The expression of progressive aspect in Grico: mapping morphosyntactic isoglosses in an endangered Italo-Greek variety

1. Introduction

In sketching a broad typological classification of the morphosyntactic expression of progressive aspect, Bertinetto et al. (2000:520ff., based on Blansitt 1975) list the strategies reported in (1) and exemplified in (2):[1]

 (1)   a Affixal progressive markers (2a)

        b Complex verb phrases ($V_1 + V_2$)

            i.   verb phrases with copula as auxiliary (state-PROG) (2b)

            ii.   verb phrases with motion or postural verb as auxiliary (motion-PROG) (2c)

            iii. verb phrases with pro-predicate (*do*-type) as auxiliary (2d)

            iv. verb phrases with special progressive auxiliary verb (2e)

(2)   a çalişi-yor-du (Turkish, Bertinetto et al. 2000:521)

         work-PROG-PST.3SG

         'he was working'

      b Peter is writing a letter (English)

      c el   calor venía   durando demasiado (Spanish, Bertinetto et al. 2000:523)

         the heat come.PST.IPFV.3SG   last.GER too.much

         'the heat had been lasting too long'

      d bago   yamo (Southern Barasano, Blansitt 1975:28)

---

[1] The literature on (Romance) progressives is too vast for us to be able to cite it in its entirety here, suffice it to note the discussion in Blansitt (1975), Comrie (1976), Bybee et al. (1994), Squartini (1998), Bertinetto (2000), Mair (2012), Deo (2015), Bertinetto & Squartini (2016). Other progressive patterns include the use of particles (e.g. Albanian emphatic particle *po*) or non-morphological devices (e.g. Hungarian word order and specific intonation contour) (Bertinetto et al. 2000:524-25).

eat.F   doing.she

'she is eating'

e en ny   kyrka håller   på att byggas (Swedish, Bertinetto et al. 2000:524)

a   new church keep.PRS.3SG on to   build.PASS

'a new church is being built'

Limiting their attention to the Romance family, represented by the (1b) category, Bertinetto & Squartini (2016:948) observe that the use of complex V_1 + V_2 structures typically involves *be/stay* (1b-i) or *go/come* (1b-ii) auxiliaries as V_1, alongside further marginal types, as summarised in Table 1 (see also Bertinetto 2000:561):

Table 1. Some Romance progressive periphrases (adapted from Bertinetto & Squartini 2016:948)

	STATE-PROG	MOTION-PROG	OTHER FORMS
Catalan	*estar* 'stay' + gerund	*anar* 'go' + gerund	?
French	-	(*aller* 'go' + gerund)	*être en train de* 'to be under way of' + infinitive
			(*être après* 'to be after' + infinitive)
Italian	*stare* 'stay' + gerund *stare a* 'stay to' + infinitive	*andare* 'go' / *venire* 'come' + gerund	*essere dietro a* 'to be after to' + infinitive
Portuguese	*estar a* 'stay to' + infinitive *estar* 'stay' + gerund	*ir* 'go'/ *andar* 'walk' / *vir* 'come' + gerund	?
Romanian	-	-	*a fi în curs de* 'to be in the course of'+ infinitive
Spanish	*estar* 'stay' + gerund	*ir* 'go' / *andar* 'walk' / *venir* 'come' + gerund	?

As for V_2, Table 1 shows how this usually features a non-finite form, such as an infinitive (3a) or a gerund (3b), but also a present participle (3c):

(3) a lle donne   tutte stevano   a   ballare

      the women all   stay.PST.IPFV.3PL   to dance.INF

      (15th cent. Neapolitan, Ledgeway 2009:638)

      'all the women were dancing'

  b estoy   comiendo (Spanish)

      stand.PRS.1SG eat.GER

      'I am eating

  c è   parlante (14th cent. Italian, Squartini & Bertinetto 2016:948)

      be.PRS.3SG   speak.PTCP.PRS

      '(s)he is speaking'

A further option for V$_2$ in STATE-progressive constructions, typically not acknowledged in traditional classifications of Romance (see for example Table 1 above), is one involving a finite, fully-inflected verb, optionally linked to STAND by an erstwhile coordinator (AC 'and'), as attested in a wide selection of Pugliese and Salentino dialects:[2]

(4) stoche   a   ppaghe (Taranto, Ledgeway 2016b:161)

    stand.PRS.1SG AC pay.PRS.1SG

    'I'm paying'

It is progressive constructions of this latter type which form the focus of our attention in this article, concentrating on new evidence from the Italo-Greek variety, Grico, spoken in a small area of southern Salento in southern Italy by an increasingly small number of predominantly elderly

---

[2] See Fanciullo (1976:59, fn. 117), Rohlfs (1969:133,167), Stehl (1988:711), Loporcaro (1997:346-47; 2009:156), Manzini & Savoia (2005, I:§3.12.2), Ledgeway (2011a; 2016a:266; 2016b; 2016c:1027-28), Andriani (2016:Ch.5; 2017), Manzini et al. (2017). In what follows, we define 'Pugliese' as the Apulian dialects spoken above the Taranto-Martina Franca-Ceglie Messapica-Ostuni isogloss and 'Salentino' as those dialects spoken below the same line (Ledgeway 2016a:246). In Pugliese and Salentino, a fully inflected verb is also attested after *scì(re)/scìri* 'go' and, to a lesser extent, after *(v)ulì(re)/(v)uliri* 'want', which is not considered here (see references above).

speakers alongside the local Romance dialect, Salentino.[3] The villages where Grico survives are the relics of a formerly much wider Greek-speaking territory (Rohlfs 1972:25).[4] Although the origins of such enclaves have been fiercely debated by scholars (see discussion in Fanciullo 2001; 2007), it is undeniable that Greek and Romance have been spoken alongside each other for centuries in these areas, giving rise to pervasive phenomena of language contact which has affected not only their lexis but, more significantly, also their core morphosyntax (see Ledgway 2013 for an overview). In relation to the expression of progressive aspect, while Salentino has already received some attention in the literature (see fn. 2), our knowledge of Grico is to date mainly restricted to the extremely valuable, yet out-dated, description by Rohlfs (1977), based on data he gathered during numerous fieldtrips during the first half of the 20th century.[5] In what follows, we integrate and update this description by providing new data collected *in loco* from native speakers during 2016. In order to shed further light on the evolution of the new patterns we identified, we have built a corpus which includes not only the data collected during our own fieldwork, but also attestations from both early and contemporary written sources. We begin by reviewing and clarifying the available empirical data (§2), after which we assess the degree of grammaticalization of those patterns which are today still productive (§3) and reconstruct their evolution from earlier periphrases (§4), paying special attention to the grammaticalization of the ambiguous element *pu* (§5). Finally, we analyse a hybrid structure consistently produced by semi-speakers from different villages (§6). We conclude the discussion with a number of observations about the role of this case study for our knowledge of

---

[3] The villages which still preserve native speakers of Grico are Calimera, Castrignano de' Greci, Corigliano d'Otranto, Martano, Martignano, Sternatia and Zollino (province of Lecce). The so-called *Unione dei Comuni della Grecìa Salentina* officially includes also Melpignano, where Grico was already moribund during Rohlfs' investigations (Aprile et. al. 2002:680; Sobrero & Miglietta 2005:215; Baldissera 2013:5) and Soleto, where the language was already being abandoned in the second half of the previous century (Rohlfs 1977:XX; Sobrero 1980:399; Aprile et al. 2002:680) and is no longer classified as Grico-speaking in Pellegrino (2016:141, fn. 3). During our 2016 fieldwork, we were however able to find one speaker from Soleto, whose data are reported below. The *Unione* also includes Carpignano Salentino, Cutrofiano and Sogliano Cavour, where Grico is no longer spoken.

[4] A small enclave of Italo-Greek also survives in southern Calabria, for which see morphosyntactic descriptions in Pellegrini (1880), Rohlfs (1977), Katsoyannou (1995; 1997), Manolessou (2005a), Remberger (2011), Ledgway (2013), Guardiano & Stavrou (2014), Schifano, Silvestri & Squillaci (2016), Squillaci (2016) and works of the *Fading Voices* project (https://greekromanceproject.wordpress.com/the-project/).

[5] Descriptions of Grico progressive periphrasis can also be found in further works mentioned in §2, though none of them offers a complete picture.

diatopic morphosyntactic microvariation in Grico and for the nature of language contact and language change (§7).

2. Progressive periphrases in Apulia: new data from Grico

In Pugliese, forms of STAND (*stà(re)/stàri*), inflected for person / number and present or imperfect past tense, combine with the forms of an equally inflected lexical verb to convey progressive aspect. The two verbal components of this periphrastic construction are linked by the erstwhile coordinator *a* (> AC 'and') (5a), which often undergoes surface deletion (5b), but whose (underlying) presence is systematically marked by the initial consonantal lengthening (so-called *raddoppiamento fonosintattico*) that it licenses on the following word:[6]

(5)   a   stok   a   bbeivə (Taranto, Ledgeway 2016b:158)

        stand.PRS.1SG AC   drink.PRS.1SG

        'I am drinking'

     b   stonə   ffachənə (Ostuni, Rohlfs 1969:133)

        stand.PRS.3PL do.PRS.3PL

        'they are doing'

In Salentino, the same strategy is exploited, but the periphrasis is so grammaticalized that the STAND component has undergone morphophonological reduction and surfaces in the invariable form *sta*, both for the present and imperfect past tenses and all grammatical persons, while the presence of *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* signals the original presence of *a*, which is systematically deleted:[7]

---

[6] See Manzini & Savoia (2005, I:§3.12.2), Andriani (2016:Ch.5; 2017) and Manzini et al. (2017) for microvariation in Pugliese progressive periphrases.

[7] The strategy *stare* + gerund reported in Baldissera (2013:46) for Salentino (e.g. *stia ndaquandu* he.stood.IPFV watering 'he was watering') is not mentioned in the literature and was not produced by our informants. Given its morphosyntactic shape, it should be treated as a calque from Italian.

(6)　a　sta　ddormu (Lecce, Ledgeway 2016b:159)

　　　　STA sleep.PRS.1SG

　　　　'I am sleeping'

　　　b　sta　ddurmìanu (Lecce, Ledgeway 2016b:159)

　　　　STA slept.PST.IPFV.3PL

　　　　'they were sleeping'

Focusing our attention now on Grico, three possible strategies are reported by Rohlfs (1977:200-202). The first consists in the use of *steo* 'stand', inflected for person / number and present (7a) or imperfect past (7b)-(7c) tense, and the invariable non-finite form in –*onta* of the lexical verb, as exemplified in (8):[8]

(7)　a　stèo /　　　　stèi /　　　　stèi /　　　　stèume /　　　　stete /　　　　stèune [9]

　　　　stand.PRS.1SG stand.PRS.2SG stand.PRS.3SG stand.PRS.1PL stand.PRS.2PL stand.PRS.3PL

　　　b　èstone /　　　　　　este /　　　　　　este /

　　　　stand.PST.IPFV.1SG　　stand.PST.IPFV.2SG　　stand.PST.IPFV.3SG

　　　　stèamo /　　　　　　stèato /　　　　　　stèane [10]

　　　　stand.PST.IPFV.1PL　　stand.PST.IPFV.2PL　　stand.PST.IPFV.3PL

　　　c　ístinna /　　　　　　ístinne /　　　　　　ístinne /

　　　　stand.PST.IPFV.1SG　　stand.PST.IPFV.2SG　　stand.PST.IPFV.3SG

　　　　stéamo /　　　　　　stéato /　　　　　　stéane [11]

---

[8] In the literature, (Italo-)Greek –*onta*/–*onda* forms have been variously referred to as participles (e.g. Rohlfs 1977:109-110, 200-201; Mackridge 1985; Manolessou 2005a) or gerunds (e.g. Katsoyannou 1995; Holton et al. 2012), given their historical evolution (Manolessou 2005b). Given the lack of agreement on the terminology, we refer to them as Grico -*onta* forms and we gloss them as English –*ing* forms. For a discussion on these forms in Italo-Greek, see also Morosi (1870:132-33), Cassoni ([1937]1990:70), Katsoyannou (1995:325), Italia & Lambroyorgu (2001:132ff.), Squillaci (2016:48ff).

[9] Castrignano (Greco 2003:44). The present paradigm seems to be the same across other villages in contemporary Grico (see also Rohlfs 1977:134 and Tommasi 2001:202).

[10] Calimera (Tommasi 2001:202).

stand.PST.IPFV.1PL   stand.PST.IPFV.2PL   stand.PST.IPFV.3PL

(8)   a   istéo   léonta[12] (Otrantino, Rohlfs 1977:201)

        stand.PRS.1SG   saying

        'I am saying'

   b   ístika   trónta (Otrantino, Rohlfs *ibid*.)

        stand.PST.IPFV.3SG   eating

        'I was eating'

In the second strategy inflected *steo* is combined with the coordinator *ce* 'and' and the lexical verb inflected for the same person / number and present (9a) or imperfect past tense (9b) as *steo*:

(9)   a   stéo   ce   tró (Zollino, Rohlfs 1977:202)

        stand.PRS.1SG   and   eat.PRS.1SG

        'I am eating'

   b   ístike   ce   pisíniske (Castrignano, Rohlfs 1977:202)

        stand.PST.IPFV.3SG   and   die.PST.IPFV.3SG

        'he was dying'

The third possibility consists in the morphological reduction of *steo* to invariable *ste* (10a)-(10b) or *e* (10c), followed by *ce* and the lexical verb inflected for person / number and present or imperfect past tense:

(10)   a   sté   ce   pínno (Otrantino, Rohlfs 1977:202)

---

[11] Castrignano and Martano (Rohlfs 1977:134; Greco 2003:44). Other imperfect past tense forms are attested in other villages, such as the *ístika* type (Rohlfs 1977:134), as illustrated in many examples below.
[12] Grico present tense verbs often feature a prosthetic *e-* or *i-* in the present paradigm (Morosi 1870:132; Rohlfs 1977:21,104), which can also be observed with *steo* (see **i**stéo in 8a and **í**stika in 8b).

STE and drink.PRS.1SG

'I am drinking'

b sté ce   xánnamo (Otr., Rohlfs 1977:202)

STE and get.lost.PST.IPFV.1SG

'I was getting lost'

c 'e   ce   vréxi (Martignano, Rohlfs 1977:202)

(ST)E and rain.PRS.3SG

'it is raining'

However, our investigation of both early and contemporary sources has brought to light a richer array of strategies, as summarised in Table 2 and exemplified below. [13] Early sources include works published between the end of the 19th century and the 1970s (cf. Morosi 1870; Cassoni [1937]1990; Cotardo [1975]2010; Rohlfs 1977). Among the early sources we also include: Karanastasis (1984-1992, cf. a; 1997, cf. b)s, as he started to collect his data in the early '60s, and Karanastasis in the *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek* as mentioned in Nicholas (2001:200) (cf. c), as well as examples from Greco (2003) and *I Spitta* (2016, n.16) coming from fairy tales (from unknown localities within *Grecìa*). Contemporary sources include Profili (1983), works published after 2000 (Italia & Lambroyorgu 2001; Tommasi 2001, 2009; Baldissera 2013; Lekakou et al. 2013) and data collected by the authors with native speakers.[14]

Table 2. Grico progressive periphrases

Pattern	Early sources	Contemporary sources

---

[13] n.a. = not attested, n.s. = native speakers, s.s. = semi-speakers (authors' fieldwork, 2016). Note that person / number and tense never affect patterns in that the periphrases listed above are attested for all persons and numbers, both in the present and imperfect, as opposed to Pugliese, where patterns can be sensitive to person and tense (Andriani 2016:Ch.5, Manzini et al. 2017). V_{finite} always indicates present indicative or imperfect past tense (with the exception of pattern iv).

