

The dynamics of linguistic contact: Ancient Greek *-ízein* and Latin *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre*

Liana Tronci
University for Foreigners of Siena

Abstract

This paper proposes a re-examination of contact phenomena in Ancient Greek and Latin through a description of the Greek verbs in *-ίζειν [-ízein]* and the Latin loans in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre*. This subject has been much debated, especially from the point of view of the recipient language, whereas the donor language has not yet been adequately taken into consideration. This paper intends to fill the gap, by describing the occurrences of Latin loan verbs and comparing them with their Greek sources. In order to understand the mechanisms of interference between the two languages, it is necessary to analyse the textual and cultural significance of both Greek and Latin verbs, and to investigate the pathways followed by Greek verbs in *-ίζειν [-ízein]* to penetrate into Latin. The cultural and textual domains involved in the borrowing process were, on the one hand, the so-called technical languages, which range from that of Christian religion to that of the treatises on medicine, architecture, agriculture, and grammar, and, on the other hand, the language spoken by the Greeks who inhabited Magna Graecia and, after the Roman occupation, transmitted, as slaves and preceptors, their language and culture to the Roman society. The paper discusses how and to what extent this borrowing process influenced the Latin lexicon and, through it, the lexicon of Romance languages. Some new insights are also given concerning the relationship between lexical borrowing and language change. On the one hand, Greek loanwords increased the Latin lexicon; on the other hand, Latin morphology was also involved, because a new derivational process arose through reanalysis. The spreading of the new derivational pattern in Latin appears to be constrained by sociolinguistic factors. Data from Romance languages provide evidence of the relevance of the new pattern for the Latin language and support the idea that spoken Latin was influenced by the Greek language much more than Classical Latin texts show.

Keywords: Ancient Greek, Latin, lexical borrowing, language change

1 Introduction

This paper aims to re-examine the general subject of language contact between Ancient Greek and Latin, with the study of a contact-induced language change, namely the arising of the Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* from lexical borrowing of Greek verbs in *-ίζειν* [*-ízein*] (Greek words or morphemes are given in Greek alphabet, followed by their transliteration in Latin alphabet in square brackets). Such verbs include, e.g. Lat. *atticissāre* ‘to speak Attic dialect’, *citharizāre* ‘to play the cithara’, and *gargaridiāre* ‘to gargle’ from Greek ἀττικίζειν [*attikízein*], κίθαρίζειν [*kitharízein*], and γαργαρίζειν [*gargarízein*]. This topic has been much debated, especially from the point of view of the recipient language; however, the donor language and its relationship with the recipient language have not yet been adequately taken into consideration. Moreover, scholars have almost exclusively adopted the perspective of external linguistics, by taking into account particularly the social circumstances of the borrowing, and any considerations on language change have been neglected. Evidence of how Greek loanwords entered the Latin lexicon and changed its structure is given not only by Latin, but also by modern languages, such as Romance languages, English, and German, whose lexicon was influenced by that of Latin. The borrowing process considered here not only changed the lexical inventory of Latin, but also gave birth to a new way of creating verbs, which became highly productive in Romance languages.

The aims of this paper are both to account for the lexical and structural influence of Greek on Latin and to contribute to the debate on language contact and its relation with language change, from the point of view of the interplay between external and internal factors (see Chamoreau & Goury 2012; Chamoreau & Léglise 2012; 2013; De Smet et al. 2013). The structure of this paper is as follows: in §2 I present the main topics investigated by scholars and put forward some suggestions based on methodological grounds; in §3 I illustrate the syntactico-semantic values of the verb forms examined here in Greek, Latin, and Romance languages, with the aim of accounting for the paths of borrowing; §4 is dedicated to a discussion of the effects of language contact on language change, and §5 to concluding remarks.

2 An overview of previous studies and some methodological remarks

The subject discussed here has attracted the interest of many scholars, particularly specialists of Latin taking a sociolinguistic perspective. The main topics hitherto investigated are: (a) the morpho-phonemic adaptation of loan verbs in Latin, and their integration within the Latin morpho-phonemic system; (b) the morpho-lexical types of Latin verbs, e.g. loans and calques, in order to determine the degree of their independence towards the donor language; (c) the syntactic and semantic functions of Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre*; and (d) the cultural paths of borrowing. These topics are briefly discussed in §2.1.

2.1 A brief discussion of the literature

As far as morpho-phonemic shapes are concerned, Latin verbs are characterised by three derivational suffixes, *-iss(āre)*, *-iz(āre)*, and *-idi(āre)*, which have been explained as follows (cf. particularly Arena 1965; Mignot 1969: 330–339; Biville 1990: 99–136). The first one (*-issāre*) is a diatopic variant of verb forms borrowed from the Doric Greek of Great Greece: forms such as (Doric) Greek σαλπίσσειν [*salpíssein*] ‘to sound the trumpet’ and λακτίσειν [*laktíssein*] ‘to kick with the foot’ attested in Heraclides of Taranto and corresponding to the (Attic) Greek σαλπίζειν [*salpízein*] and λακτίζειν [*laktízein*] give evidence of the pronunciation [ts] of the Greek consonant <ζ> and are assumed to be the sources for Latin verbs in *-iss(āre)*. The second shape of the suffix (*-izāre*) is the normalised form, which occurs in Latin since the grapheme <z> [z] was introduced into the Latin alphabet in 81 BCE. The third one (*-idiāre*) is a diastratic variant of *-izāre* that presumably reflected the popular pronunciation [dz] of Latin <z>, foreshadowing the phonemic changes in Romance languages (for more details, see Tronci 2015). The suffixes *-issāre* and *-idiāre* did not spread as much as *-izāre* in the Latin lexicon because of diachronic and diastratic constraints: *-issāre* was only used in Early Latin and then disappeared, while *-idiāre* could not occur in literary texts because of its popular and spoken-language nuance. In Latin texts, there are very few verbs in *-idiāre*: according to Cockburn (2012), only three types (*catomidiāre* ‘to strike on the shoulders’, *lactidiāre* ‘to strike with foot’, and *gargaridiāre* ‘to gargle’) are attested, but some verbs in *-izāre* also have forms in *-idiāre* as their diastratic variants, e.g. *baptidiāre* alongside *baptizāre*, and *exorcidiāre* alongside *exorcizāre*.

As for the morphological classification of words, scholars recognise the existence of four types: loans, calques, pseudo-calques (or hybrids), and autonomous Latin formations, along a scale of both greater independence from the model and progressive integration within the Latin system (cf. Funck 1886; Dardano 2008). This classification refers to the traditional sociolinguistic studies on modern languages (e.g. Haugen 1950; Weinreich 1953; Deroy 1956). I give here examples illustrating the four types (meanings of the Greek verb forms that are not present in the Latin counterparts are given in parentheses): Lat. *atticissāre* ‘to speak the Attic dialect’ is a loan from Greek ἀττικίζειν [*attikízein*] ‘to speak Attic (/to side with the Athenians)’, Lat. *graecissāre* ‘to speak Greek’ is a calque on Greek ἐλληνίζειν [*hellēnízein*] ‘to speak Greek (/to make Greek)’, Lat. *moechissāre* ‘to commit adultery with’ is a hybrid formation, created on Lat. *moechus* ‘adulterer’ (loanword from Greek μοιχός [*moikhós*] ‘adulterer’), and Lat. *trullissāre* ‘to plaster’ is an autonomous formation from the Latin word *trulla* ‘drawing tool’. According to Dardano (2008: 54), Latin loanwords in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* can be classified as both cultural and core borrowings, which are defined by Myers-Scotton (2006: 212, 215) as “words that fill gaps in the recipient language’s store of words because they stand for objects or concepts new to the language’s culture” and “words that duplicate elements that the recipient language already has in its word store”, respectively. The former are loanwords pertaining to the technical domains of Christian religion, medicine, and architecture, whilst the latter have been borrowed because of their prestige or foreign allure. The morphological integration of these verbs within the Latin lexicon was probably favoured by the co-existence of another class of Greek loanwords, that of the nouns in *-ismus/-ista*, such as *atticismus* ‘Atticism’ (*atticissāre*), *gargarismus* ‘a gargle’ (*gargaridiāre*), *citharista* ‘a player on the cithara’ (*citharizāre* ‘to play the cithara’), *euangelista* ‘an evangelist’ (*euangelizāre* ‘to evangelise’), and so on (see André 1971: 64–65 and Dardano 2008: 56–57). They were borrowed from Greek nouns in *-ισμός/-ιστής* [*-ismós/-istēs*], which were morpho-lexically related to the verbs in *-ίζειν* [*-ízein*] within the Greek system (for examples, see Necker & Tronci 2012; 2017).

From the point of view of syntax and semantics, both Greek and Latin verbs have unpredictable values; the same lexical item can occur in very different syntactic structures with very different semantic values, e.g. Greek ξενίζειν [*ksenízein*] ‘(a) to receive someone as a guest, (b) to be a stranger, to speak with a foreign accent’ (see §3.1). One semantic classification of Latin verbs (cf. Leumann 1948; Dardano 2008; Cockburn

2012) resembles that of Ancient Greek verbs (cf. Schmoll 1955). Three classes are traditionally recognised: (1) *Faktiviva*, i.e. verbs of doing/making, such as *moechissāre* ‘to commit adultery with’ and *martyrizāre* ‘to make somebody a martyr’; (2) *Instrumentativa*, i.e. verbs denoting the conventional action performed using the instrument designated in the stem, such as *citharizāre* ‘to play the cithara’ and *trullissāre* ‘to plaster’; (3) *Zustandsverba*, i.e. stative verbs, such as *martyrizāre* ‘to be a martyr’ and *graecissāre* ‘to speak Greek’. A great part of this latter class is constituted by the so-called *Imitativa* (i.e. imitative verbs), which have both proper and common nouns as lexical bases, and whose basic meaning may be ‘to behave like x’ (and, by extension, ‘to speak like x’, ‘to dress like x’, and so on): illustrated by verbs like *patrissāre* ‘to behave like a father, to play the father’, *bētizāre* lit. ‘to behave like a Swiss chard’, and *lentulizāre* ‘to imitate Lentulus, to play the Lentulus’, it is one of the most productive types. This classification is, however, too rigid and interpretation-oriented to provide a satisfactory account of the semantic and syntactic variability of verbs (see §3.2).

