

# LOAN SUFFIXATION IN MODERN GREEK DIALECTS: THE SUFFIX -OZOS

GEORGIA KATSOUDA

*Research Centre for Modern Greek Dialects - Academy of Athens*

This paper provides a morphological analysis of the borrowed derivational suffix *-ózos* (*-όζος*), used in a number of Modern Greek (MGr) dialects, as well in Common Modern Greek. Drawing on an extensive corpus, we examine the suffix from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. Our diachronic analysis places particular emphasis on the geographical distribution, the etymological provenance of the suffix and the loan accommodation strategies employed in the various MGr dialects, providing very interesting etymological findings for the lexical stock of Modern Greek (Common and dialects). Our synchronic analysis focuses on the stem categories with which the suffix combines, accounting for the phonological, morphological and syntactic constraints found to be operative in the derivational process.

## 1 Introduction

This paper provides a morphological analysis of the borrowed derivational suffix *-ózos* (*-όζος*), which until now has not been systematically investigated. The suffix is used in a number of Modern Greek (MGr) dialects to form mainly adjectives, as shown in (1):

- (1) a. *σωματ-όζος* (Myconos, Paros, Zakynthos)  
stout- NOM.SG  
'stout'
- b. *αιματ-όζος* (Kythira)  
scarlet-NOM.SG  
'scarlet'

Drawing on an extensive corpus built mainly from the unpublished archives of the Research Centre for Modern Greek Dialects (KENDI-ILNE) as well as a variety of published dialect glossaries, we examine the suffix from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. Our diachronic analysis focuses on the geographical distribution and the etymological provenance of

the suffix *-ózos*, placing particular emphasis on the loan accommodation strategies employed in the various MGr dialects within the theoretical framework of Haspelmath (2008) and Anastasiadi-Symeonidi (1994). Our synchronic analysis sheds light on the stem categories with which the suffix combines, accounting for the phonological, morphological and syntactic constraints that are found to be operative in the derivational process (see Ralli, 2005: 154-157).

The paper showcases an excellent example of modern research on the etymology of the lexical stock of the MGr dialects, while at the same time offering valuable insights into the theory and practice of dialectal lexicography and addressing theoretical issues in the study of language contact and linguistic change.

## 2 Lexical Borrowing and Loan Suffixation

According to Haugen (1950: 224) all linguistic items<sup>1</sup> are potentially borrowable, but appear to be subject to a scale of adoptability that is correlated to structural organization.

Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 74-75) have expressed the relationship between structures and borrowability hierarchically, taking into account the duration and intensity of contact between the donor and the recipient language. Linguistic items borrowed in the early stages of contact are primarily content words and subsequently function words and so on. If contact between the donor language and the recipient language is especially intense, then significant typological disruption and phonetic changes in the donor language are observed. Their proposed borrowing scale is as follows:

Casual contact	↓	Category 1	content words
		Category 2	function words, minor phonological features, lexical semantic features
		Category 3	adpositions, derivational suffixes, phonemes
		Category 4	word order, distinctive features in phonology, inflectional morphology
Intense contact		Category 5	significant typological disruption, phonetic changes

Table 1. Thomason and Kaufman's borrowing scale

A similar hierarchical scheme of borrowability<sup>2</sup> is proposed by Moravcsik (1978: 112) and Field (2002: 38), according to whom nouns are borrowed easier than function words, free morphemes than bound morphemes, derivational morphology more than inflectional morphology and finally agglutinating affixes more than fusional affixes.

From Whitney (1881) up to modern scholars (indicatively, Moravcsik, 1978; Myers-Scotton, 2002: 240; Field, 2002: 38; Haspelmath, 2008: 7; Matras, 2010: 78, 2011: 208-209) and the proposed scales of borrowability, it is obvious that lexical items tend to be borrowed more than grammatical ones, a fact that can be sufficiently justified. According to Myers-Scotton (2002),

<sup>1</sup> For grammatical features that can be borrowed, see Aikhenvald (2007: 35).

<sup>2</sup> See also Matras (2011: 208), who notes that the above hierarchy is confirmed also by his samples.

the incorporation of nouns from a donor language into a recipient one does not disrupt the structure of the recipient language's system, as the loanwords just receive thematic roles. In addition, Moravcsik (1978), Field (2002: 38) and Johanson (2002) argue that borrowing is facilitated by transparency, structural autonomy and the existence of a consistent relationship between form and meaning, properties that nouns have more than other linguistic forms (see also Aikhenvald, 2007: 33).

With regards to bound morphemes, scholars, from Sapir (1921: 206) and so forth, argue that derivational morphemes are more likely to be borrowed than inflectional ones (see also the Table 1). According to Thomason (2001: 69), this can be also justified as the former are not organized into sets of forms in the same way as inflectional morphemes. They are therefore thought to exist by themselves. Additionally, autonomy and the consistent relationship between form and meaning have once more a very significant role: Ralli (to appear) argues that derivational morphemes are monofunctional and more autonomous than inflectional ones, which are very difficult to be separated due to their fusional character (cf. Aikhenvald, 2007: 33)

In general, the factors permitting or impeding the borrowing process can be divided into language external and language internal ones (Haspemath, 2008: 10-11. See also Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, 1994: 99-105; Aikhenvald, 2007: 26-36; Matras, 2010: 78; Anastasiadi-Symeonidi and Chatzopoulou 2012: 509). The more important of them are the following:

#### A. Language external factors

- a) Intensity of contact: according to Thomason and Kaufman's scale (1988) (see Table 1) loanwords of the non-basic vocabulary can be found in a recipient language only from the 3<sup>rd</sup> degree and above.
- b) Prestige: the recipient language inserts loanwords easier if the donor language is a prestigious one.
- c) Structural incompatibility<sup>3</sup> blocks grammatical borrowing. On the contrary, typological similarity facilitates the borrowing process, as some features of the donor language can insert easier into the system of the recipient language (see Meillet 1921: 82).
- d) Genealogical relatedness: genealogically related languages tend to borrow from each other more easily (see also McMahon 1994: 204)

#### B. Language internal factors

Structural properties of both the donor and the recipient language are very important for the selection for the borrowing strategy (Symeonidi, 1994; Ralli, 2011: 191; cf. Ralli, to appear).<sup>4</sup>

### 3 The Italian suffix *-oso*

The Italian suffix *-oso* derives from the Latin *-ōsus*. Both the Latin and the Italian suffixes are very productive, forming a wide list of adjectives, as we can see in Ernout's monography (1949).

