

IO MANOLESSOU
(Academy of Athens)

ANGELA RALLI
(University of Patras)

On borrowing and integrating Italo-Romance nouns in South Italian Greek¹

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

¹ An older and abbreviated version of this article was presented at the *12th Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax-Morphology Meeting* (University of Cambridge: 3-5 July 2017). We thank the organizers and the participants of the meeting for their most constructive remarks.

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; Moravcsik 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 rearrangements in order to fit the new categories (Haugen 1950). Expanding Wohlge-muth’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 ending².

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. Anastassiadi-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 excerption 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:

onidi 1994; Christofidou 2003; Melissaropoulou 2013; 2016; Ralli / Gkiouleka / Makri 2015; Markopoulos 2019; Makri 2016; 2020).

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 mandeḍḍi.N ~ Gri mandeḍḍo.N | < Lat mantellum ‘mantle, headkerchief’ |
| Gri kastedḍi.N ~ Gri kastedḍo.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 ciuma ‘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 fiore ‘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 balcone ‘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* [ka'stel: on] and *καστέλλιν* [ka'stel: 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:

- (2) Modern Greek
- a. o meýálos ðrómos ‘the.M big.M road.M’
 - b. i meýáli avlí ‘the.F big.F yard.F’
 - c. to meýálo spíti ‘the.N big.N house.N’

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.M.IC1 ‘garden’
 - patéras.M.IC2 ‘father’
 - maθítis.M.IC2 ‘pupil’
 - kafés.M.IC2 ‘coffee’
 - papús.M.IC2 ‘grandfather’
 - b. Feminine nouns
 - oðós.F.ic1 ‘street’
 - xará.F.IC3 ‘joy’
 - tíxi.F.IC3 ‘luck’
 - alepú.F.IC3 ‘fox’
 - póli.F.IC4 ‘town’
 - c. Neuter nouns
 - vunó.N.IC5 ‘mountain’
 - xartí.N.IC6 ‘paper’
 - vélos.N.IC7 ‘arrow’
 - xóma.N.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 úrtso.M | < ItR ursu.M ‘bear’ |
| | Gre kolóno.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.F	< ItR funtana.F ‘fountain’
Gre buttiglia.F	< It bottiglia.F ‘bottle’
Gre karpíta.F	< ItR carpita.F ‘heavy blanket’
Gre/Gri cúda.F	< ItR cuta/cuda.F ‘tail’
Gri déspa.F	< Lat vespa.F ‘wasp’
Gri/Gre séđđa.	< Lat sella.F ‘saddle’
Gre presuntsióni.F	< It presunzione.F ‘presumption’
Gre kagiíni.F	< It cagione.F ‘cause’
Gre púnti.F	< It punta.F ‘point’
Gre kúrti.F	< It corte.F ‘court’
Gre amúri.F	< It amore.F ‘love’
Gre pátfi.F	< It pace.F ‘peace’
c. Gre animáli.N	< It animale.M ‘animal’
Gri/Gre paísi.N	< ItR paisi/It paese.M ‘village, land’
Gre kampanéđđi.N	< It campanello.M ‘little bell’
Gri kođđári.N	< It collare.M ‘collar’
Gri vutéđđi.N	< ItR mutedđu.M ‘funnel’
Gri veléno.N	< It veleno.M ‘poison’
Gri/Gre árbuuro.N	< It albero.M ‘tree’
Gri artáro.N	< ItR artare.M ‘altar’
Gri kurtélo.N	< It cortile.M ‘sheep-fold’
d. Gri/Gre comunióne.F	< It comunione.F ‘Communion’
Gre virtú.F	< It virtù.F ‘virtue’

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):

(5) Noun inflection in Greko (adapted from Katsoyannou 1997)

	F		N		M	
	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl	Sg	Pl
Nom.	cúda	cúde	lavúro	lavúria	kórpo	kórpi
Gen.	cúda	cudó	lavuríu	laurío	kórpu	korpó
Acc.	cúda	cúde	lavúro	lavúria	kórpo	kórpu
	‘tail’		‘work’		‘body’	

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 *-o* follow the pattern of IC5 in the singular number, but in the plural, they inflect according to IC7:

- (6) Gre *tórto*.N.SG *tórti*.N.PL < It *torto*.M.SG ‘injustice’
 Gre *fátto*.N.SG *fátti*.N.PL < It *fatto*.M.SG ‘event’
 Gre *konfórto*.N.SG *konfórti*.N.PL < It *conforto*.M.SG ‘comfort’
 Gre *kúnto*.N.SG *kúnti*.N.PL < It *conto*.M.SG ‘tale’
 Gre *storménto*.N.SG *storménti*.N.PL < It *strumento*.M.SG ‘instrument’

