1. ABSTRACT

Greek and Romance have been in contact in South Italy for at least a thousand years, in a complex linguistic situation involving long-term bilingualism and linguistic obsolescence (for an overview see Fanciullo 1996; 2005-2006; Manolessou 2005; Ledgeway / Schifano / Silvestri 2018). The contact involves two Greek-based varieties, Griko, spoken in Salento, and Greko, spoken in Southern Calabria, which have been affected by Italo-Romance: to be exact, by the Southern Italian dialects (Salentino or Calabrese, depending on the case), Standard Italian (mainly from the second half of the 20th c. onwards), and a form of Regional Italian. Inevitably, this contact has deeply influenced the structure of the Greek-based varieties on all levels (phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon), and has formed the object of many studies, especially in recent years.

This article focuses specifically on a morphological topic, namely the adaptation of loan nouns. We claim that the morphology of the recipient system, i.e. Greek, is of crucial importance for the integration of borrowed words. More specifically, we show that the adaptation of Italo-Romance nouns in South Italian Greek has been subject to the requirements of Greek morphology since, like native Greek nouns, loans are overtly inflected for grammatical gender, case and number, are ascribed to a specific inflection class, and obey native morphological tendencies. Nevertheless, the matching of forms between the two languages in contact is also vital for the transfer of nouns, in that those Italo-Romance endings that phonologically match corresponding Greek ones are reanalyzed either as pieces of Greek inflection or as stem-final segments and through them, the integrated nouns are allocated to specific inflectional paradigms/inflection classes.

Special focus is placed on grammatical gender. In accordance with gender assignment in Greek, [+human] loan nouns become masculine or feminine, depending...
on whether their referents denote male or female beings. However, for [-human] ones, a neuter value is generally triggered by the recipient’s “neuterizing” morphological tendency, which, sometimes, may create pairs of forms, where an original masculine or feminine form may coexist with a neuter one.

2. ASSUMPTIONS AND PREMISES

Nouns are considered the most easily “borrowable” grammatical category (Whitney 1881; Moravčík 1978), perhaps due to their referential properties (Matras 2009: 168). Various factors, language – internal and external, have been claimed to contribute to the transfer of nouns from one language to another. For instance, beside the vital role of socio-political and economic (external) factors which facilitate borrowing in contact settings, there are also language-internal mechanisms which govern the process between the system that exerts a controlling influence (i.e. the source or donor language) and the affected system (target or recipient language), such as form similarities, structural and semantic equivalences (see, for instance, Ibrahim 1973; Poplack / Pousada / Sankoff 1982; Winford 2005; 2010). In this article, we will see that South Italian Greek provides many examples of loan-noun accommodation which is governed by language-internal factors connected mainly to morphology, but also to phonology and semantics.

As commonly accepted in the relevant literature, in several circumstances, loanwords need to be adjusted to the morphological system of the recipient languages (Sankoff 2001; Gardani et alii 2015; Gardani 2020). More precisely, once nouns are transferred into gendered languages, it is compulsory that they come to certain re-arrangements in order to fit the new categories (Haugen 1950). Expanding Wohlgelehmuth’s (2009) postulations on loan-verb integration to loan-noun integration, nouns can be integrated either by direct insertion or by indirect insertion into a system. In direct insertion, the loan noun is plugged directly into the grammar of the target language with only the compulsory addition of an inflectional ending if the target language is an inflected one. Conversely, in indirect insertion, derivational morphology is required to accommodate loan nouns. In this study, loan nouns seem to be integrated via both strategies: their structure involves either a morphologically simple stem (inserted via the direct strategy) or a morphologically complex one (inserted by the indirect strategy); this is quite rare in Greek and its dialects, since usually nouns are directly inserted and it is mostly verbs which are subject to indirect insertion (through derivational suffixes such as -iz-, -ev- etc., see Ralli 2012a, b; 2016). It is crucial to point out that the stem of all loan nouns is followed by an overt inflectional ending, according to the Greek system, which is structurally distinct from the base, and may be either a reanalyzed element of the donor language or a Greek inflectional ending\(^2\).