<sup>3</sup> There are scholars who criticized the structural incompatibility as a factor of resistance of borrowing (Thomason & Kaufman 1988).

<sup>4</sup> Ralli (2011: 186, 193) gives a very good example: the phonological similarity of the stem-final vowel of the Turkish and the Greek verbal stems [+ Past tense] was very important for the adequate choice of the loan accommodation.

A main syntactic constraint is that, prototypically, the Latin, as well as the Italian suffix, is added to nominal stems (Magni, 2001: 4-5), i.e.

(2) *glori-ōsus* (Lat.) < [[*glori(a)*<sub>NOUN</sub> ‘glory’] -*ōsus*]<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 ‘glorious’

(3) *premur-oso* (17th c.) < [[*premur(a)*<sub>NOUN</sub> ‘rush’] -*oso*]<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 ‘who is in a great rush’

However, Montermini (2001) notes that verbal derivatives in *-oso* are also attested, which, according to Ernout (1949: 77) are rare later formations. For example:

(4) *pens-oso* < [[*pens(are)*<sub>VERB</sub> ‘to worry’] -*oso*]<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 ‘who worries a lot’

More specifically, the nominal stems on which the suffixes *-ōsus/ -oso* are added, belong to common nouns – concrete or abstract – and inanimate ones (Scalise 1994: 99), although there are new formations based on the stem of animate nouns (Magni, 2001: 4- 6)<sup>5</sup>, i.e.

(5) *serp-oso* < [[*serp(e)*<sub>NOUN-ANIM</sub> ‘serpent’] -*oso*]<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 ‘full of serpents’

So, the properties of the nominal stems can be described as follows:

(6) [[ ]<sub>NOUN</sub>] -*ōsus/-oso*]<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 [+ com.]  
 [± abstr.]  
 [± anim.]

According to the study of Magni (2001: 12-13), adjectives formed with *-ōsus/-oso* have the meaning ‘who/ that has/ presents a quantity of quality X’, when X is what the nominal stem expresses (see also Rohlf, 1969: 441; Lehmann, 1977: 231; Tekavčić, 1980: 77). Apart from the prototypical meaning “full of X”, the suffix has also some more peripheral meanings such as ‘who does the X’, ‘who/ that is characterized by X’, ‘who/ that is similar to X’ (Magni, 2001: 8).

Latin and Italian suffixed adjectives have positive and pejorative connotations. Another very interesting observation is that both the Latin and the Italian suffix can have both passive and active meaning. As an example, the Latin *invidiōsus* has two interpretations (Magni, 2001: 17):

(7) a. *invidi-ōsus*<sub>ACT</sub>  
 ‘who has jealousy’

or

b. *invidi-ōsus*<sub>PASS</sub>  
 ‘who is inviable’

<sup>5</sup> Magni (2001: 4) observed that the suffix *-ōsus/ -oso* is not added to nominal stems of color and proper names. There are not formations as *\*verd-oso* (< *verde* ‘green’) or *Giann-oso* (< *Gianni* ‘proper name’).

As regards the referent, it can be both animate and inanimate (Magni, 2001: 18). So, the referent in (8a) is animate, while the one in (8b) is inanimate:

(8) a. *paur-oso* [ $\pm$ anim.]  
‘who provokes fear’

or

b. *paur-oso* [+anim.]  
‘who has fear’

Concluding, the suffix *-ōsus/-oso* forms adjectives that refer to persons or objects, meaning in a positive or pejorative way ‘who/ that has/ presents a quantity of quality X’, when X is what the nominal stem expresses.

#### 4 Loanwords in -osos/-ózos in MGr dialect

Latin words in *-ōsus* were borrowed into Greek language in medieval times (5/6<sup>th</sup> c. - 13<sup>th</sup> c.), as we can see in (9):

(9) a. *κουριόσος* Suda κ 2188 (10<sup>th</sup> c.) (cf. *κουρισσός* V-Melan. 226 [5<sup>th</sup> c.])  
‘officer for the invigilation of travellers’

b. *γρατίωσος* *ἐπίσκοπος* Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum 1.6.15 (7<sup>th</sup> c.)  
‘respected bishop’

c. *τὸ ἐμπαθὲς ἢ τὸ βιτίσσον* Bas. B 279 1 (9-13 a. D.)<sup>6</sup>  
‘passionate or defective’

Forms as *βιτίσσον*, *γρατίωσος*<sup>7</sup> have not survived in MGr dialects. Additionally, the majority of the loanwords in *-oso* inserted in MGr dialects we will present below do not have a correspondent Latin form.

Also, we did not find the meaning of the above Latin loanwords in any of the MGr dialects. For example, the adopted loanword *κουριόσος* ‘officer for the invigilation of travellers’ retains the core meaning of the Latin word *curiōsus* ‘who oversees something’. The type *curioso* with the meaning ‘who wants to know’ appears at the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> c. (Cortelazzo and Zolli 1999<sup>2</sup>). Therefore, *curioso* ‘curious’ was borrowed into the MGr dialects with this meaning after the 14<sup>th</sup> c. from Venetian (see the lemma *curioso* in Boerio, 1856).

