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Abstract

Derivatives involving the suffix -ive in English are extremely heterogeneous with regard to their semantics, syntax and the types of bases the suffix attaches to. A similar claim can be made for the ModGreek counterpart -pî‘o. In this study I argue that the case of -ize and -pî‘o derivatives has implications for morphological theory with regard to the status of the derivational affix in general, and word-formation rules (WFRs) in the lexicon, as well as the role of semantic and pragmatic information in lexical morphology. Based on the theory of Lexical Conceptual Semantics (LCS) (Jackendoff 1990; Plag 1999), I show how the meaning of the derived verbal is compositional and results from the interaction of the meaning of the stem with the semantic structure of the potential -ize/-pî‘o derivative.
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1. Introduction

The status of affixes and word formation rules (WFRs) in the lexicon, and the role of semantic and pragmatic information in word formation are of primary importance as they have particular implications for morphological theory. With a most productive overt verb-forming suffix, such as -ize in English and -pî‘o in Modern Greek (MG), the meaning of the derivative verb results from the interaction of the meaning of the base with the semantic structure of the all possible -ize and -pî‘o derivatives.

In an earlier paper (Mela-Athanasopoulou 2004), I gave a whole range of meanings for the three major verbal derivatives in English, -ize, -ify and -ate, together with other most productive suffixes. The scope of that article was to test the power of productivity of the derivational suffix in English by applying it to pseudo-stems. In this study, I will argue on the heterogeneity of the meanings of -ize and the MG counterpart -pî‘o. In my analysis, I will apply Jackendoff’s (1990) theory of Lexical Conceptual Semantics (LCS) repeated to some extent in Plag (1999) and Lieber (1998). Whereas Plag collapses all the meanings of -ize under one single semantic representation, Lieber, following Pinker (1989), suggests that all -ize derivatives are action verbs and, according to Pinker, they share the semantic function ACT. She further supports that they are similar to verbs formed by X → V conversion. In particular, they are like Noun to Verb (N → V) conversion in the sense that part of the Event of the verb is left to pragmatic inference, i.e. the interpretation of denominal -ize verbs is not quite predictable, as is the case of adjectival -ize verbs.

Let us now consider both Plag’s and Lieber’s configurations:

1 LEXICAL CONCEPTUAL STRUCTURE (LCS)
of locative / ornative / causative / resultative / inchoative -ize verbs

[[ \text{BASE} \text {-ize} ] \text{V} \\
\{ \text{NP}_1 \text { __ NPTheme, NPTheme ___, NP}_1 \text { ___ } \}
\text{CAUSE} ( [ \text { } ], [ \text { GO ([Property, Thing] Theme / Base; [TO ([Property, Thing] Base/Theme)])} )]

Plag, I., (1999: 136)

In non technical terms the structure of (1) looks as in (2) for the semantic representation of the sentence, John \text{anthropologized} (in the field).

(2) \text{LEXICAL CONCEPTUAL STRUCTURE (LCS)}

John \text{anthropologized} (in the field).

(2a) \text{CAUSE} ([John], [GO ([anthropology] Base; [TO ([ ]Theme ])]) ‘ornative’

(2b) GO ([John]Theme; [TO ([anthropology] Base )]) ‘inchoative’

Plag, I., (1999: 138)

As the object is not overt here, we have only two syntactic structures to map onto the semantic configuration of (1), that is, [NPTheme ___] and [NP1 __]. In this case, then, John can be either interpreted as [NP1] in (2a), meaning, ‘John applied anthropology to something (an unmentioned object)’ or interpreted as [NPTheme ___], meaning, ‘John became anthropology’, an interpretation automatically ruled out on pragmatic grounds. I will discuss Plag’s descriptions of LCS in detail further on together with Lieber’s suggestions.

Now consider Lieber’s notations in (3a-d). She proposes four different LCSs of -ize derivatives which share the semantic function of ACT as mentioned before, i.e. “all -ize verbs are action verbs of some sort” (Lieber 1998:20).