\(^2\) It is worth mentioning that in both Standard Modern Greek and some of its dialects, the accommodation of loan nouns has attracted the interest of recent linguistic research (e.g. Anastassiadis-Syme-
Despite the fact that they may be subject to parametric variation depending on the systems involved, the chief factors regulating loanword integration can be listed as follows (cf. Ibrahim 1973; Poplack / Pousada / Sankoff 1982; Corbett 1991; Thornton 2001; Clyne 2003; Winford 2003; 2010):

a) The natural biological sex of the referent.

b) The formal (phonological-structural) shape of the word.

c) Phonological analogy to the ending suffix of the recipient language.

d) Semantic analogy to the semantic equivalent of the recipient language.

e) The gender of a homophonous noun with a different meaning in the recipient language.

f) The default gender of the recipient language.

g) A suffix being attached as an integrator.

We will see that all these factors are involved in the accommodation of loan nouns into the South Italian Greek morphological system. They are essential in that they highlight the general issue of morphological creativity and the way in which the donor and the recipient’s morphology in language-contact situations function in tandem (Aikhenvald 2000; 2006; Ralli 2012a, b; 2016).

Our data are drawn from the available written sources (inter alia, the full excersition of the dictionaries of Karanastasis 1984-1992; Caracausi 1979; Stomeo 1980; Greco / Lambrogeorgou 2000; Caracausi 1990; Minas 1994), as well as from the digitized oral material of the Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects (www.lmgd.philology.upatras.gr) of the University of Patras. The investigation of written sources has resulted in a corpus of ca. 900 Romance loanwords, from all Greek-speaking settlements in Puglia and Calabria. It should be kept in mind, however, that data from written sources do not all belong to the same synchrony, and some may be more than a century old (this is especially the case of a subset of texts included in the Testi Neogreci di Calabria by Caracausi 1979). It should also be noted that the sources we have examined present a certain degree of variation, something which is to be expected from a linguistic system lacking standardization and a written tradition. Variation may take the following forms (1):

3 The nouns are labelled as belonging to Griko or Greko, depending on the source, written or oral, they have been drawn from. They appear in a broad phonological transcription. Glosses are given only when they are relevant to the argumentation, according to the Leipzig convention. In addition, the following glosses are used: Gr=Greek, Gri=Griko, Gre=Greko, It=Italian, ItR=Italo-Romance, ItReg=Italian Regionale, Lat=Latin, SMG=Standard Modern Greek, ic=inflection class, der=derivation, infl=inflection, stem=stem.
(1) a. Variation in the inflectional suffix

| Gri mandaḍḍi.N ~ Gri mandaḍḍo.N | < Lat mantellum ‘mantle, headkerchief’ |
| Gri kasteḍḍi.N ~ Gri kasteḍḍo.N | < Lat castellum ‘castle’ |
| Gri pekurari.M ~ Gre pekuraro.M | < Lat pecorarius |
| Gri giudiko.M ~ Gre giudici.M | < It giudice ‘judge’ |
| Gri merkanto.M ~ Gre merkanti.M | < It mercante ‘merchant’ |
| Gre kumpare.M ~ Gre kumpari.M | < It compare ‘godfather’ |

b. Variation in gender

| Gre agrami.N ~ Gre agrami.F | < Lat gramen ‘grass’ |
| Gri kjurma.N ~ Gri kjurma.F | < Lat ciurma ‘group’ |
| Gri astriko.N ~ Gri astriko.M | < Lat astricus ‘a kind of mortar’ |
| Gre variḍḍo.N ~ Gre variḍḍo.M | < Lat varulus ‘warble fly’ |

c. Variation in both

| Gri fiuro.M ~ Gre fiuri.N | < It fioro ‘flower’ |
| Gri favoro.M ~ Gre favuri.N | < It favore ‘favour’ |
| Gri lapistro.N ~ Gri lapistra.F | < Lat rapistrum ‘wild turnip’ |
| Gri barkuna.M ~ Gre barkuni.N | < It balkone ‘balcony’ |

d. Variation in the formation of the plural

| Gri guai.N.PL ~ Gri guaita.N.PL | < It guaio ‘trouble’ |
| Gre suspiri.N.PL ~ Gre suspirja.N.PL | < It sospiro ‘sigh’ |

In some cases, the variation is even inherited from Medieval times: for example, the variants καστέλλον [kaˈstel: on] and καστέλλιν [kaˈstel: in] ‘castle’ are both attested in Medieval documents from South Italy. The variation observed is mostly diatopic (different settlements of the same area or Griko vs. Greko), but may also be diachronic. It too falls into specific patterns, which cannot be analysed here in detail, but will occasionally crop up in the following discussion.

