

On the Borrowability of Evaluative Markers and Categories: Insights from Asia Minor and Italiot Greek

Dimitra Melissaropoulou, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece & IMS-FORTH

Abstract

This paper addresses borrowability of evaluative morphology in systems that have evolved under intense contact settings. Data are drawn from Modern Greek dialects that have evolved under different contact settings, that is Italiot Greek in contact with Italo-Romance and Asia Minor Greek in contact with Turkish. Interestingly, borrowability of evaluatives varies inter-dialectally and cannot be presupposed by or be accounted for only in terms of intense long-lasting contact. The findings demonstrate that evaluative markers, similarly to other derivational elements, undergo full structural adaptation, when transferred to recipient languages, conforming to the morphological tendencies of those systems. However, borrowability is shown to be also strongly influenced by properties of the model language, particularly frequency of use, semantic opacity, and the absence of a one-to-one mapping between form and meaning. Additionally, morphophonological equivalence facilitates the reinterpretation of evaluative functions in existing elements or the establishment of paradigmatic relations between native and borrowed markers, as evidenced in Asia Minor Greek and Griko respectively. Moreover, sociolinguistic factors, such as the notion of salience is proposed to also play an active role in the potential (non-)transfer, lending further support to combinatorial approaches that integrate structural and social mechanisms into accounts of contact-induced change. These dynamics are not specific to evaluative morphology nor indicative of an extra-grammatical status but are instead language-dependent phenomena likely to extend across grammatical domains.

Keywords: *borrowability, evaluative morphology, diminution, augmentation, contact settings, Modern Greek nouns.*

1 Introduction

The extent to which different grammatical categories and domains can be borrowed has been vigorously debated over the past century, largely because this issue is central to understanding language change and the constraints shaping structural evolution along with the fact that in scholarly research contact between languages and/or varieties has been recognized as the norm, while zero-contact settings as the exception. Even though, traditionally, opinions on what can/cannot change owing to contact varied, the well-established view nowadays is summarized under the ‘anything goes hypothesis’, established by the large-scale study of Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and Thomason (2001: 11), predicting that any type of contact-induced change is probable given the appropriate circumstances.

The seminal work by Thomason and Kaufman as a whole led to the recentralization of contact in linguistic studies actualized via a respectable number of publications aiming at shedding light on different contact scenarios and at offering generalizations on the nature and the effects of contact and, of course, on the relevant weight of structural vs. sociolinguistic parameters of contact-induced transfer and change. This is the direction also taken by most recent publications, where the need for a holistic combinatorial approach integrating both social

and structural parameters (see among others, Hickey 2010; Grant 2020 and references therein) is stressed explicitly.

Narrowing down to morphology, in the relevant literature, the different morphological domains are not thought to be equally prone to contact-induced change. Derivational morphology is considered to be subject to transfer more easily and thus more frequently than inflectional one (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 74–75), a divergence often attributed to differences in structural integration, functional load, and system-internal dependencies. However, despite extensive research on inflection—both within individual languages and cross-linguistically—there is far less work on derivation, and even less on evaluative morphology.

Based on the above, this paper addresses borrowability in the domain of evaluative morphology, emphasizing nominal diminution and augmentation, drawing data from Modern Greek dialects that have evolved under different contact settings to examine whether and if so to what extent contact is a favorable parameter for the transfer of evaluative markers and/or categories. To this end, Modern Greek varieties evolving under different contact settings, i.e., Asia Minor Greek spoken in the areas of Pontus and Cappadocia on the one hand, while Italiot varieties in long-lasting contact with Italo-Romance on the other, are put under scrutiny.

The research questions we address for the purposes of this paper are as follows: What is the role of contact in the transfer of evaluative morphology? Which parameters seem to affect borrowability of evaluative morphology in intense contact settings? Are there peculiarities to be considered when it comes to the borrowability of evaluative markers and/or categories?

The article is organized as follows: in section 2 basic premises on the borrowability of derivational categories and morphological integration are summarized, while in section 3 a brief presentation of the historical and sociolinguistic background of our case study is offered, followed by the presentation of data emphasizing the (non-)borrowed diminutive markers and their characteristics in the case studies under scrutiny. In section 5, discussion, specific claims and proposals are put forward, asserting that frequency of use and the properties of the elements under question in the model language (transparency, one meaning-one form mapping or the lack thereof) along with morpho-phonological equivalences with the replica system could have an effect on the borrowability of evaluative matter and/or pattern morphology. Moreover, socio-linguistic parameters, that is salience and social indexation carried by the elements under question, is proposed to play an additive role in the potential (non-)transfer aligning with the combinatorial approaches, treating both structural mechanisms, and that social parameters, as more adequate accounts of contact-induced change. The article ends with major conclusions and a list of references.

2 Basic premises

Contemporary research on language contact generally asserts that different morphological subsystems vary in how readily they can be borrowed. In particular, derivational morphology is thought to be more easily and therefore more frequently transferred across languages than inflectional morphology (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 74–75; Weinreich 1953: 31–33). This distinction reflects both the differing roles these components play in grammatical organization and the varying degrees of contact intensity required for the actualization of transfer of bound morphology (see Moravcsik 1978; Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Field 2002; Wohlgemuth 2009 for discussion and proposed hierarchies).

Narrowing down to evaluative morphology, Matras (2007) asserts that diminutives tend to be easily borrowed cross-linguistically, while in a similar vein following Grandi (2011) and Mutz (2015) argue that evaluative categories tend to be renewed and borrowing, along with grammaticalization and refunctionalization, are the main driving forces towards this direction.

Moreover, Seifart (2013, 2015), drawing on data by the AfBo database, argues that within derivational morphology, categories such as adjectivizers, diminutives, and nominalizers are especially susceptible to borrowing. Conversely, Gardani (2020: 116), drawing on Dressler's (1989, 1997) distinction within Natural Morphology between prototypical and non-prototypical derivation and extending the logic used to explain the differing borrowability of inherent versus contextual inflections, proposes the following empirically testable hypothesis: prototypical derivational affixes and/or categories are expected to be more readily borrowed than non-prototypical ones, including agent-noun formation, action-noun formation, and diminutives.

Aligning with the established line of research (Gardani 2020: 102), and focusing specifically on derivation, we assume that genuine transfer of derivational material occurs when suffixes—initially borrowed as part of full loanwords—come to be reanalyzed, due to their high frequency, systematic use, and sheer number, as independent, transparently meaningful forms. This reanalysis enables them to detach from the original loanwords and extend their use to native stems as well (1c). By way of illustration, consider the examples¹ under (1) showing the Turkish suffixal marker *-CI* has been integrated in Greek, attaching productively with native bases as well (1c):

- (1)
- | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | ka'fes
'coffee' | < Turk. | kahve/kayfe
'coffee' | (underived loan) |
| b. | kafe-'dzis
'coffee maker' | < Turk. | kahve-ci
'coffee maker (person)' | (loan derived in <i>-CI</i> ²) |
| c. | patoma-'dzis
'floor-tiler' | < Gr. | 'patoma
'floor' | (Greek base) |

Emphasizing, for the purposes of this paper, Modern Greek suffixal evaluative morphology, it is worth noting that Greek possesses a particularly rich system of evaluative formations (see Kallergi et al. 2023). Although cross-linguistically opinions on the position of evaluative morphology in grammar vary (for relevant discussion see Anderson 1992; Dressler and Merlini-Barbatesi 1992, 1994; Scalise 1988), Greek morphological evaluation is thought to form part of the word formation domain (Melissaropoulou and Ralli 2008) in that suffixes act as heads of their constructions, imposing specific selectional restrictions to the bases they combine with and being responsible for the realization of gender and the attachment to specific inflectional markers, non-identical with those of the corresponding bases.

¹ Nominal examples throughout the paper are cited in the nominative singular form, unless cited otherwise.

