

Examining the integration of borrowed nouns in immigrant speech: the case of Canadian-Greek¹

Angela Ralli, Vasiliki Makri & Vasiliki Mouchtouri
University of Patras

Abstract

This paper investigates noun borrowing in a language-contact situation involving Greek as recipient and English as donor in Canada. It pools data from the existing bibliographical sources and the oral corpora containing narratives of Greeks who emigrated from various parts of Greece to Canada in the 20th century. It is argued that the accommodation of English-based loan nouns is not only the product of extra-linguistic factors, but follows, and heavily depends on, specific linguistic constraints, mostly due to language-internal factors, which are of phonological, morphological and semantic nature. More specifically, the paper demonstrates the recipient's inherent tendencies to classify loan nouns into specific inflection classes with the addition of native inflectional markers, and to assign grammatical gender, which forces loan nouns to be integrated as masculine, feminine or neuter, depending on the case, since in Greek, a tripartite gender distinction characterizes nouns, in opposition to the donor language (English), which is gender neutral. It is generally shown that it is possible for the morphology of a language (in this case, the fusional Greek) to be affected by a linguistic system of distinct typology (that is, the analytical English), provided that certain conditions are met.

Keywords: language contact, immigrant speech, loan-noun integration, grammatical gender, inflection class, Canadian Greek, English.

1. Introduction

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 article is concerned with the speech of first-generation Greek immigrants who immigrated to Canada in the 20th century, namely between the years 1945 and 1975, which has seen the bulk of Greek immigration. It scrutinizes how the Greek language² has evolved in a language-contact situation, where English³ is the donor and Greek the

¹ This article will appear in a volume published by Edinburgh University Press, edited by Pius ten Hacken and Renáta Panocová.

² In this article, Greek will be employed as a general term for all forms and historical stages of the language. Depending on the argumentation, other terms may be in use, such as (see Ralli 2013 on this matter): Ancient Greek (Greek of the classical period, 5th - 4th c. BC), Hellenistic Greek (ca. 3rd c. BC - 3rd c. AD), Medieval Greek (ca. 4th - 15th c. AD), Modern Greek (after the 15th c. AD), Standard Modern Greek (the official language today).

³ Till 1976, when French Quebecois was established as the official language in Quebec and one of the two official languages in Canada, the majority of Greek immigrants in Quebec did not speak

recipient. In spite of the great interest this contact situation presents, it is largely unexplored, something which poses a supplementary challenge to its examination. In fact, this work 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 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, that is, Greek and English, in such a way that underscores the linguistic resourcefulness of the speakers themselves as agents of innovations spread throughout the linguistic community, the end-product of which showcases language-internal constraints of the recipient language that are uninterruptedly at work throughout the process of the integration of borrowed words.⁴ To this purpose, an answer is attempted to a series of general research questions, such as: a) what are the various types of linguistic practices with regard to borrowed words, as they are materialized in the process of their integration in the Canadian Greek transplanted communities? b) Is the typological distance between the analytic English and the fusional Greek an inhibitor in borrowing? c) Could specific types of integration be attributed to specific properties of the languages in contact?

More specifically, it seeks to examine the performance of Canadian Greek speakers through the lens of noun⁵ transfer, and explore: a) the principal role of morphological properties of an inflectionally-rich language, that is, Greek, for the integration of loan nouns (see also Aikhenvald 2000, 2006; Ralli 2012a,b, 2013; Ralli *et al.* 2015; Makri 2016a,b, 2017 for similar contentions); b) the concerted effect of linguistic factors, such as phonological, morphological and semantic, which determine the by-product of borrowing and its final formation; c) 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, depending on the case, since in Greek, a tripartite gender distinction characterizes nouns, in opposition to the donor language (English), which is a grammatically gender-neutral language; d) 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, Quebec, 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 to collect spontaneous spoken Canadian Greek. These interviews are based on a structured questionnaire which is designed especially for the research program's purposes, and touch on three axes: a) origin/departure, b) arrival/settlement and c) integration of immigrants. Consequently, the informants are invited to recount their personal immigration stories, which is a familiar topic to them.

The article is organized as follows: after the introduction, section 2 offers a sketchy description of the socio-historical background of Greek immigration in Canada and

French and learnt only English. As a result, the influence of French Quebecois on the speech of first-generation Greek immigrants is very weak.

⁴ See also Hock & Joseph (2009) and Baran (2017) on this matter.

⁵ We solely examine loan nouns because of the scarce data of loan adjectives attested in both written sources and our oral corpus. We plan adjectives to be the subject of a future research.

defines Canadian Greek as an immigrant language. Section 3 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 4, 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 inspected in section 5, where the interaction of semantic, phonological and morphological factors ordaining gender and inflection class is examined. The work concludes with a review of the main arguments discussed in the article and the relevant bibliography.

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

Greeks began to immigrate to Canada at the end of the 19th century, when the contact situation came into being. For instance, in 1900, there were about 300 persons of Greek origin in the province of Quebec,⁶ in 1981, according to the Census of Canada, the number of Greeks in Quebec 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.

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 Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta.

Since the beginning, Canadian Greeks tried to integrate in the 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 first generation– keep communicating among themselves in their native tongue. Greek is used at home and within the community, with family and friends, as well as in formal occasions and official institutions of the community (e.g. the Greek Orthodox Church and media). It is also alive in magazines and newspapers and is often enhanced with some regional features originating in the local Greek varieties brought from the place of origin (see, for example, Ralli *et al.* 2018).