In Latin literature, verb forms in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* occur principally in Plautus’ comedies, in Christian literature (translations and commentaries of the Bible, works of the Church Fathers), and in Late Latin technical treatises, but they are not found in texts written during the Classical period, or modelled on Classical Latin (on the notion of Classical Latin, see Clackson 2011a). Scholars have therefore suggested that these verbs were perceived by Latin speakers as foreign-sounding words, and that they were only used by authors who wished to make an explicit reference to the Greek language, literature, and culture (cf. Biville 1990; Cockburn 2012). Plautus made reference to Greek and used Greek loans to claim that he was Greek and that the Attic comedy was the model for his works. In Christian literature, translations of sacred books and religious traditions had to be as close as possible to the original text, and new concepts and practices compelled translators to introduce loans from Greek into Latin (e.g. *baptizāre* ‘to baptise’, *anathematizāre* ‘to anathematise, to curse’, *euangelizāre* ‘to preach/to evangelise’, *iudaizāre* ‘to live in the Jewish manner’, *scandalizāre* ‘to cause to stumble’). Late Latin technical treatises were also mostly translated from Greek (cf. Fruyt 2011: 151), especially those dealing with medicine, and they are characterised by many technical loanwords (e.g. *elleborizāre* ‘to poultice with hellebore’, *sinapizāre* ‘to poultice with mustard’) and hybrids (e.g. *clysterizāre* ‘to apply a clyster’, *cauterizāre* ‘to burn with a hot iron, to brand’).

In summary, many important results have been obtained by scholars in understanding how Latin verbs arose, as loans from Greek or as Latin autonomous formations. However, questions have been left unanswered concerning, on the one hand, the interplay between external and internal factors in the dynamics of Latin language change and, on the other hand, the interface between sociolinguistics and diachronic linguistics, i.e. the relationship between the diastratic, diamesic, and diaphasic dimensions of variation and linguistic change. By diastratic I refer to variation across social classes or groups (e.g. educated vs. uneducated), by diamesic to variation across the medium of communication (e.g. written vs. spoken), and by diaphasic to variation in degrees of formality (depending on, e.g. communicative situation, interlocutor, and topic).

2.2 Questions, aims, and method of this study

Within the traditional views illustrated above, Latin verbs appear to be some sort of butterfly collection: there is a list of ca. 140 types that are mostly *hapax legómena* (tokens with a frequency of 1) or, in a small number of cases, verbs with many tokens. The latter, however, occur in translations, commentaries, and quotations of biblical texts, i.e. in Latin texts that closely reproduce the original Greek versions. Because of the strong dependence of the Latin occurrences on their Greek sources, it is not feasible to explain the linguistic and sociolinguistic values of Latin occurrences without taking into account their Greek sources and models. In order to capture the linguistic values of Latin occurrences and, in this way, the social meaning of the language contact that yielded them, I adopt a comparative approach and investigate both Ancient Greek and Latin, following the idea of “conspiracy” between contact-induced phenomena and internal linguistic change (Chamoreau & Léglise 2012: 9).

In order to distinguish the roles of internal and external factors in linguistic change, Johanson (2002: 286) claimed that “[i]nternal factors should probably not be regarded as “reasons” or “forces”, but rather as inherent proclivities or tendencies”. According to Johanson (2002: 286), “[c]ases in which the data seem to admit both external and internal motivations [...] are often instances of externally motivated internal tendencies”. This perspective recalls that suggested by Roman Jakobson (1990 [1938]: 208) and quoted by Weinreich (1953: 25), that a language “accepts foreign structural elements only when they correspond to its tendencies of development”. Within this perspective, the emergence of the

Latin verbs investigated here can be seen as a contact-induced language change: in the Latin system, the structural conditions for creating these verbs existed, but their birth was also made possible by the long-lasting contact with the Greek language (cf. Kaimio 1979; Biville 1990; 1992; 2002; Dubuisson 1992a; 1992b; Adams 2003; for an overview, see Tronci 2015). By structural conditions, I mean the capacity of the Latin language to create new verbs by deriving them from nouns, adjectives or verbs through suffixation (e.g. causative verbs in *-fic(āre)* formed from both nouns and adjectives, and frequentative verbs in *-it(āre)* formed from verbs). Even though Latin did not have recourse to derivational strategies as much as Ancient Greek or Sanskrit in forming new verbs, the existence of these Latin derivational patterns and the ability of speakers, who presumably were mostly bilingual, to analyse the verbs borrowed from Greek worked together in triggering the new Latin derivational process.

This study accounts for the occurrences of Latin verbs by describing them from both external and internal points of view and by comparing them with their lexical and textual Greek sources. Within this comparative perspective, Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* are not regarded as “merely lexical” items of the recipient language, but rather as the outcomes of the convergence between Greek and Latin, which was favoured by the long-lasting contact between the two languages within the Roman society – in accordance with the idea that “[g]rammatical replication is most likely to occur if there is a large degree of intensive and extensive bilingualism among the speakers of the replica language and if contact extends over a longer period of time” (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 13). In spite of the convergence between Greek and Latin, the verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* did not have an even distribution in Latin texts: as often noted, they were prevented from occurring in Classical Latin texts. This uneven distribution is the result of multiple factors, which concern the relationship between the two languages within Roman society and over time, involving diastratic, diaphasic, and diamesic variations.

3 Ancient Greek, Latin, and the paths of borrowing (with an appendix on Romance languages)

In this section, I provide an account for the paths of lexical borrowing, through an in-depth examination of the Greek source verbs and the Latin loans, from both internal and external points of view. My investigation on Greek verbs (§3.1) is restricted primarily to the internal structure of words

(i.e. the relationship between form and function), their occurrences in the texts and their spreading into the lexicon. As far as Latin is concerned (§3.2), external factors are particularly taken into account. I discuss language contact and bilingualism as triggers of lexical borrowing, the role of the Greek language within Roman society, the sources of loanwords, and the literary models for the new Latin formations. The issue of the outcomes of Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* in the Romance languages is also touched upon (§3.3) because of their relevance for understanding the sociolinguistic status of these verbs in the Latin language and society.

3.1 Ancient Greek verbs in *-ίζεῖν [-ízein]*: lexicon, syntax, and semantics

The derivational suffix *-ίζ(εῖν) [-íz(ein)]* arose in Ancient Greek from a morphological reanalysis of verb forms such as *ἐλπίζεῖν [elpízein]* ‘to hope’ and *συρίζεῖν [surízein]* ‘to play the pipe’, where *-ίζ(εῖν) [-íz(ein)]* may be diachronically explained as due to the phonetic coalescence of the nominal stem ending in a stop (either dental, *ἐλπιδ-* [elpid-], or velar, *συριγγ-* [surigg-]) and the inherited verbal suffix *-je/o-*: Ancient Greek *-δ-/γ-* [-d/-g-] + *-j-* > *-ζ-* [-z-] [z]. Once this phonetic coalescence made the two morphemes indistinguishable, the verbs were synchronically reinterpreted as *ἐλπ-ίζεῖν [elp-íz(ein)]* and *σyr-ίζεῖν [sur-íz(ein)]*, and thus arose the verbal suffix *-ίζ(εῖν) [-íz(ein)]*, which was very productive during the history of Greek, starting from Homeric poems until the Hellenistic period and beyond (e.g. Schmoll 1955). Evidence of this productivity is provided by both the morphological and the syntactico-semantic levels of analysis. As for morphology, nominal, adjectival, verbal, adverbial stems, and also proper nouns, numerals, and idioms could combine with *-ίζεῖν [-ízein]*. As for syntax and semantics, the syntactic values of these verbs are so variable that they are unpredictable out of context and their meanings are therefore strongly dependent on the context. The same lexeme can show very different values in different contexts and the verb *ξενίζεῖν [ksenízein]* provides a good example of this. The two meanings of the verb ‘to receive someone as a guest’ and ‘to be a stranger, to speak with a foreign accent’ (cf. Liddell et al. 1996 [1843], s.v.) are due to two different lexical-syntactic processes, as the transitive vs. intransitive syntax of the verb clearly shows. These two meanings reflect the two different but related meanings ‘guest’ and ‘foreign’ of the lexical basis *ξένος [ksénos]*, but a

verb ξενίζεῖν [*ksenízein*] with the meaning ‘to be a guest, to behave like a guest’ would not a priori be excluded.

Besides the lexicalised verbs, e.g. πολεμίζεῖν [*polemízein*] ‘to wage war, to fight’, ὀργίζεῖν [*orgízein*] ‘to make angry, to irritate’, ὀνειδίζεῖν [*oneidízein*] ‘to make a reproach’, νομίζεῖν [*nomízein*] ‘to use customarily, to practise’, and κομίζεῖν [*komízein*] ‘to take care of, to provide for’ (see Tronci 2010; 2012 for a lexico-syntactic analysis), evidence of the extraordinary productivity of -ίζεῖν [*-ízein*] is provided by occasional new formations, as the following examples show. The examples include the original text in Greek and Latin, the transliteration for the Greek, and the translation into English. Translations are taken from the *Cambridge Edition of Greek and Latin Classics and the World English Bible*, with some adjustments. Original texts and abbreviations of Greek and Latin works are available on the website of the Perseus Project.¹

- (1) οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλωπεκίζεῖν,
οὐδ’ ἀμφοτέροισι γίγνεσθαι φίλον. (Aristoph. *Wasps* 1241–1242)
ouk éstin alōpekízein,
oud’amphotéroisi gígnesthai philon.
‘I know not how to play the fox, nor call myself the friend of both parties.’
- (2) εἰ γὰρ μὴ νύμφαι γε θεαὶ Βάκιν ἐξαπάτασκον,
μηδὲ Βάκις θνητούς, μηδ’ αὖ νύμφαι Βάκιν αὐτὸν–
ἐξώλης ἀπόλοι’, εἰ μὴ παύσαιο βακίζων. (Aristoph. *Peace* 1070–1072)
ei gàr mè nýmphai ge theai Bákin eksapátaskon,
mēdè Bákis thnētoús, mēd’aû nýmphai Bákín autòn–
eksólēs apóloi’, ei mè paúsaiο bakízōn.
‘Nay, nay! if only the Nymphs had not fooled Bacis, and Bacis mortal men; and if the Nymphs had not tricked Bacis a second time...
May the plague seize you, if you don’t stop Bacizing!’
- (3) πάσας δ’ ὑμῖν φωνὰς ἰεῖς καὶ ψάλλον καὶ πτερυγίζων
καὶ λυδίζων καὶ ψηνίζων καὶ βαπτόμενος βατραχειοῖς
οὐκ ἐξήρκεσεν, [...] (Aristoph. *Kn.* 522–524)
pásas d’humîn phōnàs hieîs kai psállōn kai pterugízōn
kai ludízōn kai psēnízōn kai baptómenos batrakheioîs
ouk eksérkesen, [...]
‘he had sung in all keys, played the lyre and fluttered wings; he turned into a Lydian and even into a gnat, daubed himself with green to become a frog. All in vain!’

