

Why does a language borrow suffixes? The case of Greek and Latin

Anna Anastassiadis-Symeonidis
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Katerina Chatzopoulou
University of Chicago

1 Introduction

In this study we are examining the reasons that lead Greek to borrow two suffixes from Latin, although the functions of these suffixes were already performed by two corresponding suffixes in Greek. In particular, based on the theoretic morphological framework of Danielle Corbin (1987), we examine two suffixes, which Greek (L1) borrowed from Latin (L2): (a) *-ári(os)*, *-ár(is)*, *-(i)ár(is)*¹ < L2 *-arius*, e.g. *vivliothikarios* ‘book clerk’, *pismataris* ‘stubborn’, *klapsiaris* ‘crybaby’ and (b) *-ísi(os)* < L2 *-ēsis/ -ensis*, e.g. *vunisios* ‘of the mountain’. Both suffixes create denominal adjectives.

In the first part of this paper we discuss the two suffixes from a morphological and semantic point of view. We examine the Lexeme Creation Rule (LCR) and the meaning of the derivatives, which is stratified, in that it is the outcome of (i) the meaning of the LCR, (ii) the meaning of the base and (iii) the semantic instruction of the suffix. In the second part we examine these suffixes in comparison to competitor suffixes of the same LCR in L1 in order to explain the reasons of borrowing. In particular, we examine the derived adjectives in relation to the feature [\pm learned] as well as the genre in which they appear, for example *fthisikos* – *htikiaris*, *orinos* – *vunisios*. After discussing the conditions for the borrowing of a suffix, we propose an explanation for the borrowing of these two suffixes from Latin, based on language use.

2 The borrowed suffixes

During the last prechristianic and especially during the first christianic centuries – apart from direct loanwords² – Greek gradually borrowed a significant number of suffixes from Latin,³ for example *-arius*, *-ensis*, *-atus*, *-ianus*, *-inus*, *-ullum*. We focus here on two of these suffixes: *-ápi(oç)*, *-áp(iç)/ -áp(ηç)*, *-(i)áp(ηç)* < L2 *-arius* and *-ísi(oç)* < L2 *-ensis*.

The suffix *-arius* is a most representative case, as it is the most frequently attested instance of a suffixal loan in the Greek papyri texts of the postclassic era (cf. Filos 2008: 269–73). It was very productive both in medieval Greek under

¹ Inside the parenthesis on the right are given the inflection/gender morphemes which do not participate the derivational morphology procedures.

² From the 2900 Latin loanwords that Greek borrowed (Viscidi 1944: 58), approximately 10% survives today (Filos 2009).

³ For an overview of the bibliography on Latin loanwords in Greek see Filos (2008). For suffix borrowing in particular see Palmer (1945) and Cavenaile (1952).

various forms and spellings, *-áρι(ος)*, *-ár(ις)/-ár(ης)*, *-(ι)ár(ης)* and it remains productive in Standard Modern Greek (SMG).

The analysis we propose is cast within the theoretical morphological framework of Corbin (1987).⁴ The Corbin framework is based on the principle of associativity according to which the LCRs simultaneously create both the meaning and form of the lexemes, whose meaning is compositional according to their structure.

2.1 The *-ári(os)*, *-ár(is)*, *-(i)ár(is)* (< *-arius*) suffix

The *-arius* suffix in Latin creates adjectives and applies to a verbal or more frequently nominal base, e.g. *postulo* ‘request’ > *postularius* ‘the one who asks/demands’, *aqua* ‘water’ > *aquarius* ‘aquarium’ (Miller 2006: 140–41; Filos 2008: 263). These adjectives are nominalized by conversion and denote the one who carries about an action or has a particular profession (Filos 2008: 263).

In the Greek papyri, the *-ári(os)* is found already from the 1st century AD not only as an ending on direct loanwords from Latin,⁵ i.e. *arghentarios*, but also as a suffix on words derived in Greek, i.e. *mihanarios* ‘mechanic’ (Palmer 1945: 7, fn 1, 32, 48–9; Cavenaile 1952: 201–02; Filos 2008: 103). These derivatives are adjusted to the Greek phonology and morphology. During this phase the *-ári(os)* suffix is still very close to its latin ancestor from a phonological, morphological and semantic point of view. It creates adjectives from a verbal or nominal base, i.e. *ahirarios* ‘person who works in the barn’, which can be nominalized, as in *uposhesarios* ‘tax collector’, and refer to someone who practices an occupation.