Finally, the original form, as mentioned in the written sources, may originate not only from Italo-Romance (Italian, Italian dialect or Italian Regionale) but also from Latin.

3. ON GENDER AND INFLECTION CLASS

Gender is an inherent feature of nouns, stored in the mental lexicon as part of their distinctive features, and contributes to their classification (Corbett 1991). It does not characterize every language, but in languages with gender, its assignment may depend on semantic and formal (phonological and morphological) criteria. The grammatical gender of a noun is distinct from natural gender (sex), the latter being based on the relevant attributes of its referent. However, it usually correlates with it for nouns expressing animacy (Dahl 2000).

Grammatical gender is a fundamental morphological characteristic of Greek, where nominal words, that is, nouns, adjectives, articles, participles and a number of pronouns, are specified for one of a tripartite value system, that is, masculine, feminine or neuter, as illustrated by the following examples:
According to Ralli (2002), grammatical gender is an inherent and abstract property of Greek noun stems and derivational affixes and is actively involved in inflection and word formation. For +human nouns, grammatical gender is related to the biological sex of the referent, in that male nouns are masculine and female ones are feminine; in contrast, in –human nouns, gender assignment is triggered by the inflection class to which the nouns belong.

Following Ralli (2000), Modern Greek displays eight inflection classes (ICs) of varying productivity, two for masculine nouns (IC1 and IC2), three for feminine (IC1, IC3 and IC4) and four for neuter (IC5, IC6, IC7, IC8). Their division is based on the presence or absence of allomorphic variation of noun stems as well as on the form of the inflectional endings. For an illustration of the distribution of Greek nouns into eight inflection classes, consider the following examples:

(3) SMG

a. Masculine nouns

kípos.Μ.IC1 ‘garden’
patéras.Μ.IC2 ‘father’
maθitís.Μ.IC2 ‘pupil’
kafés.Μ.IC2 ‘coffee’
papús.Μ.IC2 ‘grandfather’

b. Feminine nouns

oðós.Φ.IC1 ‘street’
xará.Φ.IC3 ‘joy’
tíxi.Φ.IC3 ‘luck’
alepú.Φ.IC3 ‘fox’
pólí.Φ.IC4 ‘town’

c. Neuter nouns

vunó.Ν.IC5 ‘mountain’
xartí.Ν.IC6 ‘paper’
vélos.Ν.IC7 ‘arrow’
xóma.Ν.IC8 ‘soil’

Many Greek dialectal varieties share more or less similar gender and inflection-class properties, with the exception of the archaic IC4 and IC7, which seem to be absent from most dialects. There are also dialects, such as Cappadocian, where there is a significant simplification of inflection classes, and a tendency to lose the tripartite grammatical gender distinction in favour of the neuter gender (see Dawkins 1916).

Comparing the two systems under investigation, that is, Italo-Romance as donor and South Italian Greek as recipient, it is worth pointing out that they share some properties in relation to inflection, although the Italo-Romance system is poorer in
overt forms. For instance, case has disappeared from Italo-Romance, which does not display the wealth of inflectional paradigms and inflection classes that we observe in Greek. Moreover, while both languages have overt gender, Italo-Romance has a two-gender value system (masculine and feminine), contrary to Greek, which preserves its ancient tripartite one.

Interestingly, Matras (2009: 174) mentions the possibility of gender maintenance between languages in contact having more or less similar gender systems, and claims that languages which assign gender to their nouns equally assign gender to borrowed nouns as well. In this light, we expect South Italian Greek to assign gender to loan nouns originating from Italo-Romance. And in fact, we will see that loan Italo-Romance nouns either preserve or modify their original gender value in order to fit the new morphological requirements imposed by the target system. Thus, the question which arises is what are the factors which trigger such changes.