² Turkish displays two different types of harmonization processes: a. fronting harmony, that is the assimilation of a vowel with the vowel in the preceding syllable based on frontness and b. rounding harmony, that is the assimilation of a vowel with the vowel in the preceding based on roundedness. By way of illustration, *-CIK* displays the following possible realizations: *-cik*, *-çik*, *cık*, *-çık*, *-cük*, *-çük*, *-cuk*, *-çuk*. To this end, throughout the paper, all Turkish elements that are subject to harmonization are written with upper-case characters to indicate vowel harmonic changes and consonantal assimilations that are operative in Turkish.

To this end, a brief summary of the main characteristics of Greek evaluative formations in line with cross-linguistic generalizations and tendencies is in order. Aligning with other European languages (see Grandi 2002, 2015 for discussion), in Greek the same suffix can express both qualitative and quantitative aspects of evaluation (Melissaropoulou 2006, 2015; Efthymiou 2015, 2017). Nevertheless, all evaluative markers are not supposed to behave in a totally uniform way; some of them may differ in terms of prominence of qualitative vs. quantitative aspects of evaluation (Efthymiou 2023, 2024). The Greek language verifies and lends further support to the claims made by Klimaszewska (1983) asserting that positive evaluation is more characteristic for diminutives, while negative evaluation for augmentatives. By way of illustration, consider for example the Standard Modern Greek evaluative suffixes *-aci* and *-ara* which attach to nominal bases to form nominal evaluatives, denoting, the former diminution, referring refer both to a small and dear, favorite or beautiful baby as well (2a), while the latter augmentation, referring to a big and simultaneously not a pretty or well-shaped leg (2b).

(2)

- a. *-aci* : mo'ro > mo'r-aci
 'baby' 'baby.N-DIM'
- b. *-ara* 'podi > po'dara
 'leg' 'leg.N-AUGM'

Let us now turn to our case study, starting with a brief overview of the sociohistorical background of the varieties under scrutiny and their contact settings.

3 The dialects under scrutiny

3.1 Historical and sociolinguistic background

Cappadocian constitutes a dialectal enclave consisting of villages located in the provinces of Kayseri, Niğde, Nevşehir, Aksaray-*Gelveri and Prokopi (Urgup)*, in the former area of Asia Minor, today's central Turkey. The sociocultural conditions that prevailed in the area of the Greek-speaking communities of Cappadocia from the 11th century onwards, affected significantly the structure of the dialect, which developed for centuries in intense language contact with Turkish, on the one hand, and in (relative) isolation from the rest of the Greek-speaking areas of the west, on the other (see Dawkins, 1916; Janse forthcoming; Karatsareas, 2011; Manolessou, 2019). Unarguably, Cappadocian displays linguistic features that can be traced historically to earlier stages of the Greek language as well as many grammatical innovations, some of which are attributed to contact (see Dawkins 1916 among many others).

Due to the above-mentioned social, historical, and cultural settings, the dialect is often treated as a prototypical example of 'heavy borrowing' in terms of Thomason and Kaufman's borrowing scale, caused by 'overwhelming long-term cultural pressure' (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 50), a statement partly alluded to the well-known Dawkins's statement on Cappadocian that "[...] *the body ha[d] remained Greek but the soul ha[d] become Turkish [...]*", Dawkins (1916: 198).

Cappadocian was spoken in the area in circumstances of intense contact and bilingualism (asymmetrical or even regressive) until 1923, when Greece and Turkey exchanged

populations, following the signing of the Lausanne Convention. Hence, no native speakers of Cappadocian are reported to live in Turkey nowadays. After the exchange, Cappadocian speakers relocated to various parts of mainly Central and Northern Greece.

The Pontic dialect also evolved under circumstances of long-lasting contact with Turkish and was spoken in the area of today's Northwest Turkey roughly from the 12th century onwards³. Pontus, contrary to the Cappadocian-speaking area, including Pharasa and Silli, was never properly occupied by the Seljuks and was incorporated into the Ottoman Empire only in the mid-15th century (after the fall of Trebizond in 1461). Importantly, the survival of the empire acted more or less as a barrier against Islamization and in favour of the maintenance of a strong local identity (Bryer 1975), while Pontic dialectal features also attested in Early Byzantine and Late Medieval Greek provide evidence for the differentiation of the Pontic dialect before the Ottoman conquest (see Manolissou 2019: 34-40 for discussion and details).

Moreover, the linguistic and cultural dominance relations between the Greek and Turkish communities were heavy but not so heavy or intense as in the case of Cappadocia, since —apart from geographical factors which in some cases led to physical seclusion— Pontic communities were more numerous and more closely-knit than those of Cappadocia⁴. Thus, Pontic people managed to preserve their language ‘*with some success*’ (cf. Horrocks 2010: 398-399). In the case of Pontic thus, we cannot refer to ‘an excellent example of heavy borrowing – category 5’ as a result of overwhelming long-term cultural pressure causing significant disruption (cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 50), as Thomason and Kaufman classify Silliot, Cappadocian and Pharasiot (cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 74-76, 215; Thomason 2001: 70-71). Owing to its geographic vastness, the different Pontic communities are grouped into three different zones: a. the zone of Oinoi, b. the zone of Trebizond and c. the zone of Chaldia. The latter was thought of as the most influenced by Turkish, sharing also common characteristics with Pharasiot (Triantafyllides 1938 [1981]: 288).

Turning now to Italiot varieties, these are two dialectal enclaves spoken in Southern Italy; Griko in the area of Puglia, Salento (widely known as *Grecia Salentina*) and Greko in the area of Calabria (*Bovesia*). Being spoken for many centuries on an Italian ground (see Manolissou 2005, Squillaci 2017 and references therein for the different opinions with respect to their origin, i.e., Ancient Greek vs. Byzantine Greek), Italiot varieties evolved in contact and competed not only with Standard Italian (the language of school and media) but also with the local variety of Standard Italian (regional Italian) and the local Romance dialectal varieties, (*dialetti salentini* and *calabrese*) (see Profili 1985). In this multilingual setting, the local Romance varieties were/are equally available to all speakers of the areas, are used in everyday speech (street conversations, local commerce), namely enjoying covert prestige and limiting the sphere of their usage to family situations (Profili 1985; Katsoyannou 1999; Manolissou 2005).

Admittedly, the sociolinguistic status of these Greek-speaking enclaves varied over the centuries. Until the early 90s, several villages in Calabria were reported to be deserted (only in Galliciano and Bova, the dialect is thought to remain alive (Katsoyannou 1995), while in Puglia, the dialect seemed to be more resistant to attrition (nine Griko-speaking villages were reported, see Profili 1985), although it was confined mainly to people of advanced age. In

³ Pontus became independent in the 12th century and from the 13th till the 15th century it formed the Trebizond empire.

⁴ Following Augustinos (1992: 15), in the Greek populations of more densely inhabited western and northeastern coastal areas the popular traditions of Byzantine civilization survived longer.

recent decades, the dialects have experienced revitalization efforts having as a starting point their official recognition as minority languages (1999). The last two decades in particular, several activities have been initiated by the local communities and language activists, trying to establish an active role for these dialects in the local communities. Nevertheless, Griko and (especially) Greko are still in critical endangerment owing to migration, mass media and schooling probing mainly the standard form as the sole means of communication (for a detailed discussion see Manolessou 2005; Squillaci 2017).

Italiot varieties are thought to retain many archaisms, some of which are unique compared to other Modern Greek varieties, possibly due to the fact that communication between South Italy and the Greek mainland was interrupted during The Late Medieval period (before the 13th century, see Manolessou 2005), thus the dialects did not participate actively in late Medieval evolutions. Notwithstanding the common origin, Griko and Greko varieties evolved independently, displaying many similarities as well as some internal micro-variation⁵, which has not gone unnoticed (see Rohlf s 1977; Katsoyannou 1995; Karanastasis 1997; Squillaci 2017). Based on the above, for the purposes of this study, the two varieties are treated indeed as separate systems, displaying commonalities as well as peculiarities in the realization of diminution and augmentation.