[14] Profili (1983) is based on the variety spoken in Corigliano, Italia & Lambroyourgu (2001) is based on Sternatia, Greco (2003) on Castrignano de' Greci, and Tommasi (2001; 2009) on Calimera. The only contemporary data for Martignano reported in this work come from a semi-speaker, hence no claims can be advanced on the expression of progressive by proficient speakers in this locality. All the examples from written sources using the Latin alphabet are reported with the original orthographic conventions, while examples from our own fieldwork are transcribed with the closest approximation to Italian orthography. Stress is marked only on oxytones and proparoxytones.

		frequency	source	frequency	source
(i)	*steo* + *-onta* (11)-(12)	common	Morosi Cassoni Cotardo Rohlfs Karanastasis (a,b)	common	Profili Tommasi Baldissera Lekakou et al. n.s.
(ii)	A. *steo* + V_{finite} (13)-(14)	very rare	Morosi	very rare (Corigliano)	Profili Lekakou et al. s.s.
	B. *steo ce* + V_{finite} (15)-(16)	common (Martano, Corigliano?)	Morosi Cassoni Cotardo Rohlfs *I Spitta* Karanastasis (a)	rare (Martano, Corigliano?)	Profili Tommasi Lekakou et al. n.s.
	C. *steo pu* + V_{finite} (17)-(18)	very rare (Corigliano?)	Morosi Karanastasis (c)	very rare (Corigliano)	Profili
(iii)	A. *ste* + V_{finite} (19)-(20)	very rare	Cassoni Greco	common (Calimera)	Tommasi Lekakou et al. n.s.
	B. *ste ce* + V_{finite} (21)-(22)	relatively common	Morosi Cassoni Cotardo Greco Rohlfs	common	Tommasi Lekakou et al. n.s.
	C. *ste pu* + V_{finite} (23)	n.a.		very rare (Corigliano)	n.s.
(iv)	*ce pu* + V_{finite} (24)-(25)	very rare (Martignano, Sternatia)	Karanastasis (a)	common (Sternatia)	Italia & Lambroyorgu Lekakou et al. n.s
(v)	*steo* + $V_{finite(SBJV)}$ (26)	n.a.		common	s.s.

The first strategy, viz. *steo* + *-onta* (i), as already exemplified in (8) above, is common not only in early sources (11) (Morosi 1870:156; Cassoni [1937]1990:79; Cotardo [1975]2010:317; Rohlfs 1977:201; Karanastasis 1984-1992, V:58; 1997:144), but also in contemporary ones (12), where it is still attested in many villages (see also Profili 1983:253, Tommasi 2001:168, Baldissera 2013:46, Lekakou et al. 2013, ex 11):[15]

---

[15] This result contrasts with Morosi (1870:156), who claims that the *steo* + *-onta* periphrasis had almost been ousted from the system at the time of his writing, having being replaced by the *steo ce* + V_{finite} pattern. Our investigations reveal the opposite trend: while *steo* + *-onta* is still productive in contemporary Grico, *steo ce* + V_{finite} has been almost completely abandoned (see discussion below). According to Cassoni ([1937]1990:79), the *steo* + *-onta* periphrasis is limited to the imperfect past tense, but our speakers also employ it with the present (cf. 12).

(11)   *steo + -onta* (early attestations)

a   e   Madonna   estèi   ghennònta (Martano, Morosi 1870:6)

the Virgin.Mary stand.PRS.3SG giving.birth

'the Virgin Mary is giving birth'

b   c'ipe   ti   stecu   clèonta ta   pedìa

and=say.PST.PRF.3SG that stand.PRS.3PL crying   the children

(Corigliano, Morosi 1870:47)

'and he said that the children are crying'

c   istika   fenonta (Cassoni [1937]1990:79)

stand.PST.IPFV.3SG weaving

'she was weaving'

d   pôs   pai   pu stesi   ghiurìzonta? (Cotardo [1975]2010:317)[16]

how   go.PRS.3SG that stand.PRS.2SG returning

'how come you're returning?'

(12)   *steo + -onta* (contemporary attestations)

a   quai   ántrepi steune   panta   milonta (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:168)

certain men   stand.PRS.3PL always   speaking

'some men always talk'

b   ti   stei   panta   milonta? (Calimera, n.s)

what stand.PRS.2SG always speaking

'what are you always talking about?'

c   stéane   gráfonta (Castrignano, n.s.)

stand.PST.IPFV.3PL   writing

---

[16] This attestation is copied by Cotardo ([1975]2010) from D. Tondi (no further references are provided).

'they were writing'

d ístinna   dronta, ce éstase   o Petro (Corigliano, n.s.)

   stand.PST.IPFV.1SG eating   and arrive.PST.PRF.3SG the Petro

   'I was eating and Petro arrived'

e stete   gráfonta? (Martano, n.s.)

   you.2PL.stand writing

   'are you writing?'

f i Maria ístiche   plínonta tus piattu (Soleto, n.s.)

   the Maria stand.PST.IPFV.3SG washing   the dishes

   'Maria was washing the dishes'

g ístiga   marézzonta (Sternatia, n.s.)

   stand.PAST.IPFV.1SG cooking

   'I was cooking'

h motte se   fónezza,   isú   ístiche   tronta (Zollino, n.s.)

   when   you.ACC call.PST.PRF.1SG you.NOM stand.PST.IPFV.2SG eating

   'when I called you, you were eating'

Conversely, the use of inflected *steo* followed by V$_{finite}$ (ii-A), matching for person / number and tense, seems to be relatively unpopular (and thus escaped traditional descriptions), being very rare both in early sources (13) (Morosi 1870:70) and contemporary ones (14), where it is mainly produced by semi-speakers from Corigliano (14a).[17] However, as the same pattern is also reported by Profili (1983:253) and Lekakou et al. (2013) for the same village, see (14b)-(14c)-(14d), it may be the case that this periphrasis is (or has been) a genuine strategy specifically employed in this locality:

---

[17] See §2 for a definition of semi-speaker.

(13) *steo* + V_{finite} (early attestations)

(a)ttos butegaro   stècume   (ce) milùme (Calimera, Morosi 1870:70)

of.the inn-keepers stand.PRS.1PL and speak.PRS.1PL

'we are talking about inn keepers'

(14) *steo* + V_{finite} (contemporary attestations)

a dio sciddu mavru stéane   taccánnane   i Mmaria(Corigliano, s.s.)[18]

two dogs black   stand.PST.IPFV.3PL bite.PST.IPFV.3PL the Maria

'two dogs were biting Maria'

b istèo   marèo (Corigliano, Profili 1983:253, as quoted in Baldissera 2013:46)

stand.PRS.1SG cook.PRS.1SG

'I am cooking'

c istei   marei (Corigliano, Profili *ibid*., as quoted in Baldissera *ibid*.)

stand.PRS.2SG cook.PRS.2SG

'you are cooking'

d àrtena ivò stèo   studièo (Corigliano, Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 5)

now   I   stand.PRS.1SG study.PRS.1SG

'now I am studying'

The use of inflected *steo* and V_{finite} is instead common in early sources if accompanied by *ce* 'and' (ii-B), see (9) above and (15) (Morosi 1870:156; Cassoni [1937]1990:78-79; Cotardo [1975]2010:54; Rohlfs 1977:202; fairy tale from *I Spitta* 2016; see also *steco ce* in Karanastasis 1984-1992, III: 12), although today this pattern is very infrequent and can mainly, but not exclusively, be found in Martano (16) (see also one attestation from this village in Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 12), alongside other patterns (see examples above and below):

---

[18] Note the incorrect case marking on the subject, which should be *sciddi mavri* (nominative plural) rather than *sciddu mavru* (accusative plural) (see also 26a-26e below).

(15) *steo ce* + V_{finite} (early attestations)

a e   tto   tori   pu istèi /   ce pracalì   o   Teò?

not it.ACC= see.PRS.2SG that stand.PRS.3SF and pray.PRS.3SG the Lord

(Corigliano, Morosi 1870:39)

'can't you see that he's praying to the Lord?'

b èftase   's a canàli, pu   stèane   ce meràzane

arrive.PST.PRF.3SG at a river   where stand.PST.IPFV.3PL and divide.PST.IPFV.3PL

e   ladri   poddà turniscia (Martano, Morosi 1870:74)

the thieves many money

'he reached a river, where the thieves were dividing up lots of money'

c asca,   mescia, a   tt'argalìo / epù panta estèi   ce

stand.IMP.2SG mistress from the=loom   where always stand.PRS.2SG and

feni (Martano, Morosi 1870:7)

weave.PRS.2SG

'rise, mistress, from the loom / where you're always weaving'

d ihe   a cummenenzieri pu   ìstiche   c'endàli

have.PST.3SG a herdsman   who stand.PST.IPVF.3SG and=play.PST.IPFV.3SG

o   fràulo

the flute (Martano, Morosi 1870:75)

'there was a herdsman who was playing the flute'

e e   patèri estèa   c'endìnnatto (Martano, Morosi 1870:9)

the priests stand.PST.IPVF.3PL and=get.dressed.PST.IPFV.3PL

'the priests were dressing'

f estèa   ce hònnane   mia signura (Martano, Morosi 1870:75)

stand.PST.IPVF.3PL and bury.PST.IPVF.3PL a   lady

'they were burying a lady'

g evò, ipe   Cigala, en èrcome   jà macàda, ti steo   ce

   I   say.PST.PRF.3SG Cigala not come.PRS.1SG for at.all   that stand.PRS.1SG and

   travudò (Martano, Cassoni [1937] 1990:148)

   sing.PRS.1SG

   'as for me, said Cigala, I am not coming at all, since I am singing'

h stechi   ce   plonni (Martignano, Karanastasis 1984-1992, III: 12)

   stand.PRS.3SG and   sleep. PRS.3SG

   '(s)he's sleeping'

i stechi   ce   canni (Sternatia, Karanastasis 1984-1992, III:12)

   stand.PRS.3SG and   do. PRS.3SG

   '(s)he's doing'

(16) *steo ce* + V$_{finite}$ (contemporary attestations)

a o   soma ka stei   ce kanonì (Calimera, Tommasi 2009:24)

   the body that stand.PRS.2SG and look.PRS.2SG

   'the body which you are looking at'

b stete   ce gráfete? (Martano, n.s.)

   stand.PRS.2PL and write.PRS.2PL

   'are you writing?'

c e Maria ístinne   c'eddre (Martano, n.s.)

   the Maria stand.PST.IPFV.3SG   and=eat.PST.IPFV.3SG

   'Maria was eating'

d stéamo   c' egráfamo (Martano, n.s.)

   stand.PST.IPFV.1PL and write.PST.IPFV.1PL

   'we were writing'

e stéamo   c'etróamo (Martano, n.s.)

stand.PST.IPFV.1PL and=eat.PST.IPFV.1PL

'we were eating'

f stéato   c'etróato? (Martano, n.s.)

stand.PST.IPFV.2PL and=eat.PST.IPFV.2PL

'were you eating?'

g ta pedia stéane   c'etróane (Martano, n.s.)

the children stand.PST.IPFV.3PL and=eat.PST.IPFV.3PL

'the children were eating'

As many attestations from early sources belong to Martano too, it is not surprising to see relic forms in contemporary sources from the same locality.[19] Interestingly, there is also one example from Corigliano in Profili (1983:253) (as well as in early sources, cf. 15a and fn. 19), suggesting that Corigliano too may (once) have exhibited this pattern.

As a rare alternative to *ce*, inflected *steo* may also be linked to V$_{\text{finite}}$ by means of *pu* (ii-C), as attested in two early sources (17) (Morosi 1870:156; Karanastasis, as quoted in Nicholas 2001:200), and a contemporary one (18) Profili (1983:253):[20]

(17) *steo pu* + V$_{\text{finite}}$ (early attestations)

a steo   pu plonno (Morosi 1870:156)

stand.PRS.1SG PU sleep.PRS.1SG

'I am sleeping'

b iléane   pu stéune,   pu gléune   ta pedía, échune

say.PST.PRF.3PL when stand.PRS.3PL PU cry.PRS.3PL the children have.PRS.3PL

---

[19] Of nine attestations in Morosi (1870), five belong to Martano and three to Corigliano (plus a less clear case from Calimera, see 13 above). All six attestations from stories in Cassoni ([1937]1990) are from Martano.
[20] See §5 on the meaning(s) and syntactic status of *pu*.

méa   besógno azzé nneró[21]

great need   of   water

(Corigliano, Karanastasis, *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek* 836, 171, as quoted in

Nicholas 2001:200)

'they said, when children keep crying, they have great need of water'

(18)   *steo pu* + V$_{finite}$ (contemporary attestations)

istene   pu kuntene   to dialetto

stand.PRS.3PL PU speak.PRS.3PL the dialect

(Corigliano, Profili 1983:253, as quoted in Baldissera 2013:46)

'they are speaking in the dialect'

Moving on to strategy (iii), we observe that *steo* can be reduced to the invariable form *ste* (all

persons and tenses), directly combining with V$_{finite}$ (iii-A). On a par with *steo* + V$_{finite}$ (ii-A), this

pattern is very rare in early sources (19) (Cassoni [1937] 1990:168; fairy tale from Greco 2003:58),

but, unlike the former, it is today the most productive and unmarked form used in Calimera (see

also Tommasi 2001:168 and Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 6, 7, 10, 35), although it can be found in other

villages too (20) (see also Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 5, 7, from Corigliano and Martano):[22]

(19)   *ste* + V$_{finite}$ (early attestations)

    a a   pròata 'mes   ton astrico, isane   gomàta, ce tua   'mes tossi chàri

       the sheep middle the floor   be.PST.3PL full   and these middle such grace

---

[21] According to Nicholas (2001:200), Karanastasis' original translation of this example ('they said that children are crying, they have great need of water') is not accurate and should be rendered as above. For the purposes of our discussion, it is interesting to note the use of στέουνε που gλαίουνε, which according to Nicholas (*ibid.*) is an instance of the *steo pu* periphrasis mentioned by Morosi (1870:156). *Ατσέ / azze* correspond to the prepositions 'of' and 'from' with bare nouns (Rohlfs 1977:149; see also fn. 54).

[22] The fact that (at least) one of the two early instances in our corpus is from Calimera may indicate that the pattern actually originated in this village and only later spread to other localities, hence the paucity of early attestations. On the presence of this pattern in other villages, see also the considerations in §7.

Teù,   'ste' fsofùne (Calimera, Cassoni [1937] 1990:168)

God.GEN STE   die.PRS.3PL

'the sheep in the middle of the floor were fat, while these, despite such abundance of

food, are dying'

b en kuis   àrtena ka ste latì   e banda?

not hear.PRS.2SG now   that STE play.PRS.3SG the band

(fairy tale from unknown locality, Greco 2003:58)

'can you not hear now the band striking up?'

(20)   *ste* + V$_{finite}$ (contemporary attestations)

a ste leo   tzèmata? (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:84)

STE tell.PRS.1SG lies

'I'm telling lies?'

b ste pao   ettozzu (Calimera, n.s.)

STE go.PRS.1SG out

'I'm going out / to the country'

c o Giorgi ste meletá   ártena (Castrignano, n.s.)

the Giorgi STE read.PRS.3SG   now

'Giorgi is reading now'

d ste   mareo (Corigliano, n.s.)[23]

STE   cook.PRS.1SG

'I'm cooking'

e àrtena ivò ste studieo (Martano, Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 5)

now   I   STE study.PRS.1SG

---

[23] According to Profili (1983), STAND in Corigliano is always inflected in the progressive periphrasis. The fact that our informants from this locality spontaneously produced the invariable form too is consistent with the 'dissolution of isoglosses' we discuss in §7, whereby morphosyntactic strategies are no longer diatopically distributed as in the past.

'now I'm studying'

f ste grafo 'nan gramma (Zollino, n.s.)