The *-ári(os)* form of the suffix remained stable in terms of meaning (Filos 2008: 269), but the *-(i)ár(is)* form changed (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 2000a). After all the dynamic character of borrowing is closely connected to the diachronic development of L1 (Gadjeva 2008: 146). In particular, in SMG three semantic categories can be distinguished: (a) adjectives with *-ár(is)* derived from numbers, e.g. *triantaris* ‘about thirty years old’, (b) adjectives with *-ár(is)*, which at surface structure appear as ‘nouns denoting profession’ e.g. *varkaris* ‘boatman’, (c) adjectives with *-(i)ár(is)* used to describe people e.g. *kokaliaris* ‘skinny person’ (cf. Hatzidakis 1907: 611).

According to this classification, we could argue that there are at least two suffixes in SMG, *-ár(is)* and *-(i)ár(is)* (cf. Christofidou *et al.* 1990–91: 73). We find also examples of ‘profession nouns’ ending in *-ár(is)*, without considering *-i-* as part of the base e.g. *karvouniaris* ‘charcoal seller’, as well as a few adjectives which describe people, ending in *-ár(is)* e.g. *pismataris* ‘stubborn’. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that in SMG, although the ancestor is common, since all forms originate from the Latin suffix *-arius*, the following situation arises: on the one hand the *-ári(os)* form of the suffix specializes in denoting nouns of occupation in written and formal register, as in *vivliothikarios* ‘book clerk’; on the other hand the *-ár(is)* and *-(i)ár(is)* forms of the suffix are found

⁴ For more information see Corbin 1987, 1991 and forthcoming; Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1992, 1996, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2008, 2009.

⁵ According to Palmer (1945: 7) the words created in Greek with the Latin suffix *-ári(os)* are more than thirty, whereas the direct loanwords are more than seventy.

on professional as well as descriptive nouns and adjectives, which are [–learned] (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis and Fliatouras 2004). However, only the form *–(i)ár(is)* is available for creating adjectives denoting human characteristics. Moreover the *–ár(is)* is no longer available for the creation of professional or descriptive nouns and adjectives, but it is the only form that applies on a numeric base, e.g. *triantaris* ‘thirty year old (man)’.

As far as the semantic analysis of these adjectives is concerned, the suffix *–(i)ár(is)* creates adjectives which establish a permanent relationship⁶ of possession between the noun base and the noun modifying the adjective in *–(i)ár(is)*. The noun base refers to (a) illnesses or symptoms of illnesses, e.g. *vlogia* ‘smallpox’, but also the hyperonym *arostia* ‘illness’, (b) external imperfections of the body e.g. *fakidhes* ‘freckles’ or to socially undesirable character traits, e.g. *grinia* ‘moaning’, (c) entity or external property that downgrades the appearance in relation to the social norm e.g. *kourelis* ‘rag’. The characteristic that the adjective with *–(i)ár(is)* attributes to the modified noun is perceived by the senses, especially by the sight: *spiriaris* ‘pimpley’, but also by the hearing, e.g. *vlastimiaris* ‘someone who swears’, by the smell or a combination of the senses e.g. *vromiaris* ‘grimy person’. We consider this somewhat degrading or below the social norm quality contributed by the suffix as the bridge between professional and quality denoting adjectives: the occupations denoted are all of a low social status, e.g. *skoupidiaris* ‘person who collects trash’. This quality is included in the semantic instruction of the suffix *–(i)ár(is)*, which selects the degrading part of a quality according to the norm. Thus, the suffix *–(i)ár(is)* creates adjectives, which attribute in a permanent way a degrading quality which is perceived by the senses. In the semantic instruction of *–(i)ár(is)* there is a [+degrading] feature, allowing these derivatives to be used as curse words under certain situations, for instance in the vocative *klapsiari!* ‘cry baby!’

This means that the adjectives and nouns created with *–(i)ár(is)* are inherently qualitative, since they are marked with the [+degrading] feature included in their sememe. The distinctive feature [+degrading] is a hyponym of the hyperonym [subjective] (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1980). The *–(i)ár(is)* derivatives are doubly subjective since they reflect (a) the speakers ideology, (b) the fact that the speaker takes position against the referent (cf. Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1980: 91). Therefore the suffix *–(i)ár(is)*, because of its subjective character has no place in a genre which is of an objective nature, for example in scientific speech. These adjectives or nouns are expected to be used in informal, colloquial language.

