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Abstract

In this paper I present five alternations of the verb system of Modern Greek, which are recurrently mapped on the syntactic frame NP__NP. The actual claim is that only the participation in alternations and/or the allocation to an alternation variant can reliably determine the relation between a verb derivative and its base. In the second part, the conceptual structures and semantic/situational fields of a large number of -izo derivatives appearing inside alternation classes are presented. The restricted character of the conceptual and situational preferences inside alternations classes suggests the dominant character of the alternations component.¹

1.1 Alternations

Firstly, I would like to introduce the verb alternations which I have used for the analysis of the Greek derivatives in -izo. All alternations have double numbering, e.g. 1a/b or 2a/b for the first alternation, depending on whether the b-variant appears in active or passive, respectively.

In the causative/auto alternation, an agent initiates an event (causative variant a) and this Event can be conceptualized independent of that agent (auto variant b). This alternation bears the numbers 1a/b or 2a/b. (1) is an example of the alternation 1a/b and (2) is an example of the alternation 2a/b.

(1) a. I zésti ksínise to gála.
    'The hot weather has soured the milk.'
   b. To gála ksínise.
    'The milk has soured.'
(2) a. I adipolítefsi midhenízi tis prospáthies tis kivérnisis.
    'The opposition annihilates the efforts of the government.'
   b. I prospáthies tis kivérnisis midhenízode.
    'The efforts of the government are annihilated.'

The agent in (1a), i.e. the hot weather, is absent in (1b); the milk may sour without the intervention of a control agent (see below), for example, if acidification takes place for a long time. Furthermore, an agent such as the hot weather or the air may have initiated an acidification process, but the presence of that agent in the course or at the end of this process is optional, i.e. the relevant Event is conceptualized as autonomous.

Similarly, the agent in (2a), i.e. adipolítefsi 'opposition,' is absent in (2b): an effort can be annihilated without the intervention of a control agent, e.g. when these efforts take place in a
time of financial crisis. Or the agent can have only initiated an annihilation process, as would be the case in a detraction campaign. Again, the presence of the agent in the course or at the end of this process is optional and the process is conceptualized as autonomous.

The second alternation is called causative/reflexive. In this alternation, an agent initiates an Event (causative variant), in which the goal of his control action is himself or a part of himself (reflexive variant). This alternation bears the numbers 3a/b or 4a/b. The pair in (3) is an example of the alternation 4a/b.

(3)  a. Xtenízi ta maliá tis.
   'She combs her hair.'
   b. Xtenízete.
   'She combs herself.'

Alternation 3 cannot be easily validated but it is theoretically possible. An active reflexive variant (i.e. alternation 3b) may be attested in the following sentence:

(4)  I paréa skórpiše.
   'The gang broke up.' (lit. 'scattered itself')

The problem is that there is no corresponding causative variant (i.e. alternation 3a) which could contain both an agent NP and a goal NP with the same reference.

(5)  *I paréa skórpiše ton eafó tís.
   'The gang scattered itself.'

Only in a conceptual structure in the identificational field can a reflexive configuration be declared, cf. the Lexical Conceptual Structure ('LCS') in (6) for both the reflexive and the causative variants.

(6)  CAUSE([Thing PARÉA], [GOIdent([Thing PARÉA], [Path TOIdent([Property SKÓRPIOΣ])])]),

where [SKÓRPIOΣ] represents the content of the back-formed A skórpios 'scattered.'

---

1 Parts of this text can be found in Charitonidis (2005), here with some changes and elaborations. Some minor parts can be found in Charitonidis (2006).
The third alternation is the *causative/reciprocal*. In this alternation, an agent initiates an Event (causative variant), in which the goal of the actions of the participants is directed at each other (reciprocal variant). This alternation bears the numbers 5a/b or 6a/b. The pair in (7) is an example of the alternation 6a/b.

(7)  a. O Jórgos *adíkrise* ti Méri (or) I Méri *adíkrise* ton Jórgo.
    'Jórgos met Mary' (or) 'Mary met Jórgos.'
    b. O Jórgos ke i Méri *adikrístikan*.
    'Jórgos and Mary met each other.'

Only a few derivatives in *-ízo* show this alternation. The most of them are old derivations (cf. *xeretízo 'greet,' 'welcome'*') or opaque words (cf. *vrízo 'insult;' see also Charitonidis 2005). Like alternation 3 above, alternation 5 cannot be easily validated. However, it is theoretically possible. An active-reciprocal variant (i.e. alternation variant 5b) is probably substantiated in (8), which contains the informal verb *agapízo 'reconcile,* derived from verb *agapó 'love*' via the aorist paradigm.

(8)  I *adízili agápisan*.
    'The rivals *reconciled themselves.*'

Only in a conceptual structure in an extended *situational field* can a reflexive configuration be declared, cf. the LCS in (9).

(9)  \[
    \text{CAUSE([Thing ADÍZILI], [GO([Action AGÁPI], [Path TO[Thing ADÍZILI]])]),}
\]
where [AGÁPI] represents the content of the related base N *agápi 'love'* of the verb *agapízo*.

The fourth alternation is called *causative/control.* In this alternation, an agent initiates an Event (causative variant a) and has control over it, esp. defining its end (control variant b). This alternation bears the numbers 7a/b or 8a/b. (10) is an example of the alternation 8a/b.

(10)  a. O májiras *alatízi* to fajitó.
    'The cook *salts* the meal.'

---

4 See Charitonidis (2005: 45ff).

5 A derivation base such as *agápi* is related, if it is associated with an indirect derivative such as *agapízo*, which is a formation via the aorist-paradigm of *agapó 'love,'* i.e. *agapáo (present) > agápisa (aorist) > agapízo (present).*
b. To fajitó *alatíze* apó ton májira.

'The meal is being salted by the cook.'

In (10a) and (10b) the agent májiras 'cook' and the moving entity or theme aláti 'salt,' the base of the derivative alatizo 'salt,' are indispensable entities in the whole alatízo 'salt,' are indispensable entities in the whole action. The agent as a volitional entity has control over the whole Event determining the course and end of it. (11) is an example of the more scarce alternation 7a/b.

(11) a. I néa mamá *megalóni* to agoráki.

'The young mother *brings up* the small boy'. (lit. 'makes big')

b. To agoráki *megalóni* apó ti néa mamá tu.

'The young boy *is brought up* by his young mother.' 6 (lit. 'becomes big')

In (11), the agent i néa mamá 'the young mother' initiates a breeding Event (causative variant 7a) and has control over that Event, esp. by defining the end of this Event (control variant 7b). 7 We see thus that in opposition to the alternations 1a/b and 2a/b, the agent is present in the second alternation member and the whole alternation is symmetric with respect to the explicit or implicit presence of the main arguments in the conceptual structure. The last alternation is the passive participle (alternation 9). This alternation has only one member. It denotes an established end state in that it refers to an accomplished Event with a temporal State-extension after its accomplishment. An example of this alternation is (12).

(12) To psári íne *tiganisméno*.

'The fish is fried.'

In most cases, -ízo verbs which have no passive participle do not undergo the alternations 1-8, cf. the verbs *fierujízo* 'flap,' *flatter,* travlízo 'stutter,' 'stammer' and others in Charitonidis 2005.

6 The sense 'grow big' of the verb megalóno (see alternation variant 7b) must be differentiated from the related auto sense 'get old' of the same verb form, in accordance with the alternation model presented here.

7 I cite further evidence for the alternation variant 7b in (i) and (ii).

(i) Ο χαρακτήρας του χαρακτήρα του άρεμου του ισορροπεί από τον μετρημένο Liam Neeson.

'The character of his protagonist *balances* by steady Liam Neeson' (http://www.c-shop.gr/show_dvd.phtml?id=DVD.01800)

(ii) Η Πατησίων κλείνει από μαθητές και εργάτες που καταβαίνουν σε συμμαράσση.