STE write.PRS.1SG a letter

'I'm writing a letter'

Similarly, the use of invariable *ste* (all persons and tenses) linked to V_finite by *ce* (iii-B) seems to have gained ground over time, as it is only relatively common in early sources (21) (Morosi 1870:66; Cassoni [1937]1990:78; Cotardo [1975]2010:308; fairy tales from Greco 2003:58, 159, 160; see also 10 from Rohlfs 1977:202), but becomes extremely frequent in contemporary sources (22), where it is attested across all villages (see also Tommasi 2001, 2009 and Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 7, 10):[24]

(21)   *ste ce* + V_finite (early attestations)

a ehi monecu ce patèru / pu ste' ge naftu to ceri

have.PRS.3SG monks and priests who STE and light.PRS.3PL the candle

(Sternatia, Morosi 1870:66)

'there are monks and priests / that are lighting candles'

b en èrchete jà macàda, ka ste' ce travudì (Martano, Cassoni [1937]1990:148)

not come.PRS.3SG for at.all that STE and sing.PRS.3SG

'he's not coming at all, because he's singing'

c ti ste' ce canni? (Castrignano, Cassoni [1937]1990:174)

what STE and do.PRS.2SG

'what are you doing?'

---

[24] It is relevant to observe that in Morosi (1870), which is the earliest source in our corpus, there is only one instance of this strategy.

d putt'e ste ce ftazi[25] (Cotardo [1975]2010:308)

from STE and arrive.PRS.2SG

'where you are coming from'

(22) *ste ce* + V$_{finite}$ (contemporary attestations)

a ste c'étrona, dopu me fónase[26] (Calimera, n.s.)

STE and=eat.PST.IPFV.1SG when me call.PST.PRF.2SG

'I was eating when you called me'

b e chiatera ste ce troi (Castrignano, n.s.)

the girl STE and eat.PRS.3SG

'the girl is eating'

c ste ce troo (Martano, n.s.)

STE and eat.PRS.1SG

'I'm eating'

d ste ce trome (Soleto, n.s.)

STE and eat.PRS.1PL

'we are eating'

e ta pedia ste ce meletune 'nna libbro (Zollino, n.s.)

the children STE and read.PRS.3PL a book

'the children are reading a book'

As with *steo*, the use of the alternative *pu* to link invariable *ste* to V$_{finite}$ (iii-C) is less popular, but possible. Although we could not find any attestations in the early sources, this form was consistently produced by a native speaker from Corigliano:

---

[25] This attestation comes from Giannino Aprile (1972), *Calimera e i suoi traudia*. An anonymous reviewer informs us that its original source is oral, in that a variant form of this sentence is found in a local popular song (see live recording in the CD *Η Μουσική Παράδοση της Κάτω Ιταλίας*).

[26] See §3.3 for a more detailed discussion on the use of this construction in Calimera.

(23)   *ste pu* + V_{finite} (contemporary attestations)

      ste pu pleno   tus piattu (Corigliano, n.s.)

      STE PU wash.PRS.1SG the dishes

      'I'm washing the dishes'

As at least two attestations of the same pattern with inflected *steo* are also from Corigliano (cf. 17-18), we may hypothesise that the *ste(o) pu* strategy is specific of this locality.

    Interestingly, the combination of *ce* and *pu* without *ste(o)* is also possible (iv). This strategy is attested in only one of the later early sources, namely Karanastasis (1984-1992, III:12), for Sternatia and Martignano (24), but it is the most productive periphrasis employed by contemporary speakers in Sternatia (see also Italia & Lambroyorgu 2001:133, 164 and Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 10-11) and not attested in any other villages (25):

(24)   *ce pu* + V_{finite} (early attestations)

      a ce pu plonni (Martignano, Karanastasis 1984-1992, III:12)

         and PU sleep.PRS.3SG

         '(s)he's sleeping'

      b ce pu canni (Sternatia, Karanastasis 1984-1992, III:12)

         and PU do.PRS.3SG

         '(s)he's doing'

(25)   *ce pu* + V_{finite} (contemporary attestations)

      a ce pu trome (Sternatia, n.s.)

         and PU eat.PRS.1PL

         'we are eating'

b motte esí stásato, emí ce pu tróamo (Sternatia, n.s.)

    when you.2PL arrive.PST.PRF.2PL we and PU eat.PST.IPFV.1PL

    'when you arrived, we were eating'

The last strategy consists in the use of inflected *steo* and V$_{finite}$ in the subjunctive (v). This pattern is not attested either in early or in contemporary written sources, but today is very common among semi-speakers from all villages (26), namely speakers belonging to one of the following three subcategories: (i) L1 speakers whose once full competence has been eroded as a consequence of a lack of use of the language for more or less an extended period of time, (ii) L1 speakers who have naturally acquired Grico from their families, but only partially, and (iii) L2 speakers who have decided to learn Grico later in their lives, but have never reached a native-like competence.[27] This construction is judged ungrammatical by proficient speakers (27), who may use the subjunctive with *steo* only to convey other interpretations, such as purpose (28a) or prospective aspect (28b):[28]

(26)   *steo* + V$_{finite[SBJV]}$ (contemporary attestations)

   a dio   sciddu ístinne   na   taccázzune ti Mmaria[29](Corigliano, s.s.)

      two   dogs   stand.PST.IPFV.3SG SBJV bite.SBJV.3PL the Maria

      'two dogs were biting Maria'

   b motte o Pavlo éstase,   imí ísticame   na   marésscsiome[30]

      when the Pavlo arrive.PST.PRF.3SG we stand.PST.IPFV.1PL SBJV cook.SBJV.1PL

---

[27] On the notion of semi-speaker in another context of language death (cf. Scottish Gaelic), see Dorian (1981).
[28] See also the following early attestation, where the subjunctive expresses prospective aspect:

(i)   satti   ìstike   na   fthasi   sto   inferno (D. Tondi, in Cotardo [1975]2010:317)
       when stand.PST.IPFV.3SG   SBJV arrive.SBJV.3SG to.the hell
       'when he was about to reach hell'

[29] Note the incorrect case / number marking on the subject in (26a)-(26e), which should be *sciddi (mavri)* (masculine nominative plural) or *scidda (mavra)* (neuter nominative plural), rather than *sciddu* (accusative plural) and *sciddo* (nominative singular), as well as on the past imperfect of 'stand' in (26a)-(26e), which should be *steane* and *isticane* (3rd plural), respectively, rather than *istine* and *istiche* (3rd singular).
[30] Note the incorrect inflection on the past imperfect of 'stand', which should be –*amo* (past imperfective, 1st plural).

'when Pavlo arrived, we were eating'

(Zollino, s.s.)

c   ística   na   fao (Zollino, s.s.)

stand.PST.IPFV.1SG SBJV eat.SBJV.1SG

'I was eating'

d   motti me fónasse,   evó ística   na   tro[31] (Martano, s.s.)

when me call.PST.PRF.2SG I   stand.PST.IPFV.1SG SBJV eat.PRS.1SG

'when you called me, I was eating'

e   dio sciddo mavro ístiche   na   taccanni   ti   Mmaria[32] (Martano, s.s.)

two dog   black stand.PST.IPFV.3SG SBJV bite.PRS.3SG the Maria

'two black dogs were biting Maria' (intended meaning)

(27)   ?esú   ce o Giorgi   stéato   panta   n'is   milísete

you.2SG and the Giorgi   stand.PST.IPFV.2PL always SBJV=her.DAT speak.SBJV.2PL

(Calimera, n.s.)

'you and Giorgi were always speaking to her'

(28)   a m'ena   pedai ambrò / ka stei   na   kusi (Calimera, Tommasi 2009:54)

with=a boy   in.front that stand.PRS.3SG SBJV listen.SBJV.3SG

'with a boy in front of you who stays there to listen to you'

b steo   panta evò na   fio (Calimera, Tommasi 2009:110)

stand.PRS.1SG alwaysI   SBJV run.away.SBJV.1SG

'I am always about to run away'

---

[31] The subjunctive form should always feature the perfective stem in Grico (Morosi 1870:134; Rohlfs 1977:107; Tommasi 2001:176; Greco 2003:96; Baldissera 2013:120; Lekakou & Quer 2016a; 2016b), but semi-speakers' verb morphology is severely impaired and hybrid forms are often employed, see the non-existent present subjunctive *na tro* in (26d), incorrectly built on the imperfective stem *tr-* (to be compared with the correct form *na fao* in 26c, as also reported in Rohlfs 1977:134 and Greco 2003:137).

[32] Note the incorrect form of 'bite', which is erroneously inflected in the 3rd person singular present indicative, rather than in the 3rd person plural subjunctive (cf. *na daccásune*).

To sum up, the data reviewed in this section have shown how the expression of progressive aspect in Grico proves to be richer than traditionally assumed, in that at least 5 macro-strategies are attested (Table 2), showing a distinct distribution across time (cf. early vs contemporary attestations) and space (cf. patterns specific of Martano / Corigliano / Calimera / Sternatia vs the remainder villages). In the following section, we concentrate on the present-day productive patterns, namely *steo + -onta* (i), *ste (ce)* + V$_{finite}$ (iii-A,B) and *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$ (iv), and we discuss their semantic interpretation and morphosyntactic behaviour in further detail.

3. Degrees of grammaticalization

The Romance progressive periphrases show different degrees of grammaticalization of their morphosyntactic components, as witnessed, by example, in the progressive decategorialization of the auxiliaries employed reflected in the abandonment of typical morphosyntactic properties of their erstwhile lexical status (Ledgeway 2011b:725, 2012:124-127), a process which has clearly affected also the Italo-Romance varieties of Puglia.

Starting from Pugliese, Ledgeway (2016b) has shown that in the inflected STAND (AND) + V$_{finite}$ periphrasis, the erstwhile coordinator *a* (> AC 'and') has been reanalysed as a complementizer selecting an IP, so that the original coordination structure has become a biclausal pseudo-coordination one:

(29)　a　[$_{\&P}$ stok　　　[$_{\&'}$ a　[$_{Compl}$ bbeivǝ]]]　　(coordination structure) →

　　　　　stand.PRS.1SG　　AC　　drink.PRS.1SG

　　　b　[$_{IP}$ stok　　　[$_{CP}$ a　[$_{IP}$　bbeivǝ]]]　　(biclausal pseudo-coordination structure)

　　　　　stand.PRS.1SG　　AC　　drink.PRS.1SG　　(Pugliese, inflected STAND)

　　　'I am drinking'

In Salentino, the grammaticalization of the progressive periphrasis has gone even further, in that the original coordinator has been deleted (although its former presence is still marked by *raddoppiamento fonosintattico*), STAND has been reduced to the invariable form *sta*, and the whole periphrasis has been reanalysed as a restructured monoclausal structure (Cinque 2006):

(30) [$_{AgrP}$ sta ffazzu]   (restructured monoclausal structure)

STA do.PRS.1SG   (Salentino, invariable STAND form)

'I am doing'

In addition to the observed morphological attrition and syntactic reanalysis, a number of semantic tests show that Salentino *sta* has shifted from a progressive marker to a mere aspectual marker, thus reaching the most advanced stage of the 'imperfective drift' that progressive periphrases follow cross-linguistically (cf. Stage V below) (Bertinetto et al. 2000:538-541; Mair 2012:812; Deo 2015; Bertinetto & Squartini 2016:949):

Table 3. Imperfective drift of progressive periphrases (Bertinetto & Squartini *ibid*.)

(i)	Pure locativity	Stative, durative
(ii)	Progressivity I	Residually locative, durative, aspectually neutral
(iii)	Progressivity II	Durative, aspectually neutral
(iv)	Progressivity III	Focalized, strictly imperfective
(v)	Pure imperfectivity	Loss of the specifically progressive character

The natural question now concerns the Italo-Greek varieties of Puglia, namely what is the degree of grammaticalization of the contemporary productive patterns identified in §2, viz. *steo + -onta* (i), *ste (ce)* + V$_{finite}$ (iii-A,B) and *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$ (iv)? [33] In what follows, we address this question by exploiting some of tests for the grammaticalization of progressive periphrases discussed

---

[33] In what follows, we leave aside *steo ce* + V$_{finite}$ (ii-B), which was productive in early sources but today only survives as a relic form with some Martano speakers. As such, we could not apply the semantic and morphosyntactic tests necessary to assess its degree of grammaticalization discussed below. However, its role in the genesis of the productive patterns is considered in §4. The same consideration applies to the other patterns in Table 2 which are not productive (anymore), i.e. *ste(o) (pu)* + V$_{finite}$, which will also be left aside. For the contemporary productive periphrasis *steo* + V$_{finite[SBJV]}$, see §6.

in Ledgeway (2016b) (see also Ledgeway 2011b:724-25), which include semantic effects (e.g. compatibility with predicates with stative, habitual and generic interpretation), morphological effects (e.g. inflectional attrition), as well as syntactic ones (e.g. clitic placement). By paying particular attention to the placement of the distinct verb forms with respect to adverbs and clitics, we also propose an analysis of the syntactic structure of these periphrases. Our proposal rests on two assumptions. As far as the clausal spine is concerned, we assume that this can be divided into two spaces, namely a Higher Adverb Space (HAS) and a Lower Adverb Space (LAS), hosting adverbs located in high and low positions, respectively, within Cinque's (1999) hierarchy of functional projections. Adverb placement is therefore taken to be a diagnostic for the position of the verb in one of the two spaces (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005; 2014; Schifano 2015; 2016; forthcoming). As for pronominal cliticization, we follow Ledgeway & Lombardi (2005) in assuming that clitics target two possible positions, one associated with a clause-medial functional projection and the other associated with a relatively low one (see also Cardinaletti & Sholonsky 2004), and that cliticization can be syntactic, as in the Italian sentence in (31), or phonological, namely delayed until PF, as in the Cosentino sentence in (32):

(31) a Gianni **mi**   conosce   già (Italian, Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005:95)

Gianni   me.ACC= know.PRS.3SG   already

'Gianni already knows me'

b Gianni [$_{YP}$ mi conosce [$_{LAS}$ già t$_{mi\text{-}conosce}$] [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ t$_{conosce}$ t$_{mi}$]]

(low syntactic cliticization in LAS, clause-medial movement of verb pied-piping the clitic)

(32) a Gianni ggià   **mi**   canuscia (Cosentino, Ledgeway & Lombardi *ibid*.)

Gianni   already me.ACC= know.PRS.3SG

'Gianni already knows me'

b Gianni [$_{YP}$ [$_{LAS}$ ggià mi canuscia] [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ t$_{canuscia}$ t$_{mi}$]]

(phonological cliticization in LAS, low verb movement in LAS)

In conclusion, we will argue that the data provided are compatible with a monoclausal analysis of the structures under investigation.[34]

3.1 *Steo + -onta*

In accordance with its frequency in early attestations (cf. Table 2), we take *steo + -onta* to be one of the original Grico patterns, alongside the now moribund *steo ce* + V$_{finite}$. Today, this periphrasis is still productive in all villages (cf. examples in 12; see §3.3 for specialised use in Calimera) and has preserved a low degree of grammaticalization.

Considering first its semantics, (33a) shows that *steo + -onta* is incompatible with verbs with a stative interpretation, unlike Salentino *sta* (33b):

(33) a *en steo   noónta (Grico, Calimera, n.s.)

not stand.PRS.1SG understanding

'I can't understand / I'm not following'

b jeu nu' sta capiscu   nenzi   cchiui

I   not STA understand.PRS.1SG nothing more

(Salentino, Matino, Ledgeway 2016b:165)

'I can't understand anything anymore'

From a morphological point of view, *steo* is always obligatorily inflected (34a), namely no morphological attrition is observed, and the coordinator *ce* is not found (34b), again differently from Salentino invariable *sta* (cf. 6) and the Pugliese STAND AND periphrasis (cf. 5):[35]

---

[34] The reader is referred to Manzini et al. (2017) for arguments in favour a biclausal analysis of structures of the type STAND + (*a*) + V$_{finite}$, as attested in Salentino.

(34)   a   *dio scidda ste daccánonta ti   Mmaria (Soleto, n.s.)

two   dogs   STE biting   the Maria

'two dogs were biting Maria'

b   e   Maria stei   panta   (*ce) maréonta motte 'tazzo   essu

the Maria stand.PRS.3SG always and   cooking   when arrive.PRS.1SG in

(Calimera, n.s.)