⁶ For instance the adjectives *arostos* and *arostiaris*. The first one refers to a temporary quality, while the second refers to an illness-prone person, someone who is always ill.

2.2 The *-ísi(os)* (<*-ensis*) suffix⁷

The majority of the Latin derivatives with suffix *-ēnsis* are denominative adjectives derived from nouns denoting places e.g. *castrensis* ‘of the castle’, *forensis* ‘of the forum’ and especially place names (of cities and places in general) e.g. *atheniensis* < Athenae, *babyloniensis* < Babylon, *corinthiensis* < Corinthus, *europensis* < Europa, *ithacensis* < Ithaca, *mediolanensis* < Mediolanum, *peloponnensis* < Peloponnesus, *viennensis* < Vienna.⁸

The Latin suffix *-ensis*, in post-classical Greek texts, among which are the documentary papyri from Egypt, is normally attested in the form of direct loanwords as *-ísi(os)*: e.g. *castrensis* > *castrisios* ‘camp/border soldier, guard’, *commentariensis* > *kom(m)entarisios* ‘secretary, protocol officer’ (cf. Gignac 1976–81: ii.50, Filos 2008: 279, 284). Latin loanwords were gradually introduced in Greek (in the last two centuries BC and especially the first centuries AD): in literary texts *faurikisios* < *fabricensis* ‘armourer’, in official epigraphic texts of the Roman administration *kervisios* < *ceruensis* ‘of deer’. From the 6th–7th centuries AD larger numbers of *-ísi(os)* forms are attested, which vary in spelling between *-ίσι(ος)* and *-ήσι(ος)*, *kastrisios* < *castrensis*, *livellisios* < *libellensis* ‘officer who registered and presented petitions to the roman emperor’. The use of Latin loanwords with this suffix in the papyri is relatively rare as is the use of Greek stems with the Latin suffix with the exception of some geographical terms like *Kaisarisios* ‘from Caesarea’.

Next to these loan forms, we find forms with a Greek stem, especially adjectives relating to place names: *Antiohisios*, *Kesarisios*. These forms are denominative adjectives and are related to either place names or occupations. They are more in line with the semantics of the Latin derivatives in *-ensis*. These are origin-denoting adjectives which can be nominalized by conversion and refer to habitants or objects in general. A ‘new’ Greek formation is *arthrisios* ‘of many joints, articulated’ (Filos 2008: 284, 285).

As for MG, in the literature the issue of the relation between the suffix that comes from the Latin *-ēnsis*, e.g. *aet-isios* ‘of an eagle’ and the suffix *-ēsi(os)* of Ancient Greek, e.g. *et-ēsios* ‘annual’, is discussed. According to our view (cf. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 2009) they are two separate suffixes that differ from a phonological/orthographic, semantic and pragmatic perspective. The *-ísi(os)* comes from the hellenistic suffix *-ēsi(os)* < postlatin *-ēsis* < latin *-ēnsis*.⁹

As for the semantic instruction of the suffix, some traces of its original meaning in Latin can be found. Most prominently the meaning of origin. According to the framework of Corbin (1987), the semantic instruction of the

⁷ On the etymology of this suffix see also Meyer (1895), Hatzidakis (1907 : 209), Psaltes (1913: § 297, § 450), Buck (1933: § 481), Triantafyllidis (1963: 91 and 1941: § 298, 10), Andriotis (1967), Tsopanakis (1994: § 785, στ), Petrounias (1998), Klairis-Babiniotis (2005: 259), Babiniotis (1998), Palmer (1945: 31), Chantraine (1933: 41-42), Filos (2008: 279). Critical Overview Anastassiadis-Symeonidis (2009).

⁸ This suffix comes also in an extended form *-iensis*, e.g. *Carthag-iensis*, *Athen-iensis*, as a result of reanalysis in cases where the nominal base ended in *-i*, e.g. *eretriensis* < *Eretria*, *macedoniensis* < *Macedonia*, *romaniensis* < *Romania*.