<sup>6</sup> For the examples 9(a), (b), (c), see Trapp (1994-).

<sup>7</sup> The inserted Latin loanwords into Greek – as they were considered to be a part of the general Greek vocabulary – followed the ancient Greek accentuation rules and not the correspondent Latin ones (see Kramer 1998: 133-134). This can explain why adjectives such as *βιτίσσον*, *γρατίωσος* are stressed in the antepenult, although the vowel -o- in the Latin suffix *-ōsus* is a long one.

Consequently, based on morphological and semantic criteria<sup>8</sup>, we argue that the suffix *-oso* was borrowed into the MGr dialects not through Latin loanwords, but, as we will see below, through Venetian and Italian ones.

Greek texts documenting the first appearance of loanwords in *-ózos* are rare. We found cases such as:

- (10) a. *εἶπαν του τὰ μαντάτα οἱ ἀμουροῦζες του* Machairas 224<sup>29</sup> (Dawkins) (15<sup>th</sup> c.)<sup>9</sup> < Prov. *amouros*  
‘his lovers told him the news’
- b. *ἀμορόζος τῆς Πουλισένας* Katzourbos, Katal. pros. (16<sup>th</sup> c.) < Ven. / It. *amoroso*  
‘Poulisena’s lover’
- c. *γκελόζος* Bertoldinos 97 (middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> c.) < It. *geloso*/ Ven. *zeloso*  
‘passionate or defective’

The above loanwords dating from the 15th, 16th and 17th c. survive in MGr dialects.

#### 4.1 The donor language

The donor language of the majority of the loanwords in *-ózos* in the MGr dialects is mainly the Venetian dialect and the Italian language. Of course they are not the only ones. For example, although the 11a and 11b were borrowed from the Italian and Venetian language, the 11c was borrowed into the Cypriot dialect through the Provencal dialect (Kriaras 1969-),

- (11) a. *αμορόζος* (Corfu, Cephalonia, Leukada, Andros, Naxos) < Ven. *amoroso*  
< It. *amoroso* (13<sup>th</sup> c.) < prob. vulgar Lat. *\*amorōsus*  
‘lover’
- b. *μορόζος* ‘lover’ (Corfu, Cephalonia, Leukada, Cythira, Messinia) < Ven. *moroso*  
(attested at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>10</sup>)  
‘lover’
- c. *αμουρούζος* ‘lover’ (Cyprus) < Prov. *amouros* etc.<sup>11</sup>  
‘lover’
- (12) *γαρμπόζος* (Cephalonia, Leukada, Kos, Myconos, Naxos) / *γαρπόζος* (Cyprus)  
‘jaundy, dandy, flirtatious’

<sup>8</sup> cf. Anastasiadi-Symeonidi (1994: 60) argues according to semantic criteria that the loanword *parking* was inserted in Modern Koine through French and not directly through English.

<sup>9</sup> The form *αμορόζα* is found also in Cypriot manuscripts (see Kriaras, 1969-, in lemma *αμορόζος*).

<sup>10</sup> See Cortelazzo 2007.

<sup>11</sup> See lemma *αμορώζος* of Historical Dictionary of the Academy of Athens.

The (12) must have been borrowed from the Catalan dialect, as the word does not exist in Italian or in any one of the Italian varieties, but is still used in Spanish and Portugal with the meaning ‘jaunty’.

So, it happens very often to have different donor languages for related loan dialectal forms.

In many cases, it is easy to identify the Venetian dialect as the donor language, as the forms in the recipient dialects preserve the form of the Venetian word, which differs from the Italian one. For example:

- (13) *πιπιτόζος* (Corfu) < Ven. *petitoso*, when the correspondent It. form is *appetitoso*<sup>12</sup>  
‘selective in food’

Unfortunately, chronological evidence concerning their appearance in the Venetian dialect is available for only some of the loanwords we found.<sup>13</sup>

In other cases, it is difficult to discern whether standard Italian or Venetian is the donor language as:

- a) the loanword appears in the same form in both varieties; for example,

- (14) *κοστόζος* (Naxos) < Ven./ It. *costoso* expensive  
‘expensive’

- b) the loanword *-oso* is not attested in Venetian although the relevant noun, on the stem of which the production of the adjective was based, does exist; for example,

- (15) *αβανταγκιόζος* (Leukada) < \*Ven. *avantazoso*  
‘advantageous’

We suggest that the adjective could have existed in Venetian, as we found the existence of the noun *avantazo* ‘advantage’ in this dialect, when the correspondent forms of the Italian noun and adjective is *vantaggio* and *vantaggioso* respectively.

Of course, it must be taken under consideration that standard Italian was adopted as the official language by Venice long before the unity of Italy in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Fanciullo 2008).

Generally, due to the lack of chronological data, the first appearance of the adjective in *-oso* in the direct – as well as in the indirect – donor language can function as a terminus post quem, after which we expect the insertion of the loanword in MGr dialects. Below, we quote the loan adjectives in *-ózos* found in MGr dialects as well as in the MGr Koine. We present every dialectal form followed by its geographic distribution. We also note the meanings of all accommodated Greek forms and, afterwards, the postulated direct – and in many cases the indirect – donor language. We have separated the data in groups according to the century of first appearance<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> For all the Venetian adjectives in *-oso* see Boerio (1856).

<sup>13</sup> For the attested Venetian words of the 16<sup>th</sup> c., see Cortelazzo (2007).

<sup>14</sup> For the first appearance of the It. – or in some cases Ven. – adjectives in *-oso*, see Cortelazzo and Zolli 1999<sup>2</sup>.