'Patission street *is barricaded* by students and workers (lit. 'closes'), who run together for support.' (http://www.dea.org.gr/efhmerida/86/keimeno4.htm)
which do not alternate. The passive participle is thus an indication for the existence of these alternations.

1.2 Multi-mapping

The multiple mapping or ‘multi-mapping’ of semantics onto morphology in the domain of verb derivation in Modern Greek becomes apparent from the fact that parallel suffixes compete with -ízo for the expression of the same verb meaning, cf. plut-énο/plut-ízo 'become rich,' kitrin-ízo/kitrin-íázo 'become yellow,' a.o. In this section, I want to further discuss the multiple mapping of verb semantics onto the active and passive morphology, already mentioned in the previous section.

Voice switches in the Greek verb do not always correspond to different semantics, in that they can sometimes point to the same Event. Cf. the following sentences:

(13) Ta skupídhia skórpisan. (Auto alternation 1b with active morphology)

'The rubbish was scattered.'

(14) Ta skupídhia skorpístikan. (Auto alternation 2b with passive morphology)

'The rubbish was scattered.'

(15) Ta skupídhia skorpístikan apó ti gáta. (Control alternation 8b with passive morphology)

'The rubbish was scattered by the cat.'

As we can see, the active form skórpisan in (13) and the passive form skorpístikan in (14) point to the same Event. On the other hand, the same passive form skorpístikan can express an auto or a control Event, cf. (14) and (15), respectively.

The control category is regularly expressed by passive morphology. The fact that sentences like (16) with an active verb are not evaluated as ungrammatical by all informants is a further indication that the use of voice sometimes fails to obey regular morphosemantic mappings.

(16) ?Ta skupídhia skórpisan apó ti gáta. (Control alternation 7b with active morphology)

'The rubbish was scattered by the cat.'

In the alternation classes analysis in Charitonidis (2005), I tried to accommodate all cases of voice multi-mapping. All these cases suggest that active and passive morphology of the Greek verb often overlap indifferently.
1.3 Overview

Table 1 gives an overview of the alternations discussed in sections 1.1 and 1.2. The three bordered cells (alternations 3b, 5b and 7b) point to the exceptional status of the contained alternation variants.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Auto Active</td>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Auto Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Reflexive Active</td>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Reflexive Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5a</th>
<th>5b</th>
<th>6a</th>
<th>6b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Reciprocal Active</td>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Reciprocal Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a</th>
<th>7b</th>
<th>8a</th>
<th>8b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Control Active</td>
<td>Causative Active</td>
<td>Control Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízi</td>
<td>-ízete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passive Participle (established end state —endings in nominative singular)

-μένος (masc.), -μένη (fem.), -μένο (neut.)

1.4 Conceptual structures - Semantic fields

For the determination of the semantic relation between a verb derivative and its base, I propose a simple version of Jackendoff’s (1990) conceptual structures, paying special attention to the basic thematic Event. According to the proposed model, conceptual categories and functions are under-decomposed, whereas the content of the derivation base, appearing as semantic/situational field, compensates for this under-decomposition.9

---

8 For a full overview of the verb endings see appendix B.
For the determination of the semantic fields I followed these tactics:
The starting point for their differentiation is the content of the base. For example, from the two main semantic elements which compose the meaning of the verb *stubízo* 'pestle,' i.e. INSTRUMENT & CONTACT BY IMPACT, the dominant semantic field is INSTRUMENT, since it immediately represents the content of the base *stúbos* 'pestle.' The field CONTACT BY IMPACT is an accompanying semantic feature/field, since it figures only after the association of the base with a conceptual structure, in this case a conceptual structure which contains a theme moving to a reference object, cf. the following sentence with its conceptual structure (LCS1; see section 3):

(17) O María *stubízi* ta amígghala.

'María *pestles* the almonds.'

CAUSE([MARÍA], [GO([STÚBOS], [PATH TO[AMÍGDALA]])])

The assessment that INSTRUMENT is the dominant semantic field of *stubízo* may have another motivation: instruments are closely related to sensomotorics and the conceptualization of space, esp. through a body-part motion.

The clear-cut distinction between a dominant semantic field and an accompanying semantic field/feature is not always obvious, cf. the derivative *ramfízo* 'peck (at),' 'pick' whose base *râmfos* 'bill,' 'beak' denotes a BODY PART and an INSTRUMENT or *xastukízo* 'slap sb in the face,' whose base *xastúki* 'slap/smack in the face' only implies (but does not denote) a BODY PART or an INSTRUMENT. Cases like these are decided again according to the content of the base: the dominant semantic fields are BODY PART in *ramfízo* and CONTACT BY IMPACT WITH BODY PART in *xastukízo* since their bases *râmfos* and *xastúki* denote a Thing or Action, respectively.

A more difficult case is represented by verbs like *afionízo* 'give sb opium,' whose base *afióni* can be thought of to refer to the fields FOOD/DRINK, SUBSTANCE, or PSYCHOLOGICAL. Since *afióni* 'opium' refers to an object, the FOOD/DRINK or SUBSTANCE option seems more adequate. But in a situational approach the regarding of this field as dominant can only partially account for the semantics of the derivative. In this context, a principled solution cannot be offered. Cases like this are accounted for by means of complex semantic fields, e.g. FOOD/DRINK & SUBSTANCE & PSYCHOLOGICAL for *afionízo* (whereby the field PSYCHOLOGICAL may be inferred from the other fields).

Let us try to summarize the process of accessing the semantic fields of *-ízo* derivatives:
1. The content of the base of the derivative sets the frame of a semantic field.
2. There is a dominant field related to the denotatum of the derivation base and an accompanying field or feature related to the whole conceptual structure.
3. If the content of the base fails to represent the Event denoted by the derivative, then the content of the whole situation can be represented by a complex of semantic fields/features. The author is conscious of the empirical character of such an approach, since situations are complex entities. The attempt to fix prominent elements in the domain of a morphological process like verb derivation necessarily takes two basic assumptions into account:

a. The derivation base points to the relevant or prominent element of the situation denoted by the derivative (see above), and

b. the assertion of particular semantic fields/features can only be made holistically.

Case b entails that the establishment of a semantic element as field or feature is dependent on its regular appearance in a variety of situations, cf. the semantic field/feature CONFLICT which often appears with verbs of CONTACT BY IMPACT WITH BODY PART (e.g. xastukízo), VERBAL (e.g. sixtirízo1 'insult scurrilously'), etc., and the semantic field/feature CONTACT BY IMPACT which often appears with INSTRUMENT verbs (e.g. stubízo).10

For these reasons, a principled fixing of a semantic field/feature as main or secondary can miss the point of the complexity of situations. Therefore, the process of accessing the semantic fields of -ízo derivatives (under 1-3 above) imposes no hierarchy between them. The use of the terms semantic field and semantic feature is in principle only connected to the gradual extraction of semantic fields using this intuitive method. Let me now present how these three components work.

2 Split verbs with transparent structures: the verb kapnízo 'smoke'

The meanings of verbs in Modern Greek can be adequately distinguished on the basis of alternations. The conceptual structures, which represent the semantic relationship between a derivative and its base, appear then as artifacts of the situations defined by the alternation classes.

Table 2 (see next page) shows how the main senses of the verb kapnízo can be clearly differentiated only on the basis of alternations, even though kapnízo1 and kapnízo3 have the same conceptual structure (in that the denotatum of the base occupies the theme-position), and they refer to the same semantic field, i.e. the field EMISSION/ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT.