⁹ As argued by Meyer (1895 III: 75), and followed by Triantafyllidis (1909), Psaltes (1913) and partly Andriotis (1967) and Petrounias (1998).

suffix is unified on the abstract level and it is from this instruction that all the others follow. In this case the suffix *-ísi(os)* is connected to a meaning of origin, which is defined in a broad sense. In general, we have the case of a paradigmatic semantic relationship of meronymy, in which the noun base (Nb) functions as a holonym and the noun modified as a meronym, e.g. *limnisio psari* ‘lake fish’, ‘the lake has fish’, *varelisia retsina* ‘barel wine’ ‘the barel has wine’. The relation of origin has to do with a place, as in the case of *vounisios aeras* ‘mountain air’, *livadhisio hortari* ‘prairie grass’, *spitisio faghito* ‘home meal’, has to do with an animal or a plant, e.g. in *arnisia paidhakia* ‘lamb chops’, *ghidhisio ghala* ‘goat milk’, *katsikisio tiri* ‘goat cheese’, *mosharisia brizola* ‘veal steak’, *thimarisio meli* ‘thyme honey’, interpreted as extensional like in the examples above or intensional, according to the stereotypes of Greek society, for example, *aetisia matia* ‘eagle eyes’, *alepoudhisia poniria* ‘slyness of a fox’, *ghourounisia simberifora* ‘manners of a pig’, *elafisia matia* ‘eyes of a deer’, *moularisio pisma* ‘stubbornness of a mule’, *skilisia zoi* ‘life of a dog’, *fidisio kormi* ‘body of a snake’. The relation of origin has to do with an artifact, e.g. in *karavisios/vaporisios kafes* ‘coffee served on a ship’ (bad tasting coffee), *pighadhisio nero* ‘water from a well’, *varelisia bira* ‘barrel beer’, *tomarisio/touloumisio tiri* ‘cheese kept in a touloumi’, it can also relate to time e.g. *ghenarisio provato* ‘lamb born in January’, *paliokerisio forema/htenisma* ‘old style dress/haircut’; or by intension, that relates to the stereotypical meaning e.g. *gherondisia foni* ‘elderly person voice’, *pediakisia kamomata* ‘childish behavior’, *palikarisia loghia* ‘brave person words’.

3 Why borrow a suffix?

Various parameters like time, the linguistic channels through which a loan was imported, register as well other factors play an important role in the borrowing. There are often register-related differences between colloquial and learned speech as well as between spoken and written language.

Let us examine two extra-linguistic and one linguistic reason which facilitated the introduction of Latin suffixes into Greek:

(i) Time: Hellenistic period. Greek acquired, and occasionally reintroduced, Latin forms at various stages.

(ii) Conditions: Cohabitation within the *Imperium Romanum* historical interaction. Latin was the official language of the empire, but Greek retained a semi-official status in the East, due to the Roman language policy, which was generally favourable towards the Greek language (at least in the eastern part of the empire) (Coleman 2007: 799, Adams 2003: 540–41, 555, 754).

(iii) Typological affinity. Greek and Latin have typologically congruent structures (similarities in the inflectional and derivational systems), due to their common Indo-European origin. But there is a disproportionate effect: The influence of Greek on Latin was more pervasive and had longer-standing effects than conversely. This must be attributed to various reasons: the small number of Latin speakers in the East, the Greek attitude towards ‘barbaric’ languages, the Roman language policy, among others.