(3a) \{ \text{EventACT ([Thing ], [EventINCH [StateBE ([Theme ], [PlaceAT ([Thing, Property base N, A])] )])]}
\text{(unionize, civilianize, epitomize, velarize)}

(3b) \{ \text{EventACT ([Thing ], [EventGO [Thing base N], [Path TO/ON/IN ([Thing ] )]])]}
\text{(carbonize, texturize, apologize)}

(3c) \{ \text{EventACT ([Thing ], [EventGO [Thing ], [Path TO ([Thing base N)])])]}
\text{(summarize, hospitalize)}

(3d) \{ \text{EventACT ([Thing ], [MannerLIKE ([Thing, Property base N])] )]}
\text{(canibalize, economize)}

According to Lieber, what follows the ACT function may be either a Manner function (3d), or another Event function, in which case the -ize derivative verb can be causative or causative-inchoative (3a)-(3c). The inadequacy of such an account is that this second Event function must be fixed for each individual verb, depending on the category of the base. Further, whereas the interpretation of denominal -ize verbs is left to pragmatic inference, the interpretation of de-adjectival -ize verbs is much more uniform and predictable in meaning (than denominal -ize verbs), because adjectives normally denote properties and the event corresponding to a property is the coming into being of that property. That’s why with adjectival stems, Lieber says, the event must be INCHOATIVE –BE.

In my analysis, I will move within Jackendoff’s lexical conceptual semantics theoretical framework, following a schema more or less closer to Plag’s than Lieber’s because I have found it more self-explanatory and illustrative and more appropriate for
an in-depth analysis of the exact counterparts of MG for \-ize derivatives. Why, for example, isn’t the Greek *izo* (from which \-ize actually derived\(^1\)) the exact equivalent of the English \-ize in its most productive senses, and instead it is the archaic verb stem \-pi`o < AG (Ancient Greek) *ποιώ* ‘do, act’ (in the sense of creating something) used as a designated extremely productive suffix for the MG counterparts? Moreover, even the bound stem \-pió, an actual verb in Ancient Greek, does not satisfy all the senses of Jackendoff’s LCS schema of the \-ize derivatives. Instead, the second productive verbal suffix (equivalent to \-ize) \-’ono (e.g. *spitono* ‘put into a house’ in the sense of *hospitalize* is used. Finally, it will also be shown, in this study, that \-pi`o derivatives are always transitive whereas the MG \-izo, though marginally productive, produces both transitive and intransitive verbs, e.g. *furnizo* ‘put into an oven’, but *kokinizo* ‘paint something red’ or ‘become red’.

2. The present study

To start with, both \-ize and \-pi`o can be characterized as semantically indeterminate. In her analysis, Lieber does admit that there are no fixed LCSs for \-ize derived verbs within her own framework analysis of \-ize as an N to V conversion. “Semantically determinate affixes have lexical conceptual structures which are entirely fixed […]. In contrast, semantically indeterminate methods of word formation have Lexical Conceptual Structures which are in some way unfixed. The most extreme case might be a method of word formation like noun to verb conversion” (Lieber & Baayen 1993: 69). As will be shown, it is fairly clear that the two suffixes in question are not completely semantically determinate.

In what follows, I will attempt to present an illustrative picture of the semantic categories of \-ize in the framework of Plag’s analysis.

**Table 1.** Semantic categories of \-ize according to Plag’s (1999: 125) analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category</th>
<th>Paraphrase</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>Put into X</td>
<td>hospitalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornate</td>
<td>Provide with X</td>
<td>patinize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>Make more X</td>
<td>randomize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative</td>
<td>Make into X</td>
<td>peasantize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative</td>
<td>Become X</td>
<td>aerosolize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performative</td>
<td>Perform X</td>
<td>anthropologize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similative</td>
<td>Act like X</td>
<td>powerize</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plag has subsumed each of these categories under a single LCS shown in (4).