The semantic field of kapnízo2 suggests that the relationship between this verb and its base kapnós 'smoke' is not like the relationship between kapnízo1 and kapnízo3 and their respective bases. In kapnízo2 the base refers to the action-related field (or feature) COVERING, which is

10 Until this point of argumentation, some non-alternating control verbs were taken into account, e.g. ramfízo and sixtirízo1. In general, all non-alternating verbs in -ízo have contributed to the assessment of the relevant semantic fields appearing in this section (see Charitonidis 2005: 147-158 for a complete analysis of the non-alternating verbs in -ízo).
absent in *kapnizo1* and *kapnizo3*. Therefore, we should define *kapnós2* as the base of *kapnizo2* and depart from a prototype entity represented by *kapnós* for all three senses of *kapnizo*.

On the other hand, one has to define a different conceptual structure for *kapnizo2*, which is in accord with the Event denoted by this verb, i.e. the LCS in (18).

\[(18) \text{Event} \text{CAUSE}([\text{Thing} \ldots \ldots], [\text{GO}([\text{Thing} \text{KAPNÓS}], [\text{Path TO} \text{[\text{Thing}]]}])]) \text{(LCS1)}\]

In this LCS, the Path-function TO appears, in constrast to the LCSs of *kapnizo1* and *kapnizo3*, in which the Path-function FROM appears (see (19a) and (19b), respectively).

\[(19) \text{a. Event} \text{GO}([\text{THING} \text{KAPNÓS}], [\text{Path FROM} \text{[\text{Thing}]]}) \text{(LCS4)}\]
\[(19) \text{b. Event} \text{CAUSE}([\text{THING} \ldots \ldots \ldots], [\text{GO}([\text{THING} \text{KAPNÓS}], [\text{Path FROM} \text{[\text{Thing}]]}])]) \text{(LCS4)}\]

Accordingly, we see that the clustering of alternations in the three verb senses of *kapnizo* make two things possible, i.e. (a) the exact differentiation of the semantic fields and consequently the exact specification of the derivation base, and (b) the exact relationship between the derivatives and their bases, as this is manifest in the respective conceptual structures (cf. the absence of an agent in the alternation class 1*a/b_ *9 of *kapnizo1* in table 2).

The same alternations clustering allows for a specification of detailed conceptual structures for the three senses. The LCSs of the sentences in (20) and (21) are given here as examples of detailed conceptual structures.

---

(20) O Jánis *kapnízi* to psári.

'Jánis *smokes* the fish.'

\[
\text{Event} \text{CAUSE}([\text{Thing} \text{JÁNIS}], [\text{GO}([\text{Thing} \text{KAPNÓS}], [\text{Path} \text{IN}([\text{Thing} \text{PSÁRI}])])])
\]

(21) O Jánis *kápnise* ton tixo.

'Jánis *has smoked* the wall.' (e.g. by holding an ignited torch near the wall)

\[
\text{Event} \text{CAUSE}([\text{Thing} \text{JÁNIS}], [\text{GO}([\text{Thing} \text{KAPNÓS}], [\text{Path} \text{ON}([\text{Thing} \text{TÍXOS}])])])
\]

As we see in the conceptual structures in (20) and (21), a complex Path constituent, which contains the functions IN or ON in addition to the function TO, would have further differentiated the sense of *kapnízo*2, regardless of the substantially common and linguistically relevant element in the two structures, i.e. the presence of the path function TO, which refers to a spatial end point.

On the other hand, the conceptual structure of *kapnízo*1 and *kapnízo*3 needs only be differentiated in respect to the fact that in *kapnízo*1, in contrast to *kapnízo*3, an agent intervention and an established end state is out of the question. The relationship between these two derivatives and their bases, however, is in principle the same.

### 2.1 Further splitting patterns

#### 2.1.2 Split verbs with opaque structures

The following table illustrates how the make-up of an opaque verb\(^\text{12}\) like *potízo* can be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Senses</th>
<th>Alternation Classes</th>
<th>Semantic/Situational Fields</th>
<th>Conceptual Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>potízo</em>1</td>
<td>'water,' 'irrigate'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>opaque (see Table 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potízo</em>2</td>
<td>'water sth/sb'</td>
<td>4a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>LIQUID/WATER</td>
<td>opaque (see Table 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potízo</em>3</td>
<td>'ooze'</td>
<td>1a/b_2a/b_9</td>
<td>LIQUID/MOISTURE</td>
<td>opaque (see Table 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8a/b_9: Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle

4a/b_8a/b_9: Causative Active/Reflexive Passive_Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle

1a/b_2a/b_9: Causative Active/Auto Active_Causative Active/Auto Passive_Passive Participle

\(\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\) Diachronically opaque split verbs with a back formation like *skorpízo* fall into the category of the *synchronously related verbs* (see section 3), in other words they are regarded as another kind of split verbs with transparent and/or semitransparent structures (for the latter see section 2.1.4).
Let us see how the three components ACs, SFs and CSs interact. The base of all three verbs in Table 3 is opaque: the original base noun pótos 'drinking,' 'drinking-bout,' 'carousal' (LS-online) is an old word which has not survived and no correlative noun can be construed as the base of the verb in Modern Greek (potó 'drink,' 'beverage' can be only loosely connected to some of the uses of potízo2). What consequences can such an opacity have on the interpretation of the verbs?

First of all, a conceptual structure must be construed on the basis of the meaning of the verbs. The totally incorporated arguments as moving elements (themes) can be inferred: they must be something like 'water' for potízo1, 'liquid'/water' for potízo2, and 'liquid'/moisture' for potízo3 (cf. the semantic fields in Table 3). After this identification, the correlating conceptual structures can be constructed as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>potízo1</td>
<td>CAUSE([Thing], [GO([Thing][WATER], [Path][TO[Thing]])])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potízo2</td>
<td>CAUSE([Thing], [GO([Thing][LIQUID/WATER], [Path][TO[Thing]])])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potízo3</td>
<td>CAUSE([Thing], [GO([Thing][LIQUID/MOISTURE], [Path][TO[Thing]])])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion configuration for all three verbs is, in principle, the same. The totally incorporated argument has the same structural position and expresses the same ontological category in the same minimal structure: it is a Thing/theme which moves on a Path trajectory towards another Thing. As we see then, the three verbs are hardly differentiated at the level of thematic relations. (Of course, at the overall conceptual level, a differentiating factor is the optionality of the CAUSE function in potízo3. Other factors are mentioned in footnotes 8 and 9).

The next consequence of the opacity of these structures is that the relevant semantic fields cannot be reliably defined as in the case of the synchronically related verbs (see chapter 4). For example, in kapnízo the relevant base can be easily integrated in a semantic field and it can be related to three scenes according to the verb morphology/syntax (see above). However, this is not the case with potízo: although a certain similarity between the inferred incorporated arguments exists, the exact definition of these arguments must be made on the basis of the scenes in which the three verb readings appear. These scenes must be something like 'irrigating' for potízo1, 'transfer of liquid/water among humans and/or animals' for potízo2, and 'penetration of liquid/moisture into a material' for potízo3, as examples (4)-(6) illustrate:

---

13 Plus reflexive binding for the reflexive passive variant (alternation 4b).
14 Plus Argument Fusion for the causative variants, e.g. for a sentence like i igrasía pótise ton tíxo 'the moisture has oozed into/through the wall,' the totally incorporated argument [LIQUID/MOISTURE] functions as a selectional restriction for the NP i igrasía (for the rule of Argument Fusion see Jackendoff 1990:53f).
(22) potízo1

'Potízi ton kípo'

'He waters the garden.'

(23) potízo2

a. Ton potízi uíski.

'He gives him (large amounts of) whisky to drink.'

b. Potízi to álago.

'He waters the horse.'

(24) potízo3

I igrasia pótise ton tixo.

'Water oozed through the wall.'

The Event frame/structure of these scenes offer the alternation classes, i.e. the morphosyntactic make-up of the three verbs (see Table 3). It is the linguistic level at which the three verb readings are explicitly and adequately differentiated.

A similar split verb is zematízo 'scald,' 'scorch.'

