as opposed to SMG and the major part of other dialects (with some parallels in this case as well, e.g. in Pontic, Tsakonian and Cretan) (Κοντοσόπουλος, 2001).

The following conclusion can be drawn concerning the phonological development of Griko: although it presents a number of particularities different from SMG, almost all of these find their parallel in other Greek dialects. Thus, relation or not to these dialects, represents common tendencies in Greek. Only two cases seem to present a relative exception: the presence of the cacuminal sound [ɟɟ] and the complete loss of fricative dentals and [ɣ]. Both characteristics may be attributed to the Romance influence or at least coincide with the corresponding characteristics of Salentino.

4.3.3 *Morphology, Syntax and Grammatical semantics*

As mentioned above, Griko does not possess any significant structural differences compared with other Greek dialects. It preserves the three genders and three cases (nominative, genitive and accusative) in the nominal system, while preserving two inflectional voices (active and medio-passive) and three inflectional tenses (present aorist and imperfect) in the verbal system. Nonetheless, we will discuss grammatical differences among Griko, SMG and the dialectal varieties of Greek and discuss their nature in § 4.3.3.1 to 4.3.3.4.

4.3.3.1

Griko does not possess the SMG future tense construction (particle $\theta\alpha$ +personal form of perfective/imperfective stem):

- (69) $\theta\alpha$ γράψω
Part write-PFV-1SG
 ‘I will write’

Instead, we find the use of the present applied to the future:

- (70) Avri pame totzu
Tomorrow we-go-PRES to.the.field
 ‘Tomorrow we will go to the field’

The progressive construction (see the next paragraph) can also be applied to the future situation:

- (71) Avri ste pame totzu
Tomorrow PART we-go-PRES to.the.field
 ‘Tomorrow we will go to the field’

The two previous ways of expressing the future also exist in the Salentino dialect (as showed in (50) and (52)). The third is particular to Griko. There is still a modal component (necessity) in its semantics:

- (72) Avri enna pame totzu
Tomorrow need we-go-PRES to.the.field
 ‘Tomorrow we will go to the field’

According to Rohlfs (1977) and Newton (1972b), the etymology of the modal particle *enna* is the contraction of two words: *echi* (SMG *έχει* ‘has’) and the conjunction *na* (SMG *να*) which introduces all types of subordinate clauses. The same construction is present in the Cypriote dialect (Newton 1972b), where it has a purely modal meaning (necessity), while in Griko it has started to develop a future meaning as well.

4.3.3.2

Griko possesses a progressive construction consisting of a personal verb form preceded by an unchangeable particle *ste*, which is a reduced form of the grammaticalized verb *steo*, meaning ‘stand’, and has also acquired copula uses in the Salentino dialect:

- (73) *ce sto daso, mian alipuna ste kulusa enan alao*
and in the forest, a fox STAND chases a hair (no individualized gloss)
 ‘and a fox is chasing a rabbit in the forest’

4.3.3.3

Griko does not possess the SMG form traditionally labeled as “perfect”, whose meaning, however, is almost purely experiential:

- (74) *έχω πάει στην Αμερική*
have-1SG (gone) to America
 ‘I have been to America’

The form of the main verb (go) is actually not a participle, but a special form used only in this construction since it etymologically derives from the Ancient Greek aoristic infinitive. It is not present in many of the dialects where the only inflectional aorists and imperfects are used as past tenses. Griko has developed an analytic perfect similar to that present in the Salentino dialect, formed by a passive particle and an auxiliary verb ‘be’ or ‘have’:

- (75) *εχο famena*
have-1SG eaten
 ‘I have eaten’

The choice of the auxiliary seems to correspond to the romance model, that is, the tendency is to use the auxiliary “be” with motion verbs and “have” with all other verbs.

- (76) *en ene artomeno*
not is come
 ‘he (she) has not come’

4.3.3.4

Griko possesses the infinitive in contrast with other Greek dialects (this is the aoristic stem infinitive). The infinitive has a very restricted use: the only modal verb requiring an infinitive is *sozzo* ‘be able to’:

- (77) *sozzo milisi o griko*
can 1SG speak Griko
 ‘I can speak Griko’

In such circumstances, Salentino uses a serial verb construction (cf. (16)).

