

COMPOUNDING IN THE GREEK DIALECTS OF SOUTHERN ITALY*

MARIOS ANDREOU
University of Patras

The aim of this paper is to offer a rigorous descriptive analysis of the morphological process of compounding in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy and to fill the gap with respect to the study of compounding in Modern Greek dialects. In particular, the present paper presents the definition and the basic characteristics of Greek compounds and it offers a classification of Italiot compounds based on the lexical category of the compound structure and the lexical category of the compound members. In addition, based on the grammatical relation between the compound members, it offers a classification of Italiot compounds into subordinate, attributive, and coordinate and it also addresses the endocentricity-exocentricity distinction in the Greek compounds of Southern Italy. Finally, it presents the phenomenon of left-headedness in Italiot and it comments on whether it should be considered a language-interference phenomenon.

1 Introduction

1.1 Greek in Southern Italy: Bovese and Griko

The of Greek origin Bovese and Griko are spoken in the southern-most edges of Italy and, more specifically, in Calabria and Puglia respectively (for a discussion of the origins of these dialects see amongst others Rohlf, 1924; Parlangelì, 1953; Karanastasis, 1992; Ledgeway, 1998; Fanciullo, 2001; Manolessou, 2005). Bovese¹ which is the Greek dialect of Calabria was until recently spoken in nine villages, namely, Amendolea, Bova superiore, Galliciano, Bova Marina, Condofuri, Roghudi, Roccaforte, Chorio di Roccaforte, and Chorio Roghudi. Nowadays, Greek-speaking population has declined and Bovese is spoken (mostly) by elder people. In addition, several villages have been deserted for a number of reasons including amongst others floods and

* I thank Angela Ralli, Brian Joseph, and Franco Fanciullo for their most constructive remarks. This work has been supported by the ‘Constantin Carathéodory’ program (D.159) of the University of Patras.
andreoum@upatras.gr

¹ Bovese is also attested with the following names in literature: Greco, Grecanico, and Romaico. It should be noted that Italian scholars often use the term Grecanico (and sometimes Romaico) to refer to both Bovese and Griko. In this paper, I will use the term Italiot and not Grecanico to refer to both Greek dialects since for Greek scholars, the term Grecanico is usually used with respect to Bovese only.

land-slides (Katsoyannou, 1999). The following statistics are indicative of the situation (Spano, 1965, as cited in Katsoyannou, 1999):

Year	Population	Greek-speaking	%
1901	14.211	10.694	75,2
1911	14.337	8.535	59,5
1921	14.336	3.639	25,3

Table 1. Statistics of Greek-speaking population

Recent statistics also show that Bovesè is in rapid decrease since as Katsoyannou (1999: 607) reports, nowadays there is a number of 500 Greek speakers in the area. It should be mentioned that Bovesè is still resisting in Gallicianò and this is why the only modern comprehensive description of this dialect (Katsoyannou, 1995) is based on this variety. Although nowadays Bovesè has died out in some of these villages (e.g. Bova Marina, Condofuri, and Chorio Rochudi) there is agreement that Greek was spoken in a much larger area during the Middle Ages; according to Manolessou (2005) this area used to encompass not only S. Calabria, but the coast of Sicily as well.

Griko, which is the second Greek dialect of Southern Italy, is spoken in nine villages of the Salento area of Puglia. The villages are the following: Calimera, Castrignano dei Greci, Corigliano d'Otranto, Martano, Martignano, Melpignano, Soleto, Sternatia, and Zollino. In this area, Greek is still resisting due to revival efforts and it is spoken by an approximate number of 20.000 people. We should, however, mention that even in Puglia, Griko is no longer in use in some villages such as Melpignano and Soleto.

The main reason for which Greek in Southern Italy is in rapid decrease is that from the socio-linguistic point of view, the linguistic environment in Southern Italy is characterized as 'negative' with respect to Greek, since its speakers usually belonged to the lower social strata and regarded Italian, or the local Romance linguistic varieties, as the dominant, prestigious linguistic forms. Consider for example that Greek in Calabria has to compete with the Standard Italian, the local variety of standard Italian (*italiano regionale*), and the local romance dialect of Calabria (*calabrese* or *dialetto*).

1.2 Dialectology and Morphology

Although compounding in Standard Modern Greek is a well-studied phenomenon (Anastasiadi-Simeonidi, 1983, 1996; Ralli, 2005, 2007, 2009a,b, 2013), there is very little in the published literature to date that deals directly with the study of compounds in Modern Greek dialects (Giannouloupoulou, 2006; Andreou, 2010; Ralli and Andreou, 2012; Andreou and Koliopoulou, 2012). The present paper aims to contribute to the understudied compounding system of Greek dialects and to show that the study of dialects can provide us with crucial data which may inform the discussion on various issues of morphological analysis (see Ralli, 2009c for the importance of dialectal data in morphology).

The rest of this study is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the definition and the basic characteristics of Greek compounds and Section 3 offers a classification of compounds in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy based on the lexical category of the compound structures. Section 4 comments on the classification of compounds into subordinate, attributive, and coordinate, based on the grammatical relation between the compound members and Section 5 addresses the endocentricity-exocentricity distinction in compounds. Section 6 presents the

phenomenon of left-headedness in Bovesese and it comments on whether it should be considered a language-interference phenomenon. Section 7 summarizes and concludes the paper.