4. THE DIALECTAL DATA

South Italian Greek masculine loan nouns end in -o and -i, with only a few occurrences in -a which probably originate from the period when the variety was not completely cut off from the rest of the Greek-speaking world (e.g. mástora in 4a), or are the result of phonetic changes affecting the local Italo-Romance dialect from which the word is adopted (e.g. barkúna ‘balcony’, cf. Rohlfs 1966: 184). In fact, even native nouns rarely end in -a, a well known example being ándra ‘man’. Feminine nouns, in their vast majority, end in -a, and less frequently in -i (4b), while neuter nouns end in -o and -i (4c). Feminine nouns in -os (e.g. SMG próoðos ‘progress’) as well as neuter ones in -a, like the native Grekanico kréa ‘meat’ or práma ‘thing’, belong to categories which do not host the incorporation of loans. Finally, there are also some nouns which do not seem to be integrated (4d). For an illustration, consider the following examples:

(4) a. Gre úrτso.M < ItR ursu.M ‘bear’
    Gre kolόno.M < ItR colono.M ‘serf’
    Gri/Gre sordáto.M < It soldato.M ‘soldier’
    Gre cárro.M < It carro.M ‘cart’
    Gri/Gre látro.M < IrR latro.M / It ladro.M ‘thief’
    Gri mulinári.M < Lat mulinarius.M ‘miller’
    Gri pekurári.M < ItR pecoraro.M ‘shepherd’
    Gri/Gre massári/massáro.M < ItR massaru.M ‘estate manager’
    Gri mástora.M < Lat magister.M ‘teacher’
    Gri kompaniúna.M < It compagnone.M ‘companion’
    Gri portúna.M < It portone.M ‘gate’
    Gri barkúna.M < It balcone.M ‘balcony’
b. Gri funtána.\textit{F} \textit{< ItR funtana.\textit{F} ‘fountain’}
Gri buttiglia.\textit{F} \textit{< It bottiglia.\textit{F} ‘bottle’}
Gri karpita.\textit{F} \textit{< ItR carpita.\textit{F} ‘heavy blanket’}
Gri/Gri cúda.\textit{F} \textit{< ItR cura/cuda.\textit{F} ‘tail’}
Gri déspa.\textit{F} \textit{< Lat vespa.\textit{F} ‘wasp’}
Gri/Gri sédđa. \textit{< Lat sella.\textit{F} ‘saddle’}

Gri presuntsiόni.\textit{F} \textit{< It presunzione.\textit{F} ‘presumption’}
Gri kagiíni.\textit{F} \textit{< It cagione.\textit{F} ‘cause’}
Gri púnti.\textit{F} \textit{< It punta.\textit{F} ‘point’}
Gri kúrti.\textit{F} \textit{< It corte.\textit{F} ‘court’}
Gri amúri.\textit{F} \textit{< It amore.\textit{F} ‘love’}
Gri pátfi.\textit{F} \textit{< It pace.\textit{F} ‘peace’}

The full integration of Italo-Romance nouns is corroborated not only by their citation form, but also by their inflection in both singular and plural, whereby they follow the patterns of native nouns, that is, case forms in nominative and genitive. Accusative forms have coincided with those of nominative, while genitive forms are less frequently attested, mainly in the expression of possession and of the indirect object, as noted by Katsoyannou (1999: 115):

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
  & \textbf{F} & \textbf{N} & \textbf{M} \\
  & Sg & Pl & Sg & Pl & Sg & Pl \\
\hline
\textbf{Nom.} & cúda & cúde & lavúro & lavúria & kórpo & kórpi \\
\textbf{Gen.} & cúda & cudó & lavuríu & lavurío & kórpu & korpó \\
\textbf{Acc.} & cúda & cúde & lavúro & lavúria & kórpo & kórpu \\
  & ‘tail’ & ‘work’ & ‘body’ \\
\end{tabular}
\caption{Noun inflection in Greko (adapted from Katsoyannou 1997)}
\end{table}
Compared to native Italo-Romance nouns, or to those of Greek in general, we observe a smaller variety of nouns among the borrowed ones. Considering the inflection classes described earlier in (3), we see that loans predominantly belong to classes IC1 and IC2 for masculine, IC3 for feminine and IC5 and IC6 for neuter. This is not surprising, since the missing classes in the singular number comprise (in SMG) +learned nouns, that is nouns which are either remnants from Ancient Greek or are built according to Ancient Greek patterns.