Apparently, Greek in Canada, or Canadian Greek, is a minority language in the country, with Canadian English, or Canadian French, depending on the case, being the major widely used language in the Canadian community. It can also be defined as an immigrant language, since its speakers were exposed to Canadian English (or Canadian French) at some point in their adulthood, while many of them are sequential bilinguals –sequential bilingualism occurring when a person becomes bilingual by first learning one language and then another (Myers-Scotton 2008). 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 in a country later in their adulthood, show little tendency to lose

⁶ In 1910, the first Greek Orthodox Church was built and the first Greek language school was established (Maniakas 1983).

their ability to use their mother tongue and generally keep it as their primary language (Appel & Muysken 1987; Myers-Scotton 2002, 2008; Montrul 2008).

Migration, namely the movement of people, is equivalent to the movement of languages from their original geographic locations to new locations, that is, to new language ecologies. In a new context, users of a particular language enter in contact with speakers of another language and are forced to linguistically interact with them. As a result, language changes occur, which are studied within the framework of “contact linguistics” (see Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Thomason 2001; Winford 2002; Hickey 2010, among others). Pondering over 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,⁷ the better knowledge and frequent use of which brought on an increased level of borrowing. This borrowing is, by and large, seen on the vocabulary level, with lexical transfer being the most frequent type of it, as acknowledged by several researchers (among others, Thomason 2001; Matras 2009). Hereupon, in this article, 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.

3. 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, 2015). Nominal and verbal inflection are stem-based, where an inflectional suffix/marker attaches to stems to specify a number of morpho-syntactic features. For nouns and adjectives, these features are grammatical gender (with three values; masculine, feminine and neuter), case (realized as nominative, genitive, accusative and vocative), as well as number (singular and plural), while articles and some pronouns usually alter their forms entirely to encode this information. An illustration of Greek nominal inflection is given in (1), where the forms of the definite article and the modifying adjective vary and morpho-syntactically agree with those of the nouns, that is, with *δromos*.MASC ‘road’, *loriða*.FEM ‘lane’ and *vuno*.NEU ‘mountain’:⁸

(1)	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u>		
a.	<i>ο</i>	<i>μεγάλος</i>	<i>δρόμος</i>
	ο	meɣalos	ðromos
	the.MASC.NOM.SG	big.MASC.NOM.SG	road.MASC.NOM.SG
	‘the big road’		
b.	<i>τη</i>	<i>μεγάλη</i>	<i>λωρίδα</i>
	ti	meɣali	loriða
	the.FEM.ACC.SG	big.FEM.ACC.SG	lane.FEM.ACC.SG
	‘the big lane’		

⁷ See footnote 2 for the non-adoption of French by the first-generation Greek immigrants residing in the French-speaking Canadian province of Quebec.

⁸ Greek data will be given a phonological transcription according to the characters of the International Phonetic Alphabet. Stress will be noted only if it is relevant to the argumentation.

c. των	μεγάλων	βουνών
ton	megalon	vunon
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):

IC1	κηπ	cip	‘garden’
IC2	μαθητη ~ μαθητ	maθiti ~ maθit	‘pupil, student’
IC3	χαρά ~ χαρ	xara ~ xar	‘joy’
IC4	πολη ~ πολε ~ πολ	poli ~ pole ~ pol	‘town’
IC5	βουν	vun	‘mountain’
IC6	χαρτι	xarti	‘paper’
IC7	νεφ	nef	‘smog, cloud’
IC8	χωμα ~ χωματ	xoma ~ xomat	‘ground, soil’

Table 1: Examples of stems denoting the presence or absence of allomorphy (from Ralli 2000)

IC1	IC2	IC3	IC4	IC5	IC6	IC7	IC8
Singular							
κήπ-ος	μαθητή-ς	χαρά-θ	πόλη-θ	βουν-ό	χαρτί-θ	νέφ-ος	χώμα-θ
κήπ-ου	μαθητή-θ	χαρά-ς	πόλη-ς/ε-ως	βουν-ού	χαρτι-ού	νέφ-ους	χώματ-ος
κήπ-ο	μαθητή-θ/v	χαρά-θ	πόλη-θ	βουν-ό	χαρτί-θ	νέφ-ος	χώμα-θ
κήπ-ε	μαθητή-θ	χαρά-θ	πόλη-θ	βουν-ό	χαρτί-θ	νέφ-ος	χώμα-θ
cip-os	maθiti-s	xara-θ	poli-θ	vun-o	xarti-θ	nef-os	xoma-θ
cip-u	maθiti-θ	xara-s	poli-s/e-os	vun-u	xartj-u	nef-us	xomat-os
cip-o	maθiti-θ/n	xara-θ	poli-θ	vun-o	xarti-θ	nef-os	xoma-θ
cip-e	maθiti-θ	xara-θ	poli-θ	vun-o	xarti-θ	nef-os	xoma-θ
Plural							
κήπ-οι	μαθητ-ές	χαρ-ές	πόλ-εις	βουν-ά	χαρτι-ά	νέφ-η	χώματ-α
κήπ-ων	μαθητ-ών	χαρ-ών	πόλε-ων	βουν-ών	χαρτι-ών	νεφ-ών	χώμάτ-ων
κήπ-ους	μαθητ-ές	χαρ-ές	πόλ-εις	βουν-ά	χαρτι-ά	νέφ-η	χώματ-α
κήπ-οι	μαθητ-ές	χαρ-ές	πόλ-εις	βουν-ά	χαρτι-ά	νέφ-η	χώματ-α
cip-i	maθit-es	xar-es	pol-is	vun-a	xartj-a	nef-i	xomat-a
cip-on	maθit-on	xar-on	pole-on	vun-on	xartj-on	nef-on	xomat-on
cip-us	maθit-es	xar-es	pol-is	vun-a	xartj-a	nef-i	xomat-a
cip-i	maθit-es	xar-es	pol-is	vun-a	xartj-a	nef-i	xomat-a

Table 2: Greek noun inflection classes (from Ralli 2000)

Assuming Ralli’s (2000) division of Greek nouns into eight inflection classes, it is important to note that:

- (i) IC1 nouns are masculine and feminine without stem allomorphy (e.g. *κήπος cipos*.MASC ‘garden, *πρόοδος proodos*.FEM ‘progress’);
- (ii) IC2 nouns are masculine with stem allomorphy (e.g. *μαθητής maθitis* ‘student’, *φύλακας filakas* ‘guard’, *καφές kafes* ‘coffee’, *παππούς papus* ‘grandfather’);
- (iii) IC3 and IC4 contain feminine nouns with stem allomorphy (e.g. *αυλή avli* ‘yard’ (IC3), *χαρά xara* ‘joy’ (IC3), *αλεπού alepu* ‘fox’ (IC3), *πόλη poli* ‘town’ (IC4));

- (iv) The nouns of the other inflection classes are neuter, with only IC8 nouns having stem allomorphy (e.g. *χώμα xoma* ‘ground, soil’).

As already mentioned, gender in Greek has a three-value system. According to Ralli (2002) it is an inherent and abstract property of stems and derivational suffixes and is not overtly realized by a specific marker, contrary to case and number which have their own fusional markers, realized 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. From the three values, the neuter one is perceived as the unmarked gender option for all [-human] nouns (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1994; Dressler 1997; Christofidou 2003).

Compared to Greek, English is a typologically analytic language that conveys morpho-syntactic 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 three modified cases 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.

4. Noun borrowing in Greek

For lexical borrowings, Haugen (1950: 214f.) distinguishes three groups on the basis of the notions *importation* and *substitution*.⁹ In his 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; Ralli 2012a,b, 2016; Wohlgemuth 2009; Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008). Expanding Wohlgemuth’s (2009) postulation on loan verb integration to loan-noun integration, in this article, we will see that loan nouns can be integrated in Greek either by *direct insertion* or *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 overtly realized inflection. Conversely, in indirect insertion, an integrating element is required to accommodate loan nouns. As is shown by Ralli (2016) for the

⁹ Importation refers to bringing a pattern, item or element into a language, whilst substitution involves replacing something from another language with a native pattern, item or element (see also Appel & Muysken 1987: 164-165).

integration of loan verbs, the integrator can be taken from the range of native derivational affixes.¹⁰

Anastassiadis-Symeonidis & Chila-Markopoulou (2003) have pointed out that one of the morpho-syntactic features that play an active role in borrowing in Greek is grammatical gender, and that it is compulsory for loan nouns to come to certain rearrangements in order to fit the gender category. Besides gender, loan 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 reanalyzed as stems (2b is slightly modified), being supplied a gender value, while further combined with inflection denoting the features of case and number:

(2)	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u>		<u>English</u>
a.	γιάπη-ς japi.MASC-S.NOM.SG ¹¹		yuppie
			<u>French</u>
b.	κομπίνα kobina.FEM-ø.NOM.SG	‘fraud’	combine.FEM
			<u>Turkish</u>
c.	λεκέ-ς leke.MASC-S.NOM.SG	‘stain’	leke
			<u>Italian</u>
d.	μόλ-ος molo.MASC-S.NOM.SG	‘dock’	molo.MASC

Loan nouns are, thus, transferred into Greek following a very predetermined pathway. However, a number of borrowed nouns in Standard Modern Greek remain uninflected, in both singular and plural, and their phonological form is almost unaltered. In the absence of any overt inflectional marker, information about gender, case and number is usually denoted by the preceding article or another agreeing element, as for instance an adjective:

(3)	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u>	<u>French</u>
a.	το ασανσέρ to.NEU.NOM.SG asanser ‘the elevator’	ascenceur.MASC
b.	νέο μακιγιάζ neo.NEU.NOM.SG makijaz ‘new make-up’	maquillage.MASC
	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
c.	το κέικ to.NEU.NOM.SG keik ‘the cake’	cake

¹⁰ See Ralli (2016) for the selection of derivational suffixes as possible integrators for verbal loans of Turkish and Romance origin.

¹¹ When relevant to the argumentation, inflectional endings will be given separated from stems.

d.	<i>μεγάλο</i>	<i>πάρτι</i>	party
	megalo.NEU.NOM.SG	parti	
	‘big party’		

According to Aronoff (1997: 126) “borrowings that do not fit the phonological pattern of any noun class are likely to be indeclinable” (see also Corbett 1991 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 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, although its ending [i] matches the endings of the most productive class of neuter nouns in Greek, that of IC6 (see in Table 2 the IC6 noun *χαρτί xarti* ‘paper’).

In the existing literature (Ibrahim 1973; Poplack *et al.* 1988; Corbett 1991; Thornton 2001; Clyne 2003; Winford 2010), the chief factors determining loanword integration are the following:

- (i) The natural biological sex of the referent.
- (ii) The formal shape of the word in the donor language.
- (iii) Phonological analogy to the recipient language ending suffix.
- (iv) Semantic analogy to the recipient language semantic equivalent.
- (v) The gender of a homophonous noun with a different meaning in the recipient language.
- (vi) The default gender of the recipient language.
- (vii) A suffix being attached as an integrator.

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

As Ralli (2002) has proposed, in Greek, the semantic feature [+human] is the highest-ranked factor for the determination of gender in human nouns, where the masculine gender value is assigned to male nouns and the feminine one to female. This also applies to loan human nouns in Modern Greek dialects, as shown by the examples in (4), 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:

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------|------------------------------|
| (4) | a. | Masculine nouns | |
| | | <u>Pontic</u> | <u>Turkish</u> ¹² |
| | | <i>τσοπάνος</i> | <i>çoban</i> |
| | | tsopanos.MASC | |
| | | ‘shepherd’ | |

¹² Turkish does not have any overt grammatical gender values.