(4) LCS of \-ize verbs (generalized)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{BASE} \ \text{-ize}]_V \\
\{\text{NP}_1, \text{NP}_{\text{Theme}}, \text{NP}_{\text{Theme}}, \text{NP}_1\_\}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{CAUSE} ([\_], [\text{GO (Property, Thing)} \text{ Theme/Base}; [\text{TO (Property, Thing)} \text{ Base/Theme}]])
\]

Let us put this framework into practice and choose one of the semantic categories of -ize shown in Table 1, for example, the causative meaning, of the derivative verb

\(^1\) cf. Marchand (1969: 255): “\text{\textit{ize}/\textit{aiz}/ is ultimately OG\textit{r} [Old Greek] \text{-izo}, a suffix with both transitive and intransitive verbs}.”
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publicize and the MG kinopi`o. The Lexical conceptual structures of both verbs predict the two interpretations in (5a-b).

(5a) CAUSE ([ ], [GO ([ ]Theme; [TO [Property/Thing public] kin<o> stem]])
(5b) CAUSE ([ ], [GO ([Property/Thing public/kin<o>] Stem; [TO [ ] Theme]])

Now, (5a) shows that either something is made public (i.e. the Property reading), where the base is adjectival, or it shows the transfer to the public (i.e. the Thing reading), where the stem is nominal. Such an analysis makes the syntactic category of the stem unnecessary, i.e. it does not matter if the stem is treated as an adjective or as a noun. Further, the interpretations of the OED are ‘to make generally known’ (the Property reading) or ‘to bring to the notice of the public’ (the Thing reading). Thus any argument about whether publicize is de-adjectival or denominal appears of no importance. On the other hand, (5b) shows that the referent of the stem is transferred to the referent of the object NP, i.e. it is the news (the Property) that is brought to the public rather than the public to the news. (5b) then denotes that the public is impregnated with the news. A further comment here on the syntactic category of the stem is that, according to Jackendoff’s LCS analyses we have adopted here, the possible arguments of GO and TO of -ize derivatives are only Properties and Things. Hence the stem is either Adjective or Noun; it cannot be verb because then, the arguments projected by verbs would be Events, Actions or States. In our analysis of LCSs such arguments (of the verb) are excluded, as was shown in (4).

Let us now attempt a tentative analysis of the semantic categories of -pi`o within Plag’s framework of LCSs analyses for -ize derivatives, namely, LOCATIVE -pi`o ‘put into X’, e.g. konservopi`o ‘put into konserves(tins),

(6) LCS of locative –pi`o verbs
[[ ]Stem –pi`o]y
NP,___NPTheme
CAUSE ([ ], [GO ([ ]Theme; [TO [ ]Stem]])

Structure (6) reads as follows: The subject (NP,) causes the transfer of what is denoted by the object NP to the entity which is denoted by the stem. Our example, ‘konservopi`o’ roughly meaning ‘pack into konserves (tins)’, according to (6) must be interpreted as in (7), given the sentence “i ergates konservopiisan tis domates”, (‘the workers tinned the tomatoes’).

(7) CAUSE ([i ergates,NOM.PL], [GO([tis domates,ACC.PL] Theme; [TO [konserves,ACC.PL] Stem])])

This could be read as ‘the workers caused a transfer of the tomatoes into tins’.

Now, for the sake of concreteness, I will model my analysis on that of Halle & Keyser (1993). Further, according to the Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH), (Baker 1988: 46) whereby, identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure, the semantic relationship of Theme is always mapped to the internal argument position and thence to the syntactic [NP, V] position in D-structures, in English. We will see now in (8) how Morphology commits itself to this hypothesis:
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Note here that the Noun stem is the Goal rather than the Theme. Farrell (1998:43) provides a more simplified picture for Goal-centered verb formation, such as hospitalize (9a). We will attempt this with konservopi’o (9b).

(9)

Coming back to the locative category of -pi’o, interestingly enough, -pi’o is very often substituted by -‘ono as mentioned earlier (e.g. spitono ‘put into a house’) or even -izo (e.g. furnizo ‘put into an oven’) or -iazo (e.g. tsouvaliazo ‘put into a bag’). But our main concern here is to test all the potential categories of -pi’o as an equivalent of the very productive -ize. Certainly, a similar claim can be made about the ornative meaning of -ize and -pi’o. For instance, -‘ono, -iazo, or another archaic stem used as a suffix, -krato, for example, may be used, as in oxidono, ‘oxidize’, envoliazo ‘vaccinate’ and tromokrato ‘terrorize’. In this study, however, I will confine myself only to -pi’o based on both empirical data as well as the Greek Reverse dictionaries (Κουρμούλη 1967; Μπαλαφούτη 1996; Αναστασιάδη-Συμεωνίδη 2002).