## 4.2 Presentation of the loanwords in MGr dialects

The majority of loanwords in *-ózos* attested in the MGr dialects come from adjectives in *-oso* attested in the direct or indirect donor language in the 13th and 14th c., as we see below:

Loanwords in *-oso* from the 13th c.:

(16) see above 11a, b, c.

(17) *γρατσιόζος* (Corfu) / *γρατζιόζος* (Cephalonia) < Ven./ It. *grazioso*  
‘gentile, gracious’.

(18) *κουραγιόζος* (not attested) / *κουραγιόζ-ζος* (Chios) / *κουραγκιόζος* (Cyprus) /  
*κουραγκιόζους* (Tinos) / *κουραιόζος* (Naxos) / *κουραγκιόζης* (Ionia, Smyrna) < It.  
*coraggioso*  
‘courageous’

(19) a. *πρετσιόζος* (Cephalonia) / *πρεντζιόζος* (Leukada) < It. *prezioso* [< Lat. *pretiōsus*]  
‘valuable’

b. *πρετσούζος* (Cyprus) < Prov. *precious*  
‘valuable’

(20) *φαμόζος* (Cephalonia, Cyprus) / *φαμόζους* (Samos) < It. *famoso* [< Lat. *famōsus*]  
‘famous’

(21) *φουριόζος* (Common MGr) / *φουριόζους* (Tinos, Ioannina, Etoloakarnania) /  
*φουρζόζους* (Lemnos) < It. *furioso* ‘full of haste or rage’ [< Lat. *furiōsus*]  
‘who is in haste’

Loanwords in *-oso* of the 14<sup>th</sup> c.

(22) *βιρτουόζος* (Common MGr and in many MGr dialects) < Ven. / It. *virtuoso* ‘skilfull’ [<  
Lat. *virtuōsus* ‘virtuous’]  
‘skilful’

(23) *βιτσιόζος* (Common MGr and in many MGr dialects) < Ven./ It. *vizioso* ‘vicious,  
aberrant’ [< Lat. *vitiōsus* ‘sly/ incorrect’].  
‘aberrant’

(24) *γολόζος* (Cephalonia, Ithaca, Kea, Crete, Myconos, Syros, Euboia, Preveza and  
elsewhere) / *γ'λόζους* (Leukada) / *γ'λούζους* (Kythnos) / *γολούζης* (Megara)<sup>15</sup> < Ven.  
*goloso* ‘causing the appetite’ / It. *goloso* ‘glutton’ [< Lat. *gulōsus*]  
‘glutton’

<sup>15</sup> See lemma *γολόζος* in the Historical Dictionary of the Academy of Athens.

- (25) *δισπετόζος* (Corfu) < Ven. *despetoso* / It. *dispetoso*  
‘who makes tantrums’
- (26) *κουριόζος* (Cephalonia, Paxoi, Andros, Kythira, Mani) / *κοριόζος* (Leukada, Bithynia) / *κουριόζους* (Tinos, Samos, Chalcidice) / *κουριούζους* (Euboia) / *κουρνόζος* (Hpeiros) / *κορνιόζος* (Cyprus) / *σκοριόζος* (Propontida) < Ven./ It *curioso* ‘who wants to know’ (at the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> c.) < It. *curioso* ‘who cares’ (13<sup>th</sup> c.) [< Lat. *curiōsus*] ‘curious’
- (27) a. *περικόλόζος* (Cephalonia, Kythira) < Ven. / It. *pericoloso*  
‘dangerous, full of danger’
- b. *περικουλόζος* (Cephalonia) < It. *pericoloso* [< Lat. *periculōsus*] ‘dangerous, full of danger’
- (28) *περνιτσιόζος* (Corfu) < It. *pernicioso* [< Lat. *perniciōsus*] ‘dangerous’
- (29) a. *σκαμπρόζος* (Common MGr) < It. *scabroso* [< late Lat. *scabrōsus*] ‘who socks in a cute way’
- b. *σκαμπρόζος* (Cephalonia) / *σκομπρόζος* (Cephalonia, Milos) < It. *scabroso* [< late Lat. *scabrōsus*] ‘tough, difficult, irregular’<sup>16</sup>
- (30) a. *φλατόζους* Eteloakarnania < Ven. *flatoso* ‘causing gases’  
‘ill because of a chronic disease’ (cf. *φλάτος* ‘bellyache’ Kythnos)
- b. *φλατουόζος* (Byzantios Dictionary 1874<sup>3</sup>: 576) < It. *flatuoso*  
‘for a food, causing gases’

Many of the above loanwords have a correspondent Latin form, see (19a), (20), (21), (22), (23), (24), (25), (26), (27b) and (29). On the contrary, all the adjectives attested in the donor language after the 15<sup>th</sup> c., which have been inserted in MGr dialects, are formations without a correspondent form in Latin (see below).

Adjectives in *-oso* from the 15th c.

- (31) *αερόζος* (Kythira) < It. *aeroso*  
‘full of air’
- (32) *τσιριμονιόζος* (Kythira, Peridis Dictionary 1878) / *τσιριμονιόζος* (Andros) < It. *cerimonioso*  
‘excessively kind’

<sup>16</sup> See also the form *σκαμπουρόζικος* ‘difficult’ in Kythira.

The loanwords *φλατουόζος* (30) and *τσιριμονιόζος* (32) belong to the rare cases found to be lemmatized in dictionaries of the 19th c., for example in Byzantios Dictionary (1874<sup>3</sup>) and Peridis Dictionary (1878) respectively.

Adjectives in *-oso* from the 16th c.