Aivaliot

καργιάς
cajas.MASC
'caretaker'

Turkish

kâhya

Heptanesian

τζενεράλης
generalis.MASC
'general'

Italian/Venetian

generale.MASC

Griko

panefakulo(s).MASC
'baker'

Salentino

panifaculo.MASC

b. Female nouns

Pontic

ορόσπη
orospi.FEM
'prostitute'

Turkish

rospi

Aivaliot

καχπέ
kahpe.FEM
'prostitute'

Turkish

kahpe

Heptanesian

ινφερμιέρα
infermiera.FEM
'nurse.woman'

Italian

infermiera.FEM

Griko

nina.FEM
'girl'

Salentino

ninna.FEM

Contrary to [+human] nouns, all the available gender values are attested in [-human] ones, but the neuter one, being a kind of default gender value, is assigned to loans, in case no other apparent tendency is present or preponderates, as has already been claimed by Dressler (1997), Anastassiadis-Symeonidis (1994), Anastassiadis-Symeonidis & Chila-Markopoulou (2003) and Ralli *et al.* (2015). For an illustration, see the examples in (5), drawn from Ralli *et al.* (2015):

- (5) a. Pontic Turkish
καρταλίν kartalın
kartalin.NEU kartal
'hawk'

b.	<u>Aivaliot</u> <i>ιλίκ(ι)</i> ilic(i).NEU 'marrow'	<u>Turkish</u> ilik
c.	<u>Heptanesian</u> <i>σοδισφάτσιο</i> sodisfatsio.NEU 'satisfaction'	<u>Venetian</u> sodisfazion.FEM
d.	<u>Griko</u> fioro.NEU 'flower'	<u>Italian/Salentino</u> fiore.MASC

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 following words from Heptanesian, where the gender of loans is regulated by that of native synonymous nouns:

(6)	<u>Heptanesian</u>	<u>Italian/Venetian</u>	<u>Modern Greek</u>
a.	<i>κάμπια</i> kambia.FEM 'change'	cambio.MASC	<i>αλλαγή</i> alaji.FEM
b.	<i>αγιούντα</i> ajunta.FEM 'addition'	aggiunto.MASC	<i>προσθήκη</i> prosθiki.FEM
c.	<i>πιτόκα</i> pitoka.FEM 'louse'	pidocchio.MASC	<i>ψείρα</i> psira.FEM

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

(7)	a.	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u> <i>αλεγρία</i> alegria.FEM 'glee, cheerfulness'	<u>Italian/Venetian</u> a(l)legria.FEM	<u>Greek native noun</u> <i>χαρά</i> xara.FEM 'joy'
	b.	<u>Heptanesian</u> <i>βέρνο</i> verno.NEU 'winter'	<u>Italian/Venetian</u> inverno.MASC	<u>Greek native noun</u> <i>βουνό</i> vuno.NEU 'mountain'

In (7), the Italo-Romance endings *-o* and *-a* coincide with the typical endings of 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 –partly or fully– homophonous noun, but with a different meaning in Greek, may also determine the gender value allotted to a loanword, as illustrated in (8), with data from Heptanesian and Cretan:

- (8) a. Heptanesian
φούντωμα
 fudoma.NEU
 ‘roof bedrock’
- Italian/Venetian
 fondo.MASC
 ‘bottom’
- Standard Modern Greek
φούντωμα
 fudoma.NEU
 ‘flare-up’
- b. Cretan
φόρα
 fora.FEM
 ‘exterior’
- Venetian
 fora.FEM
- Standard Modern Greek
φόρα
 fora.FEM
 ‘run up, speed, impetus’

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 by the following examples:

- | | | | |
|--------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| (9) a. | <u>Heptanesian</u>
<i>γάλλικο</i>
galiko.NEU
‘turkey’ | <u>Venetian</u>
galo.MASC | <u>Integrator</u>
-ικ(ο)
ik(o).NEU |
| b. | <u>Griko</u>
vardedd ^{hi} .NEU
‘pack-saddle’ | <u>Salentino</u>
varda.FEM | <u>Integrator</u>
-edd ^{hi} .NEU |
| c. | <u>Aivaliot</u>
<i>παρτσάδ(ι)</i>
partsað(i).NEU
‘little piece’ | <u>Turkish</u>
parça | <u>Integrator</u>
-άδι
-aði.NEU |

In this article, the factors of semantics, phonology and morphology are tested on 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, irrespectively of the donor language.

5. Canadian Greek

As is the case of the other Greek varieties, and in accordance with the native morphological structures of nouns, consisting of stems and inflectional suffixes (Ralli 2005, 2013, 2015), 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 following examples, where loan nouns are classified into three categories according to their gender value and the [\pm human] feature:

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------|------------------|
| (10) | <u>Canadian Greek</u> | <u>English</u> |
| a. | Masculine [+human] | |
| | <i>μπόσης</i> | boss |
| | bosis | |
| | <i>σέφης</i> | chef |
| | sefis | |
| | <i>μπασέρης</i> | bus driver |
| | baseris | |
| | <i>πολισμάνος</i> | police man |
| | polismanos | |
| | <i>λοντράς</i> | laundryman |
| | londras | |
| | <i>λοντζάς</i> | lunch room owner |
| | lontzas | |
| b. | Masculine [-human] | |
| | <i>μπλόκος</i> | block |
| | blokos | |
| | <i>ρολός</i> | roll |
| | rolos | |
| (11) | <u>Canadian Greek</u> | <u>English</u> |
| a. | Feminine [+human] | |
| | <i>οπερέτα</i> | woman operator |
| | opereta | |
| | <i>μποσίνα</i> | female boss |
| | bosina | |
| b. | Feminine [-human] | |
| | <i>μπάρα</i> | bar |
| | bara | |
| | <i>τζάρα</i> | jar |
| | dzara | |