According to the literature, the relatively small number of loanwords from Latin to Greek is attributed to the derogatory attitude of Greeks towards Latin and its speakers. This, however, is only half the story. Greek borrowings from Latin can be divided in two kinds: (a) loanwords that are part of the administrative terminology in official document (domains of administration, court, army, legal system) and high-level literary works (secular and ecclesiastical) and (b) loanwords that come from every day vocabulary. There is a natural connection of every day vocabulary with the [–learned] character of these adjectives. The changes in the political life that took place with the foundation of the Eastern Roman Empire lead to the extinction of the loans of the first kind, meanwhile the loans of the second sort ended up as words of less prestigious character used mainly in colloquial Greek (cf. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1994: 104–105). It was basically some terms of the everyday vocabulary that managed to make their way through the medieval period and survive until present time. This fact may indicate a different degree of integration for the low-register vocabulary to that for the high-register terms: administrative, political and military terms are much more closely related to the social superstructure. Once historical changes that affected those structures occurred—primarily the gradual transformation and waning of the Eastern Roman Empire—a large part of the relevant vocabulary became obsolete. An additional reason for the disappearance of many high-register Latin forms was the conscious ‘purist’ efforts of the Byzantine state from the 10th century AD onwards to hellenize the administrative terminology and nomenclature (Kahane and Kahane 1982: 133). Greek derivatives usually refer to ‘lower’ social class professions (e.g. *ahurarios* ‘collector of chaff’, *tapitarios* ‘carpet-weaver’), in contrast to the loanwords that usually refer to military and/or administrative offices (*kagkelarios* ‘secretary’, *leghionarios* ‘legionary’). In later (Byzantine-modern) times, the suffix is found in nouns of both lower (*upodimatarios* ‘shoe seller’) and mid-/higher (*spatharios* ‘guardsman’) professions, but its use is now expanded to adjectives of quality (*psoriari(os)* ‘scabby’) and various other words too (Jannaccone 1950: 57). From the Byzantine period onwards, the suffix appears as *–ár(is)* (spelled *–άρης*) (*portaris* < *portarius*) (Jannaccone 1950: 56, Dieterich 1928: 111–12, Filos 2008: 268). Latin loanwords in *–ári(os)* < *–arius*: higher stratum. Greek-stem words in *–άριος*: lower stratum. Suffixes with a technical meaning must have entered Greek via Roman institutions like the army and the administration, which impinged on Greek speakers who had regular contacts (soldiers and administrative staff) (Adams 2003: 495).

According to the linguistic analysis, the borrowings from Latin symbolize a civilization that is considered inferior to the Greek. Although Latin loanwords are not differentiated from Greek in terms of phonology and morphology, on the level of semantics and pragmatics they have particularities which make evident their ‘socially marked’ origin. The situation is the same when it comes to the suffixes that Greek borrowed from Latin *–át(os)*, *–(i)ár(is)*, *–óúr(a)*, *–iátik(os)*, *–oúkl(a)*, *–poul(os)*, which bare the [–learned] feature. In particular, we are considering their [–learned] character a result of their being loans from Latin along with their use in everyday life situations. Since every element of a language

is considered to bear hints of the civilization of its speakers, every loan from L2 creates in L1 a representation of this civilization. The stereotypicality, which is the outcome of this representation, becomes a most integral part of the semantics of these loans in L1 and is revealing for the views of the speakers of L1 both for the civilization of the speakers of L2 as well as for their own civilization (cf. also Sarale 2008: 165). Thus, in borrowing, there is a form of integration of an intercultural stereotype in L1, a stereotype of a low prestige, degrading, attached to everyday life, which contributes to the definition of the ethnotype of “latinhood”¹⁰ (cf. also Sarale 2008: 155).

Moreover, if we make a distinction between expert and folk or of everyday use (Taylor 1989: 72), it becomes clear that the Nbs of all categories for both suffixes, while having expert definitions, in that are the outcome of categorization based on necessary and sufficient conditions, their participation on these derivatives is based on their folk definitions, which are structured around stereotypical elements and are created based on the way people understand the objects of the environment. According to our view, the predictable meaning of the derived adjectives through the suffixes *-(i)ár(is)* and *-ísi(os)* results from the semantic qualities of the Nb which cause it to contribute the notions of occupation or quality for *-(i)ár(is)* and the notion of origin for *-ísi(os)*, but through a prism of cultural relationships. In order for an adjective to be created through these suffixes, there must be a morphophonological, semantic and stylistic compatibility between the Nb and the modified noun.