Moving now to the ornate meaning of -pi’o we have the following picture: ‘provide with X’; e.g. impregnate with X ?oxygonopi’o
(10) LCS of ornative -\textit{pi}’\textit{o} verbs
\[
[[ \text{Stem } -\textit{pi}’\textit{o}] \text{V} \\
\text{NP} \_ \_ \_ \text{NP Theme} \text{CAUSE (}[[ \text{ NP }], \text{ [GO (}[[ \text{ Stem; [TO [ ]Theme]]])\text{])}}]
\]

Here the referent of the Stem word is moved to the referent of the object NP shown in (11), which is exactly the reverse of the procedure of locatives.

(11) \text{CAUSE ([They], [GO ([oxy]Stem; [TO [to metalo]Theme ]])}}

‘oxide’

‘metal’

This roughly means ‘They transferred the oxide to the metal’.

A tentative description of (11) is also illustrated in (12) (within Hale & Keyser’s (1993) framework).

(12a) \hspace{1cm} (12b)

\[\text{The Theme noun \textit{oxy} adjoins to -\textit{pi}’\textit{o} (the affixal verb) leaving a trace (shown in (12b)) and the resulting verb c-commands the trace.}\]

\[\text{So far, both the locative and ornative are characterized by Plag as change-of-place verbs in the sense that it is either the referent of the stem that is transferred to the referent of the object (ornative) or the other way round (locative).}\]

\[\text{The semantic categories where -\textit{pi}’\textit{o} is extremely productive are the causative and the resultative. Interestingly enough, the archaic verb -\textit{pi}’\textit{o} <\text{Stem poie- / poe-} (\text{cf. Latin } \textit{poe-ta} ‘poet’) does bear both the causative and the resultative conceptual semantic category, purely meaning ‘create, render shape to something’ (cf. Latin \textit{facio}) and is differentiated from the archaic \textit{prato} still in use as a verb in MG, with a lexicalized meaning, combined with the prepositions \textit{is-}, \textit{dia-}, \textit{syn-}, as in \textit{isprato} ‘collect money’, \textit{diaprato} ‘commit’, \textit{symprato} ‘co-operate’, which means ‘act, perform, be in the process of doing something’ (cf. Latin \textit{ago}) (Ko\v{n}t\'{e}o\c{s} & P\'{a}r\v{t}i\c{c}, 1994: 651). It is significant to note here that while with spatial locatives and ornatives the arguments [ ]\text{Stem and [ ]Theme belong to the semantic category Thing, the respective arguments in the LCS of causatives are Properties. Locatives and ornatives can be characterized, then, as change-of-place verbs, as already mentioned, whereas causatives are change-of-state verbs. The causative has already been illustrated in (5a-b) and is repeated here in (13).}\]

CAUSATIVE \(-\text{-pi\' o}\) ‘make more X’; \(\text{kinopi\' o}\) ‘publicize’

‘make something look like X’; \(\text{arenopi\' o}\) ‘masculinize’

(13) LCS of causative \(-\text{-pi\' o}\) verbs

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Stem} \quad \text{Vowel} \quad \text{Derived Verb} \\
\hline
\text{kinos} \quad \text{‘common, public’} \quad \text{kin\‘<o>} \quad \text{kinopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘publicize’} \\
\text{\`ynostos} \quad \text{‘known’} \quad \text{\`ynost\‘<o>} \quad \text{\`ynostopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘make known’} \\
\text{nomimos} \quad \text{‘legal’} \quad \text{nomim\‘<o>} \quad \text{nomimopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘make legal’} \\
\text{\`yleiros} \quad \text{‘ridiculous’} \quad \text{\`ylei\‘<o>} \quad \text{\`yleiopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘make ridicule’} \\
\text{pangosmosi\‘os} \quad \text{‘world wide’} \quad \text{pangosmi\‘<o>} \quad \text{pangosimiopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘globalize’} \\
\text{megalos} \quad \text{‘big’} \quad \text{megal\‘<o>} \quad \text{megalopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘make bigger’} \\
\text{steganos} \quad \text{‘water proof’} \quad \text{stegan\‘<o>} \quad \text{steganopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘make water proof’} \\
\text{aplos} \quad \text{‘simple’} \quad \text{apl\‘<o>} \quad \text{aplopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘make simple’} \\
\text{refstos} \quad \text{‘liquid’} \quad \text{refst\‘<o>} \quad \text{refstopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘make liquid’} \\
\end{array}
\]