(33) *γουστόζος* (Common MGr) / *γουστοζόςος* (north dialects) / *’ουστόζος* (Naxos) < Ven. / It. *gustoso*<sup>17</sup>  
‘tasteful, stylish, funny’

(34) *καπριτσιόζος* (Common MGr and in many MGr dialects) / *καπριτσόζος* (Crete) / *καπροτσόζος* (W.Crete) < It. *capriccioso*  
‘who does caprices/ which is done with caprices’

(35) *μπριόζος* (Common MGr and in many MGr dialects) < It. *brioso*  
‘cheerful’

(36) *σπιριτόζος* (Naxos) / *σπιρτόζος* (Common MGr and MGr dialects) / *σπιρτόζουος* (Alonnisos, Tinos) / *σπιρτσόζος* (Etelocarnania) < Ven. / It. *spiritoso* ‘which contains alcohol/ full of energy’  
‘clever, lively’

Adjectives in *-oso* from the 17th c.

(37) *αβανταγκιόζος* (Leukada) < Ven. \**avantazzoso* < Ven *avantazzo* (cf. It. *avanzaggioso*)  
‘advantageous’

(38) *πρεμουρόζος* (Cephalonia, Kythira) < It. *premuroso*  
‘who is in rush/ willing’

(39) *σκερτσόζος* (Common MGr) / *σκιρτσόζουος* (Ioannina) / *σκιρτσιόζουος* (Etolocarnania) < It. *scherzoso*  
‘who frills/ frilling’

(40) *τσαρδόζος* (Corfu) < It. *azzardoso* ‘dangerous’  
‘for a woman, aggressive and sexy’

Adjectives in *-oso* from the 18th c.

(41) *λουσόζος* (Corfu, Cephalonia, Paxoi-Antipaxoi, Messinia) < It. *lussuoso*  
‘luxurious, sprangly, dandy’

(42) *ποντιλιόζος* (Cephalonia, Corfu, Leukada, Paxoi) / *ποντιγιόζος* (Corfu), / *ποντιλιόζος* (Hpeiros) / *ποντ’λιόζος* (Leukada) < Ven. *pontiglioso* (cf. It. *puntiglioso*)  
‘stubborn, nippy’

<sup>17</sup> Both Ven. and It. forms are attested in the 16th c.

Adjectives in *-oso* from the 19th c.

- (43) *σπετακολόζος* (Cephalonia) < Ven. / It. *spetacolosso* ‘spectacular’  
‘imposing’
- (44) *μαφιόζος* (Common MGr) < It. *mafioso*  
‘member of the mafia, mafioso’

We must note that the recipient dialects are spoken in regions where language contact with Venetian and Italian was intense due to a) historical and b) geographic reasons having to do mainly with the Venetian domination, which in many areas lasted more than three centuries, and with the proximity to the Italian peninsula. The Ionian islands (and West Greece), Kythira and the Cyclades have adopted most of the above loanwords.

With regards to the accommodation strategy, Anastasiadi-Symenodi (1994: 195) notes that, in the stage of the secondary morphological adoption, the stem’s final item and the stress position play a determinant role in the accommodation of a loan noun or adjective in an inflectional paradigm of the recipient language. The phonological similarity of the final vowel between the loanwords in *-oso* with the Greek nominal stems in *-o* facilitates their accommodation: they are formed according the model of the adjectives *-ος, -α, -ο*, i.e. *γραπσιόζος, -α, -ο*<sup>18</sup> // *ωραίος, -α, -ο*.

All loanwords function as adjectives in the recipient language, except for the noun *αμορόζος* and *μαφιόζος* that had already been substantivised in Italian and Venetian.

In later stages, the adopted loanwords were combined with Greek suffixes, such as *-ικός, -οσύνη, -ιά, -ιάρης, -λογώ, -εύομαι* etc. and produced some loanblends such as:

- (45) a. *κουριόζ-ικός* (Kythira)  
‘courageous’
- b. *αμουρουζ-εύομαι* (Syros) / *αμουρουζ-εύομαι* (Naxos)  
‘be in love’
- c. *γολοζ-ιά* (Arcadia)  
‘gluttony’
- d. *γολοζ-ιάρης* (Arcadia)  
‘glutton’
- e. *μουρ’ζο-λο’ώ* (< \**αμοροζολογώ*) (Myconos)  
‘be in love’
- f. *αμουρουζ-οσύνη* (Naxos)  
‘courtship’

<sup>18</sup> It must be noted that in many dialectal varieties the neuter gender is formed in *-óz-o* and not in *-óz-iko*. In Common MGr the prevail of the suffix *-óz-iko* can be justified because of the higher frequency of the later formed adjectives in *- óz-ikos, -óz-ici, -óz-iko* than the correspondent forms in *-ózos, -óza, -ózo*.

As far as semantics is concerned, recipient varieties seem to have preserved one of the meanings of the donor language, maintaining the same connotations. It is worth pointing out that in some cases the referent [-inanimate] of the donor language has changed to [+animate] in the recipient varieties. For example, the Ven. *petitoso* ‘causing appetite’ was adopted in Corfu (see 13) with the meaning ‘person selective in food’

## 5 New formations in MGr dialects

In our corpus we found some new dialectal forms in *-ózos*. Meyer is the first who in 1895 noted the productivity of the suffix *-ózos* in MGr dialects. 1895 can therefore be used – due, of course, to the lack of other chronological evidence – as a terminus ante quem for the first appearance of the above words.