'Maria is always cooking when I arrive home'

As for its syntactic placement, *steo* follows the sentential negator (35a) and pronominal clitics (35b), and can be separated from *–onta* by low aspectual adverbs such as *panta* 'always' (35b) and *ancora* 'still' (35c) (see also (i) in fn. 35):

(35)   [neg clitic *steo* Adv [*-onta*]]

a   e   ántrepi en esteune   panta   milonta (Calimera, n.s.)

the men   not stand.PRS.3PL always speaking

'men are not always (there) speaking'

b   e   Maria to   stei   panta   pínnonta (Calimera, n.s.)

the Maria it.ACC= stand.PRS.3SG always drinking

'Maria is always drinking it'

c   ìstigghe   ankora   marèonta (Sternatia, Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 11)

---

[35] One potential counterexample to lack of morphological attrition is the following example from Lekakou et al. (2013, ex. 10), where an apparently invariable *ste* combines with *–onta* in the 3rd person singular, instead of the expected fully flected *stei*:

(i)   ste ankòra marèonta (Sternatia)
        STE still   cooking
        '(s)he still cooking'

However, it may be the case that this reduction is simply conditioned by the phonological environment (cf. following word beginning with a vowel).

stand.PST.IPFV.3SG still   cooking

'(s)he was still cooking'

Accordingly, we claim that *steo + -onta* is a monoclausal structure, with the auxiliary *steo* base-generated in Asp$_{Durative/Progressive}$ (Cinque 2006) and the lexical verb in *v*-VP. The linear facts in (35) indicate that the lexical verb incorporates to *–onta* (possibly located within a *v* projection) and leaves the *v*-VP (see its movement beyond *calà* 'well', which is located at the very low boundary of the IP in Cinque's 1999 hierarchy of adverbs: *e Maria stei panta travudonta calá (*travudonta)* 'Maria is always singing well', Calimera), only reaching a low position within the IP (see its placement below *panta*, which occupies a low position in Cinque's 1999 hierarchy) Conversely *steo*, after its base-generation in Asp$_{Durative/Progressive}$, undergoes clause-medial verb movement, pied-piping the clitic from its low site of syntactic cliticization:

(36)   [$_{HAS}$ neg clitic *steo* [$_{LAS}$ low-Adv [$_{AspDurative}$ t$_{clitic}$ t$_{steo}$] V-*onta* [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ t$_v$ t$_{clitic}$]]]

3.2 *Ste ce* + V$_{finite}$

As discussed above, the use of invariable *ste (ce)* + V$_{finite}$ seems to be a rather innovative pattern, at best proving only relatively common (*ste ce* + V$_{finite}$) or rare (*ste* + V$_{finite}$) in the early sources but today productively employed by speakers in accordance with the parameters described below.

Starting from the option in which *ce* is retained (iii-B), commonly produced by speakers of different villages (cf. 22) and thus not diatopically specialised, its semantic, morphological and syntactic properties betray a high degree of grammaticalization. Beginning with its interpretation, *ste ce* proves to be compatible with verbs with a stative (37a) and habitual (37b) interpretation, on a par with Salentino *sta* (37c) but unlike the *steo –onta* periphrasis seen above (cf. 33a):

(37)   a ste ce noó (Grico, Calimera, n.s.)

STE and understand.PRS.1SG

'I can understand / I'm following'

b feto   en   este   c'érchese   pleo   sti   scola?

this.year   not   STE   and=come.PRS.2SG   no.longer   to=the   school

(Grico, Calimera, n.s.)[36]

'aren't you coming to school anymore this year?

c nu   sse   sta ssèntenu   cchiùi (Salentino, Lecce, Ledgeway 2016b:166)

not   selves=   STA listen.PRS.3PL   anymore

'they no longer speak to one another'

As for its morphological properties, STAND is always inflectionally reduced to invariable *ste*, occasionally featuring a prosthetic *e-* (38) or *i-* (39) (cf. fn. 12), although an invariable *stei* (40) is occasionally produced too by native speakers:

(38)   a   este c'éplonna   dopu   éstase   o   Pietro (Castrignano, n.s.)

         STE and=sleep.PST.IPFV.1SG   when   arrive.PST.PFV.3SG the   Pietro

         'I was sleeping when Pietro arrived'

   b   evó esté   c'égrafa (Castrignano, n.s.)

         I   STE   and write.PST.IPFV.1SG

         'I was writing'

   c   esté ce   troo (Martano, n.s.)

         STE   and eat.PRS.1SG

         'I am eating'

   d   dio scidi   esté ce   taccánnone   i   Mmaria (Martano, n.s.)

         two dogs   STE and bite.PRS.3PL   the   Maria

---

[36] See §3.3 on the emergence of prosthetic *e-* on *ste* after words ending in consonant in Calimera.

'two dogs are biting Maria'

(39)   esí   isté ce   plónnato (Castrignano, n.s.)

you.2PL STE and sleep.PST.IPFV.2PL

'you were sleeping'

(40)   a e   Maria stei ce   grafi (Martano, n.s.)

the M.   STE and   write.PRS.3SG

'Maria is writing'

b stei ce   troo (Soleto, n.s.)

STE and eat.PRS.1SG

'I am eating'

c   stei ce   troi (Soleto, n.s.)

STE and eat.PRS.2SG

'you are eating'

Conversely, the *ste > e* reduction described by Rohlfs (1977:202) (cf. 10c) is no longer common,

having being produced only by one semi-speaker (41), while *ce > c'* reduction applies if the

following verb begins with a stressed (42a) or unstressed (42b) vowel (as with the *steo ce* pattern,

cf. 16c-16d-16e-16f), although this deletion does not appear to be obligatory (42c-42d): [37]

---

[37] *Ce* can independently undergo deletion before stressed vowels also when used as a coordinator:

(i)   c'ibbie   trèhonta e   Maria (Martano, Morosi 1870:3)
        and=go.PST.IPFV.3SG running the   Maria
        'and Maria was running'
(ii)   es ettà   c'ìmisi   kanni (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:58)
        the seven and=half do.PRS.3SG
        'it's half past seven'

(41) diu sciddu calú 'e ce taccánane   e Mmaria[38] (Martignano, s.s.)

two dogs beautiful (ST)E and bite.PRS.IPFV.3PL the Maria

'two beautiful dogs were biting Maria'

(42) a ste c'étrona,   dopu me fónase (Calimera, n.s.)

STE and=eat.PST.IPFV.1SG when me call.PST.PFV.2SG

'I was eating when you called me'

b ste c'edrònno (Cassoni [1937]1990:78)

ste and=sweat.PRS.1SG

'I am sweating'

c à to largo ide   mian mùscia ka   ste ce èrkato

from the distance see.PST.PFV.3SG a   cat   which STE and come.PST.IPFV.3SG

òrria   ce mpikessata (fairy tale from unknown locality, Greco 2003:58)

beautiful and dressed.up

'in the distance he caught sight of a cat that was approaching, beautiful and dressed up'

d mian emera ediàvike   ap'ombrò   tto kafùrkio-tti mia scidha mavri ka

one day   pass.PST.PFV.3SG from=in.front.of the den=her   a   dog   black which

ste ce ìbbie   na tos   doki   na vizàsune   tta

ste and go.PST.IPFV.3SG SBJV them.DAT give.SBJV.3SG SBJV suckle.SBJV.3PL the

scidhùtsia-tti (fairy tale from unknown locality, Greco 2003:159)

pups=her

'one day a black bitch which was on its way to suckle its pups passed by its den'

---

[38] Note the incorrect case marking on the subject (see also 26a-26e above), which should be *sciddi calí* (nominative plural) rather than *sciddu calú* (accusative plural), and the incorrect case marking on the article of the direct object, which should be *(t)i(n)* (accusative singular) rather than *e* (nominative singular / plural and accusative plural) (Rohlfs 1977:67; Tommasi 2001:158,164). *Ste* reduction is so advanced in this semi-speaker that he consistently produced forms like (i), where *ste* is completely deleted:

(i)   a   checcia ce   trone (Martignano, s.s.)
         the   children and eat.PRS.3PL
         'the children are eating'

Finally, note that *ste > e* and *ce > c'* reduction may combine, as in the following example from a semi-speaker:

(43)　　dopu ch'irte,　　　　　　　　'e　　c'edra[39] (Martignano, s.s.)

　　　　when that=come.PST.PFV.2SG　(ST)E and=eat.PST.IPFV.1SG

　　　　'when you came, I was eating'

　　As for its syntactic properties, *ste ce* + V$_{\text{finite}}$ allows extraction of the embedded object (44), on a par with Salentino *sta* + V$_{\text{finite}}$ (45a), but unlike genuine coordination structures (45b)-(45c), where Ross' (1967) Coordinate Structure Constraint rigidly applies, thereby highlighting how *ce* has lost its original coordinating function:

(44)　　ti　　ste　ce　troi　　　　~~ti~~? (Grico, Soleto, n.s.)

　　　　what STE and　eat.PRS.2SG　what

　　　　'what are you eating?'

(45)　　a　e　ttie　cce　sta　spietti　　　　~~cce~~? (Salentino, Lecce, Ledgeway 2016b:164)

　　　　　　and　you　what　STA　wait.PRS.2SG　what

　　　　　　'and what are you waiting for?'

　　　　b　*What did Ann sleep all day and missed ~~what~~? (Ledgeway *ibid*.)

　　　　c　What did Ann go to the store and buy ~~what~~?

　　　　　　'and what are you waiting for?'

---

[39] Note the incorrect use of 'that' with *dopu* 'when' (possibly modelled onto It. *dopo che* 'after that'), to be compared with its use by fluent speakers in (22a) and (38a).

In terms of linear placement, *ste ce* follows the negation (cf. 37b above) but precedes clitics (46a), while low adverbs like *panta* 'always' cannot break up the verbal complex (46b):

(46)   [neg *ste ce* clitic/*adv [V]]

      a e   Maria ste ce   to   épinne (Calimera, n.s.)

         the Maria STE and it= drink.PST.IPFV.3SG

         'Maria was drinking it'

      b e   Maria ste (*panta) ce (*panta) marei   panta (Calimera, n.s.)

         the Maria STE   and   cook.PRS.3SG always

         'Maria is always cooking'

These empirical facts suggest that when STAND occurs in the *ste ce* + V$_{finite}$ periphrasis, it gives rise to a monoclausal structure as in (47), where V$_{finite}$ is base-generated in *v*-VP and reaches a clause-medial position in the HAS above low adverbs, pied-piping the clitic from its low site of syntactic cliticization. As for the [*ste ce*] component, both its inflectional attrition and semantic bleaching suggest that synchronically this has been reanalysed as a free head morpheme (Cinque 1999:189, fn. 22), base-generated in IP (cf. also Ledgeway 2016b:177-78 and Andriani 2016:233 on Salentino):

(47)   [$_{HAS}$ neg *ste ce* [clitic V$_{finite}$] [$_{LAS}$ low-Adv t$_{clitic}$ t$_{Vfinite}$ [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ t$_{Vfinite}$ t$_{clitic}$]]]

3.3 *Ste* + V$_{finite}$

If we turn our attention to the *ste* + V$_{finite}$ variant (cf. iii-A), the attestations in our corpus indicate this to be the main pattern in contemporary Calimera (but see 20 for examples from other villages). In what follows, we describe the semantic and morphosyntactic properties of this periphrasis as used in Calimera in more detail.

Starting from its interpretation, *ste* + V~finite~ represents the preferred means to express progressive aspect (48), the present indicative being more readily used to express habitual aspect (49):

(48)   a   ti   ste canni   e   Lucia   ártena? (Calimera, n.s.)

      what STE do.PRS.3SG the Lucia now

      'what is Lucia doing right now?'

    b   ste   cantalí

      STE   sing.PRS.3SG

      'she is singing'

(49)   a   ti   canni   e   Lucia   ártena? (Calimera, n.s.)

      what do.PRS.3SG the Lucia now

      'what does Lucia do now?' (life / job)

    b   cantalí

      sing.PRS.3SG

      'she sings' (profession / habitual activity)

In this respect, Calimerese Grico differs from Italian, where STAND + gerund is the marked alternative to non-periphrastic imperfective paradigms for the expression of progressive aspect in most cases (Lepschy & Lepschy [1977]1988:148; Bertinetto 2000:565; Ledgeway 2000:99-101, a.o.), but patterns instead with southern Italian dialects like Neapolitan, where the simple present favours the habitual interpretation while progressivity is preferably expressed by STAND + gerund (Ledgeway *ibid.*):

(50)   a   Giuanne abballa (Neapolitan)

      Giuanne   dance.PRS.3SG

'Giuanne dances'

b Giuanne sta abballanno (Neapolitan)

Giuanne stand.PRS.3SG dancing

'Giuanne is dancing'

On a par with Salentino *sta* and Grico *ste ce* + V~finite~, Calimerese *ste* + V~finite~ has also undergone drastic semantic bleaching, as shown by its compatibility with verbs with a stative (51a) and habitual (51b) interpretation:

(51) a en este noó (Calimera, n.s.)

not STE understand.PRS.1SG

'I can't understand / I'm not following'

b e Maria ce o Giorgio en este milíutte pleo (Calimera, n.s.)

the Maria and the Giorgio not STE speak.PRS.3PL anymore

'Maria and Giorgio are no longer talking to one another'

From a morphological point of view, the reduced form *ste* of this periphrasis may undergo a further reduction of the initial consonants (52) (a somewhat rare option) and systematically exhibits a prosthetic *e-* when preceded by words ending in a consonant (cf. 51 above) (see also Rohlfs 1977:21):[40]

---

[40] The gemination of the initial consonant in (52) following *s-* deletion is presumably an instance of regressive assimilation. The insertion of prosthetic *e-* also applies to *ste ce* when used in Calimera (cf. 54c). In the other villages prosthetic *e-* seems to be optional and is not necessarily triggered by a preceding consonant (cf. also fn. 12 and Rohlfs 1977:21 and Lekakou et al. 2013, ex. 7 and 10):

(i) dio sciddu esté bbaiéane sti Mmaria (Castrignano, n.s.)
two dogs stand.PST.IPFV.3PL bark.PST.IPFV.3PL at.the Maria
'two dogs were barking at Maria'

Note also in this speaker the incorrect use of accusative plural (*sciddu*) for nominative plural (*sciddi*).

(52)   'tte trome (Zollino, n.s.)

STE eat.PRS.1PL

'we are eating'

Patterns of further reduction or insertion can consistently be observed also in accordace with the following element. As we shall see below, *ste* can only be directly followed by a clitic or V$_{finite}$. Interestingly, if the clitic begins with a vowel, *ste* is reduced to *st'* (53), but if the following (stressed) vowel belongs to V$_{finite}$, the coordinator *ce* must be inserted, regardless of whether the vowel is etymological (54) or not (cf. imperfect augment in 55): [41]

(53)   a esì   'en est'i   ttorite? (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:58)

you.2PL not STE=her watch.PRS.2PL

'are you not watching it?'

b puru ji   petterà   st'us   èstiazze (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:74)

also   for=the mother.in.law STE=them prepare.PST.IPFV.3SG

'she was preparing them also for her mother-in-law'

c e   Maria en est'o pinni,   to gala (Calimera, n.s.)

the Maria not STE=it drink.PRS.3SG the milk

'as for the milk, Maria is not drinking it'

(54)   a *Feto   en este   érchese   pleo'   sti' scola? [stressed etymological *e*]

b *Feto   en est'érchese   pleo'   sti' scola?

c Feto   en este   c'érchese   pleo'   sti' scola?

this.year   not STE(=)(and)(=)come.PRS.2SG anymore to.the school

(Calimera, n.s.)

---

[41] In some instances though, *ce* insertion is optional (cf. *ste (c')ivvrische* 'you were / he was finding') or not attested (cf. *ste inonne* 'you were / he was collecting').

'are you no longer coming to school this year?'

(55)   ste   c'ígguona [stressed *i*, imperfect augment] (Calimera, n.s.)

STE and=hear.PST.IPFV.1SG

'I was hearing'

Conversely, if V$_2$ begins with an unstressed vowel, neither *ste > st-* reduction nor *ce*-insertion is observed: [42]

(56)   a   ste   alonizzo [unstressed etymological a] (Calimera, n.s.)