Nevertheless, in Greko, there are some interesting heteroclisis examples, where neuter nouns in -ο follow the pattern of IC5 in the singular number, but in the plural, they inflect according to IC7:

(6)  

| Gre τόρτο.N.SG  | tόρτι.N.PL  | < It torto.M.SG ‘injustice’ |
| Gre fάττο.N.SG  | fάττι.N.PL  | < It fatto.M.SG ‘event’ |
| Gre κόνφόρτο.N.SG | κόνφόρτι.N.PL | < It conforto.M.SG ‘comfort’ |
| Gre κόντο.N.SG | κόντι.N.PL | < It conto.M.SG ‘tale’ |
| Gre στρόμέντο.N.SG | στρόμέντι.N.PL | < It strumento.M.SG ‘instrument’ |

The examples of (6) pattern with a small group of Greko neuter nouns in -ο, whose singular is like that of all neuter nouns ending in -ο (IC5), but their plural is formed according to IC7, in spite of the fact that this inflection class contains +learned nouns:

(7)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jένο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jένο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In section 5.3, we will see that a combination of several factors lies behind the peculiar behavior of the adaptation of these loans.

According to Katsoyannou (1997) this inflectional pattern has nowadays died out in Greko. However, Marinis (2020) claims that it is still active in some villages of South Calabria, where he conducted field research. For this heteroclisis phenomenon, see also section 5.3.
5. DATA ANALYSIS

As argued above, the grammatical gender of loanwords and their assignment to an inflection class are constrained by a variety of factors, which can be grouped into three categories, depending on their type and reference to the linguistic domain they belong: morphological, phonological and semantic.

5.1. THE FACTOR OF MORPHOLOGY

Loan nouns are integrated in South Italian Greek according to the general pattern of Greek nominal morphology consisting of structures containing a stem and an inflectional ending (Ralli 2000; 2005). This integration corroborates the claim put forward by Thomason / Kaufman (1988: 37) and Repetti (2006) about the need for a morphological treatment of loans; it extends properly to Greek, a morphologically rich language, and more particularly a stem based one.

Stems can be simple (overlapping with roots (8a)) or morphologically complex, that is, derived stems (8b):

\[(8)\]
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. Gre árburo [arbúroSTEM-oINF]} & \text{< ItR arburu ‘tree’} \\
\text{b. Gri zotecúso [dzotecúsoSTEM-usDER-oINF]} & \text{< ItR zotic-o ‘wild man’}
\end{array}\]

As far as the ending is concerned, in all nominal borrowings, the particular choice is determined by the morphological properties of Greek, where most of the time the noun-final position is morphologically salient, showing its inflectional type (Ralli 2000; 2005). The presence of an ending allows the loan to be incorporated into a particular inflection class (see section 3 for the inflection classes in Greek).

A borrowed nominal item can be one of the following types:

a) Part of an Italo-Romance noun, the original ending of which is reinterpreted as a Greek (usually cognate) inflectional ending (e.g. Gre funtán-a < ItR funtan-a). This means that Greko speakers resort to a structural analysis into a stem and an ending of the transferred word form, and ultimately to a reanalysis of the ending as a native Greek one, when this ending is similar to an ending of their native nouns:

\[(9)\] funtán-a [STEM-INF] ‘fountain’, analogically to the native mán-a [STEM-INF] ‘mother’

An interesting example here is the integration of Italo-Romance infinitives. Adaptation of infinitives is of course absent from Standard Modern Greek and most of its dialects, as this grammatical category has become obsolescent since the Hellenistic period. However, South Italian Greek does preserve the infinitive in certain constructions (Squillaci 2017), and so the unusual (for Greek) phenomenon of loan infinitives does appear. Substantivised Italo-Romance infinitives are adapted as substantivised
Greek infinitives, with the Italian ending -(a/i/e)re replaced by the Ancient Greek infinitival ending -ει(ν) (pronounced as [i] with the loss of the final -n). The latter corresponds to the local (Calabrese/Salentino) infinitival ending -(a/i/e)re which has undergone raising of the final [e] into [i] (a regular phenomenon in the Southern Italian dialects), and is accidentally homophonous with the most frequent Greek neuter noun ending -ι:

(10) Gri agíri.N ‘act’ < It agire ‘to act, manner of acting’
    Gri avíri.N ‘property’ < It avere ‘to have’
    Gri/Gre piacíri.N ‘pleasure’ < It piacere ‘to like’
    Gre potíri.N ‘power’ < It potere ‘can’

b) Part of an Italo-Romance (or Latin) noun, the inflection of which is replaced by a Greek inflectional ending:

(11) Gre/Gri vutéḍḍi < ItR muted-u ‘funnel’
    Gre/Gri trápitto < ItR trapittu ‘oil distillery’
    Gre/Gri ástriko < Lat astric-us ‘starry’

It is important to point out that for a number of loans it is unclear whether they come from Italo-Romance or Latin due to an almost perfect correspondence between Latin and Italo-Romance forms (e.g. It/Lat barca -> Gre/Gri bárka).

Note now that, sometimes, the addition of an integrating element, that is, a derivational suffix (insertion by the indirect insertion strategy), can facilitate the integration process, while assigning gender to the loan. As an illustration, consider the following examples, where a number of derivational suffixes are used as integrating elements, which can be native (e.g. -ia in kamurria) or borrowed (e.g. -eḍḍa in cinereḍḍa):

(12) South Italian Greek | Italo-Romance or Latin | Integrator
    Gre kamurria.F ‘bother’ | camorro.M | -ia.F
    Gri presunía.F ‘prison’ | prigione.F | -ia.F
    Gri stangáti.N ‘water pot’ | stangatu.M | -i(ON).N
    Gri ferrári.M ‘blacksmith’ | ferrario.M | -ari(s).M
    Gri perguléa.F ‘pergola’ | pergola.F | -ea.F
    Gri cineréḍḍa.F ‘ash’ | cenere.F | -eḍḍa.F
    Gre valentíttsa.F ‘ability, worth’ | Lat valentia.F | -ittsa.F < -ezza. F
    Gri dzotekúso.M ‘boorish’ | zotico.M | -uso.M

The indirect integration strategy is already attested in the Medieval documents from South Italy. For example, pergulea and jungári are already found in such documents (see Caracausi 1990 s. vv. περγολέα, γιουγκάριον), while the tendency to add the diminutive suffix -i(on) to loan nouns is quite well documented from all Greek-
speaking areas, since the Hellenistic period (Browning 1983: 41). -ion was reduced to -in during the Medieval period (Holton et al. 2019: 609) and became the overt ending -i of the IC6 Modern Greek neuter nouns.

It is worth noting that the integration of nominal loans in South Italian Greek provides substantial confirmation to a number of proposals about the frequency/productivity rate of certain noun classes in Greek. According to Christofidou (2003), the most productive categories of Greek neuter and feminine nouns are those ending in -i and -a respectively. And in fact, these are the most frequent categories incorporating loans detected in South Italian Greek. However, productivity considerations are overridden by phonological considerations, due to the presence of frequent neuter loans in -o, which is triggered by the existence of Italo-Romance masculine nouns in -o, sharing the same endings with the IC5 Greek neuter nouns in -o (see section 5.3 on the phonological factor).

5.2. THE FACTOR OF SEMANTICS

With respect to gender allocation to loans, our data confirm the fact that semantics are a triggering factor, with the [+/- human] feature regulating a specific gender assignment (Ralli 2002). As is the general rule in Greek, and already stated above, [+human] nouns receive a gender value in alignment with biological sex. In particular, the masculine value is assigned to [+human] nouns that denote a male entity, while the feminine gender value is allotted to those denoting a female entity (see also Ralli et alii 2015; Melissaropoulou 2013; 2016; 2016; 2020, and a first discussion of this factor in the adaptation of loanwords in Greko in Katsoyannou 1997). Some indicative examples can be seen under (13):

(13) a. [+human] masculine nouns
   Gri sordáto < It soldato.M ‘soldier’
   Gre korátorá < Lat curator.M ‘head-shepherd’
   Gre/Gri milinári < Lat molinarius.M ‘miller’

b. [+human] feminine nouns
   Gri ninna < ItR ninna.F ‘girl’
   Gre/Gri nónnna < It nonna.F ‘grandmother’
   Gre patrúna < ItR padrona.F ‘lady’

Turning now to [-human] loans, we observe a general distribution of loans to all three gender classes, as is also the case of native Greek nouns (Ralli 2002; 2005):

(14) a. Gri favóro.M < It favore.M ‘favour’
    Gri/Gre fúrno/fúrro.M < Lat. furnus.M ‘oven’
    Gre córpo.M < It corpo.M ‘body’

b. Gri grútta.F < It grotta.F ‘cave’
   Gri beḍdíttsa.F < ItR beḍḍizza.F ‘beauty’
However, there is a certain preference for the neuter gender, considered to be the default option or the least marked option, in case no other apparent tendency exists or predominates.