A part of them gives the impression that we are dealing with Venetian or Italian loanwords, but in fact corresponding forms are not found in the supposed donor languages. Such formations are:

- (46) *μετζοσταγκιόζος* (Paxoi) < *μετζοσταγκι(όν)* ‘intermediate situation’ (Leucada) + *-ózos* ‘of an intermediate situation’
- (47) *φασαριόζος* (Common MGr and in many MGr dialects) < *φασαρί(α)* ‘fuss’ (< Ven. \**fesaria* < It. *fesseria*) + *-ózos* ‘noisy’
- (48) *φατσόζος* (Cephalonia) < *φάτσ(α)* ‘face, appearance’ + *-ózos* ‘presentable’

In this group of new formations we have to include also the adjective *μπουγιόζος* ‘bulky, impressive’. The adjective derives from the loanword *μπούγιο* [bújo]. According to Babiniotis Dictionary (2012<sup>4</sup>) and Triantafyllidis Dictionary (2007<sup>7</sup>)<sup>19</sup> *μπούγιο* derives from the It. *buio* ‘darkness’. This etymology does not satisfy the semantic criterion. On the contrary, according to our research, the word must come from the Ven. noun *bogio* (Boerio, 1856)/ *bojo* (Pizzati, 2007) [bójo], meaning ‘boiling, puff’ (cf. also ven. *boger/ bogir/ bugir* ‘to boil’ and *bujio* ‘boiled’). The loanword was adopted in MGr dialects as a neuter noun under the form *μπούγιο*, meaning ‘inflation, bulk’ (Ithaca, Kythira, Leukada, Paxoi).

### 5.1 Loanwords in *-ózos* from Greek nominal stems

Apart from the above examples, we found new loanblends derived by the addition of the suffix *-ózos* on Greek nominal stems of feminine nouns in *-a* or *-i*:

- (49) *ευλαβιόζος* (Naxos) < *ευλάβει(α)* ‘devoutness’ + *-ózos* ‘devout’

<sup>19</sup> The adjectives *μπουγιόζος* and *μπουγιόζικος* are not lemmatized in none of the above dictionaries.

(50) *τσινιόζος* (Cephalonia) < *τσίνι(α)* ‘obstinacy’ + *-ózos*  
‘willful’

(51) *μυταρόζος* (Othonoi, Korinthos) / *μ’ταρόζους* (Focida) < *μυτάρ(α)* ‘big nose’ + *-ózos*  
‘who has a big nose’

Some of the new formations are based on the stem of masculine nouns in *-os*, as:

(52) *τροπόζος* (Syros) < *τρόπ(ος)* ‘manners’ + *-ózos*  
‘who has very good manners’

(53) *θυμόζος* (Kythira) < *θυμ(ός)* ‘anger’ + *-ózos*  
‘very angry’

Some others are based on the stem of neuter nouns in *-i* or *-ma*:

(54) *χατιρόζος* (Kythira) < *χατίρ(ι)* ‘sake’ (< Turk. *hatır*) + *-ózos*  
‘who does many favors’

(55) *τσαλιμόζος* (Paxoi) < *τσαλίμ(ι)* ‘air and graces’ (< Turk. *çalım*) + *-ózos*  
‘who does airs and graces or what is done by airs and graces’

(56) *αιματόζος* (Kythira) / *ματόζος* (Leukada) < *αίματ(ος)*<sub>GEN</sub> ‘blood’ + *-ózos*  
‘full of blood, carmine’

The new formations are found mostly in the varieties of Ionian islands, Kythira and Cyclades, where the criterion of Thomason and Kaufmann’s scale (1988) is valid. In these varieties, the degree of exposure to the source language and the intensity of the language contact were especially high.

The morphological reanalysis of the Italian/ Venetian loanwords, which gave birth to the above new formations, was triggered by:

a) the large number of loanwords in *-oso* and the existence of certain pairs of loanwords with and without the morpheme (Weinreich, 1953 [1968<sup>2</sup>]: 31- 37; see also Anastasiadi-Symenonidi, 1994: 69-70). For example, *τσιριμόνια* ‘excessive politeness’ and *τσιριμονιόζος* ‘excessively polite’ coexist in Kythira,

These pairs help the speaker to identify a morpheme into the loanwords, to reanalyze it and later on, when the morpheme becomes productive, to use it in new word formation (cf. Capuz Juan Gómez, 1997: 85)<sup>20</sup>,

b) the semantic autonomy, which according to Moravcsik (1978), Field (2002) and Johanson (2002) facilitates the borrowing process. By the reanalysis of the loanwords into stems, it was easy for the speakers to extract the core meaning of the suffix ‘who/that has/presents a quantity or quality X’, when X is what the nominal stem expresses’,

<sup>20</sup> See also Anastasiadi-Symenonidi (1985: 91) about the productivity of the derivational loan suffix *-e* and Ralli (to appear) about the productivity of the loan suffix *-aro*. Both researchers argue that the coexistence of the suffixes with other etymological relative loanwords in the recipient language triggered the reanalysis of the loanwords into stems.

c) finally we argue that the reanalysis was induced by a main intra-linguistic factor, the property of Greek morphology to be stem based in that words consist of a bound element (cf. Ralli, to appear).

## 5.2 Constrains at the derivation of the new formations in *-ózos*

It is worth pointing out that the suffix *-oso* in the examples in all the above new formations is added to nominal stems<sup>21</sup>. Based on this, we disagree with Meyer (1895: 100) who etymologizes *ευλαβιόζος* from the adjective *ευλαβής* ‘devout’. In any case, this etymological proposal cannot explain the presence of [i] before the suffix. On the contrary we argue that it derives from the noun *ευλάβεια* ‘devoutness’. The orthographic simplification can be explained analogically to other loanwords in *-i-osos* (*\*ευλαβειόζος* > *ευλαβιόζος* // *ποντιλιόζος*, *τσινιόζος*, *τσιριμονιόζος* etc.).