2 Definition and basic characteristics of Greek compounds

The definition of compounding and its relation to other grammatical components such as syntax and phonology have been hotly debated (see amongst others Aronoff, 1976; Anderson, 1992; Lieber, 1992; Ackema and Neeleman, 2004; Ralli, 2007, 2013; Lieber and Štekauer, 2009). The difficulty to define compounding could be attributed to the fact that the typological characteristics of a language can greatly affect one's understanding and definition of this process. Consider for example that a number of languages, English included, primarily make use of independent words in order to create a compound. Therefore, it is common to find definitions of compounding whereby a compound is a word composed of two other words. The following definition of compounding by Marchand (1960) is not untypical for much work on compounds:

- (1) When two or more words are combined into a morphological unit, we speak of a compound. (Marchand, 1960, p. 11)

Other languages, however, combine stems and not full word forms. Consider the following Greek examples:

- (2) kuklóspito < kukl(a) spit(i)
 'doll-house' doll house
- agguroxórafon < aggur(i) xoraf(i)
 cucumber field
 'field for growing cucumbers'

Consider for example the Cypriot compound *agguroxórafon* (from Andreou, 2010). Contrary to an English compound such as *door knob*, this formation is based on two stems, *aggur-* and *xoraf-*, and not on two full word forms.

Let us now turn to the presentation of the basic characteristics of Greek compounds. According to Ralli (2007, 2013), Greek compounds are one-word formations and they obey the lexical integrity hypothesis (Lapointe 1980), in that their internal structure is never accessible to syntax. More specifically, their structure involves morphologically-proper constituents, i.e. either two stems ([stem stem]) or a stem and a word ([stem word]). In the first case, the inflectional ending and the stress is different from those of the second member when taken in isolation, as in *lulúdi* vs *nixtolúludo* in (3a). In the second case, stress and inflection follows the word constituent as in *saláta* vs *domatosaláta* in (3b):

- (3) a. nixtolúludo < nikt(a) lulud(i)
 'night-flower' night flower
- b. domatosaláta < domat(a) saláta
 'tomato-salad' tomato salad

In addition, Greek compounds are phonological words, i.e. they bear a single stress, independently of the stress of their constituent parts when taken in isolation. They also bear a compound marker, namely *-o-*, between the two constituents which has a compulsory character. For example, in *nixt-o-lúludo*, the compound members are linked together by the element *-o-*. Finally, Greek compounds are inflected at their right edge and their inflectional ending may be different from that of the second constituent, in the case of [stem stem] compounds. Inflection never appears within compounds unless they are built on an Ancient Greek pattern.

A closer inspection of compounding in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy reveals that compounds in Italiot exhibit all of these characteristics. Consider the following; (4a) provides examples of stem-stem compounds and (4b) contains compounds of the stem-word structure (all examples from Karanastasis, 1984-1992):

(4) a. Stem-Stem compounds

imisokálamó	<	imis(o)	kalam(i)
‘half reed’		half	reed
glikókathó	<	glik(o)	akath(i)
‘sweet thorn’		sweet	thorn

b. Stem-Word compounds

kalokánnó	<	kal(o)	kann(o)
‘to help someone’		good	to do
asprokáthi	<	aspr(o)	akath(i)
‘white thorn’		white	thorn

A comparison between *asprokáthi* ‘white thorn’ and *glikókathó* ‘sweet thorn’ illustrates the difference between stem-stem and stem-word compounds in some detail. To begin with, both compounds are composed of an adjective, *áspr(o)* and *glik(ó)* respectively, and the noun *akáthi*. In addition, both compounds bear the linking element *-o-* which appears between the compound members (*aspr-o-káthi*, *glik-ó-kathó*). They also bear a single stress (i.e. they are phonological words).

A closer inspection of these compounds, however, shows that *asprokáthi* and *glikókathó* differ with respect to (a) the position of stress and (b) their inflectional endings. As far as the position of stress is concerned, *asprokáthi* is stressed on the penultimate, whereas the stress in *glikókathó* is placed on the antepenultimate syllable. In addition, the former exhibits the same inflectional ending as its right-most constituent when the latter is taken in isolation (i.e. *akáthi*), whereas the latter ends in the inflectional marker *-o*. According to Nespor and Ralli (1996) and Ralli (2013), these differences between *asprokáthi* and *glikókathó* should be attributed to the different structure on which they are built. Based on their analysis, the compound *asprokáthi* is a stem-word formation and as such it preserves both the stress and the inflectional suffix of its right-most element which appears in a full word form, whereas *glikókathó* exhibits a stem-stem structure.

3 Lexical category of compounds and compound members

In this section I classify the compounds of the Greek dialects of Southern Italy based on the lexical category of the whole and the lexical category of the compound members. This classification will allow us to comment on (a) which categories appear inside compounds and the way they combine with one another, and (b) the productivity² of each compound type in the dialects under examination. This presentation will also allow us to make comparisons between compounding in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy and the rest of the Greek-speaking world.

3.1 Nouns

In order to form a compound of the category Noun, one can either combine two Nouns as in (5) or an Adjective and a Noun as in (6).