The examples of (6) pattern with a small group of Greko neuter nouns in *-o*, whose singular is like that of all neuter nouns ending in *-o* (IC5), but their plural is formed according to IC7, in spite of the fact that this inflection class contains +learned nouns⁴:

- (7) *jéno* ‘kin’ < Gr *γένοϋς* (Inflection from Rohlfs 1977: 70-80; Karanastasis 1997: 57)

Neuter	
Singular	Plural
<i>jéno</i>	<i>jéni</i>
<i>jénu</i>	<i>jenó</i>
<i>jéno</i>	<i>jéni</i>

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

⁴ 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) a. Gre árburu [arbur_{STEM}-o_{INFL}] < ItR arburu ‘tree’
 b. Gri zotecúso [[dzotek]_{STEM}-us_{DER}]-o_{INFL}] < ItR zotic-o ‘wild man’

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 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-INFL] ‘fountain’, analogically to the native *mán-a* [STEM-INFL] ‘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 *-i*:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| (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 vutédđi | < ItR mutedd-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. *-edđa* in *cineredđa*):

- | (12) South Italian Greek | Italo-Romance or Latin | Integrator |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Gri vardédđi.N ‘pack-saddle’ | varda.F | -edđi.N |
| Gre kamurría.F ‘bother’ | camorro.M | -ia.F |
| Gri presunía.F ‘prison’ | prigione.F | -ia.F |
| Gri stangáti.N ‘water pot’ | stangatu.M | -i(on).N |
| Gre jungári.N ‘bulrush’ | Lat <i>juncus</i> .M masc. | -ari.N |
| Gri ferrári.M ‘blacksmith’ | ferraio.M | -ari(s).M |
| Gri perguléa.F ‘pergola’ | pergola.F | -ea.F |
| Gri cinerédđa.F ‘ash’ | cenere.F | -edđa.F |
| Gre valentíttsa.F ‘ability, worth’ | Lat <i>valentia</i> .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 *jungari* 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 korátora < Lat curator.M ‘head-shepherd’
 Gre/Gri milinári < Lat molinarius.M ‘miller’
- b. [+human] feminine nouns
 Gri nínna < ItR ninna.F ‘girl’
 Gre/Gri nóнна < 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 fúrho/fúrro.M < Lat. furnus.M ‘oven’
 Gre córho.M < It corpo.M ‘body’
- b. Gri grúтта.F < It grotta.F ‘cave’
 Gri beđđittsa.F < ItR beđđizza.F ‘beauty’

Gre scóla.F	< Lat scola.F ‘school’
c. Gre/Gri kastáðði.N	< It castello.M
Gri dánno.N	< It danno.M ‘damage’
Gre/Gri páisi.N	< ItR paisi/It paese.M ‘village’

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.

(15) Gre lumbriko.N	< ItR lumbricu.M ‘worm’
Gre lumúni.N	< It limone.M ‘lemon’
Gre errúri.N	< It errore.M ‘error’
Gre púttso.N	< ItR puzzu.M, It pozzo ‘well’

This preference is in accordance with certain proposals for neuter being the unmarked/default gender option for Greek, put forward by Dressler (1997), Anastasiadi-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 (Anastasiadis-Symeonidis 1994; Makri 2016; forthcoming), among which, South Italian Greek as well:

(16) Gre dóta.F	< It dote.F	analogically to	Gr príka.F ‘dowry’
Gre amúri.F	< It amore.M		Gr ayápi.F ‘love’
Gri tšélamo.M	< Lat caelum.N		Gr thólos.M ‘dome’
Gre/Gri tširk(u)lo.M	< It. circolo.M		Gr kíklos.M ‘circle’

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 Grekaniko:

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| (17) Gri tšéd̥ða.F.IC3 | < Lat cella.F ‘room’ |
| Gre karína.F.IC3 | < Lat carina.F ‘spine’ |
| Gre kátšia.F.IC3 | < It caccia.F ‘hunt’ |
| Gri dífera.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 kúkuđ̥do.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 flókk̥o.M | < Lt floccus.M ‘tuft’ |
| b. Gre kúkuđ̥do.M/N ‘hail’ | < Lt cucullus.M ‘stone’ |
| c. Gre/Gri pét̥to.M/N | < It petto.M ‘breast’ |
| d. Gre síg̥no.N | < ItR signu.M ‘sign’ |
| e. Gre tesóro.N | < It tesoro.M ‘treasure’ ⁵ |

c) A phonological effect is also the cause of the heterocclisis 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:

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

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.