### 2.1.3 Split verbs with transparent and opaque structures

Split verbs like \textit{kapnizo}, with transparent structures, and split verbs like \textit{potizo}, with opaque structures, are similar in relation to the interpretation demands which they make: the reader/listener must connect an Event with a basically \textit{homogeneous} incorporated argument in order to grasp the prominent scenes in which these verbs appear, cf. the explicit argument [\textit{KAPNÓS}] 'smoke' for \textit{kapnizo} and the implicit argument [\textit{LIQUID}] for \textit{potizo}, respectively.

However, this is not always the case. There are split verbs with transparent and opaque structures, which demand different interpretations, cf. the verb \textit{stixizo} in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Senses</th>
<th>Alternation Classes</th>
<th>Semantic/Situational Fields</th>
<th>Conceptual Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stixízo1</td>
<td>'cost'</td>
<td>No Alternations</td>
<td>STATIVE</td>
<td>opaque (cf. the structure in (26))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stixízo2</td>
<td>'line sb up'</td>
<td>4a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{4a/b_8a/b_9: Causative Active/Reflexive Passive_Causative Active/Control Passive_Passive Participle}

In Modern Greek it is not possible to relate the meaning of \textit{stixízo1} with one of the meanings of the base \textit{stíxos}, cf. the meanings 'line,' 'file,' 'row,' 'rank,' etc. Therefore, the verb is characterized as \textit{opaque}. In a sentence like (25), the conceptual structure of this verb is something like (26).
(25) To fôrema stixízi.

'The dress is expensive.'

(26) StateBE_Ident([Thing DRESS], [Place AT_Ident([Property EXPENSIVE])])

The same is not true for stixízo2. The content of its base stíxos can be unequivocally embedded as an incorporated argument in a conceptual structure which denotes an Event, cf. (27).

(27) EventCAUSE([Thing ], [GO_Ident([Thing ], [Path TO_Ident([Thing STÍXOS])])]),

where the first argument of GO can be an animate or inanimate Thing (with the relevant binding in the 4b alternation variant).

This is a case in which readings of verbs are differentiated by means of their positive or negative membership in alternations as well as by means of their totally different conceptual structures: as opposed to stixízo2, which participates in three alternations and expresses an Event, stixízo1 is a verb which shows no alternations and expresses a State. The semantic fields STATIVE of stíxízo2 and FORM of stixízo1 confirm the different semantic make-up of these verbs.

We see that syntax, morphology and semantics co-operate extremely distinctively so that the same verb form is associated with two totally different lexical representations (see Table 5 above).

The verb xrimatízo is a slightly different case, cf. the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Senses</th>
<th>Alternation Classes</th>
<th>Semantic/Situational Fields</th>
<th>Conceptual Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xrimatízo1</td>
<td>'give (money as) bribes/backhanders'</td>
<td>8a/b_ *9</td>
<td>EXCHANGE</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xrimatízo2</td>
<td>'serve as'</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>STATIVE</td>
<td>opaque</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8ab_ *9: Causative Active/Control Passive _*Passive Participle.

As opposed to stixízo1 (see (26)), xrimatízo2 cannot be thought of as a verb with an incorporated argument, cf. the following sentence with its conceptual structure:

(28) Xrimátise ipurgós.

'He served as a minister.'

StateBE_Ident([Thing HE], [Place AT_Ident([Thing I PURGÓS])]),

where Thing [IPURGÓS] is a Type

15 See Jackendoff 1983:194ff for the definition of the identificational semantic field.
16 See Jackendoff 1983:194.
Thus we see that in addition to the absence of alternations, overt (predicative) syntax reinforces the meaning differentiation of *xrimatizo*2, so that this verb form becomes completely opaque.

### 2.1.4 Split verbs with transparent and semitransparent structures

In this chapter, the term *semitransparent structure* is used for -izo verbs with an irregular semantic connection to their base. In the case of these verbs, a native speaker of Modern Greek can easily recognize the base of a derivative, although he cannot immediately explain what the exact relation of the derivative to its base is. Linguistically speaking, the content of the base cannot be immediately embedded in a conceptual structure but only after some kind of computation on the content of the base.

With regard to the discussion at hand, there are split verbs which appear with transparent and semitransparent structures. The following table exemplifies the general make-up of such a split verb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kokinizo1</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kokinizo2</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a/b_9: Causative Active/Auto Active_Passive Participle  
8a/*b_9: Causative Active/*Control Passive_Passive Participle

*Kokinizo1* participates in two alternations showing no gaps. The semantic field of this verb is the super-category of the content of the base, i.e. it is COLOUR for *kókino* 'red.' The conceptual structure can be easily defined in the identificational field by means of the relation of an entity to a Thing(Type), i.e.

(29)  \[ \text{CAUSE}([\text{Thing}_\text{kókino}]) \]

*Kokinizo2* participates in two alternations showing no Passive Control variant. Its semantic field and conceptual structure must be inferred by means of a rule operating on the base. Such a rule could be:

(30)  *Inferred end-state rule*  
\[ \text{Relate the conceptual structure of the base with the end state of a Thing in an Event} \]
The conceptual structure of the base kôkino, i.e. \([\text{Thing}\text{Type}KÔKINO]\), must be related to the end state of a Thing like kréas 'meat' in an Event like cooking, simultaneously defining the semantic field of the verb, i.e. COOKING. In this case, the conceptual structure of kokinizo2 is not very different from that of kokinizo1 (cf. Table 7), provided that a rule like (30) immediately operates on the base in order to produce the right interpretation.

We see again that the two main readings of kokinizo are reliably/immediately differentiated only on the basis of alternation classes to which they are connected, since the conceptual structure and the semantic field of kokinizo2 cannot be immediately defined and must be computed. Kokinizo is not the only split verb which demands the use of an inference rule operating on the base for one of its readings. Similar verbs are: jalízo and xeretízo.\(^{17}\)

By means of such an analysis, even metaphorical uses of verbs can be explained, cf. the metaphorical xeretízo 'welcome.' What one needs is a rule like (30)\(^{18}\) and the correct identification of the alternation classes.

It is clear that the meaning deviation observed in kokinizo2 does not fall into the domain of regular verb derivation. Evidence for this is the fact that one cannot correlate the meaning of this verb with a corresponding meaning of the base in isolation, i.e. kôkino does not mean 'cooked.' In the same way jalí (related base of jalízo) does not mean 'burnished/polished thing' and xérete (related base of xeretízo) does not mean 'welcome.' In the case of the last two verbs, this is only possible in idiom phrases like: to asimi éjine jalí 'the silver is polished' (literally: 'the silver became glass') or den mu ípe úte éna xérete 'he didn't welcome me' (literally: 'he didn't even say hello to me').

Other similar verbs are gremízo, kerdhízo, lianízo, plutízo, prikízo, rithmízo, ro-kanízo, sixtirízo, skorpízo (cf. BF skórpios), skupízo, stolízo, thisavrízo, tonízo, vasanízo, zíjízo.\(^{19}\)

2.1.5 Split verbs with semitransparent structures

The following subclass of split verbs does not show the same interpretation pattern as that in section 6.4. The semitransparent structure doesn't seem to follow a rule like that in (30) and the verb can almost be characterized as opaque, cf. Table 8.

\(^{17}\) See appendix A for the overall properties of these verbs.

\(^{18}\) Such a rule could be, (a) for xeretízo:
'relate the conceptual structure of the base, i.e. the address 'hello,' with the behaviour of the agent in an Event,' in other words: 'when X says 'hello' to Y, then X welcomes Y,'
and, (b) for jalízo:
'relate the conceptual structure of the base, i.e. the base of the noun jalí 'glass,' with properties of a Thing in an Event,' in other words: 'when X makes Y shine like glass, then X polishes/burnishes Y.'