(5) [Noun + Noun]_{NOUN}

dzurgoššépama 'lid of pot'	<	dzurg(o) pot	ššepam(a) lid
ambelódema 'bundle to tie the vines on sticks'	<	ambel(i) vine	dem(a) bundle
petroláxano 'wild cabbage'	<	petr(a) rock	laxan(o) cabbage

(6) [Adjective + Noun]_{NOUN}

kakoginéka 'evil woman'	<	kak(i) bad/evil	ginek(a) woman
kitrinoléo 'yellow merle bird'	<	kitrin(o) yellow	le(o) merle bird
mavrópilo 'black-coloured soil'	<	mavr(o) black	pil(o) soil

Observe that this category consists of both root- and synthetic-compounds. The compound *petroláxano*, for example, is composed of only two stems *petr(a)* and *laxan(o)*, whereas *dzurgoššépama* consists of the stem *dzurg-* and the deverbial word *ššépama*.

² A caveat may be in order here. In the present study I use *productivity* as a cover term for the availability and profitability of a process (for a detailed study of productivity see Bauer, 2001a). This means that a certain process may be available and exhibit either high or low profitability.

3.2 Adjectives

The formations in (7) illustrate that adjectival compounds in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy are based on the combination of two adjectives.

(7) [Adjective + Adjective]_{ADJECTIVE}

rusogérano	<	rus(o)	geran(o)
		gold-red	gray
'(an animal which is) gold-red in the front and gray in the back of the body'			

rusokástano	<	rus(o)	kastan(o)
		gold-red	brown
'(an animal which is) gold-red and has brown spots on facial hair'			

It should be noted that the creation of compounds which belong to the lexical category of Adjectives is not profitable in the dialects of Southern Italy. A comparison with Standard Modern Greek and other Greek dialects reveals the following:

(a) In my data there is only a small number of adjectival compounds and the vast majority of these compounds has the adjective *ruso* as a first constituent. This particularity should be attributed to the low profitability of this category in these dialects since if adjectival compounds were a profitable type of compounding, we would have expected to find a number of different constituents inside compounds and not primarily the stem *ruso*. In Standard Modern Greek in which the formation of adjectival compounds is a profitable process, we can find for example compounds such as *asprómavros* 'black and white', *prasinokókkinos* 'green and red', and *psilólignos* 'tall and thin'.

(b) The low profitability of adjectival compounds in Italiot is also evident on another level since a compound of the category Adjective can only be created by the combination of two adjectives. In more detail, adjectival compounds in SMG and other dialects can be formed by the combination of (a) a noun and an adjective (8), and (b) an adverb and an adjective (9); the adjective in these cases is usually a passive past participle in *-menos*. Consider the following examples:

(8) [Noun + Adjective]_{ADJECTIVE}

SMG: anthostolisménos	<	anth(os)	stolismen(os)
'decorated with flowers'		flower	decorated

Cypriot: axeróplektos	<	axer(o)	plekt(os)
'knitted with straw'		straw	knitted

(9) [Adverb + Adjective]_{ADJECTIVE}

SMG: argokínitos	<	arg(a)	kini-t-(os)
'who moves slowly'		slowly	who moves

Cypriot: <i>alafropiasménos</i> 'slightly cramped'	<	<i>alaf(r)a</i> slightly	<i>piasmén(os)</i> cramped
---	---	-----------------------------	-------------------------------

As illustrated by these examples, the creation of adjectival compounds in SMG and Cypriot-Greek is more profitable compared to compounding in the dialects of Southern Italy in which adjectival compounds are created only by the combination of two adjectives.

3.3 Verbs

A compound of the category Verb in the dialects of Southern Italy can be created by the combination of (a) a noun and a verb or (b) an adverb and a verb. Consider the following indicative examples:

(10) [Noun + Verb]_{VERB}

<i>ambelodéno</i> 'to stake vine plants'	<	<i>ambel(i)</i> vine	<i>den(o)</i> to stake/tie
<i>dzigostréfo</i> 'turn the yoke'	<	<i>dzig(o)</i> yoke	<i>stref(o)</i> to turn
<i>skatoxédzo</i> 'to deliver an unfinished job'	<	<i>skat(o)</i> droppings	<i>xedz(o)</i> to shit

(11) [Adverb + Verb]_{VERB}

<i>kakopiánno</i> 'to mistreat someone'	<	<i>kak(a)</i> wrongly	<i>piann(o)</i> catch
<i>kalomelónno</i> 'to fondle with love'	<	<i>kal(a)</i> nicely	<i>melonn(o)</i> to hurl honey

In more detail, the compound *ambelodéno* in (10), consists of the noun *ambel(i)* and the verb *den(o)*. The noun in this compound serves as the internal argument of the verb (object). In (11), *kakopiánno* is composed of the verb *piann(o)* and the adverb *kak(a)*.

Contrary to SMG, the creation of compounds of the structure [Verb + Verb] is not profitable in these dialects. For instance, in SMG there are compounds such as *anigoklíno* 'open and close' and *pigenoérxome* 'come and go', which are composed of two verbs and which belong to the class of co-ordinate compounds (Ralli, 2007, 2009b). This type of compounding, however, is not attested in the dialects of Southern Italy.

4 Grammatical relation between compound members

The classification of compounds based on the relation between the compound members has been hotly debated and no consensus has been reached (see amongst others the classifications proposed by Bloomfield, 1933; Marchand, 1960; Spencer, 1991; Fabb, 1998; Bauer, 2001b; Olsen, 2001; Haspelmath, 2002; Booij, 2005; Bisetto and Scalise, 2005; Scalise and Bisetto, 2009). As Bisetto and Scalise (2005) show, the traditional classification of compounds into Subordinate, Coordinate, Appositive, Exocentric, and Synthetic, is highly problematic since some classes are defined by the use of various semantic and grammatical criteria and they may overlap.