¹ See www.perseus.tufts.edu.

These verbs are all formed on a nominal stem (both common and proper nouns) and occur in intransitive structures. Although their semantic values appear to be different from each other ('to play the fox', 'to prophesy like Bacis', and 'to turn into a Lydian'), they can all be reduced to an essential value 'to play the x' (where 'x' is the lexical basis), and thus to 'to play the fox', 'to play the Bacis', and 'to play the Lydian'. The processes of *antonomasia* and its opposite, *archetypal name*, involve the nouns 'fox', 'Bacis' and 'Lydian' and, then, give birth to the verbs. In *antonomasia*, the noun replacing 'x' is functionally a proper noun, although it is categorially a common noun (e.g. ἀλωπεκίζειν [*alōpekízein*] 'to play the fox'). In *archetypal name*, the noun replacing 'x' is both categorially and functionally a proper noun (e.g. βακίζειν [*bakízein*] 'to play the Bacis'). In both, the nouns are functionally proper nouns, but their creation processes are different. In the case of primary common nouns (e.g. ἀλώπηξ [*alōpēks*] 'fox' in ἀλωπεκίζειν [*alōpekízein*] 'to play the fox'), their denotative value is lost and their connotative value becomes relevant: in the case of the noun ἀλώπηξ [*alōpēks*] 'fox', its connotative value 'to be sly' becomes the commonplace associated with the new proper noun that occurs in the derived verb (e.g. ἀλωπεκίζειν [*alōpekízein*] 'to play the fox', that is, 'to be as sly as a fox'). Regarding primary proper nouns (e.g. Βάκις [*Bákis*] 'Bacis' in βακίζειν [*bakízein*] 'to play the Bacis'), one should assume two functional processes: firstly, the proper noun functionally becomes a common noun, and, secondly, the common noun functionally becomes a new proper noun. Given that common nouns are characterised by a denotative value, the common noun arising from the proper noun Βάκις [*Bákis*] 'Bacis' denotes a prophet, Βάκις [*Bákis*] being a prophet. That is, the common noun Βάκις [*Bákis*] (e.g. 'to be a Βάκις [*Bákis*]', that is, 'to be a prophet') denotes whatever 'prophet' and does not necessarily refer to the prophet called Βάκις [*Bákis*]. Once the proper noun functionally becomes a common noun, *antonomasia* can occur and, thus, a new proper noun arises (see La Fauci 2007; 2008 for the "proper to common to proper noun" cycle).

The meanings of the verbs in -ίζειν [*-ízein*] are sometimes difficult to understand, because the connotations to which they are related depend on encyclopedic knowledge, which is common among people sharing the same culture but can vary from one culture to another. In other words, it is essential to know that Bacis is a prophet to understand the meaning of the verb βακίζειν [*bakízein*] 'to play the Bacis', and hence 'to prophesy like Bacis'. Likewise, some ethnonymic verbs, such as ἑλληνίζειν [*hellēnízein*]

‘to speak Greek’ in (4), refer to the language (‘to play the x by speaking’, hence ‘to speak x’), as it is one of the most important signs of ethnic identity, but other ethnonymic verbs have different connotations, e.g. κρητίζειν [*krētízein*] ‘to play the Cretan’, that is, ‘to lie’, in (5):

- (4) Ἕλλην μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ ἑλληνίζει; (Plat. *Meno* 82b)

Héllēn mén esti kai hellēnízei?

‘He is a Greek, I suppose, and speaks Greek?’

- (5) πρὸς Κρήτα δὲ ἄρα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, κρητίζων ἠγνόει τὸν Φαρνάβαζον. (Plut. *Lys.* 20.2)

pròs Krēta dē ára, tò tou̯ lógu, krētízōn ēgnóei tòn Pharnábazon.

‘but in thus ‘playing the Cretan against a Cretan’, as the saying is, he misjudged Pharnabazus.’

Besides the intransitive ethnonymic type, there is also the transitive ethnonymic one:

- (6) ἀποδρὰς γὰρ ἐς τὴν γωνίαν τυρὸν πολλὸν

κατεσκευέλιξε κανέπλητ’ ἐν τῷ σκότῳ. (Aristoph. *Wasps* 910–911)

apodràs gàr es tēn gōnían turòn polùn

katesikelíze kanéplēt’ en tōi skótōi.

‘He sought refuge in a dark corner to glutton on a big Sicilian cheese, with which he sated his hunger.’

Verbs such as κατασκευέλιζεν [*katasikelízein*] ‘to play the Sicilian, by doing/dealing with (something)’ are a sort of double predication, implying antonomasia (‘to play the x’) on a lexical-syntactic level and a two-argument structure on a syntactic level. This type of verb can be seen as a transitivization of the type in (3).

In addition to the antonomasia type, -ίζειν [*-ízein*] is productive in creating verbs from whatever lexical basis and with no matter what syntactico-semantic value. The verbs can occur in either transitive or intransitive structures. As for the transitive ones, besides the factitive/causative meaning (e.g. βεμβικίζειν [*bembikízein*] ‘let someone be a top’ (from βέμβιξ [*bémbiks*] ‘top’) in (7), many other kinds of relationship between lexical basis and derived verb are possible, e.g. γαστρίζειν [*gastrízein*] ‘to burst the bell’ (from γαστήρ [*gastér*] ‘bell’) in (8), and σιφωνίζειν [*siphōnízein*] ‘to draw off with a siphon’ (from σίφων [*síphōn*] ‘siphon’) in (9). As for the intransitive ones, there is a broad variety of meanings: evidence for this is given in (10–12), in which

παιωνίζεῖν [*paiōnízein*] ‘to chant the Paean’ (from παιών/παιάν [*paiōn/paián*] ‘Paean’), παππίζεῖν [*pappízein*] ‘to say papa’ (from πάππας [*páppas*] ‘papa’), and γρυλίζεῖν [*grulízein*] ‘to grunt’ (from γρυῖλος [*grúlos*] ‘swine’), respectively, are attested. All examples are taken from Aristophanes.

- (7) φέρε νυν, ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς ὀλίγον ξυγγορήσωμεν ἅπαντες,
ἴν’ ἐφ’ ἡσυχίας ἡμῶν πρόσθεν **βεμβικίζουσιν** ἑαυτούς. (Aristoph. *Wasps* 1516–1517)
phére nun, hēmeîs autoîs oligon ksugkhōrēsōmen hāpantes,
*hîn ’eph ’hēsukhías hēmōn prōsthen **bembikízōsin** heautoú.*
‘Let us stand out of the way a little, so that they may twirl at their ease.’
- (8) ὦ πόλις καὶ δῆμ’, ὕφ’ οἴων θηρίων **γαστριζομαι**. (Aristoph. *Kn.* 273)
*ô pólis kai dêm’, huph ’hoiōn thēríōn **gastrízomai**.*
‘Oh citizens! oh people! see how these brutes are bursting my belly.’
- (9) ἐπεὶ τὰδ’ οὐκ εἶρηχ’, ὀρᾶς, ὡς στλεγγίδας λαβοῦσαι
ἔπειτα **σιφωνίζομεν** τὸν οἶνον. (Aristoph. *Thest.* 556–557)
epei tád’ ouk eírēkh’, orâis, hōs stleggídas laboúsai
*épeita **siphōnízomen** tôn oníon.*
‘Have I said how we use the hollow handles of our brooms to draw up wine?’
- (10) εὐφημεῖν χρῆ καὶ στόμα κλείειν καὶ μαρτυριῶν ἀπέχεσθαι,
καὶ τὰ δικαστήρια συγκλείειν, οἷς ἡ πόλις ἤδε γέγηθεν,
ἐπὶ καιναῖσιν δ’ εὐτυχίαισιν **παιωνίζεῖν** τὸ θέατρον. (Aristoph. *Kn.* 1316–1318)
euphēmeîn khre kai stōma kleíein kai marturiōn apékhesthai
kai tà dikastéria sugkleíein, hoîs hē pólis hēde gégēthen,
*epi kaináisin d’eutukhíaisin **paiōnízein** tò théatron.*
‘Maintain a holy silence! Keep your mouths from utterance! call no more witnesses; close these tribunals, which are the delight of this city, and gather at the theater to chant the Paean of thanksgiving to the gods for a fresh favour.’
- (11) [...] καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ἡ θυγάτηρ με
ἀπονίζη καὶ τὸ πόδ’ ἀλείφη καὶ προσκύψασα φιλήσῃ
καὶ **παππίζουσ’** ἅμα τῇ γλώττῃ τὸ τριώβολον ἐκκαλαμάται
(Aristoph. *Wasps* 607–609)
[...] *kai prōta mèn hē thugátēr me*
aponízēi kai tò pód’ aleíphēi kai proskúpsasa philēsēi
*kai **pappízous’** hāma tēi glōttēi tò triōbolon ekkalamátai*
‘first my daughter bathes me, anoints my feet, stoops to kiss me and, while she is calling me “her dearest father”, fishes out my triobolus with her tongue’

- (12) ὑμεῖς δὲ **γρῦλίζοντες** ὑπὸ φιληδίας
 ἔπεσθε μητρί, χοῖροι. (Aristoph. *Pl.* 307–308)
humeîs dè grulízontes hupò philēdías
hépesthe mētrí, khoîroi.
 ‘And do you too grunt with joy and follow your mother, my little pigs.’