\(^{19}\) See appendix A for the overall properties of these verbs.
The verb *mirízo* was originally derived in ancient times from the noun *mýron* 'sweet oil,' 'unguent,' 'perfume' and meant 'rub with ointment or unguent,' 'anoint' (LS-online). In MG, the noun *míro* has the same meaning as its ancient correlative, but the verb *mirízo* mainly has two different ones (see Table 8). Nowadays, the only meanings of *mirízo* that can be transparently associated with *míro* are 'send off/give off a *good* smell' or 'smell,' 'sniff' (a *good* smell) by means of the LCS4 (see section 3) in the EMISSION/ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT field, i.e.

\[(31) \text{GO}([\text{Thing} \ MÍRO], [\text{FROM} [\text{Thing} \ ]])\]

for *mirízo*1, and

\[(32) \text{CAUSE}([\text{Thing} \ ], [\text{GO}([\text{Thing} \ MÍRO], [\text{FROM} [\text{Thing} \ ]])])\]

for *mirízo*2, where the sense of MÍRO 'good smell' functions as a selectional restriction for a noun argument like ároma 'perfume' in the syntax.\(^{20}\)

It is very difficult to connect the other extended readings of *mirízo* to the related noun: for the meanings 'send off/give off a *bad* smell' of *mirízo*1 and 'smell,' 'sniff' (a *bad* smell) of *mirízo*2, we would have to revert the main attributive feature of the related noun. It is clear that these meaning deviations do not fall into the domain of regular verb derivation but in the area of a meaning extension at the word level. Evidence for this exclusion is the fact that the noun *miro* meaning 'bad smell' can be used only in a humorous way or as an indirect comment and cannot be thought of either as an established word or as a neologism so that it can be regularly related to the above established verb senses.

Other split verbs showing similar behaviour are *athrízo, gremízo, ?podhízo, tra-ganízo.*\(^{21}\)

---

\(^{20}\) See the rule of Argument Fusion in Jackendoff (1990:53f).

\(^{21}\) See Appendix A for the overall properties of these verbs.
2.2 Interaction of alternations with Path constituents: the verbs kimatízo 'wave,' glikízo 'taste sweet,' and glifízo 'be brackish.'

The participation of the derivatives in alternations or their allocation to an alternation variant defines the content of the Path constituent, e.g. similitative verbs can be regarded as Event verbs with a TO- or TOWARD-function or as State verbs with an AT-function in their conceptual structure. This depends on whether they participate in one of the alternations defined in section 1.1, or not.

Let us take the two conceptual options for the similitative verb kimatízo 'wave,' 'ripple' (base N kíma 'wave'). See (33a) and (33b).

(33) a. EventGO_{Ident} ([Thing ], [Path TO/TOWARD_{Ident} ([Thing KÍMA])])

b. StateBE_{Ident} ([Thing ], [Path AT_{Ident} ([Thing KÍMA])])

Both structures refer to Jackendoff's identificational field, in which a Thing/Type or a Property can be conceptualized as reference object (s. Jackendoff 1983:194ff).

Since the verb kimatízo participates in the Event alternations 1a/b and 9, we must define it as an Event verb with a conceptual structure which contains a Path TO or TOWARD constituent (see (33a)). As I mentioned in the introduction, in the auto alternation an agent initiates an Event and this Event can be conceptualized independently of that agent. In other words, we cannot have a State in the auto variant, since we have an Event in the causative variant.

On the other hand, similitative verbs such as glikízo 'taste sweet' (base A glikós 'sweet'), which appear only in the alternation variant 1b, have a different conceptual structure than verbs like glifízo 'be brackish' (base A glifós 'brackish'), which cannot be assigned to an alternation variant. Compare, for example, the conceptual structure of glikízo in (34) with the conceptual structure of glifízo in (35).

(34) EventGO_{Ident} ([Thing ], [Path TO/TOWARD_{Ident} [Property GLIKÓS]])

(35) StateBE_{Ident} ([Thing ], [Path AT_{Ident} [Property GLIFÓS]])

These different conceptual structures are developed especially because glikízo is related to a denotational shift of its base glikós (i.e. it does not refer to the actual Property [SWEET], but to a Property, which is similar to [SWEET]), as opposed to glifízo, whose base glifós has a direct denotation, i.e. it directly refers to the Property [BRACKISH]. In other words, one can regard similitative verbs as Event verbs with a GO function in the identificational field.22

At the same time, if we assume that glikízo participates in the alternation base + suffix -éno / base + suffix -ízo, i.e. expresses the alternation CAUSE BECOME/BECOME at the semantic level, then we have a further argument for the correctness of the LCS in (34). In this respect, see the sentences in (36) and (37) which together build up an alternation pair in a situation such as COOKING.

(36) I záxari glikéni to fajító.
    'Sugar sweetens the meal.'

(37) To fajító glikízi.
    'The meal is sweetish.'

On the other hand, glifízo cannot participate in this alternation or in an alternation similar to this. This must be attributed to the fact that an agent cannot appear in the conceptual structure of this verb at all. The same goes for an analytic construction, like the one in (38).

(38) *O Jánis ékane to neró glifó.
    'Jánis made the water brackish.'

The fact that glifízo can neither alternate nor be assigned to an alternation variant like glikízo, points to a totally different conceptual structure. One can thus certainly define glifízo as a State verb and assume the LCS in (35) for it (repeated below as (39)).

(15) \text{St}_{Ad} \text{BE}_{Ident} ([\text{Thing }], [\text{AT}_{Ident} ([\text{PropertyGLIFÓS}])])^{23}

3. The analysis of -ízo derivation: Alternation Classes, Conceptual Structures, Semantic Fields

The combination of the alternations defined in the introduction has resulted in 41 alternation classes (15 class groups; about the notion of 'class group' see below) for approx. 400 -ízo derivatives examined in Charitonidis (2005). These classes, in my opinion, have some interesting implications for the semantics of the Greek verb and consequently for the status of the verb derivation in Modern Greek. An adequate approach has to be based on groups of classes having a typical member inside them, e.g. a group of alternations is constituted by the classes 1a/b_9, 1a/b_9*, 1a/b_9, and 1a/b_9, with the typical member being class 1a/b_9 showing all alternation variants. In the remainder of this paper, when using the term class group,

---

23 From now on, I omit the indication Event/State for the whole conceptual structure. Also, note that for typographic convenience no square brackets enclose the whole LCSs in this paper.
I will refer to the typical alternation class and departures from it, a pattern which is associated with a different conceptualization of Events.\textsuperscript{24}

In addition, the following morphological subclasses were taken into account in the analysis:

1. The main subclasses \textit{synchronically related verbs} and \textit{synchronically unrelated verbs}, contain derivatives which are regularly or not regularly associated with an independent word (or words) as their formation base, respectively.

2. Further subclasses inside the \textit{synchronically related verbs}, i.e. the subclass \textit{Main verbs} with neologisms, loan translations, and verbs from the modern vernacular language, cf. torpilízo 'torpedo,' magnitízo 'magnetize,' fefgatízo 'transfer sth far away secretly/legally,' the subclass \textit{Old Derivation} with verbs which come from the ancient, Hellenistic, and medieval Greek, e.g. alatízo 'salt,' frodízo 'care,' etc., the subclass \textit{Verb-to-Verb}, for which the morphosemantic relatedness to a 'base' can be construed through a disregarding of more complex morphological processes, e.g. akoná
\begin{tabular}{l}
(a) (present) > akónízo
\end{tabular} 
\begin{tabular}{l}
(aorist) > akonízo 'grind,' 'whet' (present), and the subclass of \textit{-ízo} verbs which have a back-formed noun or adjective and can together constitute a related pair, e.g. kazadízo 'get rich' > kazádi 'gain,' 'profit' 'good.'
\end{tabular}

To the results: the following clustering of \textit{semantic fields} was attested inside the alternation classes.