STE thresh.PRS.1SG

'I'm threshing (the corn)'

b   ste   anemízzome (Calimera, n.s.)

STE winnowe.PRS.1PL

'we're winnowing'

Moving on to its syntactic properties, *ste* + V$_{finite}$ also allows extraction of the object (57) and exhibits the same linear placement as *ste ce* + + V$_{finite}$, namely *ste* follows the negation (58a) but precedes clitics (58a)-(58b) and cannot be separated from V$_{finite}$ by intervening low adverbs like *già* 'already' (58c):[43]

(57)   ti   ste canni   ~~ti~~? (Calimera, n.s.)

---

[42] Semi-vowels patterns with consonants, i.e. if V$_2$ begins with a semi-vowel, no reduction or *ce*-insertion is observed, e.g. *ste jalizzo* 'I am combing'*, ste jelune* 'they are laughing'.
[43] However, adverb interpolation seems to be possible in Corigliano, as shown by the following example from Lekakou et al. (2013, ex. 9):

(i)   an èrkese   ses   ettà   ste   ankòra   marèo (Corigliano)
      if come.PRS.2SG at.the seven STE still   cooking
      'if you come at seven I'll still be cooking'

what STE do.PRS.2SG what

'what are you doing?'

(58)   [neg *ste* clitic/*adv [V]]

      a esì   'en est'i   ttorite? (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:58)

         you.2PL not STE=her watch.PRS.2PL

         'are you not watching it?'

      b ste se   mènamo (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:116)

         STE you.2SG wait.PST.IPFV.1PL

         'we were waiting for you'

      c e   Maria (già)   ste (*già)   marei   (già) (Calimera, n.s.)

         the Maria already STE already cook.PRS.2SG already

         'Maria is already cooking'

Accordingly, we propose the same analysis as that suggested for *ste ce* + V_{finite}, namely *ste* + V_{finite} instantiates a monoclausal structure in which V_{finite} moves to a clause-medial position in the HAS above low adverbs, pied-piping the clitic from its low site of syntactic cliticization, while *ste* is a free head morpheme base-generated in IP:

(59)   [_{HAS} neg *ste* [clitic V_{finite}] [_{LAS} low-Adv t_{clitic} t_{Vfinite} [_{v-VP} t_{Vfinite} t_{clitic}]]]

We conclude by noting that the *steo* + *-onta* strategy is also possible in Calimera, but is limited to the expression of durative / continuous aspect, similarly to Italian *stare (lì) a* 'stand (there) to' + infinitive (Squartini 1998:127-133; Bertinetto 2000:561,567,576; Bertinetto et al. 2000:536; Cinque 2017:543), as shown in (60a)-(61a)-(62a), to be compared with the Italian translations in (60b)-(61b)-(62b). Not surprisingly, the use of *steo* + *-onta* in Calimera is consistently attested when

panta 'always' is employed (vs early and contemporary attestations from other villages in 11-12), hyperbolically denoting an uninterrupted duration (cf. Squartini 1998:131 on Italian *stare sempre a* 'stand always to' + infinitive):[44]

(60) a o   Giorgio stei   panta   tronta   mila (Calimera, n.s.)

      the Giorgio stand.PRS.3SG always eating   apples

    b Giorgio sta   sempre (lì)   a mangiare mele (Italian)

      Giorgio stand.PRS.3SG always there to eat.INF   apples

      'Giorgio is always there eating apples'

(61) a echi   o   Kkolinci ka   stei   panta   milonta

      have.PRS.3SG the Kolinci   who stand.PRS.3SG always   speaking

      (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:36)

    b c'è   Colinci che   sta   sempre (lì)   a chiaccherare (Italian)

      LOC=be.PRS.3SG Colinci who stand.PRS.3SG always   there to speak.INF

      'there is Colinci who is always there speaking'

(62) a quai àntrepi steune   panta   milonta (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:168)

      certain men   stand.PRS.3PL always   speaking

    b certi   uomini stan   sempre (lì)   a parlare (Italian)

      certain men   stand.PRS.3PL always   there to speak.INF

      'certain men are always there speaking'

---

[44] This interpretation is confirmed by the SMG expressions used by Karanastasis to translate the *steo* + *-onta* periphrases attested in Calimera, cf. the use of συνέχεια 'always' in his translation of στέω πολεμώντα 'I'm working' (Karanastasis 1984-1992, V:58), and the use of συνεχίζω 'continue' in his translation of στέω γράφοντα 'I'm writing' (Karanastasis 1997:144). Notably, translations of attestations of the same periphrasis from other villages do not include such expressions (cf. the example from Martano in Karanastasis 1997:144, στέει ναασταίννοντα 'she's raising', which is rendered with a present tense).

Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that in Calimera *steo + -onta* belongs to Stage III of Bertinetto's diachronic path (cf. durative interpretation) in Table 3 (see also Deo 2015), on a par with Italian *stare a* + infinitive (stage III) and Spanish *estar* + gerund (Stage III and IV, cf. Bertinetto et al. 2000:540-41), rather than Stage IV (cf. strictly imperfective), differently from the other villages where *steo + -onta* does not necessarily license a durative interpretation but can express the same strictly imperfective reading as Italian *stare* + gerund.[45]

3.4 *Ce pu* + V$_{finite}$

The last productive pattern to be considered is the *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$ periphrasis. Recall from §2 that this strategy is reported by one late early source only for Martignano and Sternatia (Karanastasis 1984-992), while all contemporary attestations come from Sternatia. As such, we conclude that, from a chronological point of view, *ce pu* is a rather innovative pattern; from a diatopic point of view, it may have originated in both Martignano and Sternatia, but today it is the specialised form of the latter village only, possibly as a by-product of the poor vitality of Grico in the former locality. Accordingly, the discussion below is based on its use in Sternatia and shows that, on a par with *ste (ce)* + V$_{finite}$, the semantic and morphosyntactic properties of *ce pu* also betray a high degree of grammaticalization.

Starting from the former, we observe that the original meaning of *ce* and *pu* is so bleached in this periphrasis that, in addition to expressing progressive aspect with activities (cf. 25), they are also compatible with stative verbs:

---

[45] The fact that *panta* 'always' triggers the use of *steo + -onta* in Calimera confirms its classification as Stage III, as the compatibility with this adverb is one of the clues for the difference between Italian *stare* + gerund (Stage IV) and Spanish *estar* + gerund (Stage III and IV) (Squartini 1998:80ff). As noted by Squartini (1998:132) with reference to another regional Italian construction '[t]he fact that the periphrasis is referred to in conjunction with the durative adverbial *sempre* 'always' suggests that such a form is restricted to a pure durative function'. The same is not true of other villages, where *panta* does not necessarily trigger *steo + -onta*:

(i)   i   Maria ste   ce   marei   panta   motte stazo   essu (Soleto, n.s.)
       the Maria STE and   cook.PRS.3SG always when arrive.PRS.1SG in
       'Maria is always cooking when I arrive home'

Whether Calimera retains an archaic stage in the use of this periphrasis or has innovated remains to be established.

(63) e' ce pu anoó (Sternatia, n.s.)

      not CE PU understand.PRS.1SG

      'I can't understand / I'm not following'

Besides progressive, *ce pu* can also be employed to express prospective aspect (64) (cf. also Italia & Lambroyorgu 2001:133, 164 and Carmine Greco's online grammar of Grico of Sternatia on https://sites.google.com/site/gricoinrete/home/d), on a par with Salentino inflected STAND + the irrealis complementizer *cu* 'that' (65) (cf. also Ledgeway 2016b:178):

(64) ce pu iklinna (Grico, Sternatia, Italia & Lambroyorgu 2001:133)

      CE PU close.PST.IPFV.1SG

      'I was closing / I was about to close'

(65) a stau   cu bbiu   stu mieru (Salentino, Lequile, Lecce, n.s.)

         stand.PRS.1SG CU drink.PRS.1SG this wine

         'I am about to drink this wine'

      b stìamu   cu nni parlamu   alla   Maria

         stand.PST.IPFV.1PL CU to.her speak.PST.IPFV.1PL to=the Maria

         (Salentino, Lequile, Lecce, n.s.)

         'we were about to speak to Maria'

      c stìanu   cu mme scrìenu   (li strei)

         stand.PST.IPFV.3PL CU to.me write.PST.IPFV.3PL the children

         (Salentino, Lequile, Lecce, n.s.)

         '(the children,) they were about to write to me'

Outside Sternatia, prospective aspect must be rendered with alternative strategies, such as the present (66a) or inflected *steo* + subjunctive (66b) (see also 28b) (but not *ste* + V~finite~):

(66) a arte vrechi,   min   eggui! (Calimera, n.s.)

now rain.PRS.3SG NEG.SBJV go.out.SBJV.2SG

b arte stei   na   vvrechi,   min   eggui! (Calimera, n.s.)

now stand.PRS.3SG SBJV rain.PRS.3SG NEG.SBJV go.out.SBJV.2SG

'now it's about to rain, don't go out!'

Turning now to the morphosyntactic properties of this periphrasis, inflectional attrition is so advanced that STAND has been completely deleted (see §4). As for the *ce pu* component, this is always fully retained, even before stressed vowels:[46]

(67) motte me   fónase,   ce pu etra (Sternatia, n.s.)

when me.ACC call.PST.PFV.2SG CE PU eat.PST.IPFV.1SG

'when you called me, I was eating'

As for its syntactic properties, the *ce pu* periphrasis patterns with *ste (ce)* + V~finite~ in allowing the extraction of object (68), thus showing complete bleaching of the original meaning of *ce*, but differs from the former in its placement, in that the *ce pu* complex follows both negation and clitics (69):

(68) ti   ce pu lei   t̶i̶? (Sternatia, n.s.)

---

[46] Unlike the coordinator *ce*, which independently displays *ce > e* reduction before stressed vowels (cf. fn. 37), *pu* is always fully retained also outside the *ce pu* progressive construction, as in the following example from Calabrian Italo-Greek (see §5 for a discussion on the use of *pu* as 'that'):

(i) ívre   pu íssa   tósso máñese (Calabrian Italo-Greek, Rohlfs 1977:205)
     see.PST.PFV.3SG that be.PST.3PL so   beautiful
     'he saw that they were so beautiful'

what CE PU say.PRS.2SG what

'what are you saying?'

(69) a i Maria en i ce pu pinni (Sternatia, n.s.)

the Maria not her= CE PU drink.PRS.3SG

'Maria isn't drinking it'

b isú ce o Iorgi en i ce pu milúato tis Maria

you.2PL and the Iorgi not to.her= CE PU speak.PST.IPFV.2PL the.DAT Maria

(Sternatia, n.s.)

'you and Iorgi were not speaking to Maria'

These distinct placement facts show that this periphrasis is also a monoclausal structure, where *ce pu* is a free head morpheme base-generated in IP and the finite verb occupies a clause-medial position in the LAS after leaving the *v*-VP complex, but differs from *steo + -onta* and *ste (ce) +* V_{finite} in the site of syntactic cliticization, which is low in the former but high in the latter, as sketched in (70) below:[47]

(70)   [$_{HAS}$ neg clitic *ce pu* V_{finite} [$_{LAS}$ t_{clitic} $t_{Vfinite}$ [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ $t_{Vfinite}$ t_{clitic}]]]

This instance of syntactic microvariation within Grico (cf. proclisis on *ce pu* vs enclisis on STAND in Calimera *ste +* V_{finite} and *ste ce + +* V_{finite} / *steo + -onta* in other villages) is not surprising in that it

---

[47] An anonymous reviewer observes that high syntactic cliticization could be invoked for the *steo + -onta* strategy too, where the clitic occurs to the left of *steo* (cf. 35b). Reasons of economy justify our choice to derive the relevant linear facts through low syntactic cliticization and clitic pied-piping by *steo* (cf. 36). Invoking high syntactic cliticization for (36) would imply that two distinct operations are responsible for the attested linear order (cf. clitic + *steo + -onta*), namely clitic movement from a low position of phonological cliticization to a high position of syntactic cliticization and independent clause-medial movement of *steo*. By assuming that when *steo* moves, it pied-pipes the clitic, we obtain the same linear facts with one operation only. Conversely, the same strategy cannot be applied to *ce pu +* V_{finite} to derive the superficially identical linear order (cf. clitic + *ce pu +* V_{finite}), as in this case there is no verb independently moving to a position higher than *ce pu* which could pied-pipe the clitic, hence high syntactic cliticization (i.e. independent clitic movement) must be invoked.

finds a parallel in the progressive periphrasis of the neighbouring Salentino varieties, some of which

exhibit proclisis onto *sta* (71) while others show proclisis onto V_{finite} (72) (Manzini & Savoia 2005,

I:§3.12.2; Ledgeway 2016b; Manzini et al. 2017:37):[48]

(71)   nu tte   sta ccapiscu   filu (Salentino, Lecce, Ledgeway 2016b:163)

not you= STA understand.PRS.1SG NEG

'I don't follow you'

(72)   sta te   visciu (Salentino, Scorrano, Lecce, Ledgeway 2016b:171)

STA you= see.PRS.1SG

'I can see you'

3.4 Interim summary

In this section we have discussed the interpretative and morphosyntactic properties of the

productive strategies of Table 2 in further detail. Starting from *steo + -onta*, we have shown that

this periphrasis is incompatible with a stative interpretation and does not allow any morphological

reduction of its components, suggesting that it has preserved a low degree of grammaticalization,

unlike Sal. *sta*. As for its internal structure, we have shown that both the sentential negator and

---

[48] Neither is this instance of variation limited to the progressive, witness the WANT-periphrasis in (i)-(ii), where AUX vs V_2 proclisis can notably be observed within the same variety:

(i)   a vogghiu   lu   vesciu (Salentino, Mesagne, BR, Manzini & Savoia 2005:691)
           want.PRS.1SG him   see.PRS.1SG
        b lu   vogghiu   vesciu
           him want.PRS.1SG see.PRS.1SG
           'I want to see him'

(ii)   a nol lu vogghiu   fazzu   ccui (Salentino, Torre S. Susanna, BR, Manzini & Savoia 2005:693)
           not it   want.PRS.1SG do.PRS.1SG anymore
        b no vvogghiu   lu fazzu   ccui
           not want.PRS.1SG it do.PRS.1SG anymore
           'I don't want to do it any more'

pronominal clitics appear to the left of *steo*, which can be separated from –*onta* by aspectual adverbs which occupy a low position in Cinque's (1999) clausal hierarchy. Accordingly, we have proposed a monoclausal analysis for this structure, whereby *steo* leaves its base position in $Asp_{Durative/Progressive}$ to reach a clause-medial position by pied-piping the clitic from its low site of syntactic cliticization, while the –*onta* form leaves the *v*-VP to reach a low position in IP. Conversely, the *ste (ce)* + V_{finite} periphrases betray a higher degree of grammaticalization, as shown by their compatibility with stative and habitual interpretations, as well as the morphological reduction of some of their components. As for their internal structure, *ste (ce)* follows negation but precedes clitics and cannot be separated from the lexical verb by intervening adverbs. In order to capture these linear facts, we have suggested that *ste (ce)* + V_{finite} instantiates a monoclausal structure where V_{finite} is based generated in *v*-VP and reaches a clause-medial position by pied-piping the clitic from its low site of syntactic cliticization, while *ste (ce)* is a free head morpheme base-generated in IP. Finally, we have discussed the properties of *ce pu* + V_{finite}, which is also compatible with a stative interpretation and shows extreme morphological reduction (cf. complete deletion of the STAND component), suggesting again a high degree of grammaticalization. On a par with *ste (ce)*, *ce pu* follows negation, but unlike the former, it also follows pronominal clitics. Accordingly, we proposed that *ce pu* also occurs in a monoclausal structure, where *ce pu* is a free head morpheme base-generated in IP and the finite verb moves to a clause-medial position. However, it differs from *ste (ce)* in the site of syntactic cliticization, which is low in the former but high in the latter, mimicking the internal microvariation attested across Salentino progressive periphrases, which variously exhibit proclisis onto *sta* or V_{finite}.