7. REFERENCES

- ANASTASSIADI-SYMEONIDI A. (1994), *Νεολογικός δανεισμός της Νεοελληνικής* [Neological borrowing in Modern Greek], Thessaloniki, Institute for Modern Greek Studies.
- BROWNING R. (1983), *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2nd edition, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

- CARACAUSI G. (1979), *Testi neogreci di Calabria. Indice lessicale*, Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici.
- CARACAUSI G. (1990), *Lessico greco della Sicilia e dell'Italia meridionale (secoli X-XV)*, Palermo, Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
- CHATZIDAKIS G. (1907), *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά T. Β'* [Medieval and Modern Greek Vol. B'], Athens, Sakellarios.
- CHRISTOFIDOU A. (2003), Γένος και Κλίση στην Ελληνική. Μια Φυσική Προσέγγιση [Gender and Inflection in Greek. A Natural Approach], in *Θέματα Νεοελληνικής Γραμματικής: Το Γένος* [Modern Greek Grammar Issues: Gender] ed. by ANASTASSIADI-SYMEONIDI A., RALLI A, and CHILA-MARKOPOULOU D., Athens, Patakis, pp. 100-131.
- CLYNE M. (2003), *Dynamics of Language Contact*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- CORBETT G. (1991), *Gender*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- CORBETT G. / FRASER N.M. (2000), *Gender Assignment: a Typology and a Model*, in *Systems of Nominal Classification*, ed. by SENFT G., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 293-325.
- DAWKINS R. (1916), *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- DRESSLER W.U. (1997), *On productivity and potentiality in inflectional Morphology*, «Classnet Working Papers», VII, pp. 3-22.
- FANCIULLO F. (1996), *Fra oriente e occidente: Per una storia dell'Italia meridionale*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS.
- FANCIULLO F. (2005-2006), *Ancora di latino e di greco di Calabria*, «L'Italia dialettale», LXVI-LXVII, pp. 49-68.
- GARDANI F. / ARKADIEV P. / AMIRIDZE N. (2015), *Borrowed Morphology*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- GARDANI F. (2020), *Morphology and contact-induced language change*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*, ed. by GRANT A., Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 1-31.
- GRECO C. / LAMBROGEORGOU G. (2000), *Lessico di Sternatia (paese della Grecia Salentina)*, Lecce, Edizioni del Grifo.
- HAUGEN E. (1950), *The analysis of linguistic borrowing*, «Language», 26, pp. 210-331.
- HOLTON D. / HORROCKS G. / JANSSEN M. / LENDARI T. / MANOLESSOU I. / TOUFEXIS N. (2019), *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 4 volumi.
- IBRAHIM M.H. (1973), *Grammatical gender: Its origin and development*, The Hague, Mouton.
- KARANASTASIS A. (1984-1992), *Ιστορικό Λεξικό των ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας* [Historical Dictionary of the Greek Dialects of South Italy], Athens, Academy of Athens, 5 volumi.
- KARANASTASIS A. (1997), *Γραμματική των ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας* [Grammar of the Greek dialects of South Italy], Athens, Academy of Athens.
- KATSOYANNOU M. (1997), *Ελληνικά της Κάτω Ιταλίας: μορφολογία των ονομάτων και εξέλιξη του κλιτικού συστήματος* [South Italian Greek: noun morphology and evolution of the inflectional system], «Studies in Greek Linguistics», XVII, pp. 328-341.