(i) Class group 1a/b_9: 
\begin{itemize}
  \item COLOUR (e.g. blavízo 'become dark blue'), ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT (e.g. tsiknízo 'burn the food and make it emit smoke'), FLAVOUR (e.g. ksinízo1 'sour'), FORM (e.g. adhinatízo 'slim'), PSYCHOLOGICAL (e.g. laxtarízo 'give sb a turn'), SIMILATIVE (e.g. xrisízo 'make sth shine like gold'), EARNING OF PROPERTY (e.g. plutízo1 'make rich')
\end{itemize}

(ii) Class group 2a/b_9: 
\begin{itemize}
  \item PSYCHOLOGICAL (e.g. fanatízo 'make fanatic'), LOSS (e.g. xaramízo 'waste')
\end{itemize}

(iii) Class 4a/b_9: 
\begin{itemize}
  \item RESPONSIBLE ACTION (e.g. sinetízo 'bring sb to reason')
\end{itemize}

(iv) Class 6a/b_*9: 
\begin{itemize}
  \item VISUAL FIELD (e.g. adikrízo 'see,' 'meet'), VERBAL (e.g. xeretízo1 'say hello,' 'greet')
\end{itemize}

(v) Class group 8a/b_9: 
\begin{itemize}
  \item INSTRUMENT (e.g. planízo 'plane'), VERBAL (e.g. onomatízo 'mention by name'), NEW PLACE (e.g. stalízo 'lead (a flock) to a shaded resting place'), CONFLICT (ksilízo 'beat (with a wooden stick)'), CONTACT BY IMPACT (e.g. stubízo 'pestle'), JOB (e.g. telonízo 'clear through the customs'), ARRANGEMENT (kanonízo 'regulate,' 'adjust'), MAINTENANCE (e.g. frodízo 'take care of,' 'look after'), PORTION (e.g. merízo 'portion out'), VALUE (e.g. midhenízo2 'reduce to zero,' 'give no marks at all'), etc.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{24} See Charitonidis (2005) for a complete view of the analysis summarized in this section.
(vi) Class group 2a/b_8a/b_9:
MATTER CHANGE (e.g. k kapsalizo 'singe'), COVERING (e.g. kapnizo2 'smoke,' 'cure').
(vii) Class group 4a/b_8a/b_9:
(BODY) CARE (e.g. aromatizo 'perfume'), INSTRUMENT (e.g. xtenizo 'comb'), PROVISION (e.g. oplizo 'arm'), SUBSTANCE (e.g. afionizo 'give sb opium').

The patterns in (i)-(vii) suggest that in most of the classes (class groups), a group of semantic fields can be recognized as constituting a distinct semantic core. This core, however, does not coincide with all semantic fields under each of these classes. Semantic fields like PSYCHOLOGICAL appear in a variety of classes (see Charitonidis 2005). A finer differentiation of these fields on the basis of a larger number of verbs may reveal a more strict class membership, a major task which goes beyond the scope of the present analysis.

The conceptual structures which could be identified from the analysis of the -ízo derivatives are given in (40). Mat stands for 'Material Entity' (s. Jackendoff 1992).

(40) LCS1: \text{CAUSE}([\text{Mat} \ldots], [\text{GO}([\text{Mat,Action,Energy-IA-}],[\text{Path,TO}[[\text{Mat}]])])

LCS2: \text{CAUSE}([\text{Mat} \ldots], [\text{GO}([\text{Mat}],[\text{Path,TO}[[\text{Mat,Property,Event-IA-}])])

LCS3: a. \text{CAUSE}([\text{Mat} \ldots], [\text{GO}([\text{Mat,Action,Property-IA-}],[\text{Path,TO}[[\text{Mat}]])])

b. \text{CAUSE}([\text{Mat} \ldots], [\text{GO}([\text{Mat}],[\text{Path,TO}[[\text{Mat,Property,Event-IA-}])])

LCS4: \text{CAUSE}([\text{Mat} \ldots], [\text{GO}([\text{Mat,Action,Energy-IA-}],[\text{FROM}[[\text{Mat}]])])

LCS5: \text{CAUSE}([\text{Mat}],[\text{GO}([\text{Mat}],[\text{Path,TO}[[\text{Mat}]])])

\text{VIA}[[\text{Mat-IA-}]

LCS6: \text{CAUSE}([\text{Mat-IA-}],[\text{GO}([\text{Mat}],[\text{Path,TO}[[\text{Mat}]])])

The sentences (41)-(47) exemplify these LCSs. As we can see, in LCS1 the incorporated argument appears as theme and in LCS2 the incorporated argument appears as goal. In the ambiguous LCS3, the incorporated argument appears either as theme (LCS3a) or as goal (LCS3b). In LCS4, the incorporated argument appears as theme in relation to a reference object in source position. In LCS5 the incorporated argument appears as argument of the function VIA in a modifying conceptual structure. In LCS6, the incorporated argument occupies the agent position.
(41) LCS1
O májiras [alatí] to fajító. (base: N aláti 'salt')
'The cook salts the meal.'
CAUSE([Thing-MÁJIRAS], [GO([Thing-ALÁTI], [Path-TO[Thing-FAJITÓ]])])

(42) LCS
I jinéka [katharízó] to pukámiso. (base: A katharós A 'clean')
'The woman cleans the shirt.'
CAUSE([Thing-JINÉKA], [GO([Thing-PUKÁMISO], [Path-TO[Property-KATHARÓ]])])

(43) LCS3a
O mixanikós [magnitízó] to ilikó. (base: A magnitikós 'magnetic')
'The engineer magnetizes the material' (he induces magnetic properties in the material).
CAUSE([Thing-MIXANIKÓS], [GO([Property-MAGNITIKÓS], [Path-TO[Thing-ILIKÓ]])])

(44) LCS3b
O mixanikós [magnitízó] to ilikó. (base: N magnítis 'magnet')
'The engineer magnetizes the material' (he converts the material into a magnet).
CAUSE([Thing-MIXANIKÓS], [GO([Thing-ILIKÓ], [Path-TO[Property-MAGNÍTIS]])])

(45) LCS4
O Jórgos [kapnís] éna tsigáro (base: N kapnós 'smoke')
'Jórgos smokes a cigarette.'
CAUSE([Thing-JÓRGOS], [GO([Thing-KAPNÓS], [FROM[Thing-TSIGÁRO]])])

(46) LCS5
O skopeftís [pistolízó] éna bukáli. (base: N pistóli 'pistol')
'The shooter shoots a bottle (with a pistol).'
CAUSE([Thing-SKOPEFTÍS], [GO([Thing-non specified-], [Path-TO[Thing-BUKÁLI]])])
VIA[Thing-PISTÓLI]

(47) LCS6
O Marcello [delalízó] ta néa stin póli. (base: N delális 'town crier')
'Marcello announces the news in the town (as a town crier).'
CAUSE([Thing-DELÁLIS], [GO([Thing-NÉA], [Path-TO[Thing-PÓLI]])])

As in the case of the semantic fields, there is some clustering of conceptual structures associated with specific alternation classes.