A great amount of productivity is also evident when new concepts and tools need to be named, e.g. in Christian religion, philosophy, and medicine. In the context of religion, new meanings are attributed to already existing verbs, cf. βαπτίζειν [*baptízein*] ‘to baptise’ instead of ‘to dip’ in (13) and δαιμονίζεσθαι [*daimonízesthai*] ‘to be possessed by a demon’ instead of ‘to be deified’ in (14), and new verbs are created as well, e.g. σκανδαλίζειν [*skandalízein*] ‘to give offence or scandal to anyone’ in (15) and γαμίζειν [*gamízein*] ‘to give a daughter in marriage’ in (16):

- (13) ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς **βαπτίζω** ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν· (Matthew 3.11)
egò mèn humâs baptízō en húdati eis metánoian;
 ‘I indeed baptise you in water for repentance.’
- (14) ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς **δαιμονιζομένους**· (Mark 1.32)
opsías dè genoménēs, hóte édu ho hélios, épheron pròs autòn pántas toùs kakôs ékhontas kai toùs daimonizoménoús;
 ‘At evening, when the sun had set, they brought to him all who were sick, and those who were possessed by demons.’
- (15) εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ὁ δεξιὸς **σκανδαλίζει** σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν (Matthew 5.29)
ei dè ho ophthalmós sou ho deksiðs skandalízei se, éksele autòn
 ‘if your right eye causes you to stumble, pluck it out and throw it away from you’
- (16) ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε **γαμίζονται**, ἀλλ’ εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. (Mark 12.25)
hótan gàr ek nekrôn anastôsin, oúte gamoûsin oúte gamízontai, all’ eisìn hōs ággeloi en toîs ouranoîs.
 ‘For when they will rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.’

All these types of verbs occur in Latin, as both loanwords and new Latin formations, and constitute a consistent type within the Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre*.

3.2 Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre*: texts, morphological patterns, and syntactico-semantic values

The first occurrences of Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* date back to the 3rd century BCE, and are found in Plautus' comedies and in other Early Latin texts (fragments of Accius', Pacuvius', and Lucilius' works). There are loanwords and calques, both of them reflecting a strong relationship with their Greek model, but there are also new Latin formations. By creating these words, Plautus was allegedly referring to Aristophanes' pieces, and his puns.

- (17) *idne tú mirare, si patrissat filius?* (Pl. *Ps.* 442)
 'Are you surprised at it, if the son does take after the father?'
- (18) *atque adeo hoc argumentum graecissat, tamen non atticissat, verum sicilicissitat* (Pl. *Men.* 11–12)
 'and, in fact, this subject is a Greek one; still, it is not an Attic, but a Sicilian one'
- (19) *mi vir, unde hoc ornatu advenis?*
quid fecisti scipione aut quod habuisti pallium?
in adulterio, dum moechissat Casinam, credo perdidit. (Pl. *Cas.* 974–976)
 'My good man, whence come you in this guise? What have you done with your walking-stick, or how disposed of the cloak you had?
 While he was playing his loving pranks with Casina, he lost it, I fancy.'

The syntactico-semantic features of these forms are clearly similar to those of the Greek verbs above. The shape of Lat. *patrissāre* in (17) recalls that of Greek *παπίζειν* [*pappízein*] in (11) and *πατερίζειν* [*paterízein*], but their values are different: Lat. *patrissāre* 'to play the father' belongs to the antonomasia type, while Greek *παπίζειν* [*pappízein*] 'to say papa' and *πατερίζειν* [*paterízein*] 'to call someone father' do not. Although they are traditionally interpreted as 'to speak Greek/the dialect of Attica/the dialect of Sicily', respectively, Lat. *graecissāre*, *atticissāre*, and *sicilicissitāre* in (18) also belong to the antonomasia type, like the ethnonymic verb form of *ἑλληνίζειν* [*hellēnízein*] in (4). Finally, the verb form of *moechissāre* in (19) is transitive, like that of *κατασκευίζειν* [*katasikelízein*] in (6), so both of them imply a transitivization of the antonomasia type.

Antonomasia-type verbs have had a longstanding durability in diachrony and across languages: they entered Latin through lexical borrowing, and were subsequently inherited by Romance languages,

through regular language change. In both Greek and Italian, the antonomasia type is very productive (cf. Tronci 2015). In Latin, however, the antonomasia type does not appear to be so productive, with the exception of Plautus' creations, and some other later occurrences like the following (see Clackson 2011b: 507):

- (20) *ponit assidue et pro stulto 'baceolum apud pullum pulleiaceum' et pro Cerrito 'uacerrosus' et 'uapide' se habere pro male et 'betizare' pro languere, quod uulgo 'lachanizare' dicitur. (Suet. Aug. 87.2)*
 'He [Augustus] constantly puts *baceolus* for *stultus*, *pullejaceus* for *pullus*, *vacerrosus* for *cerritus*, *vapide se habere* for *male*, and *betizare* for *languere*, which is commonly called *lachanizare*.'

This passage from Suetonius is sociolinguistically interesting for several reasons. First of all, it speaks to the fact that verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* (and particularly the antonomasia type) were not only used by slaves in Plautus' comedies but also by Roman people belonging to the ruling class (here, the emperor Augustus). The differences in using these forms depend on sociolinguistic and diachronic factors. In Plautus' performances, the characters belonged to people of the lower classes, being in most cases Greek slaves, so their speech reproduced that of the lower-class and Graecising people who lived in Rome in the 3rd century BCE. Two centuries later, the Roman ruling class was also Graecised, as evidenced by the passage in (20). According to Suetonius, the emperor Augustus used the verb *bētizāre* instead of the Latin verb *languēre*, or the vernacular loanword *lachanizāre*. Thanks to the metalinguistic remarks of Suetonius, the quasi-synonym Latin verbs *bētizāre*, *languēre*, and *lachanizāre* can find their places within the diasystem of the Latin language. The verb *bētizāre* is the Latin form corresponding to the Greek loanword *lachanizāre*, by means of morpheme induction: they have the same Graecising suffix *-izāre*, but the former has a Latin lexical basis (*bēta* 'beet'), whilst the latter is a Greek loanword. Both forms were considered as belonging to the lower-level language and therefore were avoided in written language, in which only *languēre* was accepted. As regards the verb *bētizāre*, its creation presupposes the ability of the speaker to both analyse the Greek loanword *lachanizāre* (*lachan-izāre*, from Greek *λάχανον* [*lákhanon*] 'garden herbs, vegetables') and create the new lexeme *bētizāre* by replacing the Greek lexical basis *λάχανον* [*lákhanon*] with the Latin one *bēta*. According to Suetonius, the emperor preferred to use the Latin form *bētizāre* rather than the Greek loanword *lachanizāre*. The reasons for his lexical choice are not

given by Suetonius; however, it may be suggested that either the Latin form sounded more expressive than the Greek loanword, or the Greek loanword was considered vernacular Latin, and therefore unsuitable for the emperor (cf. Tronci 2017 for more details).

In sum, Latin played a very important role in ensuring the continuation of the lexical process occurring from Ancient Greek to modern languages. For this reason, it may be assumed that many loanwords and Latin new formations in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* existed in spoken and non-literary Latin, even though they did not find a place in literary texts because of their foreign sounding and low-class nuance. The development of these forms in Romance languages is, however, consistent with the hypothesis of their alleged high frequency in spoken Latin.

It is traditionally recognised by scholars (cf. Cockburn 2010; 2012) that most of the verb forms in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* were created when the Bible was translated from Greek into Latin, and when the clergymen and theologians started to write commentaries on it (see Burton 2011: 489). These verbs are mostly loanwords from Ancient Greek, have many occurrences in Latin, and should be considered technical words, as they are words that Latin borrowed from Greek to refer to Christian religious practices (see Mohrmann 1961). Some Latin examples and their Greek correspondences are given below, in (a) and (b), respectively; they are all extracted from the Bible.

- (21) a. *si tu cum Iudaeus sis gentiliter et non iudaice vivis quomodo gentes cogis iudaizare?* (Galatians 2.14)
 b. εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἔθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις **Ἰουδαΐζειν**;
*ei sù Ioudaîos hupárkhōn ethnîkōs kaì oukhì Ioudaikōs zêis, pōs tà éthnē anagkázεις **Ioudaízein**?*
 ‘If you, being a Jew, live as the Gentiles do, and not as the Jews do, why do you compel the Gentiles to live as the Jews do?’
- (22) a. *thesaurizat et ignorat cui congregabit ea.* (Psalm 38.7)
 b. **θησαυρίζει** καὶ οὐ γινώσκει τίτι συνάξει αὐτά.
thēsaurízei kaì ou ginóskei títi sunáksei autá.
 ‘He heaps up, and doesn’t know who shall gather.’
- (23) a. *praemium enim tibi bonum thesaurizas in die necessitatis;* (Tobit 4.11)
 b. θέμα γὰρ ἀγαθὸν **θησαυρίζεις** σεαυτῷ εἰς ἡμέραν ἀνάγκης·
théma gàr agathòn thēsaurízeis seautōi eis hēméran anágkēs;
 ‘So you will be laying up a good treasure for yourself against the day of necessity.’

- (24) a. *ille autem coepit **anathematizare** et iurare quia nescio hominem istum quem dicitis. (Mark 14.70)*
 b. ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο **ἀναθεματίζειν** καὶ ὀμνύναί ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὃν λέγετε.
*ho δὲ ἔρξαστο **anathematízein** καὶ omnúnai hóti Ouk oída tòn ánthrōpon toúton hōn légete.*
 ‘But he began to curse, and to swear, “I don’t know this man of whom you speak!”’
- (25) a. *et adplicuit ad eos et **anathematizavit** eos (1 Maccabees 5.5)*
 b. καὶ παρενέβαλεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς καὶ **ἀνεθεμάτισεν** αὐτοὺς
*καὶ parenébalen ep’ autoùs καὶ **anethemátisen** autoùs*
 ‘and he marshaled his troops against them and anathematized them’
- (26) a. *et dixit illis angelus nolite timere ecce enim **evangelizo** vobis gaudium magnum. (Luke 2.10)*
 b. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ἄγγελος, Μὴ φοβεῖσθε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ **εὐαγγελίζομαι** ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην.
*καὶ εἶπεν autoîs ho ággelos, Mē phobeîsthe, idou gàr **euaggelízomai** humîn kharàn megálēn.*
 ‘The angel said to them, “Don’t be afraid, for behold, I bring you good news of great joy”.’
- (27) a. *multa quidem et alia exhortans **evangelizabat** populum.*
 b. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν **εὐηγγελίζετο** τὸν λαόν· (Luke 3.18)
*pollà mèn oûn καὶ hétera parakalōn **euēggelízeto** tòn laón;*
 ‘Then with many other exhortations he preached good news to the people.’