4. Paths of grammaticalization

Having described the semantic, morphological and syntactic properties of the periphrases that Grico productively employs for the expression of progressive aspect and assessed their degree of grammaticalization (cf. low for *steo* + -*onta* and high for *ste (ce)* / *ce pu* + V_{finite}), we shall now try

to reconstruct their genesis and the relationship with the less grammaticalised and no longer productive options in §2.

Among all the existing patterns, only *steo + -onta* and *steo ce* + V_{finite} are commonly attested in the early sources, naturally suggesting that these can be taken as the most archaic strategies employed by Grico. The former, the still productive *steo + -onta* periphrasis, replicates a common Romance pattern for the expression of progressive, whereby inflected forms of STAND are combined with non-finite forms of the lexical verb (cf. Table 1). The STAND-PROG device does not seem to be exploited by Standard Modern Greek (SMG), where the imperfective stem of a simple verb is sufficient to convey progressive or continuous interpretation (Mackridge 1985:105, 106; Holton et al. 2012: 287, 293), as shown by the examples below, featuring a present (73a), imperfect (73b) and imperfective future (73c):[49]

(73) a min   ton   diakóptis   tora jatí   gráfi (SMG, Holton et al. 2012: 287)

NEG.SBJV him   interrupt.SBJV.2SG now   because write.PRS.3SG

'don't interrupt him now because he is writing'

b égrafa   éna grámma sto   Níko tin óra   pu tilefónises

write.PST.IPFV.1SG a   letter   to.the N.   the hour that telephone.PST.PRF.2SG

'I was writing a letter to Nick when you telephoned'

c tha kimáme   ótan ghirísis   píso

FUT sleep.PRS.1SG when return.SBJV.PRF.2SG back

'I will be sleeping when you come back'

---

[49] As for other early / modern varieties of Greek, Manolessou (2005a:118) observes that the Italo-Greek *ste(c)o + -onta* pattern is attested in Hellenistic Greek but not in any modern Greek dialects. However, she excludes the possibility that it can be considered an ancient survival, considering it rather a borrowing from Italian. An anonymous reviewer also points out attestations in Medieval and Early Modern Greek which, interestingly, mostly belong to works translated from Romance (e.g. *Cypriot Canzoniere*, see Siapkaras-Pitsillides 1975), hence suggesting their contact nature. As for Grico, given the frequent attestations of this pattern in late 19th century sources, when Italian influence on this variety was unlikely, we intepret it as a common Romance development rather than a calque from the national language. See also Squillaci (2016:96-98), who claims that Calabrian Italo-Greek *steko + -onda* can be traced back to the influence of the neighbouring Romance dialect.

Depending therefore on context, the same imperfective form in SMG can receive either an habitual or progressive interpretation:

(74) a ti káni o Níkos? (SMG, Holton et al. 2012:287)

what do.PRS.3SG the Níkos

'what does Nikos do?' / 'what is Nikos doing?'

b didáski

teach.PRS.3SG

'he teaches' / 'he is teaching'

Similarly, the *steo ce* + V$_{finite}$ pattern, which today only survives as a relic pattern in Martano (and possibly Corigliano), superficially replicates the Pugliese pattern *stà(re)/stàri a* + V$_{finite}$, as originally attested in Salento too, where *a* is now systematically deleted but betrays its historical presence by triggering *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* of the initial consonant of V$_{finite}$.[50] Although an assessment of the direction of the process of replication is beyond the scope of this paper, it is clear that language contact must have been the triggering force behind the formation of this periphrasis.[51] Furthermore, we claim that this periphrasis is also one of the original patterns from which the innovative periphrases developed (cf. *ste (ce)* + V$_{finite}$ and *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$), through a process of gradual morphological attrition that we shall sketch below.

Recall from §2 that, in addition to the *steo ce* + V$_{finite}$ periphrasis, mirroring the Pugliese/Salentino STAND (AND) + V$_{finite}$ pattern, our early sources include attestations of *steo* + V$_{finite}$ (today only produced by semi-speakers from Corigliano and reported by Profili 1983 and

---

[50] If anything, the use of *ce* in Grico progressive periphrases seems to lend support to Rohlfs' (1969:167) original intuition that the linking element of Pugliese *stà(re)/stàri a* constructions is the synchronically opaque Latin conjunction AC 'and'. Unlike the latter, which only survives in a few lexicalised forms in Romance (e.g. cardinal numbers for 10+7/8/9, cf. Meyer-Lübke 1935:5; Rohlfs *ibid.*; Ledgeway 2016b), *ce* is still transparently employed as a coordinator in Grico. See Andriani (2016:Ch.5) for an alternative analysis to the AC-construction hypothesis as the source of inflected V$_2$ in Pugliese progressives.

[51] Coordinating structures of the type STAND/GO + & + V$_{finite}$ seem to be attested already in 5th/6th century Latin (Andriani 2016:212).

Lekakou et al. 2013 for the same village), as well as of *steo pu* + V$_{finite}$ (today only reported by

Profili 1983 for Corigliano), exemplified in (13) and (17) and partly repeated in (75a) and (75b),

respectively:

(75)   a   (a)ttos butegaro   stècume   (ce)   milùme (Calimera, Morosi 1870:70)

          of.the inn-keepers stand.PRS.1PL and   speak.PRS.1PL

          'we are talking about inn keepers'

       b   steo   pu   plonno (Morosi 1870:156)

          stand.PRS.1SG PU   sleep.PRS.1SG

          'I am sleeping'

Grouping the three together, we can hypothesise a Stage I in the development of Grico progressive

periphrases, where STAND either directly combines with the verb or is linked to it by the coordinator

ce (cf. Pugliese STAND (AND) + V$_{finite}$) or by *pu* (see §5 on the meaning(s) and syntactic status of this

element):

(76)   Stage I (*ce* / *pu* competition)

       a   †*steo* + V$_{finite}$

       b   (†)*steo ce* + V$_{finite}$

       c   †*steo pu* + V$_{finite}$

In order to get to the present-day patterns, we can reconstruct a transitional stage in which the two

functional items have combined in the compound structure **steo ce pu* + V$_{finite}$. Note that the

relative ordering *ce* > *pu* (as attested in the later development Sternatia *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$), rather than

the logically plausible alternative *pu* > *ce*, is not unexpected, as it simply follows from the original

syntactic placement of the two elements, lexicalising an external &P (cf. coordinator *ce*) and a more internal CP (cf. C-element *pu*, but see §5), respectively:

(77) Stage II (*ce* + *pu* combination)

steo ce pu + V$_{\text{finite}}$ (*ce* > *pu* → [$_{\&\text{P}}$ *ce* [$_{\text{CP}}$ *pu*]])

The compound form of Stage II has then undergone two further possible developments. The first one is a stage in which partial inflectional attrition of *steo* into invariable *ste* takes place and one of the two possible linking elements is deleted (cf. Stage III-a, 78), giving raise to the infrequent but attested *ste pu* + V$_{\text{finite}}$ periphrasis and to the very productive *ste ce* + V$_{\text{finite}}$ periphrasis, as exemplified in (23) and (21)-(22), respectively, and partly repeated in (79):

(78) Stage III-a (inflectional attrition + retention of linking element)

    a *ste pu* + V$_{\text{finite}}$

    b *ste ce* + V$_{\text{finite}}$

(79)   a ste pu pleno   tus   piattu (Corigliano, n.s.)

          STE PU wash.PRS.1SG the   dishes

          'I'm washing the dishes'

    b e chiatera ste ce   troi (Castrignano, n.s.)

          the girl   STE and   eat.PRS.3SG

          'the girl is eating'

When deletion of the linking elements is pushed to its furthest stage, this produces the Calimera *ste* + V$_{\text{finite}}$ periphrasis (cf. Stage IV-a, 80), as exemplified in (19)-(20), partly repeated here as (81):

(80)   Stage IV-a (inflectional attrition + deletion of linking element)

      ste + V$_{finite}$

(81)   e   chiatera ste troi (Calimera, n.s)

      the girl   STE eat.PRS.3SG

      'the girl is eating'

Evidence that Calimera *ste* + V$_{finite}$ has developed from an original STAND AND construction (cf. *ste ce* + V$_{finite}$) comes from the fact that the coordinator emerges again epenthetically when V$_{finite}$ begins with a stressed vowel (cf. 54-55), presumably for phonological reasons (namely, to break up the vowel-vowel sequence).[52] The second possible development of Stage II that we can reasonably reconstruct in order to get to the *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$ pattern of Sternatia is a parallel competing one in which the partial inflectional attrition of *ste* is accompanied by the retention of both linking elements, as in Stage III-b (82). When the inflectional attrition is pushed to its furthest stage, *ce pu* survives as the only mark of the progressive (Stage IV-b) (83), as exemplified in (25), partly repeated here as (84):

(82)   Stage III-b (inflectional attrition + retention of linking elements)

      **ste ce pu* + V$_{finite}$

(83)   Stage IV-b (deletion of STAND + retention of linking elements)

      ce pu

---

[52] An anonymous reviewer suggests the possibility that Calimera simply exhibits the *ste ce* + V$_{finite}$ strategy, with special restrictions on the appearance of *ce*. Our data show that this is not the case: in (37), for example, we observe the *ste ce* + V$_{finite}$ strategy produced by a speaker from Calimera, where the use of *ce* does not follow the phonological constraints described for *ste* + V$_{finite}$ (§3.3) (see also the early attestation from Calimera in 21d). This suggests that speakers of Calimera can avail themselves of two strategies, i.e. the older *ste ce* + V$_{finite}$, where *ce* is systematically produced, and the innovative *ste* + V$_{finite}$, where *ce* is inserted only if phonological reasons independently force its appearance.

(84)   ce   pu   trome (Sternatia, n.s.)

     CE   PU   eat.PRS.1PL

     'we are eating'

All the relevant stages are summarised in Table 4:

Table 4. Grammaticalization of Grico progressive periphrases

Stage I	Stage II	Stage III		Stage IV
[†]*steo* + V$_{finite}$ [(†)]*steo ce* + V$_{finite}$ [†] *steo pu* + V$_{finite}$	**steo ce pu* + V$_{finite}$	*ste* *pu* + V$_{finite}$ *ste ce* + V$_{finite}$	→	*ste* + V$_{finite}$
		*ste ce pu + V$_{finite}$ →		*ce pu* + V$_{finite}$

In conclusion, while the STAND + linking element + V$_{finite}$ periphrasis has been subject to increasing degrees of grammaticalization, leaving casualties behind (cf. the extinct patterns in Stage I), *steo* + *-onta* has been preserved, virtually unchanged since the earliest attestations in our corpus and is still productively employed. If we take into account the syntactic structures, we can also observe that while in its earlier stages Grico possessed both a monoclausal (cf. *steo* + *-onta*) and a biclausal construction (cf. *steo ce* + V$_{finite}$), contemporary Grico can only avail itself of monoclausal strategies, due to the gradual grammaticalization of the descendants of (*steo*) (*ce*) (*pu*) + V$_{finite}$, which has led to their reanalysis as monoclausal constructions (cf. 47, 59 and 70).[53]

5. On the grammaticalization of *pu* as progressive marker

Before we consider the last progressive strategy in our corpus, namely *steo* + V$_{finite[SBJV]}$, we add some comments on the use of *pu* in Grico progressive periphrases, which first appears in the early

---

[53] See Ledgeway et al. (forthcoming) for a parallel development from bi- to monoclausality in the early vs innovative causative constructions of the Calabrian variety of Italo-Greek.

stages (cf. *steo pu* + V~finite~, Stage I) before surfacing in the pattern attested in Sternatia (cf. *ce pu* + V~finite~, Stage IV-b).

According to traditional descriptions and as confirmed by our investigations, Grico *pu* represents the homophonous outcome of a number of different lexical items and functions. These include: the wh-element 'where' (as the reduced form of *epú* / *ipú*, see Rohlfs 1977:138; Tommasi 2001:223; cf. SMG πού) (85), the preposition 'from' (a the reduced form of *apú*, also attested as *apó* / *ap'* / *a'*, see Cassoni [1937]1990:91; Rohlfs 1977:148; Italia & Lambroyorgu 2001:152; Tommasi 2001:227; cf. SMG από) (86), (iii) the complementizer 'that' (Rohlfs 1977:205,207; cf. SMG που, Roussou 2000) (87a) (a no longer productive function, cf. 87b); and (iv) the relative pronoun 'that / which' (Rohlfs 1977:98; cf. SMG που) (88a) (a no longer productive function, cf. 88b):[54]

(85) pu   pai,   Ntoni? (Calimera, Tommasi 2001:201)

     where go.PRS.2SG Ntoni

     'where are you going, Ntoni?'

(86) a mi   pproní frontì tu   marti guenni   t'afidi   pu   kau   sto

      with.the first   thunder of.the March go.out.PRES.3SG the=snake from under at.the

---

[54] In its prepositional usage, *(a)pu* 'from' is only found with adverbs and names of localities (Rohlfs 1977:148) and can combine with definite articles (cf. Rohlfs 1977:148; Tommasi 2001:227) (i); it also functions as the preposition 'from' with other nouns when these are modified by the definite article (ii), otherwise *azze/afze* 'from' / 'of' is employed (iii) (Rohlfs 1977: 149-151):

(i)   jurizzo   atti [> apú+tin] Roca (Calimera, n.s.)
       return.PRES.1SG   from.the   Roca
       'I come back from Roca'

(ii)   atti [>apú+tin] kkardía (Rohlfs 1977:150)
       from.the   heart
       'from the heart'

(iii) ti   téli   afs'eména? (Zollino, Rohlfs 1977:149)
       what want.PRS.2SG from=me
       'what do you want from me?'

See Rohlfs (1977:204ff) for further discussion on the uses of *pu*.

lisari (proverb, Tommasi 2001:24)

stone

'with the first thunder of March, the snake comes out from under the stone'

c ércome pu Luppiu (Calimera, n.s.)

come.PRS.1SG from Lecce

'I come from Lecce'

(87) a evrési pu jávike mía aleáta (Otrantino, Rohlfs 1977:205)

b vresi ca jáviche mia ajelada (Calimera, n.s.)

find.PST.PFV.3SG that pass.PST.PFV.3SG a cow

'a cow happened to pass by'

(88) a to neró pu tréxi (Rohlfs 1977:98)

the water which run.PRS.3SG

'the water which runs'

b o ántrepo ca milí (Calimera, n.s.)

the man who speak.PRS.3SG

'the man who speaks'

Because of the observed homophony between different lexical items and functions, various hypotheses can be formulated regarding the grammaticalization of *pu* in progressive periphrases. On the one hand, it is striking to observe that two out of its (originally) four functions include a locative meaning, cf. 'where' (from *epù*) (85) and 'from' (from *apù*) (86). From a cross-linguistic perspective, the grammaticalization of locative elements represents a very common strategy in the creation of progressive constructions, as highlighted in the following quote from Bertinetto et al. (2000) (see also Anderson 1973:15; Heine 1993:32-33; Bybee et al. 1994:§5; Mateu & Amadas

1999; Heine & Kuteva 2002:97-99; Mair 2012; Cinque 2017:§4.2.1; Manzini et al. 2017:49-52, a.o.):

(89)　‘As is well known, PROG constructions include, in one way or another, a locative morpheme. […] although the morphological structure of these constructions is based on a locative morpheme of some kind, the degree to which this meaning component persists in each constructions varies from case to case.’ (Bertinetto et al. 2000:532)

The common and rapid grammaticalization of locative expressions as progressive markers seems to be particularly clear in (European-lexifier) creoles (Mair 2012:810), where we even find cases of homophony between the progressive marker and a locative preposition, directly mirroring the Grico case. By way of illustration, consider the following example from Guinea-Bissau Kriyol, where the progressive marker *na* coincides with the preposition meaning 'in, on, at' (< Pt. *em* < Lat. IN 'in'):

(90)　e　　bajudas **na**　　laba　kurpu (Mair 2012:810, from Peck 1988:279)
　　　DEM girls　　PROG　wash body
　　　'the girls are bathing'

The fact that the grammaticalization of locative elements in progressive periphrases is a common trend across the languages of the world, where cases of homophony between progressive markers and locative prepositions are also attested, supports the hypothesis that the use of *pu* in Grico progressive periphrases originates from its locative function (cf. wh-element 'where' and preposition 'from').[55]

---

[55] Importantly, this strategy is not unknown in Italo-Romance, witness the many northern Italo-Romance dialects where the locative element is still visible (although semantically bleached) in progressive periphrases:

(i)　　ea Ciana ze　　　drio　　magnare (Padovano)
　　　the Ciana be.PRS.3SG behind　eat.INF

On the other hand, its (original) function as a complementizer 'that' (87a) could also be seen as the driving force behind its grammaticalization in progressive constructions. This is the hypothesis advanced by Nicholas (2001:200), according to whom the *pu*-complement of the *steo pu* periphrasis calques the participle (viz. the *–onta* form), which is 'now obsolete in its supplementary function in Apulia'. Although assessing the validity of this hypothesis is beyond the scope of the present paper, it is worth noting that this analysis contrasts with our finding, inasmuch as *-onta* is still productively employed in the progressive periphrasis (see 12, *pace* Morosi 1870:156, on which Nicholas 2001 was relying). That this non-finite form is still alive in Grico is also shown by the possibility of using it in isolation to denote a progressive event, as attested not only in early (91a) but also contemporary sources (91b):

(91)   a   ce   cini   o   canonònta   on   ancantei (Calimera, Morosi 1870:70)

          and that.one him   looking   him   enchant.PRS.3SG

          'and looking at him, she enchants him'

       b   emì   diavènnume   tes   emere   polemònta (Castrignano, Greco 2003:46)

          we   spend.PRS.1PL the   days   working

           'we spend the days working'

Nevertheless, analysing *pu* in the *steo* periphrasis as (originally) stemming from its complementizer function, whatever the original triggering force behind this may have been, opens up the way to an interesting suggestion in relation to the competing periphrasis *steo ce* (cf. Stage I, §4). As early as the Classical period, the history of Greek complementation is characterised by cases of pseudo-coordination, namely instances in which embedded clauses are not introduced by the relevant complementizer but by the coordinator *καɩ* 'and' (Jannaris 1897:402; Kühner & Gert

---

'Ciana is eating'

See further examples in Cinque (2017:551) and references therein.