Observing the examples (1) and (56), it is obvious that the new formations obey one main morphological constraint of the recipient language: the suffix *-ózos* is added only to the augmented allomorph of nouns in *-ma*. So we find *σωματ-όζος* and not *\*σωμ-όζος*.

Another significant observation is that the certain suffixation in MGr does not obey the constraint of the distinguishing lexical features of the stems: the suffix *-oso* shows preference for both stems of foreign origin (Italian, Venetian, Turkish) (see examples 50, 54, 55) and stems of Greek origin (see examples 49, 51, 52, 53, 56).

Further, in an effort to explain why this suffixation became productive in the MGr dialects, one may appeal to the fact that the suffixes *-ώδης* or *-ης*:

a) are [+ learnt] ones and

b) are characterized by morphological problems in the formation of certain cases of the singular and plural (for example, *\*ευλαβή άτομο<sub>NOM.SG</sub>* instead of *ευλαβές άτομο<sub>NOM.SG</sub>*, *\*σωματώδη άντρα άτομο<sub>GEN.SG</sub>* instead of *σωματώδους άντρα<sub>GEN.SG</sub>*) and by the lack of discrimination between the masculine and feminine forms (cf. Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, 1985: 100-101)<sup>22</sup>.

Consequently, the significance of the above suffixed new formation is not expressed by other already existing words of the recipient language and so the suffixation does not function against Aronoff’s blocking constraint (1976: 43-44).

We finally observe that the core significance of the loan suffix is maintained. The new formations express in a positive or pejorative way that somebody or something has the quality or quantity of the basis. The new formations have also active (see example 53) and passive readings (see example 55), while the referent is mostly an animate one but also an inanimate one (see example 56).

## 6 The suffix *-ózos* in Common Modern Greek

Adjectives in *-ózos* in Common Modern Greek are very few. Their group consists of just very few members (*βιτσιόζος*, *γουσιόζος*, *καπριτσιόζος*<sup>23</sup>, *κομπλιμεντόζος*<sup>24</sup>, *μπριόζος*, *σπιρτόζος*,

<sup>21</sup> About the constraints in the derivation, see Ralli (2005: 154: 157).

<sup>22</sup> Anastasiadi-Symeonidi (1985: 100-101) argues at the same way, explaining the establishment of the suffix *-e* in Koine Greek.

<sup>23</sup> This adjective is not lemmatized in Babiniotis Dictionary.

<sup>24</sup> This adjective is not lemmatized in Triantafyllidis Dictionary,

*σκαμπρόζος*, *φουριόζος* and *φασαριόζος*<sup>25</sup>) and one noun (*μαφιόζος*), which is used both as an adjective and as a noun in the donor language. All the adjectives and the one noun in *-ózos* introduced in Common MGr refer mainly to animate referents. Note also that all of them form secondary adjectives in *-íkos*, such as *γουστόζικος*, *φουριόζικος*, *φασαριόζικος*, *μαφιόζικος*, which refer also to inanimate referents.

## 7 Conclusions-Further hypotheses

The suffix *-ózos* was inserted in Greek through Venetian and Italian loanwords. Their insertion must have occurred after the 13th c. and their accommodation depended on the properties of the recipient language. We found examples in many regions all over Greece, but mostly in the Ionian islands, Kythira and the Cyclades, where language contact with the donor languages was very intense. In these varieties, the loan suffix proved to be quite productive, as a significant number of new adjectives – positive or pejorative – was found. The loanblends are derived only from nominal stems from both foreign and native origin, maintaining the core meaning of the loan suffix.

Apart from the examination of this suffix, we believe that this paper opens new avenues for further research on lexical borrowing, loan suffixation and language change in general. It will be particularly interesting, for example, to compare the productivity of the loanwords in *-ózos* and *-átos*, both forming adjectives, in order to check whether they both form compounds and derivatives and whether they can be both combined with the same derivational suffixes. For example, we find that both can be secondarily combined with the nominal suffix *-ia* and the verbal *-evo* (i.e. *αμορουζιά* ‘love’, *αμορουζέομαι* ‘feel love’ and *βαρβατιά* ‘the goat’s bad odor due to orgasm’, *βαρβατεύω* ‘for animal, feel libido’). Note, however, that while compounds can be formed using adjectives in *-átos* (*αφρατολέμονο* ‘a kind of lemon with fluffy skin’ < *αφράτος* ‘fluffy’, *βαρβατότραγος* ‘a stallion goat’ < *βαρβάτος* ‘not gelded animal’), the same does not hold with *-ózos*.

Consequently, this paper not only showcases an excellent example of modern research on the etymology of MGr dialects, but can also offer valuable insights into the theory of language contact and language change, testing many further theoretical issues and hypotheses.

## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. Y. 2007. Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic perspective. In *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology*, ed. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Robert M. W. Dixon, 1-66. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν 1933-. *Ἱστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς, τῆς τε κοινῶς ὀμιλουμένης καὶ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων*, τ. 5 (*Α-δαχτυλωτός*). Ἀθῆναι: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν. (= Historical Dictionary of the Academy of Athens).
- Αναστασιάδη-Συμεωνίδη Άννα. 1985. –ε ένα νέο επίθημα στη ΝΕ. *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* 5: 89-110.
- Αναστασιάδη-Συμεωνίδη Άννα. 1994. *Νεολογικός δανεισμός της Νεοελληνικής*. Θεσσαλονίκη.

<sup>25</sup> This adjective is not lemmatized in Triantafyllidis Dictionary.

- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Anna and Katerina Chatzopoulou. 2012. "Why does a language borrow suffixes? The case of Greek and Latin. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, ed. Katerina Chatzopoulou, Alexandra Ioannidou and Suwon Yoon, 505-516 (available at [https://webshare.uchicago.edu/users/cchatzop/Public/42\\_Anastassiadi\\_Chatzopoulou\\_KEDIT\\_ED\\_pp12\\_492.pdf?uniq=p10129](https://webshare.uchicago.edu/users/cchatzop/Public/42_Anastassiadi_Chatzopoulou_KEDIT_ED_pp12_492.pdf?uniq=p10129)).
- Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph No. 1. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Boerio, Giuseppe. 1856. *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*. Venezia: Tipografia di Giovanni Cecchini.
- Βυζάντιος, Στέφανος. 1874<sup>3</sup>. *Λεξικὸν τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς Ἑλληνικῆς Διαλέκτου μεθρημηνευμένης εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ γαλλικόν*. Αθήναι: Ἀνδρέας Κορομηλάς. (= Byzantios Dictionary)
- Capuz Juan Gómez. 1997. Towards a Typological Classification of Linguistic Borrowing (Illustrated with Anglicisms in Romance Languages). *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 10: 81-94.
- Cortelazzo, Manlio and Paolo Zolli. 1999<sup>2</sup>. *Il nuovo etimologico. DELI – Dizionario Etimologico della lingua Italiana*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Cortelazzo, Manlio. 2007. *Dizionario Veneziano della lingua e della cultura popola nel XVI secolo*. Padova: La Linea Editrice.
- Ernout, Alfred. 1949. *Le adjectives latins en -osus e en -ulentus*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fanciullo, F. 2008. Gli italianismi del neogreco. *L'Italia Dialettale* 69:1-41.
- Field, Fredrick W. 2002. *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability. In *Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes*, ed. Thomas Stolz, Dik Bakker and Rosa Salas Palomo, 43-62. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26: 210 – 231.
- Johanson, Lark. 2002. *Structural Factors in Turkish Language Contacts*. Richmond: Routledge - Curzon.
- Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη. 2007<sup>7</sup>. *Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής*. Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών. (= Triantafyllidis Dictionary)
- Kramer, Johannes. 1998. Von der 'Lex Wackernagel' zur 'Lex Clarysse'. Zur Akzentuierung der Latinismen im Griechischen. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 123: 129- 134.
- Κριαράς, Εμμανουήλ. 1969-. *Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημόδους γραμματείας (1100-1669)*, τόμ. Α-ΙΗ (Α-ραβέντι). Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Lehmann, Manu. 1977<sup>5</sup>. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: Beck.
- McMahon, April. 1994. *Understanding language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Magni, Elisabetta. 2001. Questioni di semantica nella morfologia derivazionale dell' italiano: il suffisso -oso fra sincronia e diacronia. *Archivio Glossologico Italiano* 86: 3-24.
- Matras, Yaron. 2010. Contact, Convergence and Typology. In *The Handbook of Language Contact*, ed. Raymond Hickey, 66- 85. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Matras, Yaron. 2011. Universals of structural borrowing. In *Linguistic Universals and Language Variation*, ed. Peter Siemund, 204- 233. Berlin/ New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1921 [1965], 1936 [1952]. *Linguistique historique et Linguistique générale*. 2 vol. I (1965). Paris: Champion, II (1952). Paris: Klincksieck.
- Meyer, Gustav. 1895. *Neugriechische Studien. IV. Die Romanischen Lehnworte im Neugriechischen*. Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Band CXXXII. Wien.
- Montermini, Fabio. 2001. The unitary base hypothesis and the semantics of word-formation rules. In *First international workshop on generative approaches to the lexicon (April 26-28, 2001, Geneva)*, ed. Pierrette Bouillon and Kyoko Kanzaki, 26-28 Genève: École de Traduction et d'interprétation.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Universals of Language Contact. In *Universals of human language, vol. 1 Method and Theory*, ed. Joseph H. Greenberg et al., 93-122. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Μπαμπινιώτης, Γεώργιος. 2012<sup>4</sup>. *Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*. Αθήνα: Κέντρο Λεξικολογίας. (= Babiniotis Dictionary)
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Language Contact: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ralli, Angela. 2011. Morphology in language contact: verbal loanblend formation in Asia Minor Greek (Aivaliot). In *Morphologies in contact (Studia Typologica)*, ed. Thomas Stolz, Martine Vanhove, Hitomi Otsuka and Aina Urdze, 185- 201. Berlin: Akademie Verlag,
- Ralli, Angela (to appear). Verbal loanblends in Griko and Heptanesian: a case study of contact morphology. *Italia Dialettale* 2012 (available at [http://www.academia.edu/2431388/Verbal\\_loanblends\\_in\\_Griko\\_and\\_Heptanesian\\_a\\_case\\_study\\_of\\_contact\\_morphology](http://www.academia.edu/2431388/Verbal_loanblends_in_Griko_and_Heptanesian_a_case_study_of_contact_morphology))
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Περιδης, Μάρκος, Π. 1878. *Λεξικόν Ἑλληνοϊταλικόν*. Τόμος Α'. Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Βιβλιοπωλεῖον Σ. Κ. Βλαστοῦ-Τύποις «Μέλλοντος». (= Peridis Dictionary)
- Pizzati, Lodovico. 2007. *Venetian-English. English-Venetian. When in Venice do as the Venetians*. Bloomington/ Milton Keynes: Author House.
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language*. New York: Harcourt.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1994. *Morfologia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Tekavčić, Pavao. 1980. *Grammatica storica dell'italiano* vol. 3. Lessico. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Thomason, Sarah. 2001. *Language contact. An introduction*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Trapp, Erich. 1994. *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität, besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, Bände 1- 7 (Α-ταρχευτικός). Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953 [1968<sup>2</sup>]. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Whitney, William D. 1881. On mixture in language. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Association* 12:1-26.