These words spread rapidly in both the commentaries on the Bible and the Christian liturgies, which were addressed to clergymen and theologians, and, for the latter, also to the public. The fact that the Latin language was preserved during centuries in the Christian liturgy helped these words enter Romance languages as loans, as *-izzare*, *-iser*, and *-izar* types in Italian, French, and Spanish, respectively.

The syntactico-semantic values of these verbs are variable, as (21–27) show. Close to the *antonomasia* type, here exemplified in (21) by *iudaizāre* (see also *christianizāre* ‘to profess Christianity’, *barbarizāre* ‘to play the barbarian, to speak a barbarian language’, *epicurizāre* ‘to play the Epicurus, to behave like Epicurus’, *admartyrizāre* and *martyrizāre* ‘to play the martyr, to be a martyr’), there are verbs like *thesaurizāre* ‘to treasure up, to store’ and *anathematizāre* ‘to curse, to devote to evil’, which are intransitive in (22) and (24), and transitive in (23) and (25), as well as

euangelizāre ‘to proclaim glad tidings, to proclaim as glad tidings’, which has two different transitive structures illustrated in (26) and (27) (see also *baptizāre* ‘to baptise’). As far as their Greek correspondences are concerned (θησαυρίζειν [*thēsaurízein*] ‘to treasure up’, ἀναθεματίζειν [*anathematízein*] ‘to curse, to devote to evil’, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι [*euaggelízesthai*] ‘to bring good news, to preach’, and also βαπτίζειν [*baptízein*] ‘to baptise’), I suggest an analysis taking the internal point of view. If we assume that the intransitive type arose first, and that a transitivization process happened afterwards, alongside lexicalization, it is reasonable to think that the intransitive type is related to either light verb constructions or cognate object constructions. For instance, ἀναθεματίζειν [*anathematízein*] (τινί [*tiní*]: intransitive) can be related to ἀνάθεμα ἀνατιθέναι τινί [*anáthema anatithénai tiní*] ‘to put a curse on someone’, whilst ἀναθεματίζειν [*anathematízein*] (τινά [*tiná*]: transitive) probably arose from transitivization. This internal analysis cannot be applied to Latin occurrences, since they are loanwords and, for this reason, lack any relationship with Latin lexical items and syntactic structures. However, because of the widespread bilingualism of Roman society, which concerned both upper and lower classes, Latin speakers were able to analyse loanwords and reproduce their morpho-semantic models in creating calques or genuine Latin formations, e.g. *hymnizāre* ‘to sing hymns’ (a hybrid formation derived from the loan *hymnus*, Gr. ὕμνος [*húmnos*] ‘hymn’).

Let us now turn to the Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* which are not borrowed or calqued from Greek, that is, verbs that are formed on Latin lexical bases without any Greek counterpart. According to Mignot (1969: 330), less than twenty *types* formed on Latin lexical bases are attested during the history of Latin, which means that this derivational process was not productive in Latin. Cockburn (2012) pointed out that most of these verbs are attested in Late Latin. This is an interesting fact because it confirms the idea that Classical Latin authors acted as a sort of filter with respect to the Graecising *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* verbs, by avoiding them in their texts.

In Early and Classical Latin, only six verbs formed on Latin lexical bases are found, i.e. *exuibrissāre* ‘to shake the voice (in singing)’ from the Latin verb *uibrāre* ‘to shake’; *patrissāre* ‘to take after one’s father’ from the noun *pater, patris* ‘father’; *matrissāre* ‘to become like one’s mother’ from the noun *mater, matris* ‘mother’; *certissāre* ‘to inform’ from the

adjective *certus* ‘fixed’; *purpurissāre*² ‘to paint with purple’ from the noun *purpura* ‘purple’; and *trullissāre* ‘to plaster’ from the noun *trulla* ‘dipper’. The new Latin formations derive from both nouns and adjectives, similarly to the loanwords: for instance, Lat. *cyathissāre* ‘to fill a *cyathus*’, borrowed from the denominal Greek verb καθαίζειν [*kuathízein*] (lexical basis: the noun κύαθος [*kúathos*] ‘small ladle’) or Lat. *malacissāre* ‘to render soft’, borrowed from Greek μαλακίζειν [*malakízein*] (lexical basis: the adjective μαλακός [*malakós*] ‘soft, sweet’). Even though deverbal formations are very rare in Latin, as are Greek deverbal verbs in -ίζειν [-ízein], some examples exist, e.g. *uibrissāre* and *exuibrissāre* ‘to shake the voice (in singing)’. These six Latin formations in *-issāre* do not seem to have been productive in language use: *patrissāre*, for instance, is attested three times in Plautus, and *purpurissāre* is attested once in Plautus and then disappeared.

With respect to Classical Latin, a turnaround occurred during the first two centuries CE: fifteen new *types* of verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* are attested in that period (Cockburn 2012: 162). Most of them are loanwords which show not only the lexical relationship with the donor language but also its inflectional morphology, e.g. the Greek-like participles *aerizousa* which designates a kind of precious stone (from Gr. ἀερίζειν [*aerízein*] ‘to resemble air’), *amethystizontas* ‘resembling the amethyst in color’ (from an unattested Gr. verb *ἀμεθυστίζειν [*amethustízein*] formed on ἀμέθυστος [*améthustos*] ‘amethyst’), and *astragalizontes* ‘the dice-players’ (from Gr. ἀστραγαλίζειν [*astragalízein*] ‘to play with dice’). All these forms occur in the *Naturalis Historia* by Pliny the Elder, who is well-known for his Graecising language (see Cockburn 2012: 167–179). However, other genuine Latin forms occurred in that period, e.g. the verbs attested by Suetonius, *bombizāre* ‘to buzz (said of bees)’ from the noun *bombus* ‘deep sound’ (which is a loanword from Gr. βόμβος [*bómbos*]), and *tetrissitāre* ‘to cackle’, which presumably refers to the model of the Gr. verbs τρίζειν [*trízein*], τρύζειν [*trúzein*], and τερετίζειν [*teretízein*], all of them designating some human or bird sounds, whilst bearing the Latin frequentative suffix *-it(āre)*. In the Latin language of that period, there are also some interesting forms attested in the *Satyricon* by Petronius. Besides the loanword *catomidiāre* ‘to strike on the shoulders’ (from Gr. κατομίζειν

² Some scholars have suggested that the verb derives from the noun *purpurissum* ‘a kind of dark purple color’ (e.g. Funck 1886: 406, 413; Leumann 1948: 373; Cockburn 2012: 119–120), but I follow Biville (1990: 111), according to whom the verb is a loanword or a calque from the reconstructed Greek verb *πορφυρίσσειν [*porphuríssein*].

[*katōmízein*]) and the hybrid formation *excatarissāre* ‘to clean’, which is formed by the Latin prefix *ex-* and the Greek loan *καθαρίζειν* [*katharízein*] ‘to purify’, the genuine deverbal Latin form *exopinissāre* ‘to think’ (from *opināri* ‘to think’) shows that the derivational process is morpho-lexically meaningless and serves the purpose of providing the new form with a Greek-like sound.

In summary, both loanwords/calques and genuine Latin formations appear to be comparable to their Greek counterparts, as far as both their morphological patterns and their syntactico-semantic values are concerned. The derivational pattern concerns mainly nominal and adjectival lexical bases. The derived verbs can be both transitive and intransitive, like their Greek models. The meanings of the verbs also range from the imitative type (‘to behave/speak/act like x’) to the causative one (‘to make something x’). There is a difference, however, between the Early Latin forms and those belonging to Christian literature: the former were mainly of the *antonomasia* type, while the latter had a greater variety of meanings. Plautus’ loanwords and new formations were considered as amusing and foreign-sounding by Latin speakers, so they were allegedly used in vernacular and spoken language. As far as Christian literature is concerned, the use of Greek loanwords was a requirement imposed by translation, more precisely by the fact that the Latin version of the Bible had to be as close as possible to the Greek source text. Latin speakers who converted to the Christian religion presumably knew the Greek language and viewed it as a feature characterising the lexicon of their religion, because of many Greek-sounding neologisms.

3.3 The evidence of Romance languages

The Latin derivational suffixes *-iss(āre)/-iz(āre)/-idi(āre)* gave rise to two different suffixes in most Romance languages, e.g. It. *-eggiare* and *-izzare*, Fr. *-oyer* and *-iser*, and Sp. *-ear* and *-izar*. This fact is very interesting for my research perspective, because it can be considered as a consequence of the different sociolinguistic spaces of Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre*. Here, I limit myself to giving some general insights into this topic, my main issue being to determine the dynamics of language contact vs. language change in Latin.