(i) Class group 1a/b_9:
LCS2  (COLOUR, FLAVOUR, FORM, PSYCHOLOGICAL, SIMILATIVE)
LCS4  (ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT)

(ii) Class group 2a/b_9:
LCS2  (PSYCHOLOGICAL, LOSS)
(iii) Class 4a/b_9:
LCS2 (RESPONSIBLE ACTION)
(iv) Class group 8a/b_9:
LCS1 (INSTRUMENT, VERBAL, CONTACT BY IMPACT, CONFLICT), LCS2 (NEW PLACE), LCS5 (INSTRUMENT), LCS6 (JOB)
(v) Class group 4a/b_8a/b_9:
LCS1 (INSTRUMENT, SUBSTANCE)

4. General conclusions

Here are the general conclusions of the analysis of the synchronically related Event verbs in -izo:
(i) The data suggest that the conceptualization of Events to which -izo verbs refer can differ even among the members of the same class group, cf. the variations 1a/b_*9, 1*a/b_9, 1*a/?b_9, etc. of the class 1a/b_9.
(ii) The alternations in which an -izo verb participates are lexically encoded options on the basis of situations and they can vary only in a limited way, cf. the class 2a/b_4a/b_8a/b_9, which, as a marginal case, shows four alternations.
(iii) The majority of -izo verbs are control verbs.
(iv) There are field and conceptual preferences inside (most of) the alternation classes (class groups).
(v) The restricted character of these preferences suggests that alternations are more relevant in an account of (-izo) derivation.

The comparison between new and old derivation inside the alternation classes has shown that the patterns in which the suffix -izo appears are not very different. Particularly:
(vi) There is a larger spectrum of semantic fields in the old derivation, a fact which is mainly accounted for on historical grounds, e.g. because some semantic fields are exhausted in the old derivation (cf. the exhausted field COLOUR).
(vii) On the other hand, the underlying conceptual structures in old and new derivation are the same. 25

Taking syntax into consideration when describing verb derivation is a sound methodological principle for determining the relationship between a verb derivative and its base. The arguments in the second part of this paper and the discussion of the results from the analysis in the third part suggest that this enterprise gains in explanatory power and consequently in reliability if

25 See Charitonidis (2005: 80-86) for details of the analysis of old and new derivation. Remember that according to the proposed model, conceptual structures are under-decomposed (see section 1.4).
verb derivation is examined within concrete meaning/syntax shifts, i.e. alternations, at the level of the whole verb unit.

**Abbreviations**

AC: Alternation Class  
AF: Argument Fusion  
CS: Conceptual Structure  
ISC-verbs: Verbs with an irregular semantic connection to their base  
LCS: Lexical Conceptual Structure  
SF: Semantic Field
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Appendix A: The make-up of the split verbs