This preference is in accordance with certain proposals for neuter being the unmarked/default gender option for Greek, put forward by Dressler (1997), Anastassiadi-Symeonidi (1994) and Christofidou (2003). It should be noted that the default gender has been usually called ‘prototypical gender’ and is the category with most members (Corbett / Fraser 2000).

With respect to masculine nouns, and contrary to the [+human] ones, the selection of gender seems to be ad hoc and their inflectional paradigm is predominantly that of IC1, which contains nouns in -os in the citation form (-i in plural). Again, the same preference is also attested in many Greek dialectal loans of masculine gender (Makri 2016; Melissaropoulou 2013). Masculine nouns among the –human loans are few though, the vast majority of them being assigned the default neuter gender, where no other clear motivation exists or prevails (Corbett 1991; Clyne 2003). Note, however, that Italo-Romance feminine nouns in -a are adapted as feminine in South Italian Greek, and the morphological matching criterion overrides semantics. The only way for a noun in -a to appear with a different gender value in South Italian Greek, for instance as neuter, is through the addition of a derivational suffix, e.g. fóssi. N ‘underground storage area’ from the It fossa. F (with the suffix -ion).

Finally, a supplementary semantic criterion which affects gender assignment is that of concept association, according to which a synonymous noun in the recipient language may determine the gender value assigned to loanwords (Corbett 1991: 71; Clyne 2003: 147). In fact, quite often, we witness the analogical assignment of a specific gender value of a synonymous word in both SMG and its dialects (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1994; Makri 2016; forthcoming), among which, South Italian Greek as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gre dótá.F</td>
<td>&lt; It dote.F</td>
<td>analogically to Gr prika.F ‘dowry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gre amúrí.F</td>
<td>&lt; It amore.M</td>
<td>Gr ayápi.F ‘love’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gre/Gri tširk(ʊ)lo.M</td>
<td>&lt; It. circolo.M</td>
<td>Gr kiklos.M ‘circle’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. The Factor of Phonology

Phonology has been proven to play a key role in the integration process of dialectal loan nouns. Its effect on gender assignment and the inflectional shape of loans can be summarized in the following cases:

a) A certain correspondence between the ending segments of the source and the target language can determine both the gender and the inflection of the integrated loan. Consider the following set of data, where specific endings of Italo-Romance or Latin nouns activate the form of inflection and feminine gender of loan nouns in Grekanico:

(17) Gri tšéḍḍa.f.ic3 < Lat cella.f ‘room’
    Gre karína.f.ic3 < Lat carina.f ‘spine’
    Gre kátśia.f.ic3 < It caccia.f ‘hunt’
    Gri difera.f.ic3 < ItReg bifera.f / It vipera.f ‘viper’

b) The absence of a word final -s (exponent of the nominative case of Greek masculine nouns (IC1), and present in a number of archaic neuter ones (IC7)), often creates a certain confusion concerning the assignment of masculine or neuter gender in Greko loans (18b), since, deprived of the final -s in the citation nominative singular form, both end in -o. This is one of the causes of both diachronic and diatopic variation that we saw in (1).

(18) a. Gri/Gre pjánto.n ‘crying’ < It pianto.m ‘crying’
    vs.
    b. Gre kúkuḍḍo.m/n ‘hail’ < Lat cucullus.m ‘stone’.