Table 2. Causative \(-\text{-pi\' o}\) derived from adjectives

We will analyze now, the resultative meaning of \(-\text{-pi\‘ o}\) ‘make into X: convert into X’
(Marchand 1969: 258), e.g. \(\text{poltopi\‘ o}\). Here the process is A \(\Rightarrow\) B. The LCS is illustrated in (14) and (14a-b).

(14) LCS of resultative \(-\text{-pi\‘ o}\) verbs

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Stem} \quad \text{Vowel} \quad \text{Derived Verb} \\
\hline
\text{pulpar}\‘<o> \quad \text{pulparopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘robotize’} \\
\text{leptoparis}\‘<o> \quad \text{leptoparisiopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘refgarrisonize’} \\
\text{poltopi\‘o} \quad \text{‘convert into pulp’} \\
\end{array}
\]

Now, the crucial difference between the causative and the resultative categories lies in the syntactic category of the stem: the causative is de-adjectival (as already shown), meaning “make more X”, e.g. \(\text{refstopi\‘ o}\) ‘liquidize’, \(\text{nomimopi\‘ o}\) ‘legalize’, etc., and the resultative is denominal, meaning “make into X”, e.g. \(\text{konioriopi\‘ o}\) ‘pulverize’, \(\text{poltopi\‘ o}\) ‘turn into pulp’, \(\text{?robotopi\‘ o}\) ‘robotize’, etc. The productivity of \(-\text{-pi\‘ o}\) with both a causative and a resultative meaning is vast if one can think of already established,
forms such as γελιοπ' ‘ridicule’, στεγανοπ' ‘make waterproof’, παγωσμίοπ' ‘globalize’, απλοπ' ‘simplify’, and ἰλοπ' ‘materialize’, πραγματοπ' ‘realize’, etc.

Consider now, the inchoative category of -πιμε verbs, the Middle Voice of -πί', used intransitively and paraphrased as ‘become X’. Here the active -πί', producing only transitive derivative verbs, as it has been shown, and functioning as the exact equivalent of -ize with most of its semantic categories, fails as a counterpart of the inchoative -ize. For example, primitivize ‘become primitive’ does not find the equivalent protagonοπ'. Rather the Middle Voice -πιμε as an inchoative ‘become X’, is significantly productive with de-adjectival derivatives, e.g. προθιμοπιμε ‘become willing’, διαφοροπιμε ‘become different’, etc. The gap of the inchoative -πιό is also filled up here by the marginally productive -izo, used both transitively and intransitively, e.g. κοκινίζω ‘become red’ and make something red’ (a change of state); γίαλίζω ‘shine; become shiny’ and ‘make something shiny; polish’.

It is worth noting here that together with -πιμε and -izo, another verb root, with inchoative meaning, used as a verbal suffix in the place of -πί', is -φερνο <Archaic, φέρω ‘carry’, e.g. γινεκοφερνο ‘derog. (of a man) to behave like a woman’ (cf. womanize, usu. derog. (of a man) ‘to habitually pay attention to many women for sexual purposes’, Longman Dictionary 1990: 1211). It wouldn’t be farfetched here to add the Middle Voice suffix -ονομε (cf. -όνο, Active) as in φαντασιομε ‘fantasize’.

In the analysis of the LCS of inchoative -ίζε/MG -πιμε, -ίζο verbs the function CAUSE is missing and as a result there is no Agent argument of CAUSE. Further, the Theme occurs in the surface subject position and not in the object position.