A comparison between the class of exocentric and the class of subordinate compounds is illustrative of the inconsistency which manifests itself in the traditional classifications. On the one hand, the category of exocentric compounds is based on the criterion of head (more specifically absence of head), and on the other hand the class of subordinate compounds is based on a different criterion, namely the grammatical relation between the compound members. In order to provide a better classification, Bisetto and Scalise (2005) propose that compounds should be classified into three macro-types: (a) Subordinate, (b) Attributive, and (c) Coordinate compounds. This classification makes use of only one criterion, namely the grammatical relation between the constituents.

4.1 Subordinate

Subordinate compounds are defined as the compounds in which there is an argumental relation between the constituents; (12) contains examples of subordinate compounds from the dialects of Southern Italy:

(12) <i>ambelodéno</i>	<	<i>ambel(i)</i>	<i>den(o)</i>
‘to stake vine plants’		vine	to stake/tie
<i>dzigostréfo</i>	<	<i>dzig(o)</i>	<i>stref(o)</i>
‘turn the yoke’		yoke	to turn
<i>tsukkoššépama</i>	<	<i>tsukk(a)</i>	<i>ššepam(a)</i>
‘lid of pot’		pot	lid
<i>skordófiddo</i>	<	<i>skord(o)</i>	<i>fidd(o)</i>
‘garlic leaf’		garlic	leaf

The class of subordinate compounds in these dialects consists of two different types of compounds. The first type comprises compounds in which the first constituent serves as a complement of the verb or the deverbal second constituent. In the compound *ambelodéno*, for example, the noun *ambel(i)* saturates one of the theta-roles of the verb; in this case it serves as an internal argument (object). In a similar vein, the noun *tsukk(a)* serves as a complement of the deverbal *ššépama* which acts as head.

The second type of subordinate compounds consists of [Noun Noun] compounds in which there is an argumental relation between the head and the non-head. This argumental relation is

usually found as the ‘of-relation’ in the relevant literature. The compound *skordófiddo*, serves as an example, since in this formation, the non-head, *skord(o)*, and the head, *fid(d)o*, are in an argumental relation (‘of-relation’); *skordófiddo* is the *fill(o)* of *skord(o)*.

4.2 Attributive

The second class of compounds, namely attributive compounds, consists of formations in which there is a modification relation between the head and the non-head. These compounds are usually composed of an adjective and a noun modified by the adjective. In (13), I present attributive compounds from the dialects of Southern Italy:

(13) <i>kakoginéka</i>	<	<i>kak(i)</i>	<i>ginek(a)</i>
‘evil woman’		bad/evil	woman
<i>mavrópilo</i>	<	<i>mavr(o)</i>	<i>pil(o)</i>
‘black-coloured soil’		black	soil
<i>avropastanáka</i>	<	<i>avr(o)-</i>	<i>pastanak(a)</i>
‘pastinaca sativa’		wild	pastinaca

More specifically, in the compound *kakoginéka*, the adjective *kak(i)* modifies the head of the word which is the noun *ginek(a)*. In a similar vein, there is a modification relation between the non-head *mavr(o)* and the head *pil(o)* in the compound *mavrópilo*.

4.3 Coordinate

Coordinate compounds are the last class of compounds which will concern us here. In this class, the compound constituents are in a relation of coordination. Consider the following examples:

(14) a. <i>imeráspero</i>	<	<i>imer(a)</i>	<i>esper(a)</i>
‘day and night’		day	night
b. <i>rusopétrolo</i>	<	<i>rus(o)</i>	<i>petrol(o)</i>
		gold-red	gray
‘with gold-red and gray hair’			

Observe that in (14a) the relation of coordination holds between two nouns and in (14b) it holds between two adjectives.

It should be noted that the creation of coordinate compounds in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy is not-profitable and it does not exhibit the same productivity as in SMG. This holds for all lexical categories in which we classified the Greek compounds of Southern Italy (verbs, adjectives, and nouns). For example, as discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.3, compounds of the type *asprómavros* ‘black and white’, *anevokatevéno* ‘go up and down’, and *anigoklino* ‘open and close’ which are commonly attested in SMG do not exhibit the same profitability in these dialects. It should also be mentioned that as Andreou (2010) has shown, the creation of coordinate compounds is not productive in Cypriot-Greek either. In this dialect, a periphrastic construction is usually preferred to a coordinate compound.

5 Endocentric and exocentric compounds

In morphological theory the difference between endocentric and exocentric compounds is considered as a primarily semantic distinction and it is based on the presence or absence of head (see for example Bloomfield, 1933; Bauer, 2008; Lieber, 2009). Based on this criterion, the head of an exocentric compound lies outside the compound structure, whereas an endocentric compound is usually headed by its right-most constituent.

Given that head can be identified by the hyponymy test which is a semantic test, an endocentric compound is a hyponym of its head, whereas an exocentric one is headless since it fails the hyponymy test. This can be captured by the semantic 'IS A' condition in (15) proposed by Allen (1978: 11). According to this condition, a compound (Z) is a hyponym of its head (Y):

(15) In a compound [[]X []Y]Z, Z 'IS A' Y

Consider as illustrative examples the English compounds *doorknob* and *red-haired*. The compound *doorknob* is endocentric since based on the hyponymy test it is a hyponym of its head, *knob*, whereas *red-haired* is rendered exocentric since it fails the semantic test of hyponymy; *red-haired* is not a kind of hair.