	<i>μαρκέτα</i>	market
	marketa	
	<i>μάπα</i>	mop
	mapa	
	<i>φρίτζα</i>	fridge
	fritza	
(12)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
	Neuter [-human]	
	<i>κάρο</i>	car
	karo	
	<i>μπόξι</i>	box
	boksi	
	<i>μπάσι</i>	bus
	basi	
	<i>μπίλι</i>	bill
	bili	
	<i>φλόρι</i>	floor
	flori	
	<i>στέσιο</i>	station
	stesio	
	<i>βακέσιο</i>	vacation
	vakesio	
	<i>τελεβίζιο</i>	television
	televizio	

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 & Kaufman (1988: 37) and Repetti (2003, 2006), related to the manifest need for a morphological treatment of loan words 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 the whole word forms, but mold them as stems, which necessitate gender assignment and the presence of an inflectional marker. When the original word ends in a consonant, a vowel is added to them, before the attachment of an inflectional marker. The type of the vowel depends on two things: the grammatical gender and the inflection class assigned to the loan. If the word is assigned the neuter gender, the vowel can be either [o] (IC5) or [i] (IC6). For instance, in (10-12), *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, *bar*, *jar*, *market*, *mop* and *fridge* accept an [a], *block* and *roll* are added an [o], while *boss* and *chef* become *μπόση bossi*¹³, and *σέφη sefi*, respectively (-s being the inflectional

¹³ Although the English word *boss* ends in *-os*, like the native nouns of IC1, it is transformed into *bosis* because were the *-os* 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.

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, respectively (see Table 2), and, in fact, these are also the inflection classes which accept the integrated loan nouns 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 professional *-eri-* added to *bus* (*μπασέρης baseris* ‘bus driver’) ascribes 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 [\pm human] feature regulating a specific gender value in loans. As is the general rule in Greek (Ralli 2002, 2003), and already stated in section 4, [+human] nouns receive this value in alignment with biological sex, in that masculine is assigned to [+human] nouns denoting a male entity, while feminine is allotted to those denoting a female one.¹⁴ Consider the following data:

(13)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
a.	<i>πολισμάνος</i> polismanos.MASC	police man
b.	<i>σέφης</i> sefis.MASC	chef
c.	<i>μπόσης</i> bosis.MASC	boss
d.	<i>οπερέτα</i> opereta.FEM	woman operator

In (13), [+human] masculine nouns classify according to two different inflection classes, IC1 (*πολισμάνος polismanos*) and IC2 (*σέφης sefis*, *μπόσης basis*). It is worth noting though that most Canadian [+human] masculine nouns show a preference for inflecting according to IC2, which, in Greek, contains nouns ending in *-is* and *-as*.¹⁵ Interestingly, the same tendency is also observed in Greek dialectal masculine loans:

(14)	a. <u>Pontic</u> <i>κολαγούζης</i> kolyuzis.MASC ‘driver’	<u>Turkish</u> kılavuz
b.	<u>Heptanesian</u> <i>ινφερμιέρης</i> infermieris.MASC ‘nurse.man’	<u>Italian</u> infermiere.MASC
c.	<u>Cretan</u> <i>δατσέρης</i> ðatseris.MASC ‘customs officer’	<u>Venetian</u> dazièr.MASC

¹⁴ See also Alvanoudi (2017: 14) for the same distinction in Australian Greek.

¹⁵ In Greek, IC2 masculine nouns ending in *-as* (e.g. *ταμίας tamias* ‘cashier’) are fewer than those in *-is*, and are usually reserved to masculine professional nouns, where *-a(s)* is a derivational suffix denoting profession (e.g. *σκεπάς scepas* ‘roof man’ < *σκεπ(ή) scep(i)* ‘roof’ + *as*).

As for feminine nouns, receiving an *-a*, (13d), this preference is ascribable to the very productive *-a* feminine nouns of IC3¹⁶, which is vastly witnessed in Greek, as noted by Christofidou (2003) and Ralli (2005).

With respect to [+human] nouns denoting a profession, the application of an indirect integration strategy, with the help of a native derivational suffix, is often observed. This suffix is also responsible for providing the gender value to the noun, that is, masculine (15a-d) or feminine (15e), depending on the case. For an illustration, consider again the following examples:

(15)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>	<u>Integrator</u>
a.	<i>μπαγκ-αδόρ-ος</i> bang-aðor-os ¹⁷	banker	-aðor.MASC
b.	<i>μπασ-έρη-ς</i> bas-eri-s	bus driver	-eri.MASC
c.	<i>λοντζ-ά-ς</i> lontz-a-s	lunch room owner	-a.MASC
d.	<i>λοντρ-ά-ς</i> londr-a-s	laundryman	-a.MASC
e.	<i>μπος-ίνα-∅</i> bos-ina-∅	woman boss	-ina.FEM

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 *-aðor-* (15a), *-eri-* (15b), and *-a-* (15c,d), which are used for native professional nouns of masculine gender:

(16)	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u>	<u>Native nouns</u>
a.	<i>τραπεζι-έρη-ς</i> trapezi-eri-s 'waiter'	< <i>τραπέζι</i> trapezi.NEU 'table'
b.	<i>γυψ-αδόρ-ος</i> jips-aðor-os 'plasterboard technician'	< <i>γύψος</i> jipsos.MASC 'plaster'
c.	<i>λεφτ-ά-ς</i> left-a-s 'rich man, filthy rich'	< <i>λεφτά</i> lefta.NEU 'money'

As regards the female humans, they opt for the derivational suffix *-ina* (15e), which productively produces feminine nouns in Greek, out of masculine ones (Ralli 2005; Koutsoukos & Pavlakou 2009):

(17)	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u>	<u>Native nouns</u>
a.	<i>δικαστ-ίνα-∅</i> ðikast-ina-∅ 'woman judge'	< <i>δικαστή-ς</i> ðikasti-s 'judge'

¹⁶ There are also feminine nouns ending in *-i* (e.g. *αυλή avli* 'yard'), but the majority of feminine nouns of IC3 end in *-a*.