(15) LCS of inchoative -ίζο, πιμε verbs

[[ Stem *-πί'/-πιμε, -ίζο]V
NP Theme ___
[GO ([Thing Property ]Theme; [TO [Thing, Property ]Stem]])
[GO ([Thing Property ]Theme; [TO [kokino ]Stem]])] ‘inchoative’

A similar picture of -πί' is observed with the performative and similative semantic categories of -ίζε. Consider the illustration of the performative first.

(16) LCS of performative verbs

[[ Stem *-πί'/archaic verb stem Χ’ο, e.g. -λογο, δοτον, (philos)-σοφο < philosphosN

Here Χ’ο can be an archaic verb root, used as a suffix as an exact substitute for -πί' (Mela-Athanasopoulou 2000), e.g. θυκολογο ‘moralize’, λογοδοτο ‘account for’, φιλοσοφο ‘philosophize’;

{NP1 ___ NPTheme, NPTheme ___, NP1 __} CAUSE ([ ], [GO ([Property, Thing Theme/Stem; [TO [Property, Thing Stem/Theme ]])])

The LCS of (17) would be:

(17) Ο φίτιτις φιλοσοφιζε πανο στο θέμα.
The student philosophizes on the subject.
(17a) CAUSE ([φίτιτις], [GO ([philosophy] Stem; [TO [ ]Theme)])
(17b) GO ([φίτιτις] Theme; [TO [philosophy]Stem])
This can be roughly interpreted as

(18a) o fititis skeftete filosofika to \( \theta \)ema,
the student thinks of the subject in a philosophical way,
i.e. eksetazi to \( \theta \)ema se va\( \theta \)os
i.e. he examines the subject in depth

(18b) o fititis simperiferete san filosofos
the student acts in a way characterized by philosophical thought
i.e., becomes a philosopher

All the archaic roots already mentioned (i.e. -\( \delta \)oto, \( \delta \)oto, etc.) fall under the same
analysis of (17) and can be used both transitively and intransitively. Interestingly
enough, for this group of the intransitive -ize verbs (with the performative reading) the
MG counterpart would be the Middle voice of -\( \pi`o \), i.e. -\( \pi`u \)me, combined with a
preposition and yet, having a purely lexicalized meaning, e.g. pro\( \pi`u \)me ‘pretend’,
apop\( \pi`u \)me ‘decline, refuse’ and antip\( \pi`u \)me ‘usurp’, for instance. But such an approach
must be ruled out (cf. Αναστασιάδη-Συμεωνίδη 1986:51) because in these forms -\( \pi`u \)me
functions as an actual verb stem rather than an affix and, in particular, it is the head of a
compound verb (with a non-compositional meaning) with a preposition as a non-head,
e.g. [prosp\( \pi`u \)me\( \pi`u \)s\( \pi`u \)me\( \pi`u \)m] pro\( \pi`u \)me ‘pretend’.

In the case of -\( \pi`u \)me as an inchoative ‘become X’, as already shown, the derived
verb is de-adjectival and -\( \pi`u \)me does behave like an affix, in the sense of -ize. For
example, pro\( \pi`u \)mop\( \pi`u \)me ‘become willing’, ev\( \pi`u \)mop\( \pi`u \)me ‘become sensitive’,
apost\( \pi`u \)mop\( \pi`u \)me ‘become rebellious’, etc.

Coming back to the similative meaning of -ize /-\( \pi`o \) derivatives, i.e. ‘act like X’;
imitate X’, we notice that -izo and, to a limited extent, the archaic verb root used as a
pseudo-suffix (-\( \delta \)erno) blocks the productivity of -\( \pi`o \) as a similative. Consider the data
in (19a-b). In (19a) the Stem (X) is a proper name, whereas in (19b), it is an adjective or
a name of an animal.

(19a) \begin{align*}
\text{americanizo} & \quad \text{act like an American} \\
\text{galizo} & \quad \text{act like a French} \\
\text{platonizo} & \quad \text{follow the doctrines of Plato} \\
\text{lakonizo} & \quad \text{imitate the people of Lakonia (Peloponese) in terms of} \\
& \quad \text{concise speech (lexicalized idiosyncratic meaning)} \\
\text{helinizo} & \quad \text{act like a Greek}
\end{align*}

(19b) \begin{align*}
\text{pi\( \theta \)ikizo} & \quad \text{act like an ape} \\
\text{papa\( \gamma \)alizo} & \quad \text{act like a parrot ‘learn by rote} \\
\text{neanizo} & \quad \text{behave like a youth}
\end{align*}

The possible analysis of (19a-b) as intransitive similatives yields the following LCS
where the Theme occurs in Subject position.