[1904]1976:351-52; James 2008; Bentein 2015:107-110, a.o.). According to Mackridge (1985:241-43) and Ralli (2006:130), this strategy is still common to spoken Modern Greek and Modern Greek dialects, such as Cappadocian, and many cases are reported by Rohlfs (1977:209) for Italo-Greek too.[56] Accordingly, it would be reasonable to hypothesise that the *ce / pu* competition attested in Stage I is part of this common tendency to replace complementizers with the coordinator, i.e. when the complementizer *pu* 'that' is introduced in progressive periphrases, it begins to alternate with *ce* 'and' in the pseudo-coordination strategy.

To sum up, as the meaning component of the *ce pu* periphrasis barely persists, it proves difficult to unambiguously reconstruct the original nature of *pu* as locative or C-element. In fact, it is reasonable to assume that its homophony with respect to different items and associated functions which are all in principle compatible with a progressive interpretation may have contributed to its introduction in this construction in line with that general tendency whereby phonomorphological (and syntactico-semantic) ambiguity is often the trigger to language change and reanalysis (see Harris & Campbell 1995:53-54,70-72; Hopper & Traugott 2003; Traugott 2011; Brinton & Traugott 2017:559-63; Madariaga 2017:72-75; Roberts 2017:426-28; Willis 2017:494-95, a.o.).[57]

6. The subjunctive hybrid pattern

---

[56] The C-elements which can be replaced by *κα * 'and' in spoken Modern Greek also include *πον* 'that' (Mackridge 1985:242):

(i) vlépo   ke chamoghelás (cf. sé vlépo   pú chamoghelás)
     see.PRS.1SG and smile.PRS.2SG   you see.PRS.1SG PU smile.PRS.2SG
     'I can see you smiling'

Interestingly, in Italo-Greek *pu* 'that' was especially common to express a consequence (Rohlfs 1977:205) and *και*-replacement in spoken Modern Greek is very common 'especially with the sense of result' (Mackridge 1985:242). Finally note that *και*-constructions can also replace spoken Modern Greek *–οντας* forms with progressive interpretation (Mackridge 1985:241-42):

(ii) vriskótan   stón próto órofo tú   spitiú   tu ki évlepe   tileórasi
      find.PST.IPFV.PASS.3SG at.the first floor of.the house his and watch.PST.IPFV.3SG television
      (cf. vlépontas)
           watching
      'he was on the first floor of his house watching television'

[57] Recall that, beyond its locative and complementizer functions, *pu* can also be used as relative pronoun. The hypothesis that this function lies behind its usage in the Grico *steo pu* progressive periphrasis is hinted at by Baldissera (2013:46).

We conclude our overview of the expression of progressive aspect in Grico by commenting on a structure which is productively employed by semi-speakers (see definition in §2). As exemplified in (26), partly repeated here as (92), a very productive strategy employed by this category of speakers from all localities consists in the use of inflected forms of *steo* followed by the subjunctive:

(92)   dio   sciddu ístinne   na   taccázzune   ti Mmaria (Corigliano, s.s.)

        two   dogs   stand.PST.IPFV.3SG SBJV   bite.SBJV.3PL   the Maria

        'two dogs were biting Maria'

In spite of its superficial Greek appearance, witness the use of the indigenous irrealis *na*-clause, this form does not belong to the core Grico repertoire (either archaic or innovative, cf. Table 2). As it is produced by those speakers who are more likely to suffer from language contact, due to their partial competence in the language, it is worth asking what the underlying model(s) may be. Before doing so, it also important to highlight that this construction should not be dismissed *a priori* because it is produced by speakers with a partial competence. Indeed: (i) it was consistently produced by all informants falling into this category; (ii) despite expected mistakes in verbal morphology and person / number / case marking (see footnotes for examples in 26), the same pattern (cf. inflected STAND plus subjunctive) was consistently replicated, while other logical variants (e.g. invariable form of STAND plus subjunctive) were never attested; (iii) as shown in the discussion below, it does not represent a random combination of elements but clearly replicates underlying patterns which are part of semi-speakers' competence, namely it complies with the rules of their grammar(s). It is this striking consistency, in production, shape and relation to other patterns which sets this construction apart from genuine 'mistakes', which are incoherent by nature, and indicates that it should not be dismissed as noise.

Turning now our attention to the underlying model(s), we would like to suggest that this hybrid form arose as a 'third' option within the local linguistic landscape, combining progressive with

irrealis marking. First of all, recall from §3.4 that Gr. *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$ can be used to express not only progressive, but also prospective aspect (cf. 64), suggesting a link in Grico between these two values. Second, also recall that prospective aspect is associated with irrealis marking in Salentino, where the irrealis complementizer *cu* is combined with STAND to express an event which is about to happen (cf. 65). Indeed, it is intuitively plausible, not to say entirely natural, that something which has not happened (yet) should be marked as irrealis. In this scenario, where Grico combines prospective with progressive aspect and Salentino combines prospective aspect with irrealis marking, the *steo* + subjunctive periphrases coined by Grico semi-speakers seems to have evolved as a natural third combination of such values, namely progressive and irrealis, as sketched below:

(93)   a   Gr. *ce pu* + V$_{finite}$ = prospective + **progressive**

        b   Sal. STAND *cu* + V$_{finite}$ = prospective + **irrealis**

        c   Gr. *steo* + V$_{finite(SBJV)}$ (s.s.)   = **progressive** + **irrealis**

If this hypothesis is correct, then the hybrid periphrasis produced by semi-speakers is an innovation, viz. a combination of progressive and irrealis, itself arising from another innovation, namely the combination of prospective and progressive, which is now strengthened in the Grico system, as *steo* + subjunctive crucially can also convey prospective aspect for proficient speakers (cf. 28b, 66b).[58] Also note that this hybrid pattern is consistent with the other language available in the local linguistic repertoire, i.e. (regional) Italian, where both prospective and progressive aspect can be conveyed by periphrastic forms including the infinitive (e.g. STAND *per* 'for' + infinitive 'to be about to', STAND *a* 'to' + infinitive 'to be –ing'), where the infinitive is typically rendered with *na*-clauses in Grico.[59] That Italian too has been indirectly playing a role in the formation of this hybrid construction is confirmed by the fact that a parallel *steko* + subjunctive is also historically attested

---

[58] We thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing out the relevance of Sal. STAND *cu* + V$_{finite}$ for the hybrid pattern produced by Grico semi-speakers.
[59] On the reduced use of the infinitive in Grico, see Morosi (1870), Cassoni ([1937]1990), Rohlfs (1977), Ledgeway (2013), a.o.

in Early Modern Greek too but, crucially, in works under Romance influence, such as *Katzourbos* (e.g. *καὶ στέκω νὰ χτικιάσω* and stand.PRS.1SG SBJV consume.SBJV.PFV.1SG 'and I'm consumed (with desperation)' Katzourbos 3.521), which notably has Italian antecedents (Vincent 1991).[60] Although the corresponding form produced by today's semi-speakers cannot plausibly be the direct outcome of the Early Modern Greek construction, such early attestations show that this hybrid construction is also compatible with contact-induced change from Italian, alongside the other varieties considered above.

Before we conclude, note that our hypothesis regarding the genesis of the hybrid progressive *steo* + subjunctive makes an important claim regarding contact, in that it implies that the structure onto which this periphrasis has been grafted is not the corresponding progressive periphrasis in Salentino, as one might expect. As discussed in §2, Salentino employs the *sta* + indicative V2 strategy to express progressive, but indicative verbs are readily available in Grico semi-speakers' competence, hence it is unlikely that Gr. *steo* + subjunctive arose as a calque of Sal. *sta* + indicative V2.[61] Also noteworthy is the fact that the hybrid pattern never features an invariable form of STAND, as we might expect if Salentino progressive were the underlying pattern, but only inflected STAND. Our hypothesis also excludes the possibility that the hybrid periphrasis is replicating a common strategy for the expression of progressive aspect in Grico, namely the *steo* + *-onta* periphrasis, perhaps following a difficulty in employing the non-finite *–onta* form, here reproduced with the subjunctive. This alternative hypothesis is reminiscent of Nicholas' (2001:220) claim that the *pu*-complement in the Grico *steo pu* periphrasis is calquing an 'obsolete participle' (i.e. the *–onta* form, cf. §5). That this alternative hypothesis is not on the right track is shown by the fact that semi-speakers spontaneously produced *steo* + *-onta* forms too (albeit with the usual difficulties with verbal morphology). This shows that *–onta* forms are still part of their competence (as well as of

---

[60] We thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing these early attestations to our attention.

[61] As already discussed at length above, the invariable STAND form + V$_{finite}$ strategy is indeed present in Grico too, witness the innovative *ste* + V$_{finite}$ pattern in (20).

proficient speakers), hence the subjunctive in hybrid progressive periphrases must have been grafted onto a different model.

To sum up, we have claimed that the hybrid *steo* + subjunctive periphrasis has been created by semi-speakers as a natural third option, combining progressive with irrealis marking, through contact with Grico, where prospective combines with progressive (cf. *ce pu*, option 1), and Salentino, where prospective aspect combines with irrealis marking (cf. STAND *cu* + V_{finite}, option 2). Interestingly, the resulting pattern is also consistent with the third code available in the semi-speakers' linguistic repertoire, namely (regional) Italian, where prospective and progressive aspect can be expressed with periphrases including infinitives, typically rendered as *na*-clauses in Grico, and which has already induced the creation of a parallel construction in the history of Greek. This hypothesis bears important consequences for our knowledge of contact and hybridism, in that it represents a case where: (i) the replica language is not a single one (e.g. 'standard' Grico, Salentino or regional Italian), but rather a combination of all the varieties included in the semi-speakers' repertoire; (ii) the replica structure is not directly the corresponding one in one of the contact varieties (e.g. Grico progressive *steo* + *-onta* or Salentino progressive STAND *cu* + V_{finite}), but, rather, a combination of related structures (cf. Grico prospective and progressive *ce pu* + V_{finite} and Salentino prospective STAND *cu* + V_{finite}, also in accordance with Italian prospective STAND *per* + infinitive and progressive STAND *a* + infinitive).

7. Conclusions

In spite of the existence of a long tradition of studies on Grico lexical and phonological microvariation (Morosi 1870; Parlangeli 1953; Rohlfs 1977; Sobrero 1980; Fanciullo 1996, a.o.), cases of morphosyntactic microvariation in this variety are hard to come by in the literature. However, our investigation of progressive periphrases has shown that such variation does exist, as instantiated by the specialization of Calimera and Sternatia, on the one hand, and the use of generic strategies by the remaining localities on the other. Interestingly, this internal diatopic subdivision of

Grico villages for the expression of progressive aspect perfectly coincides with the phonetic isoglosses identified by Sobrero (1980:393), whereby Calimera (area A), Sternatia (area B_1) and the other villages (area B_2) constitute three separate sub-areas (see also Sobrero & Miglietta 2005).[62] If further studies in morphosyntactic microvariation confirm the internal subdivision identified here, we then have evidence that the diatopic classification above is indeed a robust one, embracing not only superficial manifestations of the language (cf. phonetic variation) but also core distinctions in its deep architecture (cf. morphosyntactic variation).

The study of the expression of progressive aspect in Grico has also brought to light a wealth of new information regarding both the current status of the language and the nature of language change and contact-induced phenomena. First, we have shown that the empirical scenario is much more nuanced than has been traditionally acknowledged by existing descriptions, in that a whole array of strategies are attested in which STAND combines with non-finite (cf. *–onta*) and finite forms (cf. present / imperfect indicative) mirroring common Romance strategies in the expression of progressive aspect. Over time, two functional elements have grammaticalised to reinforce the increasingly bleached meaning of the STAND periphrasis, namely the coordinator *ce* (cf. Pugliese / Salentino STAND AND) and the homophonous locative / C-element *pu*. The increased inflectional attrition of the STAND component, one of the clearest hallmarks of grammaticalization, has eventually led to the creation of two innovative patterns, namely *ste* + V_{finite} in Calimera (STAND partial inflectional attrition + deletion of linking element) and *ce pu* in Sternatia (STAND total inflectional attrition + retention of linking elements). So, while the speakers of the other villages simply make recourse to (original) existing strategies, speakers of Calimera and Sternatia have been able to further innovate (cf. also specialization of *steo* + *-onta* in Calimera). This is consistent with

---

[62] As for Martano, which in Sobrero's analysis belongs to Area A, this do not seem to pattern with Calimera in the expression of progressive aspect, in that all the productive patterns are currently employed by speakers in this village (cf. *steo* + *-onta* and *ste ce* + V_{finite}, as well as the archaic *steo ce* + V_{finite}), except for the pattern specific to Calimera, viz. *ste* + V_{finite} (as well as the Sternatia pattern, i.e. *ce pu*, as expected). This state of affairs, however, is not surprising, in that it confirms the 'dissolution of isoglosses' discussed below. As such, we can conclude that the above subdivision is valid, with the caveat that Martano has been absorbed into the B2 group, at least as far as progressive expression is concerned. As for Martignano, we do not have enough attestations from early and contemporary sources to make any claims in relation to the expression of progressive aspect and its location within the above subdivision.

the current status of the language, which today survives with some vitality only in these two localities. Conversely, the lack of specialisation of the other locations, which equally employ old and new patterns, fits nicely with the 'dissolution of isoglosses' that Sobrero (1980) identified on the basis of (mainly) lexical and phonological evidence, whereby lexical and phonetic variants which used to characterise a specific village are now found in a different one or have generalised to all villages, or, on the contrary, whereby a common variant has spread to all localities to the expenses of specific variants. This trend in lexical and phonological microvariation is replicated by the case of morphosyntactic variation identified here, whereby a common variant has spread to all villages (e.g. *steo + -onta*) at the expense of local strategies (e.g. Martano *steo ce* + V_{finite}) and a local strategy (e.g. Calimera *ste* + V_{finite}) has spread to all villages (cf. §2).