Indeed the suffix *-(i)ár(is)* creates adjectives which attribute in a permanent way a degrading quality of occupation or behavior to the noun modified, which is considered to be below the norm, while the speaker at the same time performs a degrading judgment for the referent of the modified noun, e.g. *vromiaris anthropos* ‘dirty person’. In addition the suffix *-ísi(os)* creates adjectives that relate to everyday life, along with the parameter of identity, which relates to the place of origin and permanent residency, diet, way of living, e.g. *festas* as well as stereotypical views. The *-ísi(os)* suffix is a morphological means through which MG creates adjectives modifying a noun according to the stereotypical qualities (Geeraerts 1985 : 30) which come from a folk definition of the referent of the Nb, cf. *gherondisia foni* ‘elderly voice’. Thus, if MG has two forms for a noun, a [+learned] and a [-learned], the *-(i)ár(is)* and *-ísi(os)* will apply to the [-learned] or [±learned]¹¹ form, e.g. *htikiaris* ‘tubercular’, **fthisiaris*/**fimatiaris* – *fthisikos*, *fimatikos* ‘tubercular’, *ghenarisios* ‘of/in January’, **ianouarisios*. This explains also why in utterance referentiality, in order to refer to *hic et nunc* ‘here and now’ from the point of view of the speaker within the system of deixis, the *-in(ós)* suffix is selected (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 2008): the adjectives with the *-in(ós)* suffix point to a time and place objectively, as opposed to the *-ísi(os)* suffix which refers to the notion of origin in a [-learned] and subjective way, e.g. *brostinos* ‘front’ – **brostisios*, *simerinos* ‘of today’ – **simerisios*.

¹⁰ As a parallel to the word *romiosini*, which characterizes the Greeks.

¹¹ We are taking this to be not a dual, but a gradual distinction with three outstanding points: [+learned], [±learned], [-learned] (cf. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis and Fliatouras 2004).

What is of particular interest is the fact that in MG there are pairs of words¹² like *htikiaris* ‘tubercular’/ *fimatikos*, *arostiaris* ‘ill-prone’/ *filasthenos*, *kambisios* ‘of the valley’/ *pedhinos*, *vounisios* ‘of the mountain’/ *orinos*, *provatisios* ‘of sheep’/ *provios*, *ghaidhourisios* ‘of the donkey’/ *ghaidhourinos*, *ghourounisios* ‘of the pig’/ *hirinos*, *agheladisios* ‘of the cow’/ *agheladinos*, which differ with respect to the semantic instruction of the suffix and the [±learned] feature of the suffix, a difference ultimately reflected with respect to the kind of genre in which they appear.¹³ There are semantic/stylistic differences between the two members of word pairs like the above (Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1994: 104–105). The adjectives created with the *-(i)ár(is)* and *-ísi(os)* suffixes do not appear in scientific texts and are not a part of scientific terminology. Therefore, different suffixes combined with the same base may select different features of the base and it is for this reason that the adjectives in the pairs above cannot be considered as synonymous.¹⁴

3 Conclusion

When it comes to the borrowing of a suffix, if tracking both its ancestor in L2 in the diachronic analysis and the semantic task with which it is endowed in L1 in the synchronic analysis are of central importance, it is of at least equal importance to trace the reasons for the borrowing. The theoretical framework of D. Corbin allows the unification of the semantic instruction of each suffix we analyzed and the unveiling of the semantic role each one performs: both suffixes create denominal adjectives of a [–learned] character. In particular, the adjectives with *-(i)ár(is)* attribute to the modified noun a degrading quality in a permanent way, a diversion from the norm, in a way which can be directly perceived by the senses. The *-ísi(os)* suffix selects from the noun base the meaning of origin within daily life usage.

Borrowing constitutes a safe way for a language to introduce finer distinctions on a pragmatic level. This is exactly what was done by the Greek language. In borrowing the *-(i)ár(is)* and *-ísi(os)* suffixes Greek acquired the grammatical equipment in order to point the difference between (i) the [+learned], the official, the objective on the one hand and (ii) the [–learned], the subjective, that which is of daily life use. For the first case, Greek employed suffixes of Greek origin, while for the second case, suffixes borrowed from Latin. This explains the presence of denotationally identical doublets, pairs of words that differ in terms of connotation or register only, e.g. *mnistiras/ aravoniaris* ‘fiacé’, *provios/ provatisios* ‘of sheep’. The Greek language using its own

¹² We will not be comparing *-(i)ár(is)* to verbal suffixes that denote occupation, such as *-tir*, *-tor*, *-tis* (spelled *-τηρ*, *-τωρ*, *-της*), as these are products of a different Lexeme Creation Rule (contra Filos 2008: 268).

¹³ They also differ in other ways (cf. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 2009).