¹⁷ *-os*, *-s*, and *-∅* are the inflectional markers. See also Table 2.

b.	<i>γιατρ-ίνα-∅</i>	<	<i>γιατρ-ός</i>
	jatr-ina-∅		jatr-os
	‘woman doctor’		‘doctor’

However, the presence of the derivational suffix is not compulsory, since there also professional nouns which are accommodated with solely the addition of a simple overt or non-overt inflectional ending, such as those in (18):

(18)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
a.	<i>πολισμάν-ος</i> polismanos	police man
b.	<i>οπερέτα-∅</i> opereta	woman operator

Turning now to [-human] nouns, we observe a general distribution of loanwords to all three gender values, as is the case with native Greek [-human] nouns (Ralli 2002, 2005), with a slight preference for the neuter one, neuter being the unmarked gender value for [-human] entities, as already stated in section 3. For clarity reasons, let us repeat part of the examples listed in (13):

(19)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
a.	Masculine nouns	
	<i>μπλόκος</i> blokos	block
	<i>ρολός</i> rolos	roll
b.	Feminine nouns	
	<i>μάπα</i> mapa	mop
	<i>μαρκέτα</i> marketa	market
	<i>φρίτζα</i> fritza	fridge
c.	Neuter nouns	
	<i>κάρο</i> karo	car
	<i>φλόρι</i> flori	floor
	<i>ρούμι</i> rumi	room

Contrary to [+human] masculine nouns, the selection of grammatical gender for the [-human] ones 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. Again, the same strategy is also

attested in the loans of some dialects, as demonstrated by Melissaropoulou (2013) and Makri (2016b):¹⁸

- | | | |
|------|--|-------------------------------------|
| (20) | Masculine -human nouns | |
| a. | <u>Cretan</u>
<i>μπίκος</i>
bikos.MASC
'mining tool' | <u>Venetian</u>
picca.FEM 'pole' |
| b. | <u>Heptanesian</u>
<i>σαγιαδόρος</i>
sajađoros.MASC
'door bolt' | <u>Venetian</u>
sagiador.MASC |
| c. | <u>Cappadocian</u>
<i>ασλάνος</i>
aslanos.MASC
'lion' | <u>Turkish</u>
aslan |

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

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| (21) | <u>Canadian Greek</u> | <u>English</u> |
| a. | <i>κρέντιτο</i>
kredito.NEU | credit |
| b. | <i>μπίλι</i>
bili.NEU | bill |
| c. | <i>κοκονότσι</i>
kokonotsi.NEU | coconut |
| d. | <i>μεσίνι</i>
mesini.NEU | machine |

Like masculine nouns, loan neuter ones 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 Christofíδου's (2003: 105) claim that consonant-ending inanimate loanwords are vastly turned into neuter nouns in Greek with the addition of an [i] vowel.

As shown in (19b), 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 (22), where synonymous nouns in Modern Greek mold the form and assign gender to English loans:

- | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| (22) | <u>Canadian Greek</u> | <u>English</u> | <u>Standard Modern Greek</u> |
| a. | <i>μπάνκα</i>
banka.FEM | bank | <i>τράπεζα</i>
trapeza.FEM |

¹⁸ Note, however, that the Modern Greek dialects do not behave evenly 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.

b.	<i>μάπα</i> mapa.FEM	mop	<i>σφουγγαρίστρα</i> sfugaristra.FEM
c.	<i>μαρκέτα</i> marketa.FEM	market	<i>αγορά</i> agora.FEM
d.	<i>σάινα</i> saina.FEM	sign	<i>πινακίδα</i> .FEM pinacida.FEM

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:

(23)	<u>Australian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>	<u>Modern Greek</u>
a.	<i>φλάτι</i> flati.NEU	flat	<i>διαμέρισμα</i> diamerisma.NEU
b.	<i>γρίλα</i> grila.FEM	grill	<i>ψησταριά/σχάρα</i> psistarja/sxara.FEM

For the integration of [-human] feminine nouns, the role of phonology is also quite intriguing, since, sometimes, gender and inflection-class assignment can be motivated by the existence of a homophonous noun in the target language, most of the times with a different meaning, as depicted by the following examples:¹⁹

(24)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>	<u>Modern Greek</u>
a.	<i>φρίτζα</i> fritza.FEM	fridge	<i>φρίτζα</i> fritza.FEM 'banquette'
b.	<i>μπάρα</i> bara.FEM	bar	<i>μπάρα</i> bara.FEM 'barrier'
c.	<i>νότα</i> nota.FEM	note	<i>νότα</i> nota.FEM 'musical note'
d.	<i>οπερέτα</i> opereta.FEM	operator	<i>οπερέτα</i> opereta.FEM 'light opera'

Homophony is operative in neuter nouns, as well. For instance, *car* is adopted as *κάρο* *karo* in Canadian Greek because the word *κάρο* *karo* already existed in the native lexicon, although with the meaning of 'carriage, buckboard', and *steak* is turned into *στέκι* *steki*, probably because there is a homophonous *στέκι* *steki* 'hotspot, haunt':

(25)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>	<u>Modern Greek</u>
a.	<i>κάρο</i> karo.NEU	car	<i>κάρο</i> karo.NEU 'carriage, buckboard'

¹⁹ See also Clyne (2003: 147) on the role of phonology.

b.	<i>στέκι</i>	steak	<i>στέκι</i>
	steki.NEU		steki.NEU
			‘hotspot, haunt’

It is worth pointing out the application of the phonological factor into molding the form of English loans in *-ion* as IC5 neuter nouns in *-o*, that is, as nouns which have undergone a final *-n* deletion:

(26)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
a.	<i>βακέσιο</i>	vacation
	vakesio.NEU	
b.	<i>τελεβίζιο</i>	television
	televizio.NEU	
c.	<i>πολιστέσιο</i>	police station
	polistesio.NEU	

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 2). Therefore, we are tempted to assume that Canadian Greek speakers subconsciously match English [-human] nouns in *-ion* with native neuter nouns in *-o(n)*, before resorting to *-n* deletion and assigning them membership to IC5.