5 Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn: Griko is a typical modern Greek dialect in its structure. The particularities that are not present in SMG are usually shared by one or more dialects of the Greek world (particularly, there are many affinities with Cypriote Greek whose nature will be explained in the future). The other features of Griko that are shared by neither SMG nor other dialects usually find corresponding phenomena in Salentino. Such features include the cacuminal [ɖɖ] sound, the perfect periphrasis and the progressive form. The same features, however, distinguish Salentino (along with some other dialects of the extreme south) from the all other Italian dialects, that is, we are dealing with an areal development where the exact source of linguistic changes is difficult to establish and cannot be ascribed to the Greek influence. Yet many of the features are shared by both languages of Salento.

Therefore, we have every reason to unite Griko and Salentino dialect to a mini-Sprachbund (let us call it the Salento Sprachbund). The following are two possible directions for future development of the topic.

First, according to (Aikhenvald, 2007, 5), the borrowings from one language to another follow the order: lexicon > pragmatics > syntactic structures > morphology. We have considered the latter two points. Yet, to better understand the nature of language contact between Griko and Salentino, a detailed study of lexicon and pragmatics of both Griko and Salentino should be made which will probably clarify the answer to the essential question: which of the two languages is to be considered substratal and which is adstratal?

Second, a broader area will be studied following the same methodology, first and foremost, the Calabrian dialect and its contact with Greek. An interesting case is also a comparison with the Albanian varieties in Northern Apulia, Basilicata, Sicily and Calabria.

References

- Aikhenvald, A., *Grammars in Contact. A cross-linguistic perspective*. In Aikhenvald & Dixon (2007), pp. 1-65.
- Aikhenvald A., Dixon R.M.W. (2007) (eds.) *Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amenta, L. (2007). *Processi di semplificazione della morfologia verbale*. In *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia (RID) XXXI*, pp.7-18.
- Aprile, R. (1994) *Grecia Salentina: origini e storia*. Calimera (LE): Ghetonia
- Auer, P. (2005). *Europe's Sociolinguistic Unity, or: A Typology of European Dialect / Standard Constellations*. In: Nicole Delbecque et al. (eds.): *Perspectives on Variation (Trends in Linguistics; 163)*, 7–42, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baldi, P. (2002). *The foundations of Latin*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Berruto, G. 1989. Main topics and findings in Italian sociolinguistics . *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 76, 7 - 30.
- Berruto, G. (2005). Dialect/Standard convergence, mixing, and models of language contact: the case of Italy . In Auer , Peter , Hiskens , Frans and Kerswill, Paul (eds.) *Dialect change* . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Bertocci, D. & Damonte, F. Distribuzione e morfologia dei congiuntivi in alcune varietà salentine [Distribution and morphology of subjunctive forms in some Salentino dialects], in *Studi sui dialetti della Puglia*, edited by Federico Damonte and Jacopo Garzonio, Padova, Unipress, 2007, pp 3 - 28.
- Bertinetto, P.M. (2000) The progressive in Romance, as compared with English, O. Dahl (ed.) *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Mouton – De Gruyter, 559-604.
- Calabrese, A. (1991). “The lack of infinitival clauses in Salentino”. In *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XIX*, Ohio State University, April 21–23, 1989, Laeuffer, Christiane and Terrell A. Morgan (eds.), 267 ff.
- Cerruti, M. (2011). Regional varieties of Italian in the linguistic repertoire. in “Italian Sociolinguistics” special issue of “ *International Journal of Sociology of Language* ”, 210, 9-28.
- Chillà, L. (2009). La distribuzione delle infinitive nei verbi modali nella variante di Squillace. In: *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica – Università di Firenze* 19, 115-140
- Comparetti, D. (1866) *Saggi dei dialetti Greci dell’Italia meridionale*
- Cortelazzo, M. (1972). *Avviamento critico allo studio della dialettologia italiana. Vol 3: Lineamenti di italiano popolare*. Pisa: Pacini.
- Coseriu, E. (1980). “Historische Sprache” und “Dialekt”. In Joachim Göschel, Ivic Pavle and Kurt Kehr (eds.), *Dialekt und Dialektologie*, 106–122. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Dal Negro, S. and Vietti, A. (2011). Italian and Italo-Romance dialects, in “Italian Sociolinguistics” special issue of *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 210 , 71 - 92.
- D’Elia, M. (1957) *Ricerche sui dialetti salentini*. Firenze: Olschki.
- Golovko, E. (2012) The Formation of Regional Italian as a Consequence of Language Contact. The Salentino Case. In *Journal of Language Contact* 5, 117-143.
- Greco, A. (1988) *Vocabolario griko-italiano, italiano-griko*. Comune di Castrignano dei Greci.
- Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. (2005). *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Καραναστάσης Α. (1997). *Γραμματική των ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της κάτω Ιταλίας*. Αθήνα: Ακαδημία Αθηνών