3.2 Data

3.2.1 Asia Minor Greek in contact with Turkish

Zooming in the morphological process of diminution, Cappadocian displays a restricted inventory of diminutive markers. Among them, the suffix *-ok(k)o⁶/-op(p)o(n)* is in fact the only extremely productive diminutive marker, attaching to both animate and inanimate nominal bases of all grammatical gender values—when active in the different Cappadocian sub-varieties (see Janse forthcoming; Karatsareas 2011), either native or borrowed, and forms neuter nouns. It is a native diminutivizer of Medieval origin (for discussion and details on its different realizations the reader is referred to Simeonidis 1968; ILIK 2024 and references therein in the corresponding lemmata). Some indicative examples can be seen under (3) below:

(3)

-ok(k)o/-op(p)o(n)_{JN}

ku'lur k(u)lu'r-opo 'cruller.N-DIM'

ko'ritsi kori'ts-ok(k)o 'girl.N-DIM'

scilos/fci'li scil-opo 'dog.M/N-DIM'

A few other suffixes of limited productivity are also reported in the dialect; these are the following:

the diminutivizer *-ka/-kas*, which attaches to [+ human] bases denoting kinship and expresses endearment. Grammatical gender, when available in the different Cappadocian sub-varieties aligns with natural gender (sex). E.g.:

⁵ By way of illustration, the Greek fricative sound /θ/ is realized as /s/ in Bova, while as /t/ in Galliciano (Martino 1980: 321).

⁶ The form in *-ok(k)o* or *-ok(k)u* is attested mainly in the Phrasiot varieties.

(4)

-ka/-kas]_{M/F}

'ciris	'cir-kas	'father.M-DIM'
ta'ta(s)	ta'ta-kas/ta'ta-k:a	'god father.M-DIM'
'kaka	ka'ka-ka	'grandmother.F-DIM'

The suffix *-ka/-kas*, although argued by Symeonidis (1975: 403-147) to derive from a final *-k* conveying diminutive meaning that is traced in Turkic languages, is in fact a Medieval Greek diminutive suffix attested in examples like *'cirkas-ci'raka* 'dear father-dear mother'⁷.

Lastly, the suffix *-itsa* (and its variants *-idza*, *-itfa*) attaches strictly to feminine bases, mainly those denoting kinship and expresses endearment (see the examples under (5) below). It is a Medieval Greek marker of a contested or debatable upper Slavic origin (see Georgakas 1982; Moutsos 1986; Symeonidis 1995), and it usually appears to have acquired a lexicalized⁸ status (see also ILIK 2024).

(5)

-itsa]_F

'kaka	'grand mother'	ka'c-itsa	'grand mother.F-DIM'
'mana	'mum'	ma'n-itsa	'mother.F-DIM'

Interestingly, in Cappadocian the suffix *-utsiko* (and its variants *-udziko*, *-utfiko*, *-itsiko*, *-idziko*) –subject to intra-dialectal variation– is also in use attaching to adjectives and adverbs. However, diverging from other Modern Greek varieties, it conveys not only a diminutive, but also or better put mainly an intensifying meaning in Cappadocian. Some illustrative examples are provided under (6) below:

(6)

-utsiko]_{Adj/Adv}

ze'stos	ze'st-utsiko	'warm-DIM'
'prasino	prasi'n-itsiko	'green-DIM'
'aspro	a'spr-utsiko	'total white'
skot'kos	skot'k-utsiko	'very small/young'

Importantly, none of the occurring elements, although subject to phonological alternations⁹, are borrowed evaluative markers from Turkish.

In a similar vein, in Pontic a very restricted number of diminutive markers is reported to be in use. Among them *-opon* (and its variant *-oplon*) is thought of as was the case also for Cappadocian, the most productive and most typical diminutive suffix, attaching to all different types of bases that are susceptible to diminution (Koutita-Kaimaki 1984: 32). Some representative examples are provided under (7) below:

⁷ Following Georgakas (1982: 89), it possibly results from the suffix *-ici*, subject to morphological reanalysis.

⁸ As reported by Costakis (1964: 67) for Anaku and Mavrochalyvides and Kesisoglou (1960: 46) for the Cappadocian community of Axo, other diminutive suffixes like *-i* and *-itsa* have lost their diminutive meaning in the dialect and appear mostly in lexicalized formations.

⁹ Mavrochalyvidis and Kesisoglou (1960: 48) report on a tendency towards the appearance of *-itsiko* form when preceded by [e] or [i], while that of *-utsiko*, after [a] or [u], which should be put into further scrutiny.

(7)

-opon] _N		
pe'ði(n)	pe'ð-op(l)on	'kid.N-DIM'
ko'ridzi(n)	kor'dz-opon	'girl.N-DIM'
'fciilos	'fci'l-opon	'dog.M-DIM'

The following suffixes are also in use displaying, however, more restricted productivity, being subject to specific selectional restrictions¹⁰. These are mainly: a. the masculine marker *-idzos/-idzis* (8a), which selects only human [-feminine] bases and may also convey negative readings; b. the feminine marker *-idza*¹¹ (8b), attaching to [+feminine] bases; and c. the neuter suffix *-idzin* (8c), attaching to [-human] nouns and may also realize negative readings. The latter form is very often non-active in its diminutive meaning but totally lexicalized. All three forms could be viewed as one unique diminutivizer diverging in terms of grammatical gender value and inflectional class membership, that is displaying three allomorphs, whose distribution depends on the characteristics of the base. In terms of origin, although opinions expressed in the existing literature vary (not regarding its immediate Medieval origin but rather on its distant one, treating it either as a loan from Slavic or as deriving for the Medieval marker *-ikion*; for a thorough discussion on which, see Georgacas 1982: 57-58 and reference therein), there exists no doubt on its non-Turkish but rather older Medieval origin.

(8)

a. *-idzos/-idzis*]_M:

'anθropos	anθro'pi-dzis/os	'friend.M-DIM'
'ðævolos	ðævo'litsos	'devil.M-DIM'
pe'ði	pe'ð-idzis/os	'child.N-DIM'

b. *-idza*]_F:

ji'neka	jine'c-idza	'woman.F-DIM'
ekli'sia	ekli'si-dza	'church.F-DIM'

c. *-idzin*]_N:

maksi'larin	maksila'r-idzin	'pillow.N-DIM'
'provaton	prova't-idzin	'sheep.N-DIM'
'fciilos	'fci'l-idzin	'dog.M-DIM'

The Pontic dialect diverges, compared not only to Cappadocian but also to other peripheral Modern Greek dialects, in the formation of masculine diminutives (with the marker *-idzos/-idzis*) from [+human], masculine bases. There also occur very few diminutive forms in *-kas*, which are, however, very restricted in number since they only attach to bases denoting kinship, as in Cappadocian.

¹⁰ In Pontic the suffix *-uði(n)* (e.g., *la'γos* 'hare' > *la'γ-uðin* 'hare.M-DIM') is also traced, displaying, however, scarce productivity and appearing highly lexicalized in the attested formations.

¹¹ It is worth noting that in some Pontic sub-varieties (namely in Oinoi and Amisos) the suffix *-idza*]_F also attaches to neuter bases to form feminine diminutives ' *ðaxtilon*]_N 'finger' > *ðaxti'l-idzin*]_N (Chaldia) *ðaxti'l-idza*]_F (Oinoi) 'finger-DIM', a rare pattern in Greek that cannot be related to contact with Turkish and certainly calls for further investigation.

Lastly, the suffixes *-ikos* and *-idzikos* (and its variants *-idzikos*, *-udzikos*, *-udzikos*), similarly to Cappadocian, are also in use in Pontic for the diminutivization of adjectives (some adjectival pronouns) and adverbs, the latter conveying also an intensifying meaning. Some representative examples follow under (9) and (10) below:

(9)

- 'ikos]_{Adj/Adv}

ka'bosos	kabo's-ikos	'some-DIM'
mi'kros	mi'kr-ikos	'small/young-DIM'

(10)

-idz/zikos/-'udz/zikos]_{Adj/Adv}

'jeros	je'r-idzikos	'old-DIM'
mi'kros	mi'kr-idzikos (Chaldia)	'small/young-DIM'
	mi'k-udzikos (Oinoi, Trebizond)	'small/young-DIM'

ko'dos	ko'd-idzikos	'short in height-INTENS.'
psi'los	psi'l-idzikos	'thin-INTENS'

As can be deduced from the above, no matter the intense and long-lasting contact settings, no diminutive affixal marker has been replicated from Turkish to the Asia Minor Greek varieties of Cappadocia and Pontus.