¹⁴ We are therefore arguing against Filos (2008: 254) who claims that ‘the introduction of the Latin suffixes was not a straightforward process since very often there were pre-existing Greek suffixes which fulfilled the same morphological and semantic functions (cf. Latin *-tor* Greek *-τωρ/τορ*; e.g. *δότηρ* vs. *lector*): in some cases the imported suffixes co-existed with the native ones and they could freely attach to both Greek and Latin stems’, *mihan-ários* ‘engineer’, *kastrítis* ‘inhabitant of Castra’.

equipment proves what was said by Horace: ‘Graecia victa ferum victorem vicit et artis et litteras agresti Latio intulit’.¹⁵

Therefore through this model we are able not only to explain similarities and differences on a semantic and pragmatic level between words which are falsely considered to be synonymous, but we can also make predictions of restrictions. In particular we can explain:

(a) Why it is possible to have derived adjectives from the same Nb with a different suffix, e.g. *vromikos/vromiaris* ‘dirty’, *agheladhisios/agheladhinios* ‘of the cow’: the *-(i)ár(is)* attributes a quality in a permanent way, the *-in(ós)* selects qualities of the referential meaning of the Nb, while the *-ísi(os)* selects from the Nb qualities that correspond to its folk definition. Thus, we are in a position to explain why adjectives that end in *-ik(ós)* and in *-(i)ár(is)* or in *-in(ós)* and in *-ísi(os)* are not synonymous.

(b) Why some suffixes do not apply to some Nbs, since there is a compatibility requirement with the Nb in terms of the feature [learned]. The derived adjectives with the *-ik(ós)*, *-in(ós)*, *-i(os)* prefer the [+learned] allomorph of the Nb, while the adjectives with the *-(i)ár(is)* and *-ísi(os)* suffixes are created with the [-learned] or [±learned] allomorph of the Nb, e.g. *fthisikos* ‘tubercular’ – *htikiaris* (**fthisiaris* – **htikikos*), *pedhinios* ‘of the valley’ – *kambisios* (**pedhisios* – **kambinos*).

(c) Why in utterance referentiality for “here and now” the *-in(ós)* suffix is selected: the adjectives created with *-in(ós)* refer to a time and place objectively, as opposed to the *-ísi(os)* which relates to the notion of origin in a subjective way, e.g. *brostinios* ‘front’ – **brostisios*, *simerinos* ‘of today’ – **simerisios*.

References

- Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 1992. Η νεοελληνική παραγωγή κατά το μοντέλο της D. Corbin. In: *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 13, Θεσσαλονίκη, 505–526.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 1994. Νεολογικός δανεισμός της νεοελληνικής-Άμεσα δάνεια της νεοελληνικής από τη γαλλική και την αγγλοαμερικανική. Μορφοφωολογική ανάλυση, Θεσσαλονίκη: ΑΠΘ.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 1996. A propos de l’emprunt suffixal en grec moderne, *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 68.79–106.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 1998. On Modern Greek Denominal Adjectives. In *Proceedings of the first Mediterranean Conference of Morphology* (Mytilene, Greece 1997), 29–40. University of Patras.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 2000a. Suffix *-(i)ar(is)* in Modern Greek. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 20.65–73. Thessaloniki.

¹⁵ Horace, *Epistulae*. 2. 1, trans. ‘conquered Greece has conquered the brute victor and has brought her arts and culture into rustic Latium’.

- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 2000b. La classe des défauts humains en grec moderne. In: *BULAG-Lexique, Syntaxe et Sémantique-Mélanges offerts à Gaston Gross à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire*. 83–94.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 2002. *A Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek*. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 2008. Word structure. In *La raison morphologique. Hommage à la mémoire de Danielle Corbin. Linguisticae Investigationes Supplementa 27*. Ed. by Bernard Fradin, 122–130. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamin.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 2009. Suffix *-isi(os)* in Modern Greek. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 29.58–73. Thessaloniki.
- Anastassiadis-Symeonidis A., and A. Fliatouras. 2004. The distinction [±learned] in Modern Greek-Definition and Typology. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference of Greek Linguistics*, 110–120. University of Crete.
- Andriotis, N. [1967] 1983. *Ετυμολογικό λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Babinotis, G. 1998. *Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας*. Αθήνα: Κέντρο Λεξικολογίας.
- Buck, C. D. 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Buck, C. D. and W. Peterson. 1945. *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives: Arranged by Terminations with Brief Historical Introduction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cavenaile, R. 1952. Quelques aspects de l'apport linguistique du grec au latin. *Aegyptus* 32.193–203.
- Chantraine, P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Christidis, A. F. (ed.) 2007. *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Christofidou, A., U. Doleschal, and W. U. Dressler. 1990–1991. Gender Agreement via derivational morphology in Greek. *Γλωσσολογία* 9-10.69–79.
- Coleman, R. G. 2007. Greek and Latin. In *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, ed. by A. F. Christidis, 792–99. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbin, D. 1987. *Morphologie dérivationnelle et structuration du lexique*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1991. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires de Lille.
- Corbin, D. 1991. Introduction – La formation des mots: structures et interprétations, *Lexique* 10.7–30.
- Corbin, D. (forthcoming) *Le lexique construit. Méthodologie d'analyse*. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
- DDBDP: Duke Data Bank of Documentary Papyri. Packard Humanities Institute. CD-ROM 7 (1996).
- Dieterich, K. 1928. Die Suffixbildung im Neugriechischen. *Balkan Archiv* 4.104–67.