Finally, as mentioned in section 3, 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 following examples depict:

(27)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
a.	<i>κέτσοπ</i>	ketchup
	ketsop	
b.	<i>φούτμπολ</i>	football
	futbol	
c.	<i>πάρτι</i>	party
	parti	

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 kinds of international terms, prior to the speakers’ immigration to Canada. It should be stressed though that, contrary to actual speakers in Greece, where other international items, like *κέικ keik* ‘cake’ and *γκαράζ garaz* ‘garage’ 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:

(28)	<u>Canadian Greek</u>	<u>Standard Modern Greek</u>	<u>English</u>
a.	<i>κέκι</i>	<i>κέικ</i>	cake
	keki.NEU	keik	
b.	<i>γκαράζι</i>	<i>γκαράζ</i>	garage
	garazi.NEU	garaz	

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

6. Conclusions

In this article, we investigated noun borrowing in a language-contact situation involving Greek as recipient and English as donor 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 typology (i.e. 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 reanalyzed 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, irrespectively 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 intervenes 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 the loanwords need an adjustment of their form, most often with the addition of a vowel in order to become a stem and be assigned 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 and an inflectional simplification. In other words, the aspects of inflection and gender of Greek do not seem to become subject to an English influence or deteriorate in spite of the *First Language Attrition* phenomenon, which is the gradual decline in native language proficiency among migrants (Köpke & 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,b) proposal 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 constraints of Greek of morphological, semantic and phonological nature, which are at work throughout the process. However, investigation of second-generation immigrants may alter the picture.

Acknowledgements

This paper is the product of a research conducted within the project “Immigration and Language in Canada. Greeks and Greek-Canadians” (2016-2018). The authors would like to acknowledge the substantial financial contribution of the *Stavros Niarchos Foundation*, sponsor of the project, as well as the contribution of the three Canadian teams which conducted the collection of material, led by Tassos Anastassiadis (McGill University), Sakis Gekas (York University) and Panayiotis Pappas (Simon Fraser University).

A preliminary version of the article has been presented at the workshop *The interaction between borrowing and word formation* (Convenors Pius ten Hacken and Renáta Panocová) of the 50th *International Conference of Societas Linguistica Europaea*, held in Zurich in September 2017. We wish to thank the organizers and the participants of the workshop for their most constructive comments. A slightly different version of the article will appear in the collective volume *Borrowing and Word Formation*, published by Edinburgh University Press and edited by Pius ten Hacken and Renáta Panocová.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. 2000. *Classifiers: a typology of noun categorization devices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, A. 2006. Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic perspective. In A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Grammars in contact. a crosslinguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-66.
- Alvanoudi, A. 2017. Language contact, borrowing and code switching: A case study of Australian Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics*: 1-42.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 1994. *Νεολογικός δανεισμός της Νεοελληνικής* [Neological borrowing in Modern Greek]. Thessaloniki.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. & D. Chila-Markopoulou. 2003. Συγχρονικές και διαχρονικές τάσεις στο γένος της ελληνικής: μια θεωρητική πρόταση [Synchronic and diachronic tendencies in gender of Greek: a theoretical proposal]. In A. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. Ralli & D. Chila-Markopoulou (eds.), *Θέματα νεοελληνικής γραμματικής: το γένος* [Modern Greek grammar issues: gender]. Athens: Patakis, 13-56.
- Appel, R. & P. Muysken. 1987. *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Aravossitas, T. 2016. The hidden schools: mapping Greek heritage language education in Canada. PhD Thesis, University of Toronto.
- Aronoff, M. 1997. Gender agreement as morphology. In G. Booij, A. Ralli & S. Scalise (eds.), *Online Proceedings of the First Mediterranean Conference of Morphology*. Patras: University of Patras, 7-18.
- Baran, D. 2017. *Language in immigrant America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Browning, R. 1969. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. London: Hutchinson and Co. Ltd.
- Christophidou, A. 2003. Γένος και Κλίση στην Ελληνική. Μια Φυσική Προσέγγιση [Gender and Inflection in Greek. A Natural Approach]. In A. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. Ralli & D. Chila-Markopoulou (eds.), *Θέματα νεοελληνικής γραμματικής: το γένος* [Modern Greek Grammar issues: gender]. Athens: Patakis, 100-131.
- Clyne, M. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Constantinides, S. 1983. *Les Grecs du Québec*. Montreal: O Metoikos-Le Métèque.
- Corbett, G. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dressler, W. U. 1997. On productivity and potentiality in inflectional morphology. *Classnet Working Papers* 7: 3-22.
- Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26: 210-331.
- Hickey, R. 2010. *The handbook of language contact*. Malden, Oxford, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Hock, H. H. & B. D. Joseph. 2009. Lexical Borrowing. In H. H. Hock & B. D. Joseph (eds.), *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 241-278.
- Ibrahim, M. H. 1973. *Grammatical gender: its origin and development*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Köpke, B. & M. S. Schmid. 2004. First language attrition: The next phase. In M. S. Schmid, B. Köpke, M. Keijzer & L. Weilemar (eds.), *First language attrition: interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-43.
- Koutsoukos, N. & M. Pavlakou. 2009. A construction morphology account of agent nouns in Modern Greek. *Patras Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 106-126.
- Makri, V. 2016a. Language contact at the service of endogenous forces: A case study of neuterisation in Heptanesian. In A. Ralli (ed.), *Contact morphology in Modern Greek Dialects*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 109-144.
- Makri, V. 2016b. Language contact substantiating the realization of gender in Heptanesian, Grekanico and Cretan. In A. Ralli, N. Koutsoukos & S. Bompolas (eds.), *Proceedings of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory* 6. Patras: University of Patras, 113-124.
- Makri, V. 2017. Gender assignment to Romance loans in Katoitaliótika: a case study of contact morphology. In T. Georgakopoulos, T.-S. Pavlidou, M. Pechlivanos, A. Alexiadou, J. Androutopoulos, A. Kalokairinos, S. Skopeteas & K. Stathi (eds.), *Proceedings of the ICGL12 (12th International Conference on Greek Linguistics)*, Vol. 2. Berlin: CEMOG, Freie Universität, 659-674.
- Makri, V., Koutsoukos, N. & M. Andreou. 2013. Δανεισμός ονομάτων και απόδοση γένους στις Επτανησιακές Διαλέκτους [Borrowing of nouns and gender assignment in Heptanesian varieties]. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 3: 58-72.
- Maniakas, T. 1983. Sociolinguistic features of Modern Greek spoken in Montreal. Master thesis, McGill University.
- Maniakas, T. 1991. The ethnolinguistic reality of Montreal Greeks. PhD Thesis, University of Montreal.
- 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* 3(4): 367-377.
- Melissaropoulou, D. 2016. Loanwords integration as evidence for the realization of gender and inflection class: Greek in Asia Minor. In A. Ralli (ed.), *Contact morphology in Modern Greek Dialects*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 145-178.
- Montrul, S. 2008. *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism: Re-examining the Age Factor*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2008. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18(7): 581-618.
- Poplack, S., Sankoff, D. & C. Miller. 1988. The social correlates and lexical processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26: 47-104.
- Poplack, S., Wheeler, S. & A. Westwood. 1990. Distinguishing language contact phenomena: Evidence from Finnish-English Bilingualism. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Codeswitching as a Worldwide Phenomenon*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 185-218.
- Ralli, A. 2000. A feature-based analysis of Greek nominal inflection. *Γλωσσολογία/Glossologia* 11-12: 201-227.
- Ralli, A. 2002. The role of morphology in gender determination: evidence from Modern Greek. *Linguistics* 40(3): 519-551.