3.2.2 Italiot varieties in contact with Romance

Turning now to the Italiot varieties, the picture is quite divergent. Starting with Griko, the most productive diminutive markers in use are as follows:

the well-known and most typical inherited Greek diminutivizer, that is *-aci*, is in use in the dialect, in the form *-a(t)f*¹², attaching mainly to neuter nouns in *-i*, both native and loan. Some illustrative examples follow under (11) below:

(11)

-a(t)f]_{iN}

a'dzari	adza'r-a(t)f	'fish.N-DIM'
mar'tedqi	marte'dq-a(t)f	'hammer.N-DIM'

The suffix *-udqi* is among the most productive diminutivizers in the dialect, attaching to masculine and neuter nouns in *-o* (corresponding to Modern Greek in nouns *-os*, and adjectives). Although formally close to other Romance diminutive suffixes (see below), it is a marker of Greek origin, deriving from the Medieval Greek suffix *-οῦλλιν*¹³ (see Rohlfs 1977: 172). Some representative examples can be seen under (12) below:

¹² The intervocalic palatal [c] is either subject to velar fronting (that is realized as [tʃ]) or most often deleted in Griko.

¹³ In both Italiot varieties under scrutiny the well-known phenomenon of the retroflex realization of *-dq-* deriving from (the Latin) *-ll-* in the dialects of extreme Southern Italy (also in Campania and Basilicata) is attested not only in loan elements (words and/or suffixes) but also generalized in native words (see Rohlfs 1977: 57 for comments and discussion).

(12)

-uđđi] _N		
'anemo	ane'm-uđđi	'wind.M-DIM'
'tserato	tsera't-uđđi	'corn.N-DIM'
xlo'ro	xlo'r-uđđi	'green, not dry-DIM'

The feminine suffix *-edđa* attaches to feminine nominal and adjectival bases, displaying also an affective meaning (see examples under (13)). Notwithstanding its formal proximity with the former suffixal marker, *-edđa* is not an inherited Greek but a loan Romance dialectal marker (with an identical form corresponding to the Italian *-ello/a* (< Latin *-ellum*)).

(13)

-edđa] _F		
'ornita.F	orni't-edđa	'hen.F-DIM'
'çera.F	çe'r-edđa	'hand.F-DIM'
'xlori.F	xlo'r-edđa	'green, not dry-F.DIM'

Nevertheless, what is worth noting is that when it comes to adjectival bases subject to diminutivization, while the masculine and neuter gender combine with *-uđđi*, the feminine form attaches to *-edđa* (Rohlf's 1977:164), becoming its corresponding feminine diminutive form. In our view, phonological accommodation of the Italiot Greek varieties towards the local Romance ones, in terms of replicating and generalizing the realization of geminate retroflex consonants in all environments, both native and loans, has resulted in the correspondence of a couple of evaluative markers acting as a paradigmatic group, corresponding to the two different gender values, that is feminine and neuter, although they are of a different origin. These are *-uđđi* and *-edđa* as can be seen in the examples under (14) below:

(14)

'afimo	af'i'm-uđđi	'ugly-DIM.M/N'	af'i'medđa	'ugly-DIM.F'
xlo'ro	xlo'r-uđđi	'green, not dry DIM.M/N'	xlo'r-edđa	'green, not dry-DIM.F'
ka'lo	ka'l-uđđi	'good/pretty DIM.M/N'	ka'l-edđa	'good/pretty-DIM.F'

This is a very nice example of an inherited and a borrowed marker entering into paradigmatic relations in the word formation domain.

Lastly, it should be mentioned that in two of the Griko speaking communities of Apulia, that is in the communities of Sternatia and Corigliano, the diminutive marker *-utfi*, (*-uzzi*), (examples under (15)) is also in use, expressing also endearment and pity. This marker has been integrated into the dialect from the dialectal Romance (*italiano meridionale*) suffix *-utso* (< *-uzzo*) (variant of the Italian *-uccio*¹⁴ (Merlini-Barbaresi 1994:286)), which is very common in the southern regions of Italy, as a result of the contact of Griko with the local Salentino dialect.

¹⁴ In Italian the suffix is argued to convey an affective or even pejorative rather than a literally diminutive meaning.

(15)

-utʃi]N

kri'a	kri-'utʃi	'ram.N-DIM'
'ʃiddo	'ʃi'ɖɖ-utʃi	'dog.M-DIM'

Similar but not identical both in terms of inventory and/or productivity, is the repository of diminutive markers in the dialect of Greko (di Calabria). Here, the diminutives in use are as follows:

To begin with, the suffix -'utʃi, mentioned just above, although of limited productivity in the area of Salento, is reported to be the most popular and productive diminutive marker in Calabria, (Rohlf's (1977: 171). It attaches mainly to masculine and neuter nouns in -o and -i, showing, however, increasing productivity. Some illustrative examples are shown under (16) below:

(16)

-utʃi]N

'andra	an'dr-utʃi	'man.M-DIM'
'riaci	ria'k ¹⁵ -utʃi	'stream.N-DIM'
ar'ni	ar'n-utʃi	'lamp.N-DIM'

The well-known and most typical inherited Greek diminutivizer has also the form -'atʃi in Greko, attaching mainly to neuter nouns in -i and forming neuter nouns. E.g.:

(17)

-atʃi]N

pe'di	pe'd-atʃi	'child.N-DIM'
pu'ɖɖi	pu'ɖɖ-atʃi	'bird.N-DIM'

The neuter inherited suffix -uɖɖi is also in use in the dialect, attaching mainly to masculine and neuter nouns in -o. Some indicative examples are shown under (18) below:

(18)

-'uɖɖi]N

'sakko.M	sa'kkuɖɖi	'bag.M-DIM'
'ðendro.N	ðen'druɖɖi	'tree.N-DIM'

In Greko, contrary to Griko, the corresponding inherited feminine form, namely -uɖɖa (< Greek -οῦλα) is also in use, attaching to feminine nouns (both common and proper to form hypocoristics in the latter case). By way of illustration consider the examples under (19) below:

¹⁵ The sounds [c] and [k] are in allophonic relation in Modern Greek and its dialectal varieties; their distribution depends on the [+/- frontness] of the following vowel.

(19)

-uḍḍa] _F		
kar'dia	kar'd-uḍḍa	'heart.F-DIM'
'mana	ma'n-uḍḍa	'mum.F-DIM'
'perdika	perdi'k-uḍḍa	'partridge.F-DIM'

Moreover, similarly to Griko, the Romance loan diminutivizer *-edḍa*, is in use, attaching to feminine nominal and adjectival bases, conveying also an affective meaning. E.g.:

(20)

-edḍa] _F		
alu'pu	alupu'd-edḍa	'fox.F-DIM'
mi'ci	mi'c-edḍa	'small/young.F-DIM'

Lastly, the suffix *-'udi*, an inherited Greek diminutivizer from the Hellenistic and Medieval *-οὔδιον*, combines with adjectival bases to realize mitigation. Some indicative examples can be seen under (21) below:

(21)

- 'udi] _{ADJ}		
'aspro	a'sprudi	'white-dim'
'mavro	ma'vrudi	'black-dim'

Summing up, in both Italiot varieties, apart from the inherited Greek there occur also loan Romance diminutive markers. Interestingly, the model languages, that is all standard, regional Italian and the local Romance dialects, diverge in their morphological structure compared to the inherited Greek one, in that they are two gender systems, whose evaluative markers are generally sensitive to the grammatical gender value of the base, thus evaluative formations, generally tend to preserve the gender of the base leading to proposals in favor of the existence of an intermediate domain in the organization of grammar between inflection and word formation, hosting evaluative morphology (Scalise 1988). As can be seen in the examples under (22) below, the Italian diminutive markers *-etto*, (22a) *-ino* (22b) and the regional *-uccio* (22c), attach to different bases retaining the grammatical gender value of the corresponding bases and select the appropriate inflectional suffixes for this grammatical gender value (when non-identical to the most typical ones, that is *-o* for masculines and *-a* for feminines).