With respect to the classification of compounds, Bisetto and Scalise (2005) and Scalise and Bisetto (2009) propose that each of the three macro-types, namely Subordinate, Attributive, and Coordinate compounds, should be divided into two sub-categories, namely endocentric and exocentric compounds. Consider the following examples from the dialects of Southern Italy; (16) gives examples of endocentric compounds and (17) contains exocentric compounds.

(16) Endocentric compounds

kombóxorto	<	komb(o)	xort(o)
'kind of grass'		knot	grass
alíokátho	<	alík(o)	akath(i)
		red	thorn
'kind of thorn with red flowers'			
kalokáño	<	kal(o)	kann(o)
'to help someone'		good	to do
agriómilo	<	agri(o)	mil(o)
'wild apple'		wild	apple

(17) Exocentric compounds

asprókéfalo	<	aspr(o)	kefal(i)
'with white hair'		white	head

gattóvidzo	<	gat(a)	vidz(i)
		cat	breast
‘whose nipples are small like the nipples of cat’			
makropódi	<	makr(i)	pod(i)
‘(pear) with a long stem’		long	foot
monóvidzo	<	mon(o)	vidz(i)
‘who has only one breast’		single	breast
platófiddo	<	plat(i)	fidd(o)
‘broad-leaved tree’		broad	leaf

In more detail, the compound *agriómilo* is considered endocentric because the whole serves as a hyponymy of its head, *mil(o)*; *agriómilo* is a kind of *mil(o)*. On the contrary, a compound such as *platófiddo* is considered exocentric since it fails the hyponymy test; the whole does not denote a kind of *fidd(o)* but a kind of tree ‘which has broad leaves’.³

6 Left-headedness in Italiot

This section is devoted to the presentation of the phenomenon of left-headedness which manifests itself in the compounding system of Italiot and particularly in Bovese compounding. To begin with, Greek compounds obey the *Right-hand Head Rule* (Williams, 1981). Consider the following indicative examples from Standard Modern Greek (Ralli, 2005, 2013) and Cypriot (Andreou, 2010):

(18) SMG: agriógata	<	agri(a)	gat(a)
‘wild-cat’		wild	cat
psaróvarka	<	psar(i)	vark(a)
‘fishing boat’		fish	boat
Cypriot: glikokolókason	<	glik(o)	kolokas(in)
‘sweet-potato’		sweet	kind of potato

³ For a theoretical discussion of the notion head and the distinction between endocentric and exocentric structures, the reader is referred to Andreou (2010) and Ralli and Andreou (2012). These scholars argue that the distinction between endo- and exo-centric compounds is not primarily semantic and that it does not manifest itself in all compound macro-types. Based on this proposal, the endocentricity-exocentricity distinction can be better understood if it is analyzed based on the order by which the word-formation processes of compounding and derivation apply. The following summarizes this proposal:

(i) [...] exocentricity is an epiphenomenon, reflecting a particular order of application of compounding and derivation, according to which when compounding and derivation co-occur within the same morphologically complex item, compounding precedes derivation. In contrast, [...] a structure is endocentric if it contains only compounding, or involves derivation and compounding, in this particular order. (Ralli and Andreou 2012: 79)

ampelopérvolon <	ampel(in)	pervol(in)
‘vine field’	vine	field

Observe that the compounds in (18) are all right-headed. For instance, the Adj. + Noun compound *glikokolókason* is headed by the noun *kolokas(in)* and not the adjective *glik(o)* since the compound as a whole is a kind of *kolokas(in)* and it belongs to the lexical category Noun and not to the category Adjective; these two properties come from its head element.

Given that Italiot is of Greek origin, it is expected to exhibit right-headed compounds. As reported by Karanastasis (1992, 1997), however, in this dialectal variety, and specifically in Bovesse, one also finds left-headed [N N] compounds. Consider the following examples:

- | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|
| (19) fiddámbelo < | fidd(o) | ambel(i) |
| ‘vine leaf’ | leaf | vine |
| klonósparto < | klon(o) | spart(o) |
| ‘twig of sedge’ | sedge | twig |
| ššulopótamo < | ššul(o) | potam(o) |
| ‘lit. wood of the river’ | wood | river |
| ‘driftwood’ | | |
| sporomárho < | spor(o) | marath(o) |
| ‘fennel seed’ | seed | fennel |
| xortanémi < | xort(o) | anem(o) |
| ‘lit. grass of the wind’ | grass | wind |
| ‘kind of grass’ | | |
| xerosíkli < | xer(i) | sikl(a) |
| ‘handle of tin bucket’ | handle | tin bucket |
| korkóššino < | kokk(o) | ššin(o) |
| ‘fruit of pistacia’ | fruit/seed | pistacia |
| sakkokreváti < | sakk(o) | krevat(i) |
| ‘mattress’ | bag | bed |
| rid:záfti < | ridz(a) | aft(i) |
| ‘base of the ear’ | root | ear |

Given that both members of these compounds belong to the lexical category of Noun, we have to rely on the semantic test of hyponymy in order to identify the head of the word. This test qualifies the left-most element as the head of each compound in (19). For example, the head in *sporomárho* is *spor(o)* ‘seed’ since the whole compound denotes a kind of *spor(o)* and not a kind of *marath(o)* ‘fennel’. In a similar vein, *fiddámbelo* is a kind of *fidd(o)* ‘leaf’ and not a kind of *ambel(i)*.