(20) LCS of similative -izo
\[
\begin{array}{l}
[ [ \text{Stem} -izo] \ \text{V} \\
\{\text{NP Theme \_\_}\} \\
\text{CAUSE ([ ]); [GO ([Property, Thing ] Theme/Stem; [TO [Property, Thing ] Stem]])}
\end{array}
\]
For instance, the LCS of the sentence, *meriki epistimones piθikizun* ‘some scientists act like apes’, looks then as in (21).

\[
\text{(21) CAUSE ([ ]; [GO ([meriki-NOM.PL epistimones-NOM.PL] Theme/Stem; [TO [piθikizun.3P]Stem]])])}
\]

Consider now the LCS of (22), in which *eksislamizo* ‘turn X to Islam’ is a transitive verb.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(22) i Irani eksislamizoun tus Kalas} \\
\text{the Iranians islamize the Kalas}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(22a) CAUSE ([i Irani], [GO ([Islam] Stem; [TO [tus Kalas] Theme]])])} \\
\text{(22b) CAUSE ([i Irani]; [GO ([i Kalas-NOM.PL] Theme; [TO [Islam] Stem]])])}
\end{align*}
\]

In (22a), Islam is induced in the Kalas people, whereas in (22b), the Kalas people are transferred to Islam.

It is worth mentioning here, that the notion of “turn X to Noun” of word forms, such as *eksislamizo*, *ekchrishanizo*, *eksellinizo*, etc. is also due to the prefix ek-/eks- (<Ancient Greek preposition ek-) the so-called pre-verb (Ralli 2003) where the stem of, say, (22a) may be a nominal (i.e. Islam, Christian, etc.). Following Ralli (2003), verbs such as *eksislamizo* may derive from a Noun or Adjective combined with -ize, for example, to produce a non-attested verb, e.g. *islamizo* to which ek-, eks- will attach to yield *eksislamizo*.

Lieber treats both performatives and simulatives as ACT verbs, as has already been mentioned earlier in this article. “What follows the ACT function may be either a Manner function in which case we get purely actional verbs like cannibalize or economize, or another Event function, in which case we derive causative or causative/inchoative verbs” (Lieber 1998:20)

So far, our treatment of the polysemy of -ize and -pi’o has suggested that whereas -ize produces both transitive and intransitive derivatives, the MG counterpart -pi’o yields only transitive derivatives due to its syntactic frame: initially an archaic verb stem of transitive nature. On the other hand, the semantic categories of both -ize and -pi’o are almost identical except for the last three, i.e. the inchoative, the performative and the simulative -ize. These are filled up by the Middle Voice -pi’o, that is, -piume, used also as a suffix, or other archaic verb stems used as suffixes such as, -loyo, -krato, -doto, etc. Moreover, the clear suffix -izo – from which -ize has derived – used both transitively and intransitively does fill the gap of -pi’o as far as its inchoative and simulative semantic categories are concerned, e.g. kokinizo and amerikanizo, respectively.

An additional argument for our analysis is that both -izo and the MG counterparts are extremely productive and as such, they are semantically highly transparent. This of course does not entail that marginally productive {-th} (e.g. warmth) is semantically opaque.

3. Conclusion

In this study I have exposed the semantic categories of the MG pseudo-suffix -pi’o as the exact equivalent for the English -ize, (actually the more productive of the two rival
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suffixes -ize and -ify). I have applied the theory of semantic decomposition of verbs put forward by Jackendoff (1990) and the more recent literature. The ideas of LCS have turned out to be extremely useful in the sense that the meaning of the derived verb can be described, predicted, and even formalized in a straightforward way. A more concise analysis of all possible archaic counterparts of -ize is beyond the length of this paper. This I have left for future research.
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