- Ralli, A. 2003. Ο καθορισμός του γραμματικού γένους στα ουσιαστικά της Νέας Ελληνικής [Gender assignment in Modern Greek nouns]. In A. Anastasiadis-Symeonidis, A. Ralli & D. Chila-Markopoulou (eds.), *Θέματα νεοελληνικής γραμματικής: το γένος* [Modern Greek grammar issues: gender]. Athens: Patakis, 57-99.
- Ralli, A. 2005. *Μορφολογία* [Morphology]. Athens: Patakis.
- Ralli, A. 2012a. Verbal loanblends in Italiot and Heptanesian: a case study of contact morphology. *Italia Dialettale: Rivista di Dialettologia Italiana* 73: 111-132.
- Ralli, A. 2012b. Morphology in language contact: verbal loanblend formation in Asia Minor Greek (Aivaliot). *Language Typology and Universals (STUF)* 12: 185-201.
- Ralli, A. 2013. Greek. *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 90: 939-966.
- Ralli, A. 2015. Modern Greek Word Formation. In P. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen & F. Rainer (eds.), *A Handbook of Word Formation*. Article no 172. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 3138-3156.
- Ralli, A. 2016. Strategies and Patterns of Loan verb Integration in Modern Greek Varieties. In A. Ralli (ed.), *Contact Morphology in Modern Greek Dialects*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 73-108.
- Ralli, A., Gkiouleka, M. & V. Makri. 2015. Gender and inflection class in loan nouns integration. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics - Special issue: A Festschrift for Pavol Štekauer* 12(3): 422-459.
- Ralli, A., Pappas, P. & S. Tsolakidis. 2018. Όψεις του Παρατατικού στη Νέα Ελληνική των Ελλήνων μεταναστών του Καναδά [Aspects of the imperfect tense in the Greek language of Greek immigrants in Canada]. Oral presentation at the *International Meeting of Greek Linguistics* (Thessaloniki, April 19-21, 2018).
- Repetti, L. 2003. Come i sostantivi inglesi diventano italiani: la morfologia e la fonologia dei prestiti. In S. Calimani (ed.), *Italiano e inglese a confronto*. Firenze: Franco Cesati, 31-42.
- Repetti, L. 2006. The emergence of marked structures in the integration of loans in Italian. In R. S. Ges & D. Arteaga (eds.), *Historical Romance Linguistics: Retrospective and Perspectives*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 209-239.
- Sankoff, D., Poplack, S. & S. Vanniarajan. 1990. The case of the nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change* 2(1): 71-101.
- Sankoff, G. 2001. Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact. In P. Trudgill, J. K. Chambers & N. Schilling-Estes (eds.), *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 638-668.
- Thomason, S. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, S. G. & T. Kaufman. 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 C. Schaner-Wolles, J. Rennison & F. Neubarth (eds.), *Naturally! Linguistic studies in honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler presented on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier, 479-487.
- Wichmann, S. & J. Wohlgemuth. 2008. Loan verbs in a typological perspective. In T. Stolz, D. Bakker & R. S. Palomo (eds.), *Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 89-121.
- Winford, D. 2002. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Winford, D. 2010. Contact and borrowing. In R. Hickey (ed.), *The handbook of language contact*. Malden/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 170-187.
- Wohlgemuth, J. 2009. *A typology of verbal borrowings*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.