The structure of these [N N] compounds is particularly striking, since Bovesese, being a dialect of Greek origin, is not expected to exhibit left-headed compounds. In fact, the corresponding compounds in SMG are all right-headed, as expected by headedness considerations in Greek. Compare the examples in (19) to their corresponding SMG right-headed *ampelófillo*, *spartóklono*, *potamóksilo*, and *marathósporos*. It is important to note, though, that the profitability of this phenomenon in Bovesese-Greek has led to the development of compounds such as *xerosikli*, *sakkokreváti*, and *rid:záfti* which are not attested in SMG in any form.

6.1 A contact phenomenon?

Although the main purpose of the present paper is to provide a rigorous descriptive analysis of the process of compounding in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy, I would like to comment on the phenomenon of left-headedness in some detail and to present the interim conclusions of my ongoing research. I am of the opinion that in order to better understand this phenomenon, one should take into consideration both the system-internal and the system-external factors which may have given rise to left-headedness for one should exclude the possibility of *multiple causation* (Joseph, 1982; Andreou and Ralli, 2012).

First, let us consider the language contact scenario according to which the presence of left-headed compounds could be the result of Italian influence on Italo-Greek. It has been voiced by Alessio (1953), for example, that the creation of the compound *xortanémi* in (19) was based on the Italian ‘erba di vento’. If we, however, accept the view that structural compatibility must be met in order to have transfer of a rule from one language to another (for factors promoting or inhibiting contact change see Field, 2002; Hickey, 2010), it cannot be argued that the Italian formation ‘erba di vento’ may have served as a model for the Greek left-headed compound *xortanémi* since the two formations are structurally incompatible. It is not even clear whether ‘erba di vento’ should count as a compound.

In my opinion, if one would like to pursue the idea that this phenomenon is the result of contact between Italian and Greek, one should not base his/her hypothesis on formations such as ‘erba di vento’ but on left-headed [N N] Italian compounds. Consider the following formations (for a detailed analysis of Italian compounding see Scalise, 1984, 1992):

- (20) [N N] Italian compounds
 ufficio viaggi ‘travel agency’
 scuola guida ‘driver school’

Observe that these formations are left-headed. The formation *ufficio viaggi*, for example, is a kind of *ufficio* and not a kind of *viaggi*. According to the language-interference hypothesis, such formations may have served as patterns for the creation of Greek left-headed compounds.

It should also be mentioned that Italian loanwords are attested in the compounds of the Greek dialects of Southern Italy. Consider the following formations which combine a Greek and a Romance morpheme:

- (21) *agroférudda* < agr- férudda (<it. ferula)
 ‘kind of ferule’ wild ferule

<i>animagadára</i>	<	<i>anima</i> (<it. anima)	<i>gadára</i>
		soul, human	mule

‘a half-woman half-mule fairy’			
largokéri	<	it. largo	ker(as)
		wide/broad	horn
‘animal with wide/broad horn’			
survomíti	<	sorv(ao) (it. sorbire)	mit(i)
		absorb/suck	nose
‘who sucks his nose all the time’			

Notice that there is no constraint on the position of these loanwords inside the compound since they can appear on both the head and the non-head position. The word *férudda* for example appears on the right (head)-position, whereas *largo* is the non-head in the compound *largokéri*.

It should be stressed, however, that despite the fact that Romance words from all major lexical categories, Nouns, Verbs, and Adjectives, participate in the creation of compounds, no incorporation of Italian compounds into Bovesè is attested. To put it bluntly, there are no Italian compound loanwords in Bovesè such as *scuola guida* on which a pattern for left-headed Greek compounds could be based.

In addition, in the case of left-headedness in Bovesè, it is not clear whether the typological make-up of Italian and Greek compounding argues for structural compatibility or structural incompatibility. A comparison between the Bovesè compound *xortanémi* ‘kind of grass’ and the Italian *ufficio viaggi* reveals the following: *xortanémi* is composed of two stems, namely *xort(o)* and *anem(o)*. On the contrary, the Italian *ufficio viaggi* consists of two full word forms. Another difference is that *xortanémi* is inflected at the right edge and its inflectional ending is different from that of the second constituent when the latter taken into isolation (compare the full word form *anem-o* to the compound *xortaném-i*), whereas the Italian *ufficio viaggi* allows for inflectional suffixes on both constituents even in the plural (i.e. *uffici viaggi*).

A number of other factors also argue against the proposal that left-headedness should be primarily considered as a contact-induced phenomenon. Consider for example the skepticism with respect to the direct transfer of morphosyntactic rules which is reflected in the hierarchy of borrowability of morphological elements (Field, 2002). Research has shown that the more bound an element is, the less possible it is to be chosen for transfer: the closer an element is to grammar the less likely it is to be borrowed. For example, loanwords are better candidates than derivational affixes for transfer and the latter are more likely to be borrowed than inflectional affixes. Information regarding grammatical settings (rules and constraints), such as the position of head, is highly unlikely to be transferred. Another argument against the language contact hypothesis is that formations such as *ufficio viaggi* are not as old as left-headed compounds such as *fiddámpelo* (Franco Fanciullo, p.c.). Therefore, they could not have triggered the phenomenon of left-headedness.

Finally, Thomason (2001) argues that a number of conditions should be met in order to prove that a rule has been transferred directly from a language to another without the mediation of lexical borrowings. Of particular interest are the following two conditions:

(a) Prove that the change in question is a true innovation and that it was not present in the recipient language before it came into contact with the proposed source language and

(b) consider any internal factor which could lead to the change in question.

These conditions show that it is particularly difficult to prove that a change in the structural make-up of a language is due to the direct transfer of a rule from a proposed donor language.

As far as left-headedness is concerned, a closer examination of the long attested history of Greek reveals that left-headed [N N] compounds are present in previous evolutionary stages. Consider the following examples of left-headed [N N] compounds from Classical and post-Classical Greek:

(22) θεόινος 'god of wine'	<	θεός god	οἶνος wine	<i>A.Fr.382</i>
καρποβάλσαμον 'the fruit of the balsam'	<	καρπός fruit	βάλσαμον balsam	<i>Gal.14.166</i>
κοκκόδαφνον 'laurel seed/berry'	<	κόκκος seed/berry	δάφνη laurel	<i>Paul.Aeg.3.28</i>
ξιφοδρέπανον 'sickle-shaped sword'	<	ξίφος sword	δρεπάνη sickle	<i>Ph.Bel.99.51</i>
ξύλοκάρπασον 'wood of flax'	<	ξύλον wood	κάρπασον flax	<i>Gal.19.738</i>

The analysis of these formations shows that they are head-initial. The compound *κοκκόδαφνον* 'laurel seed', for example, which is composed of *κόκκος* 'seed' and *δάφνη* 'laurel' is headed by its left-most element, *κόκκος*, since the whole compound is a kind of *κόκκος* (compare *κοκκόδαφνον* 'laurel seed' to the Bovesse *korkóššino* 'fruit of pistacia', which is also headed by the word *κόκκος*). The presence of the formations in (22) indicates that left-headed formations are already present in Classical and, mainly, Post-Classical Greek and that the presence of left-headed [N N] compounds in Italiot could very well be linked to these formations. In fact, words such as *fillámbelo* 'vine leaf' in Bovesse are quite old: *fillámbelo* appears in Liddell et al. (1968).

It should also be mentioned that left-headed compounds which are probably relics of a previous evolutionary stage, are attested in other Modern Greek dialects as well, though with not the same profitability. Words such as *rizáfti* are shared by (at least) Bovesse, Cypriot, the dialects spoken in Kos and Karpathos, and Pontic⁴.

To conclude, the interim conclusion of my ongoing research is that left-headedness should not be considered a primarily externally motivated phenomenon since a closer inspection of compounding in Greek reveals that left-headedness in Bovesse may very well be linked to the presence of head-initial compounds in previous evolutionary stages of Greek. In addition, remnants of this Classical and Post-Classical phenomenon are also found in the peripheral Greek dialects such as Cypriot.

⁴ In Pontic we find the word *rizótin* which uses the form *otíon* instead of *aftí*.

7 Conclusions

The aim of this study was to offer a rigorous descriptive analysis of the morphological process of compounding in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy. In more detail, in Section 2 I presented the definition and the basic characteristics of Greek compounds and in Section 3 I offered a classification of compounds in the Greek dialects of Southern Italy based on the lexical category of the compound structure and the lexical category of the compound members. In Section 4, based on the grammatical relation between the compound members, I offered a classification of Italiot compounds into subordinate, attributive, and coordinate, and in Section 5 I addressed the endocentricity-exocentricity distinction in compounds. In Section 6, I commented on the phenomenon of left-headedness in Bovesese and I argued that a number of reasons militate against the proposal that left-headedness should be considered a language-interference phenomenon. This phenomenon in Italiot and particularly in Bovesese, however, and the presence of left-headedness in other Greek dialects and previous evolutionary stages of Greek certainly merit further investigation.

References

- Ackema, Peter and Ad Neeleman. 2004. *Beyond morphology*. Oxford /New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alessio, Giovanni. 1953. Calchi linguistici greco-latini nell' antico territorio della Magna Grecia. In *Atti del VIII Congr. di Studi Bizantini* (Vol. 7), 237-299.
- Allen, Margaret. 1978. *Morphological Investigations*. University of Connecticut, Connecticut: Storrs.
- Anastasiadi-Simeonidi, Anna. 1983. La Composition en Grec Moderne d' un Point de Vue Diachronique. *Lalies* 2:77-90.
- Anastasiadi-Simeonidi, Anna. 1996. I sinthesi stin neoelliniki [Compounding in Modern Greek]. In *Zitimata neoellinikis glossas: Didaktiki proseggisi*, ed. Georgia Katsimali and Fotis, 97-12. Rethymno, University of Crete.
- Anderson, Stephen. 1992. *A-morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andreou, Marios. 2010. *I sinthesi stin Kypriaki: Zitimata eksokentrikotitas [Cypriot compounding: Themes of exocentricity]*. M.A. dissertation, University of Patras.
- Andreou, Marios and Maria Koliopoulou. 2012. I sinthesi stin Kypriaki ke Kalymniaki dialekto: mia proti sigkritiki proseggisi [Compounding in Cypriot and Kalymniot: a first comparative approach]. In *Neoelliniki Dialectologia* 6, 7-29. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Andreou, Marios and Angela Ralli. 2012. Headedness in dialectal variation: evidence from Italiot. Paper read at the *Italian Dialect Meeting*, Leiden 24-26 May 2012.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2001a. *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2001b. Compounding. In *Language Typology and Language Universals Vol.1*, ed. Martin Haspelmath, 695-707. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2008. Exocentric compounds. *Morphology* 18:51-74.
- Bisetto, Antonietta and Sergio Scalise. 2005. The classification of compounds. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 4:319-332.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt.