The two series of suffixes in the three Romance languages arose from two different diachronic paths: regular morpho-phonetic change (It. *-eggiare*, Fr. *-oyer*, Sp. *-ear*) and reanalysis through lexical borrowing

from Latin (It. *-izzare*, Fr. *-iser*, Sp. *-izar*). The latter suffixes are still productive in all three languages, with both nouns and adjectives as lexical bases, e.g. It. *memorizzare* ‘to memorise’ from the noun *memoria* ‘memory’ and *civilizzare* ‘to civilise’ from the adjective *civile* ‘civil’; Fr. *étatiser* ‘to nationalise’ from the noun *état* ‘state, nation’ and *européaniser* ‘to Europeanise’ from the adjective *européen* ‘European’; Sp. *carbonizar* ‘to carbonise’ from the noun *carbón* ‘carbon’ and *legalizar* ‘to legalise’ from the adjective *legal* ‘legal’. Most verbs occur in transitive structures and are semantically oriented towards factitive and causative values. However, there are also some intransitive forms, e.g. It. *ironizzare*, Fr. *ironiser*, and Sp. *ironizar* ‘to be ironic’ which are presumably learned words. In French, some new formations in *-iser* belong to the imitative type, e.g. *gidiser* ‘to resemble (the style of) André Gide’. In Spanish, the suffix *-izar* became more productive in the 20th century (Bergua Cavero 2004: 183). However, even in past centuries forms in *-izar* existed which were borrowed from Latin or created by reanalysis. Alvar & Pottier (1983: §311) argue that in the 17th century “there are as many verbs in *-izo* as one desires to form” (my translation). Rainer (1993: 592–596) distinguishes two types of derived verbs in *-izar* in Modern Spanish: deadjectival verbs with a factitive meaning, e.g. *culpabilizar* ‘to make somebody feel guilty’ (from the adj. *culpable* ‘guilty’), and *castellanizar* ‘to make something/somebody Castilian’ (from the adj. *castellano* ‘Castilian’); and denominal verbs, whose meanings range from ‘to make something/somebody x’, e.g. *pulverizar* ‘to pulverise’, to ‘to treat somebody as x’, e.g. *tiranizar* ‘to tyrannise’ (cf. also Pharies 2002: 373–374). Verbs derived from proper nouns also belong to this group, e.g. *galvanizar* ‘to galvanise’ and *pasteurizar* ‘to pasteurise’, which are common to other European languages, e.g. Fr. *galvaniser* and *pasteuriser*, It. *galvanizzare* and *pastorizzare*, and German *galvanisieren* and *pasteurisieren*, and can be considered to be pan-European words. As far as Italian verbs in *-izzare* are concerned, their high productivity depends on their occurrence in both common language (e.g. *polemizzare* ‘to argue about’, from the noun *polemica* ‘argument’, *fraternizzare* ‘to fraternise’, from the adjective *fraterno* ‘fraternal’) and specialised languages (e.g. *scannerizzare* ‘to scan’, from the Engl. loanword *scanner*, *digitalizzare* ‘to digitise’ from the adjective *digitale* ‘digital’), according to Dardano (2009: 47–48, 54–55; cf. also Tekavčić 1980: 87–88).

Unlike the verbs formed with the learned suffixes It. *-izzare*, Fr. *-iser*, and Sp. *-izar*, which are productive in all three languages, the verbs

suffixed by Fr. *-oyer* (e.g. *foudroyer* ‘to strike by lightning’ derived from the noun *foudre* ‘lightning’, *rougeoyer* ‘to glow red’ derived from the adjective *rouge* ‘red’) were productive in past centuries but are not anymore.³ According to Pharies (2002: 184), occurrences such as It. *guerreggiare*, Fr. *guerroyer*, and Sp. *guerrear* (and Cat. *guerregar*) ‘to war’ or It. *verdeggiare*, Fr. *verdoyer*, and Sp. *verdear* (and Cat. *verdejar*) ‘to become green’ evidence the high productivity of the suffix *-idiāre* in Late Latin (see Tronci 2015 for more details on *-eggiare* in Ancient Italian). In Spanish, the morpho-phonetic change from Lat. *-izāre* has given the suffix *-ear* which is productive as both denominal (e.g. *pasear* ‘to go for a walk’, derived from the noun *paso* ‘walk’) and deadjectival suffix (*blanquear* ‘to glow white’, from the adjective *blanco* ‘white’). Spanish also preserves a couple of words derived from the same Latin source, such as the popular inherited verb *batear* (in Catalan *batejar*) and the learned loan *bautizar* ‘to baptise’ (cf. Rainer 1993: 458–465; Pharies 2002: 184–186; Bergua Cavero 2004: 185). The phonetic convergence of both Latin suffixes *-idiāre* and *-igāre* into *-ear* increased even more the class of derived verbs in *-ear* (cf. Pharies 2002: 185–186; Cockburn 2013) which counts ca. 829 types in the Spanish language spoken in Chile (cf. Morales Pettorino et al. 1969).

Let us now come back to Italian verbs in *-eggiare*. They are either deadjectival or denominal, occur in transitive and intransitive structures, and carry various semantic values (cf. Tekavčić 1980: 88; Dardano 2009: 47, 53). In some cases, they have the generic factitive nuance (‘to do/to make x’) and can be replaced by a light verb construction containing the noun which is the lexical basis of the verb: for instance, It. *guerreggiare* ‘to war’ can be paraphrased by *fare la guerra*, lit. ‘to make war’. In other cases, the verbs in *-eggiare* belong to the imitative type, e.g. *toscaneggiare* ‘to imitate the Tuscan people’ (from the ethnonym *toscano* ‘Tuscan’), *fellineggiare* ‘to imitate (the style of) Fellini’ (from the proper noun *Fellini*). According to Dardano (2009: 47), the latter type has become very frequent in the language of newspapers in recent decades. The distribution of the verbs formed by *-izzare* and *-eggiare* in Italian is particularly interesting because the two suffixes are both productive and specialise in two different functions. Combined with ethnonyms and proper nouns as lexical bases, *-eggiare*, i.e. the suffix deriving from the vernacular Latin *-idiāre* through regular morpho-phonetic change, specialises in the

³ See www.cnrtl.fr/definition/-oyer.

antonomasia-type function (e.g. *americaneggiare* ‘to behave like an American’); on the other hand, *-izzare*, that is the suffix deriving from upper-class Latin *-izāre* through borrowing, specialises in the transitive/causative function (e.g. *americanizzare* ‘to Americanise’). Both the form and function of the two Italian suffixes mirror the two different sociolinguistic spaces of Latin verbs (see §4). The labels “vernacular” and “upper-class” Latin are not just related to the social classes of speakers. It is well known that the language of the Bible could not be too popular because it was used to deal with religion and to speak of sacred subjects. As pointed out by Burton (2011: 487), one should assume that “[m]any features of biblical Latin [...] are probably best identified as belonging to a sort of post-Classical *koiné* rather than to any definitely stigmatised register”. Thus, “upper-class” and “vernacular” Latin are not absolute labels, but relative to one another. That means that the verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* occurring in Christian literature reflect a “higher” level of language than those occurring in Plautus’ comedies, and this is not surprising.

4 Lexical borrowing and language change: explaining their relationship

The picture drawn above does not exhaust the subject but is sufficient to capture some regularities of the linguistic change that took place in the Latin language as a consequence of lexical borrowing. A new derivational class of verbs arose in Latin through reanalysis of borrowed items, extraction of the suffixes and their application to genuine Latin lexical bases. This class of verbs spread through Latin into Romance languages, and then, through French, into English and German. The result of these long-standing processes is that many European languages share today the derivational patterns whose common shapes are the suffixes borrowed from Greek *-ίζειν* [*-ízein*] into Latin and then inherited or borrowed from Lat. *-izāre* into Romance languages.

4.1 Borrowing and language change: from Greek to Latin (and to Romance languages)

First of all, it must be underlined that lexical borrowing did not involve the lexicon only: syntax and semantics were also concerned because the borrowed items were associated with syntactic and semantic values that

were formerly either unknown or expressed in a different way in Latin. As seen in §3.2, Latin verb forms in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* have various semantic and syntactic values. They cannot be reduced to one type but imply different processes. Both the use of these verbs and their distribution within the texts depend on sociolinguistic variables that concern the diastratic, diaphasic, and diamesic dimensions. An important parameter to evaluate is the relationship with the Greek model, regarding both the values of the source verb and its use within the texts.

One of the most widespread values is the one found in the *antonomasia* type, which is so persistent across centuries that verbs in *-eggiare*, such as *catoneggiare* ‘to play the Cato’ (cf. Latin *lentulizāre* ‘to play the Lentulus’), still exist in Italian. It is not surprising that the *antonomasia* type spread into Romance languages by means of a regular morpho-phonemic change: the Latin verb forms of this type belonged to spoken and popular language, namely the so-called Vulgar Latin, as appears from both their presence in Plautus’ comedies, and their absence in Classical texts (on the label Vulgar Latin, see Herman 2000: 7; Adams 2013: 10–11). Among Romance languages, Italian inherited from Latin this kind of form-function relation, which became very productive in Old Italian, more than it appears to have been in Latin. From the comparison between Latin and Italian, it can be assumed that the lower productiveness of the *antonomasia* type in Latin is not caused by internal (systemic) constraints, it is in fact an optical illusion due to external factors, like the predominance of Classical literature, on the one hand, and the lack of popular texts, on the other hand, in our knowledge of Latin. This assumption is in line with both the (poor) evidence provided by Latin texts and the outcomes of Romance languages. Moreover, it can explain why the *antonomasia* type verbs are patterned on the *-eggiare* form in Italian, and why they never occurred with the *-izzare* form: their diastratic connotation in Latin correlates with their diachronic developments, in other words with the fact that they underwent the regular morpho-phonemic change and were not borrowed by Romance languages.

From Ancient Greek to Latin and from Latin to Romance languages, there exists a long-lasting persistence of some verbs (Gr. *-ίζειν* [*-ízein*], Lat. *-izāre*, It. *-izzare*, Fr. *-iser*, etc.), precisely those that belong to Christian literature. These verbs appear to be unchanged across languages in both form and function: the reason for this is that the religious practices and the ways they were labelled have been long-lastingly maintained across centuries and cultures. As opposed to the *antonomasia*-type verbs, verbs in

Christian literature did not undergo the regular morpho-phonemic change because they entered Latin and then Romance languages through the translation of the Bible and other sacred books, that is, through written texts. The written transmission of texts preserved these verb forms from morpho-phonemic and semantic change. It is interesting to note that the morphological opposition between suffixes developed by Romance languages (e.g. It. *-eggiare* vs. *-izzare*) existed as a sociolinguistic variation within the Latin system: see, for instance, the two Latin verbs *baptizāre* and *baptidiāre*.

Secondly, the study of the relationship between lexical borrowing and language change sheds new light on the social dynamics of the language and its diachrony. As we have seen, the paths through which these verbs were borrowed and spread into Latin are diverse. This fact correlates with the various sociolinguistic values of verb forms and is reflected in the form of the suffix (*-izāre* vs. *-idiāre*), in the different syntactico-semantic functions of verbs, in their distribution in literary texts, and finally in their Romance outcomes. Moreover, this sociolinguistic variation is evidence of the deep integration of the new word class within the language system as a whole, that is, within its system and diasystem. Besides the lexical entries, the inventory of Latin morphemes also increased. The new derivational suffix maintained the manifold semantic and syntactic values of the original Greek one. The difference with the Greek counterpart concerns the sociolinguistic markedness of Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre*, which is relevant not only for explaining the phonetic variability of the suffix and the uneven distribution of verbs within the Latin texts, but also for accounting for the Romance outcomes. In agreement with Matras (2007: 31), it can be claimed that “[t]here is a link between the sociolinguistic norms of a speech community, the intensity of cultural contacts, and the outcomes of structural processes of change”.