- KATSOYANNOU M. (1999), *The idiom of Calabria, Dialectal enclaves of the Greek Language*, Athens, Centre for the Greek Language, pp. 113-119.
- LEDGEWAY A. / SCHIFANO N. / SILVESTRI G. (2018), *Il contatto tra il greco e le varietà romanze nella Calabria meridionale*, «Lingue Antiche e Moderne», VII, pp. 95-133.
- MAKRI V. (2016), *Language contact at the service of endogenous forces: A case study of neuterisation in Heptanesian*, in *Contact morphology in Modern Greek Dialects*, ed. by RALLI A., Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 109-144.
- MAKRI V. (2020), *The formal expression of grammatical gender in a Modern Greek dialect affected by Italo-Romance*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Patras.
- MANOLESSOU I. (2005), *The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: an overview*, «KAMBOS – Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek», XIII, pp. 103-125.
- MARKOPOULOS TH. (2019), *The Smyrna dialect*, in *The Morphology of Asia Minor Greek Dialects*, ed. by RALLI A., Leiden, Brill, pp. 199-221.
- MATRAS Y. (2009), *Language contact: Cambridge textbooks in linguistics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- MELISSAROPOULOU D. (2013), *Lexical borrowing bearing witness to the notions of gender and inflection class: a case study on two contact induced systems of Greek*, «Open Journal of Modern Linguistics», III (4), pp. 367-377.
- MELISSAROPOULOU D. (2016), *Loanwords integration as evidence for the realization of gender and inflection class: Greek in Asia Minor*, in *Contact morphology in Modern Greek Dialects*, ed. by RALLI A., Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 145-178.
- MINAS K. (1994), *Η γλώσσα των μεσαιωνικών εγγράφων της Κάτω Ιταλίας και της Σικελίας* [The language of the medieval documents of South Italy and Sicily], Athens, Academy of Athens.
- MORAVČSIK E. (1978), *Language contact*, in *Universals of human language*, ed. by GREENBERG J., FERGUSON CH. and MORAVČSIK E., Stanford, Stanford University Press, pp. 94-122.
- POPLACK S. / POUSADA A. / SANKOFF D. (1982), *Competing influences on gender assignment: Variable process, stable outcome*, «Lingua», LVII, pp. 1-28.
- RALLI A. (2000), *A feature-based analysis of Greek nominal inflection*, «Γλωσσολογία / Glosologia», XI-XII, pp. 201-227.
- RALLI A. (2002), *The role of morphology in gender determination: evidence from Modern Greek*, «Linguistics», XL (3), pp. 519-551.
- RALLI A. (2005), *Μορφολογία* [Morphology], Athens, Patakis.
- RALLI A. (2012a), *Verbal loanblends in Italiot and Heptanesian: a case study of contact morphology*, «L'Italia dialettale», LXXIII, pp. 111-132.
- RALLI A. (2012b), *Morphology in language contact: verbal loanblend formation in Asia Minor Greek (Aivaliot)*, «STUF – Studia Typologica», XII, pp. 185-201.
- RALLI A. (2016), *Strategies and patterns of loan verb integration in Modern Greek varieties*, in *Contact morphology in Modern Greek Dialects*, ed. by RALLI A., Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 73-108.
- RALLI A. / GKIOULEKA M. / MAKRI V. (2015), *Gender and inflection class in loan nouns integration*, «SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics – Special issue: A Festschrift for Pavol Štekauer», XII (3), pp. 422-459.

- REPETTI L. (2006), *The emergence of marked structures in the integration of loans in Italian*, in *Historical Romance Linguistics: Retrospective and Perspectives*, ed. by GES R. S and ARTEAGA D., Amsterdam and Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 209-239.
- ROHLFS G. (1966), *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e di suoi dialetti*, Vol. 1, Fonetica, Torino, Einaudi.
- ROHLFS G. (1977), *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento)*, München, Beck.
- SANKOFF G. (2001), *Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact*, in *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, ed. by TRUDGILL P. / CHAMBERS J. / SCHILLING-ESTES N., Oxford, Basil Blackwell, pp. 638-668.
- SQUILLACI M.O. (2017), *When Greek meets Romance: a morphosyntactic investigation of language contact in Aspromonte*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cambridge, Cambridge University.
- STOMEIO P. (1980), *Racconti greci inediti di Sternatia*, Lecce, Edizioni “La nuova Ellade”.
- THOMASON S. (2001), *Language Contact. An Introduction*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- THOMASON S.G. / KAUFMAN T. (1988), *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- THORNTON A.M. (2001), *Some reflections on gender and inflectional class assignment in Italian*, in *Naturally! Linguistic studies in honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler presented on the occasion of his 60th Birthday*, ed. by SCHANER-WOLLES C. / RENNISON J. / NEUBARTH F., Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier, pp. 479-487.
- WEINREICH U. (1953), *Languages in contact*, The Hague, Mouton.
- WHITNEY W.D. (1881), *On mixture in language*, «Transactions of the American Philosophical Association», XII, pp. 1-26.
- WOHLGEMUTH J. (2009), *A typology of verbal borrowings* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 211), Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- WINFORD D. (2003), *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- WINFORD D. (2005), *Contact-induced changes: classification and processes*, «Diachronica», XXII (2), pp. 373-427.
- WINFORD D. (2010), *Contact and borrowing*, in *The handbook of language contact*, ed. by HICKEY R., Malden, MA/Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 170-187.