(22)

a. *-ino/a*

gatto	gattino	'kitten.M-DIM'
tazza	tazzina	'cup.F-DIM'
mano	manina	'hand.F-DIM'

b. *-etto/a*

cane	cagnetto	'dog.M-DIM'
borsa	borsetta	'purse.F-DIM'

c. -uccio/a

casa	casuccia	‘house.F-DIM’
zio	ziuccio	‘uncle.M-DIM’

On the contrary, in the varieties under scrutiny, the replicated diminutive markers are in perfect alignment with the native evaluative and derivational markers in general, that is they function as heads of their constructions, in that they bear a specific gender value and inflection class membership, which are transmitted to the derived formations (see Ralli 2005 [2022] for Greek). For example, the suffix *-uccio* has been integrated into both Griko and Greko as *-ut/i*, with a specific grammatical gender value, that is not subject to change depending on the gender of the base and a specific neuter inflectional class marker that is *-i*, in a similar vein to all native, not only diminutive but also derivational operative markers (see examples under (15) and (16) above).

Importantly, all attested diminutive markers bear either a feminine or a neuter gender value, which aligns perfectly with the inherited Greek tendency for the preference of specific gender values in diminutive morphology, (where the neuter is the most probable one, while the masculine the least probable, see Daltas 1985 for discussion) even though, the model languages have no neuter, while the masculine value is equally available.

The question that naturally arises is why in the Asia Minor Greek varieties, despite the intense contact settings and the—extensive - even regressive in some cases—bilingualism, no replication of diminutive markers was traced, while, on the other side of the Greek mainland, that is in Italo-Greek varieties a good number of Romance markers seems not only to have penetrated into the varieties but also to have entered into paradigmatic relations with native diminutive markers. Could the contrastive investigation of these two different dialectal enclaves shed light on the parameters and perhaps the peculiarities of both structural and sociolinguistic nature, to be taken into account when it comes to the borrowability of evaluative markers and/or categories? This is what next section will try to address.

4 Discussion

Our data set shows that borrowability of evaluatives varies inter-dialectally and cannot be directly linked to or be accounted for only in terms of intense long-lasting contact which is the (more or less) common denominator/basis in all investigated case studies. In other words, intense contact settings are a necessary but not a sufficient precondition for the actualization of transfer even in the domain of derivational evaluation which is thought of as more susceptible to change compared to inflection at least. From this viewpoint, the anything goes hypothesis, although theoretically possible and true (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 14; Thomason 2001: 695), is dependent in its actualization on other more specific parameters.

Interestingly, what seems to be missing in the case of Asia Minor Greek dialects is the systematic transfer of diminutive markers, albeit being a strong cross-linguistic tendency in affix borrowing. In an effort to account for the occurring divergence, the parameter of typological and/or structural incompatibility among the pairs of model languages cannot provide plausible explanation since, despite the genetic and typological incompatibility between the Greek dialects and Turkish, the latter is a highly suffixing language both generally and regarding word formation. From this viewpoint, no real incompatibility is at play as regards the coinage of new words. Moreover, other derivational suffixes (especially nominalizers and

adjectivizers on which see Kyranoudis 2009; Melissaropoulou 2025) have been replicated to Asia Minor Greek, providing evidence against the influence of some strictly structural general parameter, acting as an inhibiting factor in the replication of evaluatives.

In this vein, a thorough analysis of both the sociolinguistic settings of the case study under scrutiny and the properties of the specific diminutive markers and their function in the model language might prove particularly enlightening. Emphasizing the properties of diminutive markers first, what we assume should be scrutinized is the inventory and their functions in the model language along with their frequency of use.

Truly, the Turkish language displays a repository of diminutivizers as shown in the examples under (23):

(23)

-CAğIz:	kadın ‘woman’	kadın-cağız	‘poor dear woman’
	çocuk ‘child’	çocuk-çağız	‘poor dear child’
-CA:	küçük ‘small’	küçük-çe	‘rather small’
-CIK:	kedi ‘cat’	kedi-cık	‘cute little cat’
	kitap ‘book’	kitap-çık	‘little book, pamphlet’

(Göksel and Kersake 2005; Lewis, 2000)

Among them, *-CAğIz* attaches primarily to animate nouns, expressing endearment and/or pity, rather than smallness, while *-CA* attaches to adjectival bases, to reduce their intensity, being much less common or productive. Lastly the marker *-CIK*¹⁶, is the relatively most productive diminutivizer, showing variation in the realization of evaluative readings; It attaches to both proper and common nouns, as well as adjectives and expresses smallness, with recursive application possible. Although it is the most productive suffix, it shows some peculiarities in that it not only displays different morpho-phonological properties but also different readings depending on the grammatical category of the base it attaches to. Namely, no stem change is attested when combined with nouns. On the contrary when attached to adjectives, both stem alternations (final consonant deletion, e.g. *küçük* > *küçü-çük* ‘small-DIM’, vowel epenthesis e.g., *az* > *azı-cık* ‘little.DIM’, stress changes on which see Tietze 2016) and variation in the realization of evaluative meanings are attested that is either a diminutive or an intensifying one.

However, none of them is reported to be of high productivity or displaying a somewhat predictable distribution or to be typical of certain areas as is the case in other languages (e.g. Italian and Greek). Following Ketrez and Aksu-Koç (2009: 282) the use of diminutives is infrequent in Turkish adult speech, such that it affects significantly the acquisition of diminutive morphology (and hypocoristics) in Turkish child speech¹⁷. Namely, stem changes,

¹⁶ Türk (2020) has argued in favour of the existence of two homophonous suffixes, one with a diminutive and another with an intensifying reading. Nevertheless, in either perspective the diverging behaviour of homophonous elements could have a negative effect on contact-induced transfer due to lack of one-to-one mapping.

¹⁷ As noted by Ketrez and Aksu-koç (2009: 292) in Cypriot Turkish, acquisition of diminutive morphology is earlier compared to Standard Turkish, being related to the more frequent use of diminutives in the adult speech and may be to the linguistic and cultural contact with the Cypriot-Greeks. Interestingly, however, Terkourafi (2004), has asserted that Cypriot Greek has less diminutives than the mainland Modern Greek. This observation was interpreted by the authors as a possible instance of mutual accommodation between the two varieties. However, as noticed by Melissaropoulou (2006, 2026) this is a recurring phenomenon in Modern Greek dialects and may be related to other issues discussed in this paper such as salience and the realization of local identity.

variation in stress patterns and various conflicting meanings result in added complexity and pose a challenge in the acquisition of the marker. More particularly, based on data from a longitudinal study Ketzrez and Aksu-Koç (2009) show that, although as expected, children produce the diminutive that is used more often in the adult speech, the percentage of nominal stems conveying diminutive markers in mother's speech is very low (only 2.1%).

Expanding this line of thought in bilingual settings, we propose that the poor input, i.e., the low frequency along with the peculiarities on the formal properties of the most productive marker, which is not transparently connected with one and only concrete evaluative meaning (treated as prototypical), thus the strongest candidate, does not act as a facilitating factor for the transfer of this marker as a whole in the replica systems and its subsequent detachment and adaptation as an active evaluative marker. Generalizing, what our data seem to suggest is that the frequency of use and the properties of the elements under question in the model language could have a strong impact on the borrowability (see also Backus 1996, 2014) of evaluatives, even in intense contact settings.

Furthermore, Asia Minor Greek dialects displayed their own inherited diminutive markers which were/are strongly associated with the specific areas. This yields two important consequences; firstly, even though it is a well-established assumption that existing evaluative categories and/or markers tend to be renewed by various means, among which borrowing (see among other Grandi 2011), there was no categorical, lexical, or morphological lacuna that would have created an immediate need to fill a gap within the category. Thus, no actual structural gap was there to further enhance a potential transfer.