As for the nature of language change and contact-induced phenomena, the progressive case study has demonstrated that Grico innovative patterns are characterised by a shift from bi- to monoclausality. Furthermore, while the underlying model for contact in Grico is traditionally taken to be Salentino, the hybrid *steo* + subjunctive periphrasis has shown a interesting case where all the varieties included in the linguistic repertoire of semi-speakers contribute to the creation of a 'third' option, whose replica model is not (only) a corresponding progressive construction in the contact varieties. Interestingly, neither of these trends seem to be unique to Grico, as both are partially replicated by the innovative causative constructions in the Calabrian variety of Italo-Greek (Ledgeway et al. forthcoming), thus showing a possible pattern for future developments of this group of endangered varieties.

References

ANDRIANI, LUIGI, 2016. *The Syntax of the Dialect of Bari*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge dissertation.

ANDRIANI, LUIGI, 2017. 'The spread of inflected forms in northern Apulian aspectual periphrases'. Paper presented at *45th Romance Linguistics Seminar*, 4-5 January 2017, Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

ANDERSON, JOHN M., 1973. *An essay concerning aspect*, The Hague – Paris: Mouton.

APRILE, MARCELLO, COLUCCIA, ROSARIO, FANCIULLO, FRANCO & GUALDO, RICCARDO, 2002. 'La puglia', in MANLIO CORTELAZZO, CARLA MARCATO, NICOLA DE BLASI & GIANRENZO P. CLIVIO (eds.), *I dialetti italiani: storia, struttura e uso*, Torino: UTET, 679-756.

BALDISSERA, VALERIA, 2013. *Il dialetto grico del Salento: elementi balcanici e contatto linguistico*. Venezia: University of Venice dissertation.

BENTEIN, KLAAS, 2015. 'Minor Complementation Patterns in Post-classical Greek (I-VI AD): A Socio-historical Analysis of a Corpus of Documentary Papyri', *Symbolae Osloenses* 89(1), 104-147.

BERTINETTO, PIER MARCO, 2000. 'The progressive in Romance, as compared with English', in Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the languages of Europe*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 559-604.

BERTINETTO, PIER MARCO, EBERT, KAREN H. & DE GROOT CASPER, 2000. 'The progressive in Europe', In Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the languages of Europe*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 517-558.

BERTINETTO, PIER MARCO & SQUARTINI, MARIO, 2016. 'Tense and Aspect'. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 939-953.

BLANSITT, EDWARD L. JR., 1975. 'Progressive aspect', *Working Papers on Language Universals* 18, 1-34.

BYBEE, JOAN, PERKINS, REVERE & PAGLIUCA, WILLIAM, 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BRINTON, LAUREL & TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH C., 2017. 'Non-syntactic sources and triggers of syntactic change', in Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 556-577.

CARDINALETTI, ANNA & SHOLONSKY, UR, 2004. 'Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian', *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(4), 519-557.

CASSONI, MAURO, [1937] 1990. *Hellàs otrantina. Disegno grammaticale*, Galatina: Congedo.

CINQUE, GUGLIELMO, 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CINQUE, GUGLIELMO, 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Volume 4, New York: Oxford University Press.

CINQUE, GUGLIELMO, 2017. 'On the Status of Functional Categories (Heads and Phrases). *Language and Linguistics* 18(4): 521-576.

COMRIE, BERNARD, 1976. *Aspect*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COTARDO, ANGIOLINO, [1975], 2010. *Glossa grica. Note di grammatica per l'apprendimento del greco salentino e del greco moderno* (Ristampa anastatica con la presentazione di Luigino Sergio), San Cesario di Lecce: Manni.

DEO, ASHWINI, 2015. 'The semantic and pragmatic underpinnings of grammaticalization paths: The progressive to imperfective shift', *Semantics and Pragmatics* 8(14), 1-52.

DORIAN, NANCY C., 1981. *Language Death. The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

FANCIULLO, FRANCO, 1976. 'Il trattamento delle occlusive sonore latine nei dialetti salentini', *L'Italia Dialettale* 39, 1-82.

FANCIULLO, FRANCO, 1996. *Fra Oriente e Occidente. Per una storia linguistica dell'Italia meridionale*, Pisa: ETS.

FANCIULLO, FRANCO, 2001. 'On the origins of Modern Greek in Southern Italy,' in Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference*

on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, Patras: Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras, 67-77.

FANCIULLO, FRANCO, 2007. 'Ancora di latino e di greco in Calabria', *L'Italia dialettale* 66-67, 49-68.

GUARDIANO, CRISTINA & STAVROU, MELITA, 2014. 'Greek and Romance in Southern Italy: history and contact in nominal structures', *L'Italia Dialettale* 75, 121-148.

GRECO, ANTONIO, 2003. *Ìvrika tin glossamu. Grammatica grika della Grecìa Salentina*, Nardò: Besa Editrice.

HARRIS, ALICE C. & CAMPBELL, LYLE, 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HEINE, BERND, 1993. *Auxiliaries: Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HEINE, BERND & KUTEVA, TANIA, 2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HOLTON, DAVID, MACKRIDGE, PETER & PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE, 2012. *Greek. A Comprehensive Grammar*, 2nd Edition revised by Vassilios Spyropoulos, London: Routledge.

HOPPER, PAUL J. & TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH C., 2003. *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

I Spitta. O Periòdico Griko Derentinò (2016, n. 16).

ITALIA, GEMMA & LAMBROYORGU, GEORGIA, 2001. *Grammatica del dialetto greco di Sternatia (Grecia salentina)*, Galatina: Congedo.

JAMES, PATRICK, 2008. *Complementary Participles and Infinitives with Verbs of Perception and Declaration in the Roman and Byzantine Documentary Papyri*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge dissertation.

JANNARIS, ANTHONY, 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect*, Hildesheim: Olms.

KARANASTASIS, ANASTASIOS, 1984-1992. *Ιστορικόν Λεξικόν των Ελληνικών Ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας [Historical Lexicon of the Greek Dialects of South Italy]*, vols. 1–5, Athens, Academy of Athens.

KARANASTASIS, ANASTASIOS, 1997. Γραμματική των ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας. *[Grammar of the Greek dialects of Southern Italy]*, Athens: Academy of Athens.

KATSOYANNOU, MARIANNE, 1995. *Le parler gréco de Gallicianò (Italie)*. Paris: Université Paris VII dissertation.

KATSOYANNOU, MARIANNE, 1997. 'Interventi simbiotici tra greco e romanzo nell'area linguistica calabrese', in Emanuele Banfi (ed.), *Atti del secondo incontro internazionale di lingua greca*. Trento: Università di Trento, Dipartimento di scienze filologiche e storiche.

KÜHNER, RAPHAEL, & GERTH, BERNHARD, [1904] 1976. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre. 3rd edition*, Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2000. *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach*, Oxford: Blackwell.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2009. *Grammatica diacronica del dialetto napoletano*. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie Band 350), Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2011a. *The Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspects in the Dialects of Apulia,* paper presented at *Italian (Dialects) in Diachrony*, University of Leiden, 19-21/05/2011.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2011b. 'Grammaticalization from Latin to Romance', in Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 719-729.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2013. 'Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy', in Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph, Angela Ralli & Metin Bagriacik (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, Patras: Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras, 184-228.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2016a. 'The dialects of southern Italy', in Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 246-269.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2016b. 'From Coordination to Subordination: The Grammaticalization of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the dialects of Salento', in Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning*, Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 157-184.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, 2016c. 'Clausal complementation', in Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1013-1028.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM & LOMBARDI, ALESSANDRA, 2005. 'Verb movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance', *Probus* 17, 79-113.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM & LOMBARDI, ALESSANDRA, 2014. 'The development of the southern subjunctive: morphological loss and syntactic gain', In Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and dialects. Grammatical change in the dialects of Italy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 25-47.

LEDGEWAY, ADAM, SCHIFANO, NORMA & SILVESTRI, GIUSEPPINA, forthcoming. 'Variazione nella codifica degli argomenti verbali nelle varietà romanze e greche della Calabria meridionale: i costrutti causativi', in Patrizia Del Puente (ed.), *Atti del V Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia - Progetto A.L.Ba*. Rionero in Vulture: Calice Editore.

LEKAKOU, MARIKA, BALDISSERA, VALERIA & ANASTASOPOULOS, ANTONIS, 2013. *Documentation and analysis of an endangered language: aspects of the grammar of Griko*. University of Ioannina (http://griko.project.uoi.gr/).

LEKAKOU, MARIKA & QUER, JOSEP, 2016a. 'Subjunctive mood in Griko: A micro-comparative approach', *Lingua* 174, 65-85.

LEKAKOU, MARIKA & QUER, JOSEP, 2016b. 'Aspect in the service of mood: the morphosyntax of subjunctive in Griko', in Angela Ralli, Nikos Koutsoukos & Stavros Bompolas (eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory Meeting (MGDLT 6), 25-28 September 2014, Patras, Greece*, Patras: University of Patras, 79-92.

LEPSCHY, ANNA L. & LEPSCHY, GIULIO, [1977], 1988. *The Italian Language Today*, London: Routledge.

LOPORCARO, MICHELE, 1997. 'Puglia and Salento', in Martin Maiden & Mair Parry (eds.), *The Dialects of Italy*, London: Routledge, 338-348.

LOPORCARO, MICHELE, 2009. *Profilo linguistico dei dialetti italiani*, Bari: Laterza.

MACKRIDGE, PETER, 1985. *The Modern Greek Language. A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MADARIAGA, NEREA, 2017. 'Reanalysis', in Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 70-91.

MAIR, CHRISTIAN, 2012. 'Progressive and Continuous Aspect', in Robert I. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 803-827.

MANOLESSOU, IO, 2005a. 'The Greek dialects of South Italy: An overview', *Kambos: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 13, 103-125.

MANOLESSOU, IO, 2005b. 'From participles to gerunds', in Melita Stavrou & Arhonto Terzi (eds.), *Advances in Greek generative syntax*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 241-283.

MANZINI, MARIA RITA & SAVOIA, LEONARDO M., 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa* (3 vols). Alessandria: dell'Orso.

MANZINI, MARIA RITA, LORUSSO, PAOLO & SAVOIA, LEONARDO M., 2017. '*a*/bare finite complements in Southern Italian varieties: mono-clausal or bi-clausal syntax?', *Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies* 3: 11-59.

MATEU, JAUME & AMADAS, LAIA, 1999. 'Extended Argument Structure: Progressive as Unaccusative', *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 159-174.

MATRAS, YARON & SAKEL, JEANETTE, 2007. 'Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence', *Studies in Language* 31, 829-865.

MEYER-LÜBKE, WILHELM, 1935. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

MOROSI, GIUSEPPE, 1870. *Studi sui dialetti greci della Terra d'Otranto: preceduto da una raccolta di canti, leggende, proverbi e indovinelli nei dialetti medesimi*, Lecce: Tip. Editrice Salentina.

NICHOLAS, NICK, 2001. 'A survey of modern Greek dialectal complementation', in Angela Ralli, Brian D. Joseph & M. Janse (eds.), *Proceedings of the second international conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory,* Patras: Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras, 193-206.

PARLANGÈLI, ORONZO, 1953. *Sui dialetti Romanzi e Romaici del Salento*. Milan: Hoepli.

PELLEGRINI, ASTORRE, 1880. *Il dialetto greco-calabro di Bova*. Turin: Loescher.

PELLEGRINO, MANUELA, 2016. 'Performing Griko beyond 'death'', *Palaver* 5(1), 137-162.

PROFILI, OLGA, 1983. *Le parler grico de Corigliano d'Otranto (province de Lecce, Italie): phénomènes d'interférence entre ce parler grec et les parlers romans environnants, ainsi qu'avec l'italien*. Grenoble: Grenoble University dissertation.

RALLI, ANGELA, 2006. 'Syntactic and morphosyntactic phenomena in modern Greek dialects. The state of the art', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 7, 121–159.

REMBERGER, EVA MARIA, 2011. 'Morfosintassi verbale dei dialetti neogreci in Calabria', in Walter Breu (ed.), *L'influsso dell'italiano sul sistema del verbo delle lingue minoritarie*, Bochum: Brockmeyer, 29, 17-39.

ROBERTS, IAN, 2017. 'Inertia', in Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 423-45.

ROHLFS, GERHARD, 1933. *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*, Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.

ROHLFS, GERHARD, 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Turin: Einaudi.

ROHLFS, GERHARD, 1972. *Nuovi scavi linguistici nella antica Magna Grecia*, Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici.

ROHLFS, GERHARD, 1977. *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci*, München: C.H. Beck.

ROSS, JOHN ROBERT, 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Cambridge Mass., MIT.

ROUSSOU, ANNA, 2000. 'Modal particles and complementisers', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1, 65-94.

SCHIFANO, NORMA, 2015. 'The paradigmatic instantiation of TAM: a novel approach to Romance verb-movement', in Enoch Aboh, Jeannette Schaeffer & Petra Sleeman (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013. Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Amsterdam 2013*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 83-102.

SCHIFANO, NORMA, 2016. 'Le lingue romanze: verso una cartografia del movimento del verbo', in Eva Buchi, Jean-Paul Cheveau & Jean-Marie Pierrel (eds.), *Actes du XXVIIe Congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes (Nancy, 15–20 juillet 2013), Volume 1*, Strasbourg: ÉliPhi, 581-92.

SCHIFANO, NORMA, forthcoming. *Verb Movement in Romance: A Comparative Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SCHIFANO, NORMA, SQUILLACI, MARIA OLIMPIA & SILVESTRI, GIUSEPPINA 2016. 'Some preliminary observations on auxiliary selection and participle agreement in Greko and Bovese', *Proceedings of the 6th Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, University of Patras, 25-28 September 2014* (available at http://mgdlt.lis.upatras.gr/index.php/mgdlt/article/view/2683/2912).

SIAPKARAS-PITSILLIDES, THEMIS, 1975. *Le Pétrarquisme en Chypre: Poèmes d'amour en dialecte chypriote d'après un manuscript du xvie siècle. Texte établi et traduit avec le concours de Hubert Pernot*. Paris: Athens: Institut français d'Athènes.

SOBRERO, ALBERTO, 1980. 'Conservazione e trasformazione nella storia più recente del grico salentino', in F.A. Leoni (ed.), *I dialetti e le lingue delle minoranze di fronte all'italiano, Atti dell'XI Congresso Internazionale di studi della SLI (Cagliari, 27-30 maggio 1977)*, Roma: Bulzoni, 389-401.

SOBRERO, ALBERTO & MIGLIETTA, ANNARITA, 2005. 'Politica linguistica e presenza del grico in Salento, oggi', in Cristina Guardiano, Emilia Claresu, Cecilia Robustelli & Augusto Carli (eds.), *Lingue, istituzioni, territori. Riflessioni teoriche, proposte metodologiche ed esperienze di politica linguistica*, Roma, Bulzoni: 209–226.

SQUARTINI, MARIO, 1998. *Verbal periphrases in Romance: aspect, actionality, and grammaticalization*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

SQUILLACI, MARIA OLIMPIA, 2016. *When Greek meets Romance. A morphosyntactic investigation of language contact in Aspromonte*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge dissertation.

STEHL, THOMAS, 1988. 'Aree linguistiche XI. Puglia e Salento', in Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin & Christian Schmitt (eds.), *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik* 4, 695-715.

TOMMASI, SALVATORE, 2001. *Katalìsti o Kosmo. Tra passato e presente. Lingua, tradizione e folklore nella Grecìa Salentina. Materiali per un seminario sul griko 1995-1996*, Galatina: Editrice Salentina.

TOMMASI, SALVATORE, 2009. *Alia loja. Traùdia*, Galatina: Editrice Salentina.

TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH C., 2011. 'Grammaticalization and mechanisms of change', in Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 19-30.

VINCENT, ALFRED, 1991. 'Comedy', in David Holton (ed.), *Literature and society in Renaissance Crete*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 103-128.

WILLIS, DAVID, 2017. 'Endogenous and exogenous theories of syntactic change', in Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 491-514.