4.2 Borrowing and language change: Latin phenomena and theoretical implications

In order to provide a classification of the borrowing process from Greek to Latin, I follow the five-step scale proposed by Thomason & Kaufmann (1988: 74). The phenomenon discussed here reaches the third step because it involves structural borrowing, which is defined by the assumption that “derivational suffixes may be abstracted from borrowed words and added to native vocabulary”. From a synchronic point of view, this borrowing

results in a change of the Latin lexical system: a new set of derived verbs arose and, with them, a new form-function relation. Latin verbs borrowed from Ancient Greek are in fact lexical items, but they also triggered a structural change in derivational mechanisms of the Latin verb system. Lexical borrowing thus also entailed structural borrowing. Nevertheless, the categories of lexical and structural borrowing are sometimes too clear-cut: especially if the language contact involves ancient languages, the speakers are assumed to be bilingual, but their bilingualism cannot be accurately evaluated (see Moravcsik 1978: 120).

The discussion on the “borrowability” of grammatical features dates back, at least, to Whitney (1881), who claimed that “[w]hatever is more formal or structural in character remains in that degree free from the intrusion of foreign material” (quoted in Haugen 1950: 224). The idea that lexical borrowing is one of the factors triggering linguistic change, besides analogy and grammaticalization, dates back to Meillet (1958 [1905–1906]), on the topic of lexical and structural borrowing, and Meillet (1958 [1912]), on the internal factors that entail linguistic change. However, the suggestion that borrowed items or structures induce some changes in the system of the recipient language was unacceptable as it stood to scholars supporting the Structuralist paradigm, e.g. Jakobson (1990 [1938]), Weinreich (1953), and, more recently, Johanson (2002). In their opinion, borrowing is allowed to entail some changes in the recipient language only if these changes existed as internal tendencies in the recipient language itself. According to Weinreich (1953: 25), “[s]ince such latent internal tendencies, however, by definition exist even without the intervention of foreign influence, the language contact and the resulting interference could be considered to have, at best, a trigger effect, releasing or accelerating developments which mature independently”. Scholars have devoted much attention to this topic during the last century (see Gardani et al. 2015 for a detailed overview). Some important aspects of the debate were pointed out by Campbell (1993), who particularly addressed the issue of the borrowability of elements between languages which are not structurally similar. Against the traditional (structuralist) opinion that borrowing requires some structural similarity between donor and recipient language, Campbell demonstrated that the universals and principles which have been proposed to account for constraints on borrowing have been denied by some studies, which display several cases of borrowing between languages that are structurally different (e.g. Finnish and American English in Campbell 1980; Pipil and Spanish in Campbell 1987). Some studies have

also shown that borrowing can be used to fill gaps in the recipient language, particularly when the languages in contact are structurally different (cf., among others, Heath 1978; Muysken 1981; Stolz & Stolz 1996). In Campbell's view, "given enough time and intensive contact, virtually anything can (ultimately) be borrowed" (1993: 103–104; cf. also Thomason & Kaufmann 1988: 14).

In the case study at stake here, the languages concerned are structurally similar, in that both of them are characterised by derivational processes in the domain of verbal morphology and are able to derive verbs from adjectives, nouns, and verbs. That said, it can be argued that the borrowing and the subsequent process of reanalysis were triggered by the long-standing and intensive contacts between Greek and Latin and the sociolinguistic status of the Greek language within Roman society.

5 Concluding remarks

In this article, I have attempted to investigate the general subject of lexical borrowing and its relationship with language change from both the synchronic and the diachronic points of view. By assuming that lexical borrowing from Ancient Greek in Latin was due to the presence of many bilingual Latin speakers, I have illustrated how Greek verb items in $-\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ [*-ízein*] entered Latin and how Latin speakers considered them. Lexical borrowing can be the source for changes that involve the structures of language, in the lexicon as well as on other levels of linguistic analysis. The borrowing of lexical items does not just concern the lexicon, it also has an impact on morphosyntax and semantics because it implies the emergence of new form-function relations. Once the borrowed lexical items and their form-function relations are established in the language system, new formations can be patterned on them. Structural borrowing is at this point completed, and its consequence is a change in the synchronic system of the recipient language.

I also argued for an analysis of the borrowing process and borrowed words that takes into account both internal and external factors. Within this perspective, it was possible to distinguish two classes of loanwords, whose differences concern both synchronic features and diachronic outcomes. The first group of loanwords arose in Early Latin and is composed of *impromptu* formations, occurring particularly in the language of Plautus, who used Greek-sounding words so as to imitate the Greek language spoken by his characters. The verbs in *-issāre/-izāre* which date back to this

period are mostly loanwords and calques; genuine Latin new formations are very rare. For the most part, they are *hapax legómena* and belong to the imitative type. The second group of loanwords penetrated later into Latin, in the first centuries CE, through Christian literature, which was translated from Greek into Latin at that time. Even in this case, the loanwords and calques are more frequent than the new Latin formations. The reason for this is that several Greek verbs in -ίζειν [*-ízein*] attested in the Bible and other Christian texts designated notions and practices which were new for Greek thought and a fortiori for the Latin one. Because of this, they did not have correspondences in the Latin lexicon and could be translated only by means of loans. The verbs belonging to the second group occur frequently in the texts: this is an important difference with respect to the verbs belonging to the first group. They also became a sort of stamp of Latin Christian language. Through borrowing from Latin, most of these verbs spread into European modern languages, e.g. Engl. *to evangelise*, *to demonise*, *to anathematise*. The different outcomes of the two waves of Greek loanwords in Latin depend on external factors, especially the role of the Greek language within Roman society in the last two centuries BCE and the first two centuries CE, and the different Greek textual sources for Latin loans and calques. In Plautus and Early Latin texts, Greek was perceived as the language of slaves and preceptors. Plautus' characters came from the Greek *milieu* of Southern Italy, so their speeches are filled with Greek or Greek-sounding words. The new verbs in *-issāre/-izāre* are an instance of this tendency: by creating these verbs, Plautus made a clear reference to Aristophanes, who created many new verbs in -ίζειν [*-ízein*]. Like the latter, the verbs in *-issāre/-izāre* created by Plautus were short-lived: they did not resist the purism required by Classical Latin authors, who did not allow Greek-sounding words to occur in their works. In Christian literature, by contrast, the need to translate the new religious concepts and practices which were still unknown to Roman culture led translators to render the Greek verbs in -ίζειν [*-ízein*] through loans and calques which started the new lexicon of Christian religion. The high-level sociolinguistic status of this latter type is evidenced by the fact that Latin loanwords from Greek penetrated into Romance languages as learned words (e.g. It. *-izzare* verbs) and did not undergo morpho-phonetic changes, as was the case for the majority of verbs attested in Early Latin and belonging to the imitative type (e.g. It. *-eggiare* verbs).

Finally, my study corroborates the idea that the investigation of language contact should contemplate an approach that integrates internal

and external evidence, on the one hand, and synchronic variability and diachronic change, on the other hand. As I have shown, internal and external evidence converge towards parallel results. From the internal viewpoint, the high productivity of the verbs concerned here in both Greek and Romance languages allows us to suggest that Latin verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* were also productive, much more than Latin texts give evidence for. From the external viewpoint, the diachronic changes from Latin into Romance languages correlate with the sociolinguistic status of Latin verbs. In this case study, the sociolinguistic variation between the learned Latin suffixes *-issāre/-izāre*, on the one hand, and the vernacular suffix *-idiāre*, on the other hand, corresponds to the two different diachronic outcomes of Latin verbs into Romance languages, i.e. the verbs which were borrowed into It. *-izzare*, Fr. *-iser*, and Sp. *-izar*, and the verbs which morpho-phonetically developed into It. *-eggiare*, Fr. *-oyer*, and Sp. *-ear*. Latin has been shown to have been essential for the continuity of the long-standing processes of language interference and change, despite the lack of verbs in *-issāre/-izāre/-idiāre* in Classical Latin and their low productivity in the first centuries of Latin history, until Christian literature and Late Latin.

Acknowledgements

This research was carried out within the project *Multilingualism and Minority Languages in Ancient Europe* [HERA.29.015| CASSIO], funded by *Hera Joint Research Programme “Uses of the Past”*, Horizon 2020 – 649307. I would like to thank Elizabeth Rowley-Jolivet for her help with the English, the two anonymous reviewers and the editors for their helpful comments.

References

- Adams, James N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2013. *Social variation and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alvar, Manuel & Pottier, Bernard. 1983. *Morfología histórica del español* [Spanish historical morphology]. Madrid: Gredos.
- André, Jacques. 1971. *Emprunts et suffixes nominaux en latin* [Loanwords and nominal suffixes in Latin]. Genève: Librairie Droz & Librairie Minard.