On the contrary, in the case of augmentation, there was a morphological gap, lying in the absence of pure inherited augmentatives in the Cappadocian varieties. This lack was due to the fact that, at the time of separation, Medieval Greek had not yet developed augmentative suffixal markers, the latter appearing only after the 12th century, that is after the separation of Cappadocian from the rest of Greek-speaking (Byzantine) world (see Melissaropoulou and Manolessou 2010; Melissaropoulou 2016 for relevant discussion). Crucially, neither did the dominant Turkish language display an inventory of augmentative markers. Nevertheless, Cappadocian replicated the available grammatical pattern of partial reduplication from Turkish (following, however, a more idiosyncratic path for details and a theoretical analysis on which see Bağrıaçık and Janse (2013)) to realize an augmentative function, that of adjectival and adverbial intensification. Some illustrative examples are shown under (24) below:

(24)

'mavr(o)	'black'	'mas-mavro	'pitch-black'
ka 'l(o)	'good'	'kap-kalo	'very good'
'liyo	'little'	'lip- liyo	'very little'

On the contrary in Pontic, which fell under the Ottoman rule in the mid-15th century, native innovative augmentative formations made their appearance (Papadopoulos 1955:126) with the use of the markers *-os* or *-ala*. E.g.:

(25)

yar 'tali(n)	'eagle'	'γartal-os	'eagle-AUGM'
ko 'ritzi	'girl'	kori 'tz-ala	'girl-AUGM'

What can be deduced from the above, is that in Cappadocian, and contrary to Pontic, even though, no evaluative marker replication has taken place in the dialect, grammatical pattern

replication has occurred in order to fill a gap in the morphological realization of augmentation. This phenomenon aligns with the findings of the existing relevant literature, assuming that as regards grammatical pattern replication, replacement is more common in morphology than addition or reorganization of structure (Gardani, 2008: 22). However, it is worth noting that in the case of Cappadocian, even though no diminutive markers have been replicated, which would be seen as more easily anticipated, augmentative (intensifying) grammatical pattern replication has occurred.

Moreover, both Asia Minor Greek (AMG) varieties seem to have started assigning an extra intensifying meaning in the inherited diminutive markers *-itsikos/-utsikos* *-idzikos/-udzikos*. This innovation is not attested systematically in other Modern Greek dialectal varieties, to the best of our knowledge at least, calling, however, for further diachronic research. Cross-linguistically, it is attested in Latin (Petersen 1910: 440), or in Latvian (Rūķe-Draviņa 1959), seen, however, as a side effect of the subjective quantitative meaning of the base. In this vein, a first hypothesis we could formulate is that the expansion of the intensifying function of the productive marker *-CIK* may have also been facilitated by the phonological similarity with the existing Medieval adjectival diminutivizer *-itsiko(s)* *-utsiko(s)* *-idziko(s)* *-udziko(s)*, which is schematized under (26) below:

(26)

Turkish	küçük	[y'tʃyk]	küçü- <u>cük</u>	[ˈcy tʃydzyk]	‘thin-INTENS’
AMG		[psiˈlos]		[psiˈl- <u>itsikos/-idzikos</u>]	‘thin- INTENS’

Furthermore, the most productive markers (*-ok(k)o/-opo* for Cappadocian and *-opon* for Pontic) were/are traditionally associated with the specific areas, thus they are used as salient features, i.e., markers of local identity. Even nowadays, the average Greek speaker knows that if his/her co-speaker uses *-opon* in his/her speech, he/she must be of Asia Minor Greek or even Pontic origin.

In sociolinguistic research, the ability to recognize a variable, that is a feature, is usually referred to as salience, often connected to Labov’s work. Salience can be interpreted as ‘the property that allows a linguistic variable to be a marker’ (Rącz 2013: 23). Following Labov (2001), markers are recognizable by linguists and non-linguists, either consciously or unconsciously, and are thought of as salient and in terms of carrying social indexation (see Rącz 2013 among others for relevant discussion). In some cases, where the differences are very prominent and easily recognized, the variable could be seen as an extremely strong stereotype (see Rącz 2013: 23). In terms of diatopic variation, the salience of a geographic variable lies in its geographic indexation (same as social). Salience has been assigned great explanatory power within the frame of accounting for the causes of language change (see Trudgill (1986) and Kerswill and Williams (2002) for criticism). Nevertheless, studies on salience in relation to contact-induced change and borrowability of categories are relatively rare, while the previous definitions of salience were based mainly on phonological studies to diachronic language change.

Expanding this line of thought in our study, we propose that, apart from reasons related to the properties and the structure of the elements of the model language, the status of specific diminutives as markers or local stereotypes could also serve as a supportive factor in favour of their maintenance and against their replacement by a foreign marker. This is of no surprise at all, since this prevalence of certain diminutive suffixes in certain dialectal areas is an often-

referred phenomenon in the Greek dialectal landscape (see Melissaropoulou 2026), but also in other relevant literature (e.g. Italian, see Maiden and Parry 1997, Merlini Barbaresi 2004) lacking, however, support by some experimental or perceptual research, for Greek at least. For example, it is a recurrent phenomenon in Italian, since among the most prominent occurring diminutive markers, *-ino* prevails in the dialect of Tuscany, *-etto* in Venice and Lazio, while *-ello* in Southern Italy (see Merlini Barbaresi 2004: 283, 287 and references therein).

Indeed, and contrary to what was the case for inherited Greek diminutivizers in Asia Minor Greek, this is the case for Italiot Greek varieties, which, although retaining some of the most typical diminutive inherited Greek markers like *-a(ts)i* or *-uq̣di*, in both Salento and Calabria, loan evaluative markers have been replicated from the local Italo-Romance varieties. Unsurprisingly, the diminutive markers that have been replicated are the most typical and frequent in the local Italian dialects, and not the most frequently encountered and versatile Italian diminutive suffix, that is *-ino/a*. These are:

- a. *-ello* (in its dialectal form *-eq̣du*), which is the prevalent diminutive marker in Southern Italy, denoting often regional charm.
- b. *-uzzo* which is generally uncommon, but very frequent in the Southern Italian dialects.

What is important and should be kept in mind is that for Griko and Greko speakers the occurring linguistic setting is that of multilingualism, since the local Italian dialects and not the standard Italian, as reported by several sociolinguistic studies, were the basic means of everyday communication. Given that these markers were typical of the area, what seems to have been taken place is the transfer of elements that were part of their local linguistic identity as citizens of Southern Italy into their heritage language, that is Italiot Greek. Although on different grounds, since the speakers of Italiot varieties do not advocate a Greek identity, what seems to have occurred here, is the replication of the most typical, i.e., the most frequent and productive, thus in terms of geographical indexicality, the more salient, evaluative markers of their region, to Italiot Greek.

In a similar vein, the one and only extremely productive (Barbaresi 2004:287-8) augmentative marker *-one* (in its Romance dialectal form *-uni*) has also been transferred to the Italiot Greek varieties filling a lacuna (for further discussion on its origin and use in Modern Greek dialects see Katsouda 2017), in the suffixal repository of pure augmentatives, since, as already mentioned below, no native augmentative marker was inherited to Medieval Greek. Some illustrative examples can be seen under (27) below both for Griko and Greko:

(27)

Griko:	-una _M	'anemo	ane'm-una	'wind.M-AUGM'
		jineka	jine'k-una	'woman.F-AUGM'
Greko:	-uni _M	'liko	li'k-uni	'wolf.M-AUGM'
		am'beli	ambe'l-uni	'vineyard.N-AUGM'

In both varieties, the replicated augmentative marker bears a masculine grammatical gender value, aligning with the pattern of the model Romance dialects in which *-uni* is predominantly masculine. Nevertheless, following Rohlfs (1977: 172), in some rare cases, in Greko some feminine augmentative forms¹⁸ in *-una* are also in use (e.g. *fo'rada* > *fora'duna* 'mare.F-

¹⁸ The feminine form of the augmentative, that is *-ona* (e.g., *sorella* 'sister' > *sorell-ona* 'sister.F-AUGM'), is also rare in Standard Italian, where the masculine prevails for the majority of feminine bases as well.