- Filos, P. 2008. *Studies in the Morphology of Latin Loanwords into Greek: Evidence from the Papyri*, Ph.D. University of Oxford.
- Filos, P. 2009. Latin loanwords and their influence upon the post-classical Greek derivational morphology: the case of the suffix –άριος [in Greek]. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, Ioannina, 30 August–2 September 2007.
- Gadjeva, S. 2008. Dynamisme de l'emprunt: les turcismes dans la langue bulgare, *Neologica*. 2.131–147.
- Geeraerts, D. 1985. Les données stéréotypiques, prototypiques et encyclopédiques dans les dictionnaires. *Cahiers de Lexicologie* 46.27–43.
- Gignac, F. T. 1976–81. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica.
- Hatzidakis, G. 1892. *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*. Athens 1975.
- Hatzidakis, G. 1905–07. *Μεσαιωνικά και νέα ελληνικά*. Αθήνα: Πελεκάνος.
- Hock, H. 1991. *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Horrocks, G. 1997. *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London and New York: Longman.
- Jannaccone, S. 1950. *Recherches sur les éléments grecs du vocabulaire latin de l'empire*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Kahane, H., and R. Kahane. 1982. The Western Impact on Byzantium: The Linguistic Evidence. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 36.127–153.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. [1980] 1997. *L'énonciation – De la subjectivité dans le langage*. Paris: Masson & Armand Colin.
- Klairis, H., and G. Babiniotis. 2005. *Γραμματική της νέας ελληνικής. Δομολειτουργική – επικοινωνιακή*. Αθήνα: Ελληνικά Γράμματα.
- Meyer, G. 1895. Neugriechische Studien III: die lateinischen Lehnworte im Neugriechischen. In *Sitzungsberichte der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe* 132. Vienna.
- Miller, D. G. 2006. *Latin Suffixal Derivatives in English, and their Indo-European Ancestry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, L. R. 1945. *A Grammar of Post-Ptolemaic Papyri II*. In *The Suffixes*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Petrounias, E. 1991. Νεοελληνικό επίθημα –αρία από τα βενετσιάνικα και συγγενικά. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 11.53–69.
- Petrounias, E. 1998. *Λεξικό της κοινής Νεοελληνικής* [Ετυμολογικό τμήμα], Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Psaltis, S. B. 1913. *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Sarale, J. M. 2008. Processus de lexicalisation de quelques emprunts au japonais. *Neologica* 2.149–167.
- Taylor, J. R. 1989. *Linguistic Categorization-Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Triantafyllidis, M. 1909. Die Lehnwörter der Mittelgriechischen Vulgärliteratur; republished in *Άπαντα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη*, Πρώτος τόμος. Θεσσαλονίκη 1963: 299–494 [references from 1963 edition].

- Triantafyllidis, M. 1963. Ξενηλασία ή ισοτέλεια; In *Άπαντα* 1, 1–297. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Tsoranakis, A. 1994. *Νεοελληνική γραμματική*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυριακίδης & Βιβλιοπωλείο της Εστίας.
- Viscidi, F. 1944. *I prestiti latini nel greco antico e bizantino*. Firenze: Casa Editrice Dott. Antonio Milani.
- Triantafyllidis, M. 1998. Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Triantafyllidis, M. *et al.* [1941] 2002. *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (της δημοτικής)*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών [Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη].