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In virtually every country in the world linguistic minorities can be found as a result of immigration. In this context, linguistic interaction and contact-induced changes are apparent in the speech of immigrants and borrowing emerges as the outcome of language contact, leading to the transfer of various lexical elements, features and structures (see, among others, Haugen 1950; Poplack 1980; Poplack et al. 1988; Poplack et al. 1990; Sankoff et al. 1990; Myers-Scotton 2002; Clyne 2003).

This chapter is concerned with the speech of first-generation Greek immigrants who arrived in Canada in the period between 1945 and 1975, which has seen the bulk of Greek emigration. It scrutinises how the Greek language has evolved in a language contact situation, where English is the donor and Greek the recipient. In spite of the great interest this contact situation presents, it remains largely unexplored. In fact, this chapter constitutes one of the first attempts to investigate aspects of borrowing in the language of Greek immigrants in Canada and aspires to contribute to the study of immigrant speech in general. It aims to bring into focus the ways in which Greek immigrants resort to lexical transfer by mixing and blending Greek and English. It shows that there is a creative playing with resources spanning these two languages, in a way that underscores the linguistic resourcefulness of the speakers themselves as agents of innovations spread throughout the linguistic community. The end product of contact between Canadian English and Greek shows language–internal constraints of the recipient language that are uninterruptedly at work throughout the process of the integration of borrowed words (see also Hock and Joseph 2009 and Baran 2017 on this matter).

In order to show this, an answer is attempted to a series of general research questions, such as:

- What are the various types of linguistic practices with regard to borrowed words, as they are materialised in the process of their integration in the Canadian Greek transplanted communities?
- Is the typological distance between the analytic English and the fusional Greek an inhibitor in borrowing?
• Could specific types of integration be attributed to specific properties of the languages in contact?

More specifically, the chapter seeks to examine the performance of Canadian Greek speakers through the lens of noun transfer, and explore:

• the concerted effect of linguistic factors, such as phonological, morphological and semantic, which determine the by-product of borrowing and its final formation;
• the principal role of morphological properties of Greek as an inflectionally rich language for the integration of loan nouns (see also Aikhenvald 2000, 2006; Ralli 2012a, 2012b, 2013; Ralli et al. 2015; Makri 2016a, 2016b, 2017 for similar contentions in Greek);
• the mandatory alignment to the fundamental Greek properties of inflection and gender assignment which forces loan nouns to be accommodated in the recipient language as masculine, feminine or neuter;
• an unequivocal preference for particular inflection classes, the most productively used ones, as well as for specific grammatical gender values.

In order to illustrate arguments and proposals, we investigate evidence from Greek spoken in four Canadian provinces, Québec, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia, where the majority of Greek immigrants reside. The data are drawn from both written (e.g., among others, Maniakas 1991; Aravossitas 2016) and oral sources. As regards the oral sources, recorded interviews have been used for collecting spontaneous spoken Canadian Greek. These interviews are based on a structured questionnaire which was designed especially for the purposes of the research program ‘Immigration and Language: Greeks and Greek-Canadians’ (2016–2018), funded by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation. The questionnaire touches on three phases: origin/departure, arrival/settlement, and integration of immigrants. Consequently, the informants are invited to recount their personal immigration stories, which is a familiar topic to them.

The chapter is organised as follows: section 1 sketches the socio-historical background of Greek immigration in Canada and defines Canadian Greek as an immigrant language. Section 2 provides an overview of Greek morphology in comparison with English morphology. Previous accounts of noun borrowing in Greek and its dialectal variety are given in section 3, with an emphasis on grammatical gender assignment and inflection-class classification. The basic properties of Canadian Greek nouns and their integration into the native system are the topic of section 4, where the interaction of semantic, phonological and morphological factors ordaining gender and inflection class is examined. The chapter concludes with a review of the main arguments discussed in the article and the relevant bibliography.

1. Greek immigration in Canada and Canadian Greek as immigrant language

Greeks began immigrating to Canada at the end of the nineteenth century, when the contact situation came into being. For instance, in 1900 there were about 300 persons
of Greek origin in the province of Québec, in 1981, according to the Census of Canada, the number of Greeks in Québec was 49,420 (Maniakas 1991), while in 1983 there was an estimation of about 250,000 Greeks in the entire country (Constantinides 1983). As expected, these figures deviate from the real number of Greek immigrants in Canada because of illegal residence.

As already stated, our research focuses on Greeks who immigrated to Canada between the years 1945 and 1975. In the decades under examination, Canada has welcomed people from various Greek towns and villages, who came in principle permanently, seeking better living conditions and employment. Nowadays, most of these people and their descendants form sizeable linguistic minorities dispersed throughout Canada, but mainly residing in the provinces of Québec, Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta.

Since the beginning, Canadian Greeks have tried to integrate into Canadian society, while preserving their native language and culture. In regions with a Greek population, there are Greek restaurants, shops, associations and schools, and Greek immigrants, at least those of the first generation, maintain communication with each other in their native tongue. Greek is used at home and within the community, with family and friends, as well as on formal occasions and in official institutions of the community (e.g. the Greek Orthodox Church and media). It is also alive in magazines, newspapers, TV and radio programmes, and is often enhanced with some features of local Greek varieties brought from the place of origin (see, for example, Ralli et al. 2018).

Apparently, Greek in Canada is a minority language in the country, with Canadian English, or Canadian French, depending on the province, being the major language in the Canadian community. It can also be defined as an immigrant language, since its speakers were exposed to Canadian English at some point in their adulthood, while many of them are sequential bilinguals, having become bilingual by first learning one language and then another (Myers-Scotton 2006). As is usually accepted, immigrant languages are those spoken by relatively recently arrived populations (as is the case for first-generation Greek immigrants in Canada), who do not have a well-established multi-generational community of language users (Clyne 2003). Several studies have shown that immigrants who come to a country later in their adulthood show little tendency to lose their ability to use their mother tongue and generally keep it as their primary language (Appel and Muysken 1987; Myers-Scotton 2002, 2006; Montrul 2008).

Migration, the movement of people, is equivalent to the movement of languages from their original geographic locations to new locations with new language ecologies. In this context, users of a particular language enter in contact with speakers of another language and are forced to linguistically interact with them, while language changes occurring as a result are studied within the framework of contact linguistics (see Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Thomason 2001; Winford 2003; Hickey 2010, among others). Pondering on the influx of Greek migrants in Canada, one can observe some significant modifications in their language repertoire. With the passing of the years and the improvement of their economic status, Greek speakers had a more active participation in the Canadian lifestyle and daily contact with English, the better knowledge and frequent use of which resulted in an increased level of borrowing. This borrowing is
by and large seen at the vocabulary level, lexical transfer being the most frequent type of it, as acknowledged by several researchers (among others, Thomason 2001; Matras 2009). Hereupon, in this chapter, it would be enlightening to probe into the routes of lexical borrowing as manifested in the nominal system of Greek, its inflection and three-valued gender system, especially when the donor language is the poorly inflected and genderless English.

2. Greek and English nominal morphology: an overview

The Greek language is typologically fusional with rich morphology, showing a particularly productive system of compounding, derivation and inflection (Ralli 2005, 2013, 2016a). Nominal and verbal inflection are stem based, where an inflectional suffix attaches to stems to specify a number of morphosyntactic features. For nouns and adjectives, these features are grammatical gender, case and number, while articles and some pronouns usually alter their forms entirely to encode this information. An illustration of Greek nominal inflection (namely the Standard Modern Greek one) is given in (1), where the forms of the definite article and the modifying adjective vary and morphosyntactically agree with those of the nouns.

(1) a. o μεγάλος δρόμος
       the.MASC.NOM.SG big.MASC.NOM.SG road.MASC.NOM.SG
       ‘the big road’

b. τη μεγάλη λωρίδα
       the.FEM.ACC.SG big.FEM.ACC.SG lane.FEM.ACC.SG
       ‘the big lane’

c. τον μεγάλον βουνόν
       the.NEU.GEN.PL big.NEU.GEN.PL mountain.NEU.GEN.PL
       ‘of the big mountains’

Nouns are distributed into eight inflectional paradigms, known as inflection classes (hereafter IC), on the basis of two criteria: stem allomorphy and the form of the ending (Ralli 2000, 2005). These classes are summarised in Table 12.1.

As Table 12.1 shows, many Greek nouns display an allomorphic variation (noted with the symbol ‘~’). This variation is morphological, in that it does not follow from the application of a productively used phonological rule; it originates from the diachronic development of the language. Table 12.2 gives an example of each class.

The four forms for each noun and number in Table 12.2 are the case values, that is, nominative, genitive, accusative and vocative. Assuming Ralli’s (2000) division of Greek nouns into eight inflection classes, it is important to note that:

- IC1 nouns are masculine and feminine without stem allomorphy.
- IC2 nouns are masculine with stem allomorphy.
Table 12.1 Examples of stems for each inflection class illustrating the presence or absence of allomorphy (from Ralli 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IC1</th>
<th>IC2</th>
<th>IC3</th>
<th>IC4</th>
<th>IC5</th>
<th>IC6</th>
<th>IC7</th>
<th>IC8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κηπ</td>
<td>μαιθητ~μαιθητ</td>
<td>χαρα~χαρ</td>
<td>πολη<del>πολε</del>πολ</td>
<td>βουν</td>
<td>χαρτι</td>
<td>νεφ</td>
<td>χωμα~χωματ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip</td>
<td>μαιθιτι~μαιθιτ</td>
<td>xara~xar</td>
<td>poli<del>pole</del>pol</td>
<td>vun</td>
<td>xarti</td>
<td>nef</td>
<td>xoma~xomat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘garden’</td>
<td>‘pupil, student’</td>
<td>‘joy’</td>
<td>‘town’</td>
<td>‘mountain’</td>
<td>‘paper’</td>
<td>‘smog, cloud’</td>
<td>‘ground, soil’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.2 Greek noun inflection classes (from Ralli 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IC1</th>
<th>IC2</th>
<th>IC3</th>
<th>IC4</th>
<th>IC5</th>
<th>IC6</th>
<th>IC7</th>
<th>IC8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήπ-ος</td>
<td>μαιθητ-ες</td>
<td>χαρ-ες</td>
<td>πολ-εις</td>
<td>βου-α</td>
<td>χαρτι-α</td>
<td>νεφ-η</td>
<td>χωμα-α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήπ-ον</td>
<td>μαιθητ-όν</td>
<td>χαρ-ών</td>
<td>πολ-ειν</td>
<td>βου-όν</td>
<td>χαρτι-όν</td>
<td>νεφ-όν</td>
<td>χωμα-όν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήπ-ος</td>
<td>μαιθητ-ες</td>
<td>χαρ-ες</td>
<td>πολ-εις</td>
<td>βου-α</td>
<td>χαρτι-α</td>
<td>νεφ-η</td>
<td>χωμα-α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-os</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-s</td>
<td>xara-o</td>
<td>poli-o</td>
<td>vun-o</td>
<td>xarti-o</td>
<td>nef-os</td>
<td>xoma-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-u</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-ο</td>
<td>xara-s</td>
<td>poli-s/e-os</td>
<td>vun-u</td>
<td>xarti-u</td>
<td>nef-us</td>
<td>xomat-os</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-o</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-ο/ν</td>
<td>xara-o</td>
<td>poli-o</td>
<td>vun-o</td>
<td>xarti-o</td>
<td>nef-os</td>
<td>xoma-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-e</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-ο</td>
<td>xara-o</td>
<td>poli-o</td>
<td>vun-o</td>
<td>xarti-o</td>
<td>nef-os</td>
<td>xoma-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήπ-ος</td>
<td>μαιθητ-ες</td>
<td>χαρ-ες</td>
<td>πολ-εις</td>
<td>βου-α</td>
<td>χαρτι-α</td>
<td>νεφ-η</td>
<td>χωμα-α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήπ-ον</td>
<td>μαιθητ-όν</td>
<td>χαρ-ών</td>
<td>πολ-ειν</td>
<td>βου-όν</td>
<td>χαρτι-όν</td>
<td>νεφ-όν</td>
<td>χωμα-όν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κήπ-ος</td>
<td>μαιθητ-ες</td>
<td>χαρ-ες</td>
<td>πολ-εις</td>
<td>βου-α</td>
<td>χαρτι-α</td>
<td>νεφ-η</td>
<td>χωμα-α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-i</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-es</td>
<td>xar-es</td>
<td>pol-is</td>
<td>vun-a</td>
<td>xarti-a</td>
<td>nef-i</td>
<td>xomat-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-on</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-on</td>
<td>xar-on</td>
<td>pol-e</td>
<td>vun-on</td>
<td>xarti-on</td>
<td>nef-on</td>
<td>xomat-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-us</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-es</td>
<td>xar-es</td>
<td>pol-is</td>
<td>vun-a</td>
<td>xarti-a</td>
<td>nef-i</td>
<td>xomat-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cip-i</td>
<td>μαιθιτι-es</td>
<td>xar-es</td>
<td>pol-is</td>
<td>vun-a</td>
<td>xarti-a</td>
<td>nef-i</td>
<td>xomat-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- IC3 and IC4 contain feminine nouns with stem allomorphy.
- The nouns of the other inflection classes are neuter, with only IC8 nouns having stem allomorphy.

As already mentioned, gender in Greek has a three-value system. According to Corbett (1991) grammatical gender is an inherent property of nouns. More specifically for Greek, Ralli (2002) has proposed that it is a feature of stems and derivational suffixes and that it is not overtly expressed by a specific marker, contrary to case and number which have their own fusional markers, realised as inflectional suffixes. Ralli has further proposed that in [+human] nouns, gender is related to the semantic feature
of sex, in that male beings are grammatically masculine and female ones are feminine, while in [–human] nouns, the grammatical gender correlates with the morphological feature of inflection class. Moreover, from the three values, the neuter one is perceived as the unmarked gender option for all [–human] nouns, as suggested by Anastassiadis-Symeonidis (1994), Dressler (1997) and Christofidou (2003).

Compared to Greek, English is a typologically analytic language that conveys morphosyntactic features without usually resorting to overt morphemes. English has lost much of the inflectional morphology inherited from Indo-European over the centuries and has not gained any new inflectional morphemes in the meantime. With respect to its nominal system, Standard English has lost cases (except for the genitive case and the three modified case forms for pronouns) along with grammatical genders and has simplified its inflection. Thus, an important question that needs to be addressed is whether the typological remoteness between the two linguistic systems in contact affects loanword integration from one language to the other, since there is no direct mapping of morphemes from English to Greek.

3. Noun borrowing in Greek

For lexical borrowings, Haugen (1950: 214–215) distinguishes three basic groups on the basis of the notions of importation and substitution. Importation involves bringing a pattern, item or element into a language, while substitution refers to replacing something from another language with a native pattern, item or element (see also Appel and Muysken 1987: 164–165). For instance, Greek in its long history, has imported many words from Turkish and Italo-Romance and few patterns (Ralli 2016b, 2019). With respect to the latter, the Asia Minor Cappadocian dialect has adopted an agglutination pattern from Turkish nouns, while the material used remains Greek (see Dawkins 1916).

In Haugen’s nomenclature, loanwords show morphemic importation without substitution, loanblends exhibit both morphemic substitution and importation, while loanshifts show morphemic substitution without importation. Our analysis makes avail of inflected and fully integrated material on the one hand, as well as non-integrated and thus uninflected material on the other, although sparingly found, which pertain to the category of loanblends and loanwords respectively in terms of Haugen’s classification. However, for convenience purposes, we will use the term loanword invariably.

As commonly admitted in the relevant literature, lexical borrowings need to be adjusted to the morphological system of the recipient languages (Sankoff 2001; Winford 2003; Wichmann and Wohlgemuth 2008; Wohlgemuth 2009; Ralli 2012a, 2012b, 2016b). Expanding Wohlgemuth’s (2009) postulation on loan-verb integration to loan-noun integration, in this chapter we will see that loan nouns can be integrated into Greek either by direct insertion or by indirect insertion. In direct insertion, the loan noun is plugged directly into the grammar of the target language with only the addition of an inflectional ending, since Greek contains compulsory and overtly realised inflection. Conversely, in indirect insertion, an integrating element is required to accommodate loan nouns. As is shown by Ralli (2016b)
for the integration of loan verbs, the integrator can be taken from the range of native derivational affixes.\(^6\)

One of the morphosyntactic features that plays an active role in borrowing in Greek is grammatical gender, and as pointed out by Anastassiadis-Symeonidis and Chila-Markopoulou (2003) it is compulsory for loan nouns to come to certain rearrangements in order to fit this category. Besides gender, nouns also need a native inflectional suffix denoting the features of case and number, in accordance with the Greek pattern of nominal inflection. Indicative examples of accommodated loan nouns in Standard Modern Greek are given in (2), where the original items are re-analysed as stems (2b is slightly modified), being supplied a gender value, while further combined with inflection denoting the features of case and number.\(^7\)

\[(2)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \gamma\uppi\pi-\varsigma \quad \text{EN} \quad \text{yuppy} \\
& \quad \text{japi.masc-s.nom.sg} \\
b. & \quad \kappa\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\alpha \quad \text{FR} \quad \text{combine} \\
& \quad \text{kobina.fem-o.nom.sg ‘fraud’} \\
c. & \quad \lambda\epsilon\kappa\epsilon-\varsigma \quad \text{TR} \quad \text{leke} \\
& \quad \text{lece.masc-s.nom.sg ‘stain’} \\
d. & \quad \mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron-\varsigma \quad \text{IT} \quad \text{molo.masc} \\
& \quad \text{molo.masc-s.nom.sg ‘dock’}
\end{align*}

Loan nouns are, thus, transferred into Greek following a very predetermined pathway. However, a number of borrowed nouns in Standard Modern Greek remain uninflected and their phonological form is almost unaltered. In the absence of any overt inflectional marker, information about gender, case and number is only shown by the preceding article in (3a, c) or by another agreeing element, as for instance an adjective in (3b and 3d).

\[(3)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \tau\omicron \sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\omicron \quad \text{FR} \quad \text{ascenceur.masc} \\
& \quad \text{to.neu.nom.sg asanser} \\
& \quad ‘\text{the elevator}’ \\
b. & \quad \nu\omicron\omicron \mu\omicron\kappa\gamma\nu\alpha\varsigma \quad \text{FR} \quad \text{maquillage.masc} \\
& \quad \text{neo.neu.nom.sg macijaz} \\
& \quad ‘\text{new make-up}’ \\
c. & \quad \tau\omicron \kappa\epsilon \quad \text{EN} \quad \text{cake} \\
& \quad \text{to.neu.nom.sg ceik} \\
& \quad ‘\text{the cake}’ \\
d. & \quad \mu\gamma\alpha\alpha\omicron \pi\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron} \quad \text{EN} \quad \text{party} \\
& \quad \text{meyalo.neu.nom.sg parti} \\
& \quad ‘\text{big party}’
\end{align*}

According to Aronoff (1994: 126), ‘borrowings that do not fit the phonological pattern of any noun class are likely to be indeclinable’ (see also Corbett 1991: 40–41 on this matter). Considering that in Standard Modern Greek consonants are not usually tolerated as noun-final ones (with the exception of [s] and [n] in certain slots of the inflectional
paradigms, as shown in Table 12.2), one could suppose that loans ending in consonants are assigned the inflectional features with the mediator of another element, as in (3). However, this hypothesis does not apply to the English word *party*, which remains uninflected, in spite of the fact that its ending *-i* matches the endings of the most productive class of neuter nouns in Greek, that of IC6 (see the IC6 noun *χαρτί* ‘paper’).

In the existing literature (Ibrahim 1973; Poplack et al. 1982; Corbett 1991; Thornton 2001; Clyne 2003; Winford 2010), the chief factors influencing loanword integration are the following:

- The natural biological sex of the referent.
- The formal shape of the word in the donor language.
- Phonological analogy to the ending suffix of the recipient language.
- Semantic analogy to the semantically equivalent item of the recipient language.
- The gender of a homophonous noun with a different meaning in the recipient language.
- The default gender of the recipient language.
- A suffix being attached as an integrator.

Interestingly, these factors have already been observed in the borrowing of loan nouns in the Greek dialectal varieties, as shown in Melissaropoulou (2013, 2016), Ralli et al. (2015), Makri (2016a, 2016b, 2017), among others, where they are grouped into three general categories depending on their type and reference to the linguistic domain they belong to, namely semantic, phonological and morphological.

As Ralli (2002) proposed, in Greek, the semantic feature [+human] is the highest-ranked factor for the determination of gender in human nouns. This also applies to human nouns borrowed in Modern Greek dialects, as shown by the examples in Table 12.3, drawn from the dialects Pontic, Aivaliot, Heptanesian and Griko, the first two being affected by Turkish, while Heptanesian and Griko have been influenced by Italo-Romance.

Contrary to [+human] nouns, all the available gender values are attested in [–human] nouns, but the neuter noun, being a kind of default gender value, is assigned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek dialect</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Donor language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pontic</td>
<td>τσοπάνος</td>
<td>tsopanos. MASC</td>
<td>‘shepherd’</td>
<td>çoban</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aivaliot</td>
<td>καγιάς</td>
<td>cajas.MASC</td>
<td>‘caretaker’</td>
<td>kâhya</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptanesian</td>
<td>τζενεράλης</td>
<td>tzeneralis.MASC</td>
<td>‘general’</td>
<td>generale.MASC</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griko</td>
<td></td>
<td>panefakulo(s).MASC</td>
<td>‘baker’</td>
<td>panifaculo.MASC</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontic</td>
<td>ορόσηη</td>
<td>orospiotos.MASC</td>
<td>‘prostitute’</td>
<td>orospu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aivaliot</td>
<td>καχπέέ</td>
<td>kaxpe.FEM</td>
<td>‘prostitute’</td>
<td>kahpe</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptanesian</td>
<td>ιντζερμιέρα</td>
<td>infermjera.FEM</td>
<td>‘nurse.woman’</td>
<td>infermiera.FEM</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griko</td>
<td></td>
<td>ninia.FEM</td>
<td>‘girl’</td>
<td>ninna.FEM</td>
<td>Salentino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to loans, in case no other apparent tendency is present or predominant, as claimed by Dressler (1997), Anastassiadis–Symeonidis (1994), Anastassiadis–Symeonidis and Chila–Markopoulou (2003) and Ralli et al. (2015). For an illustration, see the examples in Table 12.4, from Ralli et al. (2015).

Concept association (Corbett 1991: 71; Clyne 2003: 147) may be a supplementary semantic criterion for gender assignment to [-human] loan nouns, according to which an existing synonymous noun in the recipient language may determine the gender value of a loan. Consider the words from Heptanesian in Table 12.5, where the gender of loans is regulated by that of native synonymous nouns.

Phonology has also proven to play a key role for the integration of [-human] loan nouns and their gender assignment. It refers to a certain matching of the final segments between the source nouns and those of the recipient language, which activates the form of inflection and gender of loans. Consider the examples in Table 12.6.

In Table 12.6, the Italo–Romance endings -o and -a coincide with the typical endings of Greek native feminine and neuter nouns, respectively. Thus, the Italo–Romance alegria remains feminine in Greek, but the masculine noun inverno assumes the neuter value (see Ralli et al. 2015 and Makri 2016b for more examples).

Furthermore, the presence of a homophonous noun, but with a different meaning in Greek, may also determine the gender value allotted to a loanword, as illustrated in Table 12.7 with data from Heptanesian and Cretan.

---

**Table 12.4** [-human] dialectal loanwords and their Turkish and Italian models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek dialect</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Donor language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pontic</td>
<td>ƙɛɾˈtɛlɛn</td>
<td>kartalın.NEU</td>
<td>'hawk'</td>
<td>kartal</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aivaliot</td>
<td>ȗlik(ɨ)</td>
<td>ilic(i).NEU</td>
<td>'marrow'</td>
<td>ilik</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptanesian</td>
<td>Ɔɗɪɒɪʃ菲τɪʋIo</td>
<td>sodisfatšio.NEU</td>
<td>'satisfaction'</td>
<td>sodisfazion.FEM</td>
<td>Venetian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griko</td>
<td>ɗjɒo.NEU</td>
<td>fiore.MASC</td>
<td>'flower'</td>
<td>fiore.MASC</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 12.5** Heptanesian loanwords with their Italian models and the corresponding Standard Modern Greek words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek dialect</th>
<th>Form/Transcription/Gloss</th>
<th>Model: Italian/Venetian</th>
<th>Standard Modern Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heptanesian</td>
<td>κάμπτα kambia.FEM 'change'</td>
<td>cambio.MASC</td>
<td>αλλαγή alaj.FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αγιούντα ajunta.FEM 'addition'</td>
<td>aggiunto.MASC</td>
<td>προσθήκη prosbici.FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πιτόκα pitoka.FEM 'louse'</td>
<td>pidocchio.MASC</td>
<td>ψέφια psira.FEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crucially, in the absence of any semantic or phonological motivation, morphology assumes the role for providing the means for the accommodation of loan nouns, in that sometimes the addition of an integrating element, that is, a derivational suffix, can facilitate the integration process and assign a gender value (Melissaropoulou 2013, 2016; Makri et al. 2013), as illustrated Table 12.8.

In the following section, the hypothesis that the same factors of semantics, phonology and morphology determine gender assignment is tested for Canadian Greek. Our claim is that if there is any comparable accommodation of loan nouns for this system as well, then it is confirmed that all Greek varieties follow the same path for integrating their loan nouns, irrespective of the donor language.
4. Canadian Greek

As is the case for other Greek varieties, and in accordance with the native morphological structures of nouns consisting of stems and inflectional suffixes (Ralli 2005, 2013, 2016a), an adopted English noun in Canadian Greek undergoes grammatical gender assignment, addition of an inflectional marker and classification to a specific inflection class, while for pronunciation purposes, a slight phonological modification may also occur. Consider the examples in (4–8), where loan nouns are classified into three categories according to their gender value and the [±human] feature. In these examples, the Canadian Greek form and its transcription are followed by the English source. If the Canadian Greek meaning is not the same as that of the English source, a gloss is given.

(4) a. μπόσης bosis boss
    b. σέφης sefis chef
    c. μπασέρης baseris bus driver
    d. πολισμάνος polizmanos policeman
    e. λοντράς londras laudyman
    f. λοντζύς lontzas lunch-room owner

(5) a. μπλόκος blokos ‘square’ block
    b. ρολός rolos ‘bun’ roll

(6) a. σεφέτσα opereta woman operator
    b. μποσίνα bosina female boss

(7) a. μπάρα bara bar
    b. τζάρα dzara jar
    c. μαρκέτα marceta market
    d. μάπα mapa mop
    e. φρίτζα fritza fridge

(8) a. κάρο karo car
    b. μπόζ boksi box
    c. μπάσι basi bus
    d. μπίλi bili bill
    e. φλόρι flori floor
    f. στέσιο stesio station
    g. βακέσιο vacesio vacation
    h. τελεβιζίο televizio television

The examples in (4) and (6) are [+human], masculine and feminine respectively. The examples in (5) are [–human] and masculine, those in (7) [–human] and feminine, while (8) displays [–human] and neuter nouns.

The procedure to license the accommodation of English nouns by assigning gender, an inflectional marker and an inflection class corroborates the claim put forward by
Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Repetti (2003, 2006) related to the manifest need for a morphological treatment of loanwords in languages with rich morphology, and extends properly to the morphologically abundant and stem-based Greek varieties, among which, Canadian Greek. That the native morphological properties prove to be particularly important in the integration of nouns is shown, among other things, by the fact that the speakers resort to the transfer of entire word forms but treat them as stems that necessitate gender assignment and the presence of an inflectional marker. When the original word ends in a consonant, a vowel is added to it, before the attachment of an inflectional marker. The quality of the vowel depends on two things: the grammatical gender and the inflection class assigned to the loan. If the word is assigned neuter gender, the vowel can be either [o] (IC5) or [i] (IC6). For instance, in (8), car assumes the [o], while box, bus, bill and floor take the [i]. Accordingly, [a] is the vowel added to feminine nouns (IC3) and [o] (IC1) or [i] (IC2) to masculine ones. Thus, in (7), bar, jar, market, map and fridge take an [a], block and roll in (5a–b) are assigned an [o], while boss and chef in (4a–b) become μπόση, \(^8\) and σώφη, respectively (\(-\zeta\) being the inflectional marker). Note that in Greek, the last position of nouns is morphologically salient, in that it flags membership to an inflection class. The most productive inflection classes of native Greek nouns are IC1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, cf. Table 12.2, and in fact these are also the inflection classes to which integrated loan nouns are assigned in Canadian Greek.

Interestingly, a Greek native derivational ending is sometimes added to the entire loan to add gender and a specific semantic value. For instance, the \(-\epsilonρη\)-[-eri] added to bus (μπασίρης [baseris] (4c)) yields the meaning of ‘bus driver’.

More analytically, with respect to grammatical gender assignment, our data confirm the fact that semantics are the triggering factor, with the [± human] feature regulating a specific gender value in loans. As is the general rule in Greek (Ralli 2002, 2003), and already stated in section 3, [+human] nouns receive this value in alignment with biological sex.\(^9\) This is illustrated in (9).

(9) a. πολισμάνος polizmanos.masc policeman
b. σώφης seis.masc chef
c. μπόσης bosis.masc boss
d. οπερέτα opereta.fem woman operator

In (9), [+human] masculine nouns are assigned to two different inflection classes, IC1 (9a) and IC2 (9b–c). As for feminine nouns receiving an –a, (9d), this preference can be ascribed to the very productive –a feminine nouns of IC3, as noted by Christofidou (2003: 105).\(^10\)

It is worth noting that most Canadian Greek masculine nouns show a preference for inflecting according to IC2, which, in Greek, contains nouns ending in –is and –as.\(^11\) Interestingly, the same tendency is also observed in Greek dialectal masculine loans (Makri 2016b), as in Table 12.9.

With respect to [+human] nouns denoting a profession, the application of an indirect integration strategy is often observed, with the help of a native derivational suffix. This suffix is also responsible for providing the gender value to the noun, as illustrated in Table 12.10.
For male humans, we assume that Canadian Greek speakers replace the English morphemes expressing the agent who performs the action (e.g. the words man, owner or the derivational suffix -er) by the common Greek derivational suffixes -að, -eri- and -a in Table 12.10, which are used for forming native professional nouns of masculine gender, as follows.

(10) a. τραπεζ-eri-s ‘waiter’ < τραπεζ trapezi.neu ‘table’
    b. γύψ-αðor-os ‘plasterboard technician’ < γύψος jipsos.mascl ‘plaster’
    c. λεφτ-á-s ‘rich man, filthy rich’ < λεφτά lefta.neu ‘money’

As regards nouns denoting female humans, they opt for the derivational suffix -ina in the last line of Table 12.10, which productively produces feminine nouns in Greek out of masculine ones (Ralli 2005; Koutsoukos and Pavlakou 2009), as illustrated in (11).

(11) a. δικαστ-ína-o δíkasta-ína-o ‘woman judge’ < δíkastí-ç dikasti-s ‘judge’
    b. γιατρ-ína-o jíatr-ína-o ‘woman doctor’ < γιατρ-óç jíatr-os ‘doctor’
However, the presence of a derivational suffix is not compulsory, since there are also professional nouns that are accommodated with solely the addition of a simple ending, such as those in (9a) and (9d), repeated in (12).

(12) a. πολισμάνος polizmanos policeman
b. οπερέτα opereta woman operator

Turning now to [-human] nouns, we observe a general distribution of loanwords to all three gender values, as is the case of native Greek [-human] nouns (Ralli 2002, 2003), with a slight preference to the neuter one, neuter being the unmarked gender value for [-human] entities, as already stated in section 2. For reasons of clarity, (13) repeats some examples from (5), (7) and (8).

(13) a. μπλόκος blokos.MASC block
b. ρολός rolos.MASC ‘bun’ roll
c. μάπα mapa.FEM mop
d. μαρκέτα marceta.FEM market
e. φρίτζα fritza.FEM fridge
f. κάρο karo.NEU car
g. φλόρι flori.NEU floor
h. ρούμι rumi.NEU room

Contrary to [+human] masculine nouns, the selection of grammatical gender for the [-human] nouns seems to be ad hoc; moreover, their inflectional paradigm is predominantly that of the IC1, ending in -os in the citation form, contrary to that of [+human] masculine nouns which show a preference for the paradigm of IC2. The same strategy is also attested in the case of loans of some dialects, as demonstrated by Melissaropoulou (2013) and Makri (2016b), and as illustrated in Table 12.11.12

Masculine nouns among the [-human] loans are few though. The vast majority of them are assigned neuter gender, the default gender value, where no other clear motivation exists or prevails (Corbett 1991; Clyne 2003; Ralli et al. 2015), as in (14).

Table 12.11 Dialectal loanwords assigned to IC1 with their model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek dialect</th>
<th>Form/Transcription/Gloss</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretan</td>
<td>μπίκος</td>
<td>picca.FEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bikos.MASC</td>
<td>‘pole’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘mining tool’</td>
<td>(Venetian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptanesian</td>
<td>σαγιάδόρος</td>
<td>sagiador.MASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sajadioros.MASC</td>
<td>(Venetian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘door bolt’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappadocian</td>
<td>ασλάνος</td>
<td>arslan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aslanos.MASC</td>
<td>(Turkish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘lion’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like masculine nouns, neuter loan nouns belong to two different inflection classes; as already stated, they are attached a final –o and are assigned to IC5, but most of them receive a final –i and are assigned to IC6. Thus, Canadian Greek data corroborate Christodou’s (2003: 105) claim that consonant-ending inanimate loanwords are generally turned into neuter nouns in Greek with the addition of an [i] vowel.

As shown in (13c–e), a number of [–human] nouns can also be feminine. In contrast with the masculine ones, where there is no particular reason for the determination of the gender value, the feminine gender seems to be due to a semantic criterion which appeals to the existence of a synonymous feminine noun. For an illustration consider the examples in (15), where synonymous nouns in Standard Modern Greek influence the form and gender of English loans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>a. kredito.NEU</td>
<td>kréntito</td>
<td>kredito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. bill.NEU</td>
<td>μπίλι</td>
<td>bill</td>
<td>bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. coconut.NEU</td>
<td>κοκονότσι</td>
<td>kokovótsi</td>
<td>kokonotsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. machine.NEU</td>
<td>μεσίνι</td>
<td>mesini</td>
<td>mesini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that the same criterion is also at play in Australian Greek, as pointed out by Alvanoudi (2017: 8–10) who has identified some loanwords being assigned the same gender as the equivalent words in Standard Modern Greek, as illustrated in (16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>a. EN bank</td>
<td>βάνκα</td>
<td>banka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. EN mop</td>
<td>μάπα</td>
<td>mapa</td>
<td>mapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. EN market</td>
<td>μάρκετα</td>
<td>marcēta</td>
<td>marcēta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. EN sign</td>
<td>σάινα</td>
<td>sainē</td>
<td>sainē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the integration of [–human] feminine and neuter nouns, the role of phonology is also quite intriguing, since gender and inflection-class assignment can sometimes be motivated by the existence of a homophonous noun in the target language, most of the times with a different meaning, as in (17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>a. fridge</td>
<td>φρίτζα</td>
<td>fritza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. EN bar</td>
<td>μπάρα</td>
<td>bara</td>
<td>bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. operator</td>
<td>οπερέτα</td>
<td>operēta</td>
<td>operēta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. EN car</td>
<td>κάρο</td>
<td>karo</td>
<td>karo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. EN steak</td>
<td>στέκι</td>
<td>stekē</td>
<td>stekē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth pointing out the application of the phonological factor in the form of English loans in –ion as IC5 neuter nouns in –o, that is, as nouns which have undergone final –n deletion. This is illustrated in (18).
A word-final -n deletion is not unknown in the history of Greek. It has occurred during the late medieval period (Browning 1969), while a trace of it exists in a very formal style of language, mainly in the accusative case (see Table 12.2). Therefore, we are tempted to assume that Canadian Greek speakers subconsciously match English [–human] nouns in -ion with native neuter nouns in -ο(n), before resorting to -n deletion and assigning them membership to IC5.

Finally, as mentioned in section 2, a number of loans in Standard Modern Greek remain uninflected and have entered the language as such. Crucially, most of them appear with the same unaltered form in Canadian Greek as well, as the examples in (19) show.