- Arena, Roberto. 1965. Contributi alla storia di lat. *-isso* [Contribution to the history of Lat. *-isso*]. *Helikon* 5. 97–122.
- Bergua Caverio, Jorge. 2004. *Los Helenismos del Español* [Graecisms in Spanish]. Madrid: Gredos.
- Biville, Frédérique. 1990. *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonétique. Tome I: Introduction et consonantisme* [Loanwords from Greek to Latin. Phonetic approach. Volume 1: Introduction and consonantism]. Louvain: Peeters.
- . 1992. Le grec parlé en latin vulgaire. Domaines lexicaux, structures linguistiques d'accueil [Uses of Greek in Vulgar Latin. Lexical domains, linguistic structures of the target language]. In Iliescu, Maria & Marxgut, Werner (eds.), *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif III. Actes du IIIème Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Innsbruck, 2–5 septembre 1991* [Vulgar Latin – Late Latin III. Proceedings of the third international conference on Vulgar and Late Latin, Innsbruck, 2–5 September 1991], 25–40. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- . 2002. The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A terminological framework for cases of bilingualism. In Adams, James N. & Janse, Mark & Swain, Simon (eds.), *Bilingualism in ancient society*, 77–102. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burton, Philip. 2011. Christian Latin. In Clackson, James (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language*, 485–501. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Campbell, Lyle. 1980. Towards new perspectives on American Finnish. In Paunonen, Heikki & Suojanen, Matti (eds.), *Central problems in bilingualism*, 43–54 (vol. 3, part 4 of Osmo Ikola (ed.), *Congressus Quintus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*). Turku: Suomen Kielen Seura.
- . 1987. Syntactic change in Pipil. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 53. 253–280.
- . 1993. On proposed universals of grammatical borrowing. In Aertsen, Henk & Jeffers, Robert J. (eds.), *Historical linguistics 1989: Papers from the 9th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, New Brunswick, 14–18 August 1989*, 91–109. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chamoreau, Claudine & Goury, Laurence (eds.). 2012. *Changement linguistique et langues en contact* [Language change and languages in contact]. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Chamoreau, Claudine & Légliise, Isabelle (eds.). 2012. *Dynamics of contact-induced language change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . (eds.). 2013. *The interplay of variation and change in contact settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clackson, James. 2011a. Classical Latin. In Clackson, James (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language*, 236–256. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- . 2011b. The social dialects of Latin. In Clackson, James (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language*, 505–526. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cockburn, Olivia C. 2010. The use of the Latin *-izare* (*-issare*, *-idiare*) suffix in early Christian literature. *Revista de Estudios Latinos (RELat)* 10. 105–116.
- . 2012. *Los verbos latinos en -IZARE (-ISSARE, -IDIARE)* [Latin verbs in *-izare* (*-issare*, *-idiare*)]. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

- 2013. Los sufijos verbales *-ficare* e *-izare* (*-issare*, *-idiare*) y su propagación en el español [The verbal suffixes *-ficare* and *-izare* (*-issare*, *-idiare*) and their spread in Spanish]. In Casanova Herrero, Emili & Calvo Rigual, Cesáreo (eds.), *Actas del XXVI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y de Filología Románicas* [Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Romance Linguistics and Philology], vol. 4, 505–512. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dardano, Paola. 2008. Contatti tra lingue nel mondo mediterraneo antico: i verbi in *-issare/-izare* del latino [Language contact in the Ancient Mediterranean world: Latin verbs in *-issare/-izare*]. In Orioles, Vincenzo & Toso, Fiorenzo (eds.), *Circolazioni linguistiche e culturali nello spazio mediterraneo* [Linguistic and cultural circulation in the Mediterranean area], 49–61. Genova: Le Mani Editore.
- Dardano, Maurizio. 2009. *Costruire parole. La morfologia derivativa dell'italiano* [How to create words. Italian derivational morphology]. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Deroy, Louis. 1956. *L'emprunt linguistique* [Linguistic borrowing]. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- De Smet, Hendrik & Ghesquière, Lobke & Van de Velde, Freek (eds.). 2013. *On multiple source constructions in language change* [special issue]. *Studies in Language* 37(3).
- Dubuisson, Michel. 1992a. Le grec à Rome à l'époque de Cicéron. Extension et qualité du bilinguisme [Greek in Rome in the time of Cicero. Extension and quality of bilingualism]. *Annales ESC* 47(1). 187–206.
- 1992b. Le contact linguistique gréco-latin: problèmes d'interférences et d'emprunts [Linguistic contact between Greek and Latin: interferences and loanwords]. *Lalies* 10. 91–109.
- Fruyt, Michèle. 2011. Latin vocabulary. In Clackson, James (ed.), *A companion to the Latin language*, 144–156. Malden, MA & Oxford, Chichester: Blackwell.
- Funck, Anton. 1886. Die Verba auf *-issare* und *-izare* [Verbs in *-issare* and *-izare*]. *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 3. 398–442.
- Gardani, Francesco & Arkadiev, Peter & Amiridze, Nino. 2015. Borrowed morphology: an overview. In Gardani, Francesco & Arkadiev, Peter & Amiridze, Nino (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 1–26. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26(2). 210–231.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1978. *Linguistic diffusion in Arnhem Land*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, Jozsef. 2000. *Vulgar Latin*. The Pennsylvania State University Press. (Translation of Herman 1967.)
- Jakobson, Roman. 1990. On the theory of phonological affinities. In Waugh, Linda R. & Monville-Burston, Monique (eds.), *On language. Roman Jakobson*, 202–213. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Translation of Jakobson, Roman 1962 [1938].)
- Johanson, Lars. 2002. Contact-induced change in a code-copying framework. In Jones, Mari C. & Esch, Edith (eds.), *Language change: the interplay of internal, external, and extra-linguistic factors*, 285–313. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Kaimio, Jorma. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek language*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- La Fauci, Nunzio. 2007. Antonomasie [Antonomasia]. In Cresti, Emanuela (ed.), *Prospettive nello studio del lessico italiano. Atti del IX Convegno Internazionale della SILFI, Firenze, 14-17 giugno 2006* [Perspectives on the study of the Italian lexicon. Proceedings of the 9th international congress of SILFI, Florence, June, 14–17, 2006], Vol. I, 279–283. Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- . 2008. Nomi propri, luoghi comuni [Proper names, common places]. In Arcamone, Maria Giovanna & De Camilli, Davide & Porcelli, Bruno (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Onomastiche, Pisa, 28 agosto-4 settembre 2005* [Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Onomastics, Pisa, August, 28 - September, 4, 2005], vol. I, 605–613. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Leumann, Manu. 1948. Griechische Verben auf *-ίζειν* im Latein [Greek verbs in *-ίζειν* in Latin]. In *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau* [Essays in ancient philology, literature and history in honour of J. Marouzeau], 371–389. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Liddell, Henry G. & Scott, Robert & Jones, Henry S. 1996 [1843]. *Greek-English lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007. The borrowability of grammatical categories. In Matras, Yaron & Sakel, Jeanette (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 31–74. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1958 [1905–1906]. Comment les mots changent de sens [How words change their meaning]. In Meillet, Antoine (ed.), *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* [Historical and general linguistics], 230–271. Paris: Champion.
- . 1958 [1912]. L'évolution des formes grammaticales [The evolution of grammatical forms]. In Meillet, Antoine (ed.), *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* [Historical and general linguistics], 130–148. Paris: Champion.
- Mignot, Xavier. 1969. *Les verbes dénominatifs latins* [Latin denominal verbs]. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Mohrmann, Christine. 1961. *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens* [Studies on Christian Latin]. Vol. I. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Morales Pettorino, Félix & Quiroz Mejías, Oscar & Mayorga Aravena, Dora. 1969. *Los verbos en -ear en el español del Chile* [The verbs in *-ear* in Chilean Spanish]. Santiago: Editorial del Pacífico.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Universals of language contact. In Greenberg, Joseph H. & Ferguson, Charles A. & Moravcsik, Edith A. (eds.), *Universals of human language. Volume 1: Method and theory*, 93–122. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1981. Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: The case for relexification. In Highfield, Arnold & Valdman, Albert (eds.), *Historicity and variation in Creole studies*, 52–78. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Necker, Heike & Tronci, Liana. 2012. Italian *-ismo* and *-ista* and Ancient Greek *-ismós* and *-istéś*. Morphological processes and diachronic relationships. In Ralli, Angela & Booij, Geert & Scalise, Sergio & Karasimos, Athanasios (eds.), *Morphology and the architecture of grammar. Online proceedings of the Eighth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (Cagliari, Italy, 14–17 September 2011)*, 203–221. (http://www3.lingue.unibo.it/mmm2/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/MMM8_Cagliari_Proceedings.pdf) (Accessed 2017-09-15.)
- . 2017. Proper names and derivational morphology. Italian *-ismo/-ista* and Ancient Greek *-ismós/-isté:s*. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 46(1). 41–60.
- Pharies, David. 2002. *Diccionario etimológico de los sufijos españoles y de otros elementos finales* [Etymological dictionary of Spanish suffixes and other word endings]. Madrid: Gredos.
- Rainer, Franz. 1993. *Spanische Wortbildungslehre* [Spanish word formation]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Schmoll, Hans. 1955. *Die griechischen Verba auf -ίζω* [Greek verbs in -ίζω]. Tübingen: Universität Tübingen Thesis.
- Stolz, Thomas & Stolz, Christel. 1996. Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika Spanisch-amerindischer Sprachkontakt (Hispanoindiana II) [The borrowing of function words in the contact between Spanish and indigenous Mesoamerican languages (Hispanoindiana II)]. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49(1). 86–123.
- Tekavčić, Pavao. 1980. *Grammatica storica dell'italiano. III. Lessico* [Historical grammar of Italian. III. The lexicon]. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Kaufmann, Thomas. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tronci, Liana. 2010. Funzioni, forme, categorie. Una nota su costrutti con verbi in *-ίζω* [Functions, forms, and categories. Some remarks on constructions with verbs in *-ίζω*]. In Putzu, Ignazio & Paulis, Giulio & Nieddu, Gian Franco & Cuzzolin, Pierluigi (eds.), *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia* [Greek morphology between typology and diachrony], 495–511. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- . 2012. Valori differenziali di costrutti con forme verbali in *-ίζω* [Differential values in constructions with verbs in *-ίζω*]. In Lorenzetti, Luca & Mancini, Marco (eds.), *Discontinuità e creolizzazione nella formazione dell'Europa linguistica* [Discontinuity and creolization in the formation of European languages], 273–289. Roma: Il Calamo.
- . 2015. Greco *-ίζω* e latino *-isso/-izo/-idio*. Note preliminari per lo studio di un caso di contatto interlinguistico [Preliminary remarks on Greek *-ίζω* and Latin *-isso/-izo/-idio* as a case-study of language contact]. In Consani, Carlo (ed.), *Contatto interlinguistico tra presente e passato* [Language contact between present and past], 173–195. Milano: LED. (<http://www.ledonline.it/Il-Segno-le-Lettere/allegati/728-Contatto-Interlinguistico-Tronci.pdf>) (Accessed 2017-09-15.)
- . 2017. Quelques remarques pour une reconsidération des verbes latins en *-isso/-izo/-idio* [Some remarks for a new look at Latin verbs in *-isso/-izo/-idio*]. In

- Spevak, Olga (ed.), *Études de linguistique latine II* [Studies in Latin linguistics II], *Pallas* 103, 293–300.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Whitney, William D. 1881. On mixture in language. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 12. 5–26.

Contact information:

Liana Tronci
Università per Stranieri di Siena
Piazza Rosselli 27/28
I-53100 Siena
Italy
e-mail: tronci(at)unistrasi(dot)it