However, since [-human] nouns tend to become neuter (see section 5.2), masculine gender is rarely assigned (19a). In most cases, the neuter gender prevails, providing support to the general tendency for neuterization of [-human] nouns:

(19) a. Gri flókko.m < Lt floccus.m ‘tuft’
    b. Gre kúkuḍḍo.m/n ‘hail’ < Lt cucullus.m ‘stone’
    c. Gre/Gri pétto.m/n < It petto.m ‘breast’
    d. Gre signo.n < ItR signu.m ‘sign’
    e. Gre tesóro.n < It tesoro.m ‘treasure’

5 Note that tesoro is a “returning” loan from the original Greek θησαυρός.m, which, however, has not influenced the neuter gender assignment.

c) A phonological effect is also the cause of the heteroclisis case in Greko, as mentioned in section 4, involving some neuter nouns in -o, which, in the plural number, inflect differently from most neuter ones, that we saw above in (6) and (7). Compare the following examples:
The plural inflection in -i is actually attested in Greek, in a handful of +learned native nouns in -os (e.g. krátos.N.SG ‘state’ vs. kráti.N.PL, méros.N.SG ‘part’ vs. méri.N.PL, dásos.N.SG ‘forest’ vs. dási.N.PL, etc.). These are the nouns of IC7, which is not productively used today, although its plural inflection has been attested to function as model for the inflection of some neuter nouns during the medieval period (Holton et alii 2019: 608, 676). The loss of final /s/ has rendered these nouns homophonous in the singular number with the productively used neuter nouns in -o belonging to IC5 (e.g. vuno.N.SG ‘mountain’ provato.N.SG ‘sheep’). In fact, transfer from IC7 to IC5 (21a) but also from IC5 to IC7 (21b) is attested since Medieval times, and is actually found in Medieval documents from South Italy and Sicily (Chatzidakis 1907: 64; Minas 1994: 93), as shown by the following examples (for the words and their variant forms in Medieval documents see Caracausi 1990: s. vv. ἀκρός, μέτρος, ζεύγος, μέρον, μέρος):

(21) a. IC5 -> IC7
    ἀκρός [ákros] (d. 1200) < ἀκρόν [ákron] ‘edge’
    μέτρος [métros] (d. 1147) < μέτρον [métron] ‘measure’

b. IC7 -> IC5
    ζεύγον βοῶν [zévγον voon] ‘pair of oxen’ (d. 1086) < ζεύγος [zévγος] ‘pair’
    μέρον [méron] (d. 1179) < μέρος [méros] ‘part’

One could assume a preservation of this archaic feature in Greko, which shows a conservative character regarding the presence of other grammatical features as well. However, since all these loan nouns originate from masculine Italo-Romance ones, the plural ending of which is -i (e.g. It fatt-o.M. SG ‘event’ vs. fatt-i.M. PL), one could also postulate that a phonological matching between the -i Italo-romance ending and that of the IC7 Greek one has functioned as a trigger for the occurrence of heteroclisis. Thus, we are dealing here with a combination of two different factors, which strengthen a normally residual paradigm.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we investigated noun borrowing in a language-contact situation involving South Italian Greek as recipient and Italo-Romance as donor. The examined data provided corroborating evidence to Ralli’s (2012a, b; 2016) and Ralli et alii’s (2015) proposal that the accommodation of loans in a language is not only the product of extra-linguistic factors (e.g., among others, degree of bilingualism,
Weinreich 1953; Thomason 2001; Winford 2003; Matras 2009), but follows specific language-internal constraints of which are at work throughout the process.

We showed that with the exception of few examples, Italo-romance loan nouns are subject to complete integration into the Greek nominal system, with attachment of native nominal endings and inflecting according to the recipient system.

We argued that their adjustment brings to the forefront an explicit preference for specific inflection classes, jointly with the choice of specific values of grammatical gender. The principal grammatical variables governing loan-noun integration are the following:

1) Morphological

(a) All loans are adapted to a native Greek/South Italian Greek structural pattern consisting of a stem and an inflectional ending.
(b) If a loan cannot be assigned to an inflection class as such, an inflectional suffix is added which is correlated to the most productive inflection ending in Greek (direct insertion).
(c) Some loan nouns require an integrator to be accommodated (indirect insertion).

2) Semantic

(a) The [+human] feature is a key factor in inflection class integration, with the obligatory alignment of masculine gender with nouns denoting male and feminine gender with nouns denoting female.
(b) Default assignment in [–human] nouns is often attested when no other factors operate.
(c) [–human] nouns can be assigned a gender value by means of the concept association principle.

3) Phonological

(a) Homophonous endings between the source and the target language may determine the choice of an inflectional ending and thus, assignment to an inflection class.
(b) Phonological processes may feed the selection of particular forms.
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