- Καραναστάσης Α. (1984-1992) Ιστορικόν Λεξικόν των ελληνικόν ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας. Αθήνα: Ακαδημία Αθηνών
- Kisilier (2012) Румейский язык и новогреческие диалекты [Rumaiic language and Modern Greek dialects]. In: ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКОЕ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ И КЛАССИЧЕСКАЯ ФИЛОЛОГИЯ-XVI (чтения памяти И. М. Тронского). Saint-Petersburg: Nauka, 2012, 355-368
- Κοντοσόπουλος Ν. (2001). Διάλεκτοι και ιδιώματα της Νέας Ελληνικής. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη
- Ledgeway, A. (2000). A comparative syntax of the dialects of southern Italy: a minimalist approach. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mancarella, G. B. (1975) Salento. In *Profilo dei dialetti italiani*. Pisa: Pacini.
- Masini, F. and Jacobini, C. (2009) I verbi sintagmatici tra innovazione e persistenza: il ruolo dei dialetti, in Cardinaletti, A. and Nicola, M. (eds), *Italiano, italiani regionali e dialetti*, Milano, Franco Angeli, pp. 115-135.
- Matras, Y. and Sakel, J. (2007). Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31.4:829-865.
- Maiden, M. and Parry, M. (eds) (1997). *Dialects of Italy*. London: Routledge.
- Miglietta, A. (2002) L'infinito in Salento, oggi. In "Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia", Bologna, CLUEB, 2002: 79-93.
- Parlangeli, O. (1060) *Storia linguistica e storia politica nell'Italia meridionale*. Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Ribezzo, F. (1911) *Il dialetto apulo-salentino di Francavilla Fontana*. Apulia, Martina Franca.
- Morosi, G. (1870) *Studi Sui Dialetti Greci Della Terra D'Otranto*. Lecce: Editrice Salentina
- Newton, B. (1972a). A generative interpretation of dialect: a study of Modern Greek phonology. *Cambridge studies in linguistics*, 8
- Newton, B. (1972b). *Cypriot Greek. Its phonology and inflections*. The Hague: Mouton
- Palumbo V.D. (1998) *Io' mia fora' - Fiabe e Racconti della Grecia Salentina*, in due volumi, a cura di S. Tommasi. Calimera (LE): Ghetonia
- Palumbo V.D. (1999) *'Itela na su pò - Canti popolari della Grecia Salentina*, a cura di S. Sicuro. Calimera (LE): Ghetonia.
- Remberger, E.-M. Morfosintassi verbale dei dialetti neogreci in Calabria. In Breu, W. (ed.) *L'influsso dell'italiano sul sistema del verbo delle lingue minoritarie. (Resistenza e mutamento nella morfologia e nella sintassi)*. Bochum: Brockmeyer Verlag (Diversitas Linguarum), 2011, 123-148.
- Rohlf, G. (1933) *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*. Roma: Collezione Meridionale.
- Rohlf, G. (1956) *Vocabolario dei dialetti salentini: terra d'Otranto*. Galatina: Congedo.
- Rohlf, G. (1966) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: fonetica*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Rohlf, G. (1968) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: morfologia*. Torino: Einaudi.

- Rohlf, G. (1969) Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: sintassi e formazione delle parole. Torino: Einaudi.
- Rohlf, G. (1972) Nuovi scavi linguistici nella antica Magna Grecia. Palermo: Luxograph.
- Rohlf, G. (1977) Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci. München: Beck
- Rohlf, G. (1980) Calabria e Salento: saggi di storia linguistica: studi e ricerche. Ravenna: Longo.
- Rohlf, G. (1988) Studi linguistici sulla Lucania e sul Cilento. Galatina: Congedo Editore.
- Sobrero, A. and Tempesta, I. (2002) Puglia. Roma: Laterza.
- Tempesta, I. (2005) Fra forma e varietà. Bari: Edizioni B.A. Graphis.
- Tondi D. (1935) Glossa: La Lingua Greca Del Salento. Noci (BA): Cressati
- Talmy, L. (2000). Tomards cognitive semantics. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Tempesta, I. (2005). Fra norma e varietà. Bari: Edizioni B.A. Graphis.
- Winford, D. (2008) Processes of creole formation and related contact-induced language change. In *Journal of Language Contact*. THEMA 2, 124 -145.