AUGM', *ji 'neka* > *jine 'kuna* 'woman.F-AUGM'). It is worth noting that in all attested examples the bases susceptible to augmentation are [+animate] feminine bases ending in *-a*. Although, examples are few to allow for strong generalizations, what can be seen in the occurring forms is the prevalence of the natural gender of the referent also marked by a specific inflectional marker (*-a*) onto the augmentative formation, pointing probably the alignment of the natural and the grammatical gender value of the base, similarly to the Italian pattern.

Lastly, it should not go unnoticed that transfer of diminutive markers is also attested in other Modern Greek dialectal varieties that have evolved under contact settings, although not as long-lasting and intense, as the present case studies. By way of illustration consider the Heptanesian dialectal varieties, which have replicated diminutive markers (e.g. the suffix *-ino*). An exhaustive inter-dialectal study on the replication of evaluative markers and/or categories could offer useful insights on the different parameters affecting the borrowability of evaluative morphology.

5 Conclusions

To sum up, in this paper borrowability of evaluative markers was addressed based on the two Greek empirical case studies in contact with different languages. Our data revealed that evaluatives, when transferred to replica languages, adapt and align fully with the recipient system tendencies, in line with other derivational elements/categories. The frequency of use and the properties of the elements under question in the model language (especially the low transparency and lack of one meaning-one form mapping) are proposed to have a strong impact on their (non-)borrowability. Moreover, morpho-phonological equivalence seemed to enhance the transfer of evaluative functions in already existing elements even with a different evaluative reading (in the case of Asia Minor Greek) or to enhance the formation of paradigmatic relations between native and borrowed evaluative markers (in the case of Griko). Furthermore, sociolinguistic parameters, i.e., salience and geographical indexation, are proposed to play an additive role in the potential (non-)transfer aligning with the combinatorial approaches, treating both structural mechanisms and social parameters, as more adequate accounts of contact-induced change. This is not claimed, however, to occur only in evaluative morphology or to pose a question on its (extra-)grammatical status. In our view, it is very likely to occur in other grammatical domains and should be treated as a language dependent rather than a universal property. A thorough areal or even cross-linguistic study on the borrowability of evaluative markers and categories along with their status as indexical markers, i.e. acting as inhibitors or accelerators in contact-induced transfer might be revealing, opening new avenues on the interface between (evaluative) morphology and sociolinguistics.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and constructive suggestions, which have contributed to improving the quality and clarity of this paper. Usual disclaimers apply.

References

- Anderson, Steven. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Backus, Ad. 1996. Two in One: Bilingual Speech of Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands. Doctoral thesis, Tilburg University.
- Backus, Ad. 2014. A usage-based approach to borrowability. In Zenner, Eline & Kristiansen, Gitte (eds.), *New Perspectives on Lexical Borrowing: Onomasiological, Methodological and Phraseological Innovations*, 19-40. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614514305.19>
- Bağrıaçık, Metin, & Janse, Mark. 2013. Μερικός αναδιπλασιασμός στις Καππαδοκικές διαλέκτους [Partial reduplication in Cappadocian dialects]. *Patras Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, 110–131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26220/pwpl.v3i0.2155>
- Daltas, Periklis. 1985. Some patterns of variability in the use of diminutive and augmentative suffixes in spoken Modern Greek Koine (MGK). *Glossologia* 4, 63-88.
- Dawkins, Richard. M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1989. Prototypical differences between inflection and derivation. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42(1): 3–10.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1997. Universals, typology, and modularity in natural morphology. In Hickey, Raymond & Puppel, Stanislaw (eds.), *Language History and Linguistic Modelling: A Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th Birthday*, Vol. 2: *Language History and Linguistic Modelling*, 399–1421. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Merlini-Barbatesi, Lavinia. 1992. Italian diminutives as non-prototypical word formation. In Tonelli, Livia & Dressler Wolfgang U. (eds.), *Natural morphology-Perspectives for the nineties*, 21–30. Unipress, Padova.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. U. & Merlini-Barbatesi, Lavinia. 1994. *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German and other languages*, Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.
- Efthymiou, Angeliki. 2023. Η έκφραση του υποκορισμού στη νέα ελληνική: ανταγωνισμός, ποικιλία και περιορισμοί [Diminution in Modern Greek: competition, variation and constraints]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 42, 127-136.
- Efthymiou, Angeliki. 2024. Diminutive formation in Modern Greek: Variation and competition. In Bagasheva, Alexandra & Nagano, Akiko & Renner, Vincent (eds.), *Competition in Word-Formation*, 178-207. John Benjamins Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (LA).
- Field, Fredric. W. 2002. *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gardani, Francesco. 2008. *Borrowing of inflectional morphemes in language contact*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

- Gardani, Francesco. 2016. Allogeneous exaptation. In Norde, Muriel & Van de Velde, Freek (eds.), *Exaptation and Language Change*, 227-260. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gardani, Francesco. 2020. Morphology and Contact-Induced Language Change. In Grant, Antony P. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*, 96-122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Georgakakis, Dimitrios. I. 1982. *A Greco-Slavic Controversial Problem Reexamined: The -ITS- Suffixes in Byzantine, Medieval, and Modern Greek: Their Origin and Ethnological Implications*. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Grandi, Nicola. 2002. *Morfologie in contatto: le costruzioni valutative nelle lingue del Mediterraneo*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Grandi, Nicola. 2011. Renewal and innovation in the emergence of Indo-European Evaluative is a Morphology, *Lexis* 6, 5-25.
- Grandi, Nicola. 2015. Introduction: Why Evaluative Morphology? In Grandi, Nicola & Körtvélyessy, Livia (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 3-20. Edinburgh University Press.
- Grant, Antony. P. (ed.) 2020. *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Hickey, Raymond. (ed). 2010. *The Handbook of Language Contact*, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (2nd edition). Wiley/Blackwell.
- Janse, Mark. 2001. Morphological Borrowing in Asia Minor. In. Agouraki Yoryia & Arvaniti, Amalia & Davy, J.I.M. & Goutsos, Dionisios & Karyolaimou, Marilena & Panagiotou, Andreas & Papapavlou, Andreas & Pavlou, Pavlos & Roussou, Anna (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 473–79. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
- Janse, Mark. forthcoming. Cappadocian. In Tzitzilis, Christos (ed.) *The Greek language and its dialects*, Thessaloniki.
- Kallergi, Haritini & Katsouda, Georgia & Konstantinidou, Magdalini & Tsangalidis, Anastasios. 2023. *Expressivity in Modern Greek: Some morphological mechanisms for the expression of emotions*. In Williams, Jeffrey. P. (ed.), *Expressivity in European Languages*, 123-227. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karanastasis, A. 1997. Grammar of Modern Greek varieties of Southern Italy [Γραμματική των ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας]. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2011. *A study of Cappadocian Greek nominal morphology from a diachronic and dialectological perspective*, Doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Katsouda, Georgia. 2017. Το επίθημα -ούνα στη ΝΕΚ και τις νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα [The suffix -una in Modern Greek and its varieties]. In Georgakopoulos, Thanasis & Pavlidou, Theodosia & Pechlivanos, Miltos & Alexiadou, Artemis & Androutsopoulos, John & Kalokairinos, Alexis & Skopeteas, Stavros & Stathi, Katerina (eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Greek Language*, vol. 1, 539–554.
- Katsoyannou, Marianne. 1995. *Le parler gréco de Galliciano (Italie): Description d'une langue en voie de disparition*. Doctoral thesis, Université Paris VII.
- Katsoyannou, Marianne. 1999. Greek of Southern Italy: the sociolinguistic perspective [Ελληνικά της Κάτω Ιταλίας: η κοινωνιογλωσσολογική άποψη]. In A. Moser (ed.), *Greek Linguistics '97*:

- Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 605-13. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Kerswill, Paul & Williams, Anne. 2002. Salience as an explanatory factor in language change: evidence from dialect levelling in urban England. In Jones, Marie. C. & Esch, Edith (eds.) *Language change. The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors*, 81-110. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Ketrez, Nihan. F. & Aksu-Koç, Ayhan. 2007. The (scarcity of) diminutives in Turkish child language. In Savickienė, Ineta & Dressler, Wolfgang. U. (eds.), *The Acquisition of Diminutives: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 279-293. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Klimaszewska, Zofia. 1983. *Diminutive und augmentative Ausdrucksmöglichkeiten des Niederländischen, Deutschen und Polnischen: Eine konfrontative Darstellung*. Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Wrocław.
- Koutita-Kaimaki, Mirto. 1984. Ο υποκορισμός στην Ποντιακή Διάλεκτο [Diminution in Pontic]. Doctoral thesis, University of Thessaloniki.
- Kyranoudis, Panayotis. 2009. *Μορφολογία των τουρκικών δανείων της ελληνικής γλώσσας* [The morphology of Turkish loans in the Greek language], Thessaloniki: INS (Manolis Triantafyllides Foundation).
- Labov, William. 2001. *Principles of linguistic change: Social factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Levon, Erez & Buchstaller, Isabelle. 2015. Perception, cognition, and linguistic structure: The effect of linguistic modularity and cognitive style on sociolinguistic processing. *Language Variation and Change* 27(3), 319–348.
- Maiden, Martin & Parry, Mair. 1997. *The dialects of Italy*. London: Routledge.
- Manolessou, Ioanna. 2005. The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: An Overview. *CAMPOS, Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 13. 103-125.
- Manolessou, Ioanna. 2019. The historical background of the Asia Minor dialects. In Ralli, Angela (ed.), *The Morphology of Asia Minor Greek: Selected Topics*, 20-65. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Manolessou, Ioanna & Katsouda, Georgia & Tsolakidis, Simeon & Papanagiotou, Christos & Chairidakis, Georgios. 2024. *Το Ιστορικό Λεξικό των Ιδιωμάτων της Καππαδοκίας*, [The Historical Dictionary of the Cappadocian dialects] vol. 1 (2024) (vol. 2 and vol 3 in press). Athens: Academy of Athens. Online at <https://ilik.academyofathens.gr>
- Matras, Yaron. 2007. The borrowability of grammatical categories. In Matras, Yaron & Sakel, Jeanette. (ed.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mavrochalyvidis, Georgios & Kesisoglou, Ioannis, I. 1960. The dialect of Axos (Le dialecte d’Axos). Institut Français d’Athènes, Athens.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2006. Η μορφολογική διαδικασία του υποκορισμού στη διαλεκτική ποικιλία της Ελληνικής-Σύγκριση με την ΚΝΕ. [The morphological process of diminution in Greek dialectal variation-Comparison with Standard Modern Greek]. Master Thesis, University of Patras.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2015. Modern Greek. In Grandi, Nicola & Körtvélyessy, Livia (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 278-286. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2016. Variation in word formation in the light of the language contact factor: the case of Cappadocian Greek. *Journal of Language Sciences*, 55, 55-67.

- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2019. Accounting for morphological complexity vs. simplification in situations of language contact: Evidence from Cappadocian Greek. In Tzitzilis, Christos. (ed.), *Language Contact in the Balkans and Asia Minor*, 321-336. Thessaloniki: INS.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2025. Investigating Derivational Borrowability in the Cappadocian Greek Dialectal Landscape: The Emergence of allo-morphemes. In Bentein, Klass & Bağrıaçık, Metin (eds.), *From Greece to Cappadocia. Ancient and Modern Greek Language Studies in honour of Mark Janse*, 401-428. De Gruyter.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2026. Insights on the Realization of Nominal Evaluative Morphology in the Modern Greek Dialect of Lesbos. *Languages*, 11(5), 100.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/languages11050100>
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra & Ralli, Angela. 2008. Headedness in diminutive formation: Evidence from Modern Greek and its Dialectal Variation. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55, 138-204.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra & Manolassou, Ioanna. 2010. Theoretical and diachronic aspects of augmentation: evidence from Greek. In Ralli, Angela & Booij, Geert & Scalise, Sergio (eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, 63–77 (E-publication. Available online at <https://www.lilec.it/mmm/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/63-77-Melissaropoulou-Manolassou.pdf>).
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2004. Alterazione. In Grossmann, Maria & Rainer, Franz (eds.), *La Formazione Delle Parole in Italiano*, 264-292. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Moravcsik, Edith. A. 1978. Language contact. In Greenberg, Joseph H. & Ferguson, Charles A. & Moravcsik, Edith (eds.), *Universals of Human Language: Method and Theory*, 93–122. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Moutsos, Dimitrios. 1984. Prodromic δρομβανιστὸν ὀξύγαλα. *Byzantion* 54, 586-592.
- Mutz, Katrin. 2015. Evaluative morphology in a diachronic perspective. In Grandi, Nicola & Körtvélyessy, Livia (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 142-154. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos. 1955. *Historical Grammar of the Pontic Dialect* [Ιστορική γραμματική της ποντικής διαλέκτου], Pontic Archive, Appendix 1. Athens: Committee for Pontian Pontic Studies.
- Petersen, Walter. 1910. *Greek Diminutives in -ion*, Weimar: R. Wagner Sohn.
- Profili, Olga. 1985. La romanisation d'un parler grec de l'Italie du Sud par les parlers romans environnants, *Actes du XVIIe Congrès Inter-national de Linguistique et de Philologie romanes, Aix-en-Provence 29 août - 3 septembre 1983*, 129-39. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence.
- Profili, Olga. 1999. Greek in Southern Italy [Η ελληνική στη νότια Ιταλία]. In Christidis, Anastasios-Phoevos (ed.) (in collaboration with Maria Arapopoulou and Gianna Giannouloupoulou), *Dialectal enclaves of the Greek language* [Διαλεκτικοί θύλακοι της ελληνικής γλώσσας], 31-37. Athens: YPEPTH and KEG.
- Rácz, Péter. 2013. *Salience in Sociolinguistics*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Ralli, Angela. 2005 [2022]. *Morphology*. Athens: Patakis.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1977. *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento)*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbunchhandlung.
- Rūķe-Draviņa, Velta. 1959. *Diminutive im Lettischen*. Lund: Håkan Ohlsoons Boktryckeri.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1994. *Morfologia*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

- Seifart, Francesco. 2013. *AfBo: A World-Wide Survey of Affix Borrowing*, Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://afbo.info>
- Seifart, Francesco. 2015. Does structural-typological similarity affect borrowability? A quantitative study on affix borrowing. *Language Dynamics and Change* 5(1), 92–113.
- Squillaci, Maria Olympia. 2017. When Greek meets Romance: a morphosyntactic investigation of language contact in Aspromonte. Doctoral Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Symeonidis, Charalampos. 1975. The Modern Greek diminutive marker -ka, -kas [Η Νεοελληνική Υποκοριστική Κατάληξη -κα, -κας]. *Filtra, S. Kapsomenos Honorary volume*. Thessaloniki, 403–417.
- Symeonidis, Charalampos. 1995. Small contribution to Pontic etymology [Μικρή συμβολή στην ποντιακή ετυμολογία]. *Greek Dialectology* 4, 61–72.
- Terkourafi, Marina. 2004. Politeness in Cyprus: A coffee or a small coffee? In Hickey, Leo & Stewart, Miranda (eds.), *Politeness in Europe*, 277–291. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*, Edinburgh; Washington, DC: Edinburgh University Press and Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey 2008. Social and linguistic factors as predictors of contact-induced change. *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1): 42–56.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Kaufman, Terrence. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tietze, Andreas. 2016–2019. *Tarihi ve etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugati*, 10 vol. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi (TÜBA).
- Triantafyllides, Manolis. 1938 [1981], *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική. Ιστορική Εισαγωγή. Άπαντα 3ος τόμος* [Modern Greek Grammar. Historical Introduction. Complete work 3rd volume], Thessaloniki: Institute for Modern Greek Studies.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Türk, Utku. 2020. Tackling the Augmentative Puzzle in Turkish. 2020. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Turkic and Languages in Contact with Turkic* 5, 155–162. <https://doi.org/10.3765/ptu.v5i1.4771>
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*, New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *A typology of verbal borrowings*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Dimitra Melissaropoulou
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
School of Philosophy,
Department of Italian Language and Literature,
Thessaloniki GR-54124, Greece
e-mail: dmelissa@itl.auth.gr