(19) a. κέτσοπ cetsop ketchup
b. φούτμπολ futbol football
c. πάρτι parti party

A possible explanation for the existence of these uninflected nouns could be the fact that they had already been inserted in Greek as such, that is, as types of international terms, prior to the speakers’ immigration to Canada. It should be stressed though that, contrary to speakers in Greece, where other international items remain uninflected, there is a tendency among immigrants to assign them a neuter gender (as argued above [–human] nouns are predominantly neuter, unless other factors intervene) as well as inflection according to the most productively used IC6 paradigm. This is illustrated in (20).

(20) a. κέκι ceci.NEU.IC6 EL κέκι ceik EN cake
b. γκαραζί garazi.NEU.IC6 EL γκαράς garaz EN garage

Therefore, Canadian Greeks may also diverge from speakers in Greece, sometimes showing a greater consistency to Greek morphological rules.

5. Conclusions

In this chapter we investigated noun borrowing in a language contact situation involving Greek as recipient and English as donor language in Canada. First, we have demonstrated that it is possible for the lexicon of a language (in this case, the fusional Greek) to be enriched by a linguistic system of distinct type (here the analytical English), provided that certain conditions are met. More specifically, the English noun loans are subject to complete integration into the Greek nominal system if they are re-analysed as stems, are assigned grammatical gender, and receive inflection according to the native inflection rules. Their adjustment brings to the forefront an unequivocal preference for the most productively used inflection classes in Greek, jointly with the choice of specific values of grammatical gender.
Second, we have shown that the Canadian Greek data confirm that there is a comparable accommodation of loan nouns for all Greek varieties, since they all follow the same paths for integrating their loan nouns, irrespective of the donor language. In accordance with previous work on loan integration in Modern Greek dialectal varieties, the principal grammatical factors dictating loan-noun integration are of semantic, phonological and morphological nature. Concerning the semantic factors at play, the [+human] feature is the key factor, with the obligatory alignment of masculine gender with nouns denoting male entities and feminine gender with nouns denoting female ones. Concept association may be a criterion for semantically-based gender assignment to [–human] nouns, while default neuter gender is attested when no other factors operate. Phonology operates in cases of homophonous words on the one hand, and of analogy to the recipient language ending segment on the other. More importantly, the morphology factor is in effect, since loanwords need an adjustment of their form, most often with the addition of a vowel in order to become a stem and be assigned a gender and inflection class.

Third, indirect insertion is also employed for loan accommodation in case that some loan nouns require an integrator, drawn from the range of Greek derivational suffixes, which is responsible for their gender and basic meaning.

In spite of contact with the analytic, thus morphologically simpler, English the data prove that Canadian Greek does not undergo a gender-value shrinkage or an inflectional simplification. In other words, the aspects of inflection and gender of Greek do not seem to become subject to English influence nor deteriorate in spite of the First Language Attrition phenomenon, which is the gradual decline in native language proficiency among migrants (Köpke and Schmid 2004), at least as far as first-generation Greek immigrants are concerned.

It is important to stress that the nominal system of Canadian Greek bears corroborating evidence to Ralli’s (2012a, 2012b, 2016b) hypothesis that the accommodation of loan nouns in a language is not only the product of extra-linguistic factors (e.g. degree of bilingualism and/or heavy contact) but follows specific language-internal morphological, semantic and phonological constraints of Greek, which are at work throughout the process. However, investigation of second-generation immigrants may alter the picture.
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Notes

1. In this article, Greek will be employed as a general term for all forms and historical stages of the language. Modern Greek is used for the language from the fifteenth century and Standard Modern Greek (EL) for the official language today (cf. Ralli 2013 for more details).

2. Until 1976, when French Québécois was established as the official language in Québec and one of the two official languages in Canada, the majority of Greek immigrants in Québec did not speak French and learned only English. As a result, the influence of French Québécois on the speech of first-generation Greek immigrants is very weak.

3. We examine solely loan nouns because of the scarce data of loan adjectives attested in both written sources and our corpus. We plan to investigate adjectives in future research.

4. In 1910 in Montreal, the first Greek Orthodox Church was built, and the first Greek language school was established (Maniakas 1983).

5. On first occurrence, Greek data will be given with a phonological transcription using characters of the International Phonetic Alphabet. Stress will not be noted on the transcribed data when it is irrelevant to the argumentation.

6. See Ralli (2016) for the selection of derivational suffixes as possible integrators for verbal loans of Turkish and Romance origin.

7. When relevant to the argumentation, inflectional endings will be given separated from stems.

8. Although the English word boss ends in -os, like the native nouns of IC1, it is transformed into μπόσις [bosis] because, were the -os to be identified as the inflectional ending of IC1, only the consonant b- would have been left as the stem, something which contrasts the Greek stem patterns containing at least one syllable.


10. In Greek, there are also feminine nouns ending in -i (e.g. αυλή awli ‘yard’), but the majority of feminine nouns of IC3 end in -a.

11. IC2 masculine nouns ending in -as (e.g. ταμίας tamias ‘cashier’) are fewer than those in -is, and are usually reserved for masculine professional nouns, where -a(s) is a derivational suffix denoting profession (e.g. σκεπάς scepas ‘roof man’ < σκεπ(ή) scep(i) ‘roof’ + as).

12. Note, however, that the Modern Greek dialects do not behave the same as far as their inflection is concerned. For instance, while ασλάνος aslanos belongs to IC1 in Cappadocian, it is inflected according to IC2 (ασλάνης aslanis) in Aivaliot and Pontic.

13. See also Clyne (2003: 147) on the role of phonology.
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