Note: In the cases of semitransparent verbs with an irregular semantic connection to their base (ISC-verbs), an approximate semantic field and an approximate conceptual structure is given (where possible). INTENTION is used as a general field for complex situations. LCS7 stands for the conceptual structure \text{SemBE}([\text{int}], \text{AT([BASE])}).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Alternations</th>
<th>Semantic Fields</th>
<th>Conceptual Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anemízo1</td>
<td>'wave'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>NATURE ELEMENT &amp; MOTION</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anemízo2</td>
<td>'flap,' 'flatter'</td>
<td>1a/b_9</td>
<td>INTERNAL MOTION</td>
<td>see section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asfalízo1</td>
<td>'secure,' 'lock'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>PROVISION</td>
<td>LCS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asfalízo2</td>
<td>'insure'</td>
<td>4a/b_9</td>
<td>PROVISION</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asprízo1</td>
<td>'turn white'</td>
<td>1a/b_9</td>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asprízo2</td>
<td>'whitewash'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>SUBSTANCE &amp; COVERING</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athrízo1</td>
<td>'add (up),' 'total up,' etc.</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>INTENTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athrízo2</td>
<td>'gather'</td>
<td>2a/b_9</td>
<td>FORM &amp; MOTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axnízo1</td>
<td>'steam,' 'emit steam'</td>
<td>1a/b_9</td>
<td>EMISSION &amp; ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT</td>
<td>LCS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axnízo2</td>
<td>'steam sth' (food)</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>MATTER &amp; COOKING</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhrosízo1</td>
<td>'cool'</td>
<td>1a/b_9</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhrosízo2</td>
<td>'effect a feeling of coolness,' 'refresh'</td>
<td>2a/b_2a/b_9</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL &amp; BODY FEELING</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gremízo1</td>
<td>'demolish,' 'knock/pull/tear down'</td>
<td>2a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>MAJOR CHANGE OF STATE &amp; NEW PLACE &amp; FALL</td>
<td>ISC (?)LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>stemming</td>
<td>Part of speech</td>
<td>LCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gremizo2</td>
<td>'throw/dash/fling down'</td>
<td>2a/b_4a/b_9</td>
<td>NEW PLACE &amp; FALL</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jalizol</td>
<td>'polish,' 'burnish'</td>
<td>1a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>(MANUAL) WORK</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jalizol2</td>
<td>'shine (like glass),' 'shimmer'</td>
<td>1<em>a/b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>SIMILATIVE &amp; LIGHT EMISSION</td>
<td>LCS7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapnizol</td>
<td>'smoke,' 'give off smoke'</td>
<td>1<em>a/b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>EMISSION &amp; ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT</td>
<td>LCS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapnizol2</td>
<td>'smoke,' 'cure'</td>
<td>2a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>COVERING</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapnizol3</td>
<td>'smoke,' 'fuff'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>EMISSION &amp; ENDOGENOUS PRODUCT</td>
<td>LCS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerdhizolo</td>
<td>'earn,' 'win'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>CHANGE OF POSSESSION</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerdhizolo2</td>
<td>'beat/defeat sm,' 'win'</td>
<td>8a/<em>b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>INTENTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokinizol</td>
<td>'redden,' 'make sth red'</td>
<td>1a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokinizol2</td>
<td>'brown' (food)</td>
<td>8a/<em>b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>COOKING</td>
<td>ISC (LCS2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksinizol</td>
<td>'sour'</td>
<td>1a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>FLAVOUR</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksinizol2</td>
<td>'feel a sour taste'</td>
<td>2<em>a/b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lianizol</td>
<td>'chop up,' 'cut up'</td>
<td>8a/<em>b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lianizol2</td>
<td>'beat fiercely,' 'cut up sb,' 'defeat'</td>
<td>8a/<em>b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>INTENTION &amp; FORCE</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midhenizol</td>
<td>'reduce to nothing'</td>
<td>2a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>VALUE &amp; LOSS</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midhenizol2</td>
<td>'reduce to zero' (for counter), 'give no marks at all' (literally 'give the mark 0')</td>
<td>8a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>LCS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirizol</td>
<td>'smell (of),' 'send off/give off a (good/bad) smell'</td>
<td>1<em>a/b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>SMELL</td>
<td>ISC (?LCS4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirizol2</td>
<td>'smell,' 'sniff'</td>
<td>8a/<em>b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>SMELL</td>
<td>ISC (?LCS4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orizol</td>
<td>'appoint,' 'fix,' 'lay down,' 'define,' etc.</td>
<td>8a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>ARRANGEMENT</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orizol2</td>
<td>'rule over,' 'be master,' 'have at one's disposal'</td>
<td>8a/<em>b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>ARRANGEMENT</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plevrizol</td>
<td>'anchor,' 'drop/cast anchor'</td>
<td>1<em>a/b_8</em>a/b_9</td>
<td>THING PART &amp; MOTION</td>
<td>LCS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plevrizol2</td>
<td>'come up to,' 'draw/come alongside'</td>
<td>8a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>THING PART &amp; MOTION</td>
<td>LCS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plutizol</td>
<td>'make rich'</td>
<td>1a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>EARNING OF PROPERTY</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plutizol2</td>
<td>'enrich'</td>
<td>2a/b_8*a/b_9</td>
<td>INTENTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podhizol</td>
<td>'go back into port,' 'seek refuge in a harbour' (naut.)</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>MOTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>podhizo2</td>
<td>'bear off/away,' 'take the bow of a ship away from the wind' (naut.)</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>THING PART &amp; MOTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potizo1</td>
<td>'water,' 'irrigate'</td>
<td>8a_9</td>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>opaque (?LCS1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potizo2</td>
<td>'water sth/sm'</td>
<td>4a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>LIQUID/ WATER</td>
<td>opaque (?LCS1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potizo3</td>
<td>'ooze'</td>
<td>1a/b_2a/b_9</td>
<td>LIQUID/ MOISTURE</td>
<td>opaque (?LCS1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prasinizo1</td>
<td>'make green'</td>
<td>1a/b_9</td>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prasinizo2</td>
<td>'become covered with plants'</td>
<td>1*a/b_9</td>
<td>COLOUR &amp; FLORA</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prikiz01</td>
<td>'provide with a dowry'</td>
<td>8a*b_9</td>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; CHANGE OF POSSESSION</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prikiz02</td>
<td>'endow'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>INTENTION</td>
<td>ISC (?LCS1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progizo1</td>
<td>'boo,' 'hiss,' 'shout down'</td>
<td>8a*b_9</td>
<td>VERBAL &amp; CONFLICT</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progizo2</td>
<td>'shy' (animal), 'scare'</td>
<td>1a/b_9</td>
<td>VERBAL &amp; PSYCHOLOGICAL</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rithmiz01</td>
<td>'regulate,' 'adjust'</td>
<td>2a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>ARRANGEMENT</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rithmiz02</td>
<td>'organize,' 'arrange'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>INTENTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rokaniz01</td>
<td>'plane,' 'smooth,' 'crunch'</td>
<td>8a*b_9</td>
<td>INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rokaniz02</td>
<td>'squander,' 'gnaw' (property)</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; MAJOR CHANGE OF STATE</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixtiriz01</td>
<td>'insult scurrilously'</td>
<td>8a*b_9</td>
<td>VERBAL &amp; CONFLICT</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixtiriz02</td>
<td>'get exasperated' (not as a result of insulting!)</td>
<td>2*a/b_9</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL</td>
<td>ISC (?LCS2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skorpiz01</td>
<td>'scatter,' 'distribute' (things)</td>
<td>1a/b_2a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>LOSS OF INTEGRITY</td>
<td>LCS2 (+BF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skorpiz02</td>
<td>'scatter,' 'move apart' (people)</td>
<td>3a/b_4a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>LOSS OF INTEGRITY</td>
<td>LCS2 (+BF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skorpiz03</td>
<td>'spread,' 'emit,' 'send forth,' 'give out'</td>
<td>2a/b_9</td>
<td>EMISSION</td>
<td>ISC (+BF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skorpiz04</td>
<td>'squander,' 'waste' (money)</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>LOSS OF PROPERTY</td>
<td>LCS2 (+BF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skupiz01</td>
<td>'clean with a broom'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>INSTRUMENT</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skupiz02</td>
<td>'wipe,' 'dry'</td>
<td>4a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>(MANUAL) WORK</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stixiz01</td>
<td>'cost'</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>STATIVE</td>
<td>opaque (see section 2.1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stixiz02</td>
<td>'line sb up'</td>
<td>4a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoliz01</td>
<td>'ornament'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>MANUAL WORK</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoliz02</td>
<td>'dress'</td>
<td>4a/b_8a/?b_9</td>
<td>COVERING &amp; DRESS</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sximatiz01</td>
<td>'form'</td>
<td>2a/b_9</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sximatízo2</td>
<td>'draw (e.g. a circle),' 'set sth/sh up'</td>
<td>2a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>termatízo1</td>
<td>'bring to an end'</td>
<td>2a/b_8a/b_9</td>
<td>TIME &amp; END</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>termatízo2</td>
<td>'get to the finish line' (runner, etc), 'terminate' (vehicle, etc.)</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>MOTION IN PLACE</td>
<td>LCS7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thisavrízo1</td>
<td>'amass wealth,' 'accumulate riches'</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; MAJOR CHANGE OF STATE</td>
<td>?LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thisavrízo2</td>
<td>'collect sth valuable'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>(MANUAL) WORK</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tonízo1</td>
<td>'accent,' 'stress,' 'emphasize'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>VERBAL</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tonízo2</td>
<td>'set off,' 'show off'</td>
<td>2a/b_9</td>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traganízo1</td>
<td>'eat sth crispy,' 'crunch'</td>
<td>8a/?b_?9</td>
<td>FOOD &amp; SOUND EMISSION</td>
<td>ISC (?LCS2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traganízo2</td>
<td>'emit a crunchy sound,' 'crunch'</td>
<td>1*a/b_9</td>
<td>SOUND EMISSION {FOOD}</td>
<td>ISC (?LCS4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vasanízo1</td>
<td>'worry,' 'give sb a bad time'</td>
<td>2a/b_9</td>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vasanízo2</td>
<td>'torture,' 'torment'</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>NEGATIVE AFFECTION</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xeretízo1</td>
<td>'say hello,' 'greet'</td>
<td>6a/b_*9</td>
<td>VERBAL &amp; INTERPERSONAL CONTACT</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xeretízo2</td>
<td>'hail,' 'welcome'</td>
<td>8a/b_*9</td>
<td>VERBAL</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xrimatízo1</td>
<td>'give (money as) bribes/backhanders'</td>
<td>8a/b_*9</td>
<td>EXCHANGE</td>
<td>LCS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xrimatízo2</td>
<td>'serve as'</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>STATIVE</td>
<td>opaque (see section 2.1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xronízo1</td>
<td>'become a year old,' 'reach the first anniversary'</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>TIME COMPLETION</td>
<td>LCS7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xronízo2</td>
<td>'delay,' 'drag on'</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>STATIVE</td>
<td>LCS7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zematízo1</td>
<td>'scald,' 'scorch' (immerse sth in very hot water/liquid for various purposes)</td>
<td>8a/b_9</td>
<td>(MANUAL) WORK (?HOT LIQUID)</td>
<td>opaque (?LCS2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zematízo2</td>
<td>'scald,' 'scorch' (injure)</td>
<td>2a/b_9</td>
<td>MAJOR CHANGE OF STATE (?HOT LIQUID)</td>
<td>opaque (?LCS1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zijízo1</td>
<td>'weigh sth/sm'</td>
<td>4a/b_8a/b_*9</td>
<td>INSTRUMENT &amp; NEW PLACE</td>
<td>LCS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zijízo2</td>
<td>'weigh'</td>
<td>No alternations</td>
<td>STATIVE</td>
<td>ISC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Verb endings in Modern Greek


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st conjugation</th>
<th>2nd conjugation: type A</th>
<th>2nd conjugation: type B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active voice:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
<td>Sg.</td>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>Sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-ume</td>
<td>-áme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-is</td>
<td>-ete</td>
<td>-áte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperfect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-áa</td>
<td>-áme</td>
<td>-úsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-áes</td>
<td>-áte</td>
<td>-ísa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ái</td>
<td>-án</td>
<td>-í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-ume</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-í</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simple past</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-aa</td>
<td>-ame</td>
<td>-áame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-aes</td>
<td>-ate</td>
<td>-íate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperfective imperative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ete</td>
<td>-íte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfective imperative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ete</td>
<td>-íte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gerund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ódas</td>
<td>-ódas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | 3rd conjugation |                         |                         |
| **Passive voice:** |                 |                         |                         |
| **Present**     | Sg.             | Pl.                     | Sg.                     |
|                 | -ome            | -ómaste                 | -úme                   |
|                 | -ese            | -este                   | -íse                    |
| **Imperfect**   |                 |                         |                         |
|                 | -úmun           | -úmastan                | -úmnun                 |
|                 | -úsun           | -úsanastan              | -úsun                   |
| **Dependent**   |                 |                         |                         |
|                 | -ó              | -úme                    | -ó                      |
| **Simple past** |                 |                         |                         |
|                 | -íka            | -ikame                  | -íkame                 |
| **Imperfective imperative** |       |                         |                         |
|                 |                 | (lacking)               | (lacking)               |
| **Perfective imperative** |         |                         |                         |
|                 | -u              | -ite                    | -ite                   |
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