- Booij, Geert. 2005. *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fabb, Nigel. 1998. Compounding. In *Handbook of Morphology*, ed. Andrew Spencer and Arnold Zwicky, 66-83. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fanciullo, Franco. 2001. On the origins of Modern Greek in Southern Italy. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. Angela Ralli, Brian Joseph and Mark Janse, 67-78. Patras: University of Patras.
- Field, Frederic W. 2002. *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giannouloupoulou, Giannoula. 2006. Dialectological research and linguistic theory: the case of compounding. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. Mark Janse, Brian Joseph and Angela Ralli, 68-82. Patras: University of Patras.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. *Understanding morphology*. London: Arnold.
- Hickey, Raymond. 2010. Language Contact: Reconsideration and Reassessment. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*, ed. Raymond Hickey, 1-28. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1982. Multiple causation in language contact change. In *microfiche in ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Database by ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics*, document #ED205021.
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1992. Origine e sviluppo dei dialetti italogreci. In *Studi filologici offerti a Girolamo Caracausi*, , 177-183. Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici italiani.
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1997. *Grammatiki ton ellinikon idiomaton tis Kato Italias [Grammar of the Greek dialects of Southern Italy]*. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Katsoyannou, Marianna. 1995. *Le parler gréco de Galliciano (Italie): description d'une langue en voie de disparition*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris VII – Denis Diderot.
- Katsoyannou, Marianna. 1999. Ellinika tis Kato Italias: i kinonioglossologiki apopsi [Greek of Southern Italy: the sociolinguistic approach]. In *Elliniki Glossologia '97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Linguistic Conference for the Greek Language*, 605-613). Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Lapointe, Steven. 1980. *The theory of grammatical agreement*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1998. Variation in the Romance infinitive: the case of the South Calabrian inflected infinitive. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96(1):1-61.
- Lieber, Rochelle. 1992. *Deconstructing morphology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lieber, Rochelle. 2009. A Lexical Semantic Approach to Compounding. In *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, ed. Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer, 78–104. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lieber, Rochelle and Pavol Štekauer. 2009. *The Oxford handbook of compounding*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Manolessou, Io. 2005. The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: An overview. *KAMPOS: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 13:103-125.
- Marchand, Hans. 1960. *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-formation. A synchronic-diachronic approach*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Nespor, Marina and Angela Ralli. 1996. Morphology-phonology interface: Phonological domains in Greek compounds. *The Linguistic Review* 13:357-382.

- Olsen, Susan. 2001. Copulative compounds: A closer look at the interface between morphology and syntax. In *Yearbook of morphology 2000*, ed. Geert Booij and Jap van Marle, 279-320. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Parlangeli, Oronzo. 1953. Sui dialetti romanzi e romaici del Salento. *Memorie dell'Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere (Classe di Lettere)*, 25-26, s. II/III, 93-198.
- Ralli, Angela. 2005. *Morphologia [Morphology]*. Athens: Patakis.
- Ralli, Angela. 2007. *I sinthesi lekseon: Morphologiki diachroniki prosengisi [The composition of words: A morphological cross-linguistic approach]*. Athens: Patakis.
- Ralli, Angela. 2009a. IE, Hellenic: Modern Greek. In *The Oxford handbook of compounding*, ed. Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer, 453-463. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ralli, Angela. 2009b. Modern Greek V V dvandva compounds: A linguistic innovation in the history of the Indo-European language. *Word Structure* 2(1):48-68.
- Ralli, Angela. 2009c. Morphology meets dialectology. Insights from Modern Greek dialects. *Morphology* 19(1):87-105.
- Ralli, Angela. 2013. *Compounding in Modern Greek*. Springer.
- Ralli, Angela and Marios Andreou. 2012. Revisiting Exocentricity in compounding: Evidence from Greek and Cypriot. In *Current Issues in Morphological Theory. (Ir)regularity, analogy and frequency*, ed. Kiefer Ferenc, Mária Ladányi and Péter Siptár, 65-81. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1924. *Griechen und Romanen in Unteritalien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Unteritaliensichen Gräzität* [Bibliotheca dell'Archivium Romanicum, ser. II, Linguistica, vol. 7]. Geneva: L. S. Olschki.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1984. *Generative Morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1992. Compounding in Italian. *Rivista di Linguistica* 4(1):175-200.
- Scalise, Sergio and Antonietta Bisetto. 2009. The classification of compounds. In *The Oxford handbook of compounding*, ed. Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Štekauer, 34-53. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spano, Benito. 1965. *La grecità bizantina e i suoi riflessi geografici nell'Italia meridionale e insulare*. Pisa: Libreria Goliardica.
- Spencer, Andrew. 1991. *Morphological Theory: An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Williams, Edwin. 1981. On the notions of 'lexically related' and 'head of the word'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:245-274.

Dictionaries

- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. 1968. A Greek-English lexicon: compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie... With a supplement 1968 [edited by EA Barber with the assistance of P. Maas, M. Scheller and ML West.].
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1984-1992. *Istorikon leksikon ton ellinikon Idiomaton tis Kato Italias [Historical dictionary of the Greek dialects of Southern Italy]* (Vols. 1-5). Athens: Academy of Athens.