

# Italian *-ismo/-ista* and Ancient Greek *-ismós/-istés* formations. Morphological processes and diachronic relationships\*

Heike Necker  
Universität Zürich  
[hnecker@rom.uzh.ch](mailto:hnecker@rom.uzh.ch)

Liana Tronci  
Università per Stranieri di Siena  
[tronci@unistrasi.it](mailto:tronci@unistrasi.it)

## 1. Preliminaries, corpus and literature

The aim of this study is to examine Italian and Ancient Greek noun formations which are characterized by the highly productive suffixes It. *-ismo* and *-ista* and AGr. *-ismós* and *-istés*, such as for instance It. *bonapartismo* 'Bonapartism, i.e. behaviour like a Bonaparte, a personal and authoritarian regime based on direct popular consensus with demagogic and plebiscitary tendencies; support for the restoration of the Napoleonic Dynasty', *bonapartista* 'Bonapartist' and AGr. *lakōnismós* 'imitation of the Lacedaemonian manner; acting in the Lacedaemonians' interest', *lakōnistés* 'one who imitates the Lacedaemonians; one who sides with the Lacedaemonians'. Traditionally, grammarians and scholars underline the high productiveness of our suffixes in both languages; suffice it to take a look at Schwarze (1995), Grossmann & Rainer (2004), Dardano (2009) for Italian, and Chantraine (1933), Schwyzer (1953) for AGr. The same holds, however, for the etymologically corresponding suffixes in many modern European languages: nouns such as e.g. German *Marxismus*, *Marxist*, English *Marxism*, *Marxist*, French *marxisme*, *marxiste* are considered to form so-called *internationalisms* (see e.g. Braun, Schaeder & Volmert 2003) and indeed often the English translation of our examples also presents *-ism*.

Our interest in this topic originates from the fact that, in both modern languages and Ancient Greek, noun formations characterized by these suffixes appear to share not only morphological but also "syntactic", that is, combinatorial properties. By means of a simple morphological procedure, it may be observed that lexical bases are variable as far as the lexical category is concerned (see § 2). Besides, it may be noticed that the relationship between lexical base and derived noun yields different derivational processes, which are manifested by different lexical meanings (see § 1.3.).

This paper tries to illustrate these different derivational processes, considering both Ancient Greek and Italian (see § 1.1). As regards Ancient Greek, a synchronic survey will be furnished, in order to clarify what kind of derivational processes are involved in the *-ismós/-istés* noun formations (§ 4). As regards Italian, the synchronic survey will be paralleled by a diachronic research on the more ancient texts of Italian (see § 6). Similarities and differences between derivational processes of the two languages will emerge from our research.

---

\* All the conclusions expressed in this work come from close collaboration between the two authors. Italian regulations on authorship require the authors to specify which sections they are responsible for: sections 1.1, 1.2, 2 and 6 are the work of H. N., whilst 1, 1.3, 1.4, 3, 4, 5 and 7 were contributed by L.T. The research of L.T. has been developed within the PRIN 2008 project *Contact and change in the history of Mediterranean languages* (PRIN 2008). We would like to thank Nunzio La Fauci, for comments and advice on various stages of the work and Ronald Packham for his help with the English. We are most grateful to the organizers of the 8<sup>th</sup> Mediterranean Morphology Meeting for the possibility of contributing to the present publication.

## 1.1. Languages and corpora

Italian and Ancient Greek are the two languages this research deals with. Italian has been chosen among other modern languages showing similar derivational processes, because of our knowledge and specific interest in this language. However, this research will subsequently be extended to other modern languages. As for Ancient Greek, it is important to underline that the noun forms in question are the etymological origin of the suffixes of all modern languages, at least from the point of view of form. Some AGr. *-ismós/-istés* nouns become Latin loanwords, with *-ismus/-ista*: for instance, AGr. *barbarismós* 'barbarism' or *exorkistés* 'exorcist' become Lt. *barbarismus*, *exorcista*; then, starting from Latin, these formations spread through modern languages: It. *-ismo/-ista*, French *-isme/-iste*, English *-ism/-ist* and German *-ismus/-ist*.

As we will show below, the high productiveness of both derivational suffixes in Italian (and in other modern languages) cannot be simply explained by recourse to diachronic relationships, that is, lexical borrowing (from Ancient Greek to Latin) and transmission (from Latin to modern languages). With the exclusion of forms such as It. *idiotismo* 'idiotism', *solecismo* 'solecism', *sillogismo* 'syllogism', *eufemismo* 'euphemism', which derive from the corresponding AGr. formations *via* Latin<sup>1</sup>, the derivational processes by means of which new It. *-ismo/-ista* forms are created have to be explained in terms of synchronic word-formation rules. For this reason, we examined all *-ismo* and *-ista* formations within the dictionary Zingarelli 2003 (together with Zingarelli 2008 on Cd-rom): we found 1570 *-ismo* forms and 1380 *-ista* forms. Scholars observe that the majority of Italian *-ismo* and *-ista* formations are systematically related to each other (Schwarze 1995: 502) and are created starting from extremely different lexical bases, such as adjectives (e.g. *totalitarismo* 'totalitarianism'), proper names (*bonapartismo* 'Bonapartism'), but also whole phrases as in *menefreghismo* 'couldn't-care-less attitude, so-what attitude' (see § 2). This is an important point, not only for Italian, but also for Ancient Greek noun formations. As regards Ancient Greek, our lexical collection was made within the *Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell, Scott & Jones: 860 *-ismós* forms and 530 *-istés* forms were found. From the comparative point of view, it is interesting to notice that:

(a) *-ismós* and *-istés* suffixes show a morphological relationship such as in *kordakismós* 'the dancing of the Kordax' and *kordakistés* 'dancer of the Kordax';

(b) categorially different lexical bases may be recognized in Ancient Greek derivational processes as well: adjectives such as in *psellismós* 'stammering' (from *psellós* 'stammering'), proper names such as in *philippismós* 'Philippism, to be on Philip's side' (from *Phílippos* 'Philip'), prepositional phrases such as in *skorakismós* 'lit. going to the crows, going to hell!' (from *es kórakas* 'lit. to the crows, get lost! go to hell!'). For a more detailed description on this point, see § 2., as well as Chantraine (1933: 138f.) and Schwyzler (1953: 493).

## 1.2. Literature

We will take a short look at two approaches in relevant literature. To our knowledge, there are not many morphological studies on this topic, neither for Italian nor for Ancient Greek. The first study we will take into consideration is one on word formation in Italian by Grossmann & Rainer (2004). Here the primary criterion for classification is the semantic (or rather interpretative) category. The authors classify It. *-ismo* formations into four groups, based on the meaning of the derivate:

<sup>1</sup> They are the only four *-ismo* forms which occur, for instance, in the novel by Alessandro Manzoni *I promessi sposi* (1840).

1) approaches/conceptions of every type (political, philosophical, scientific, religious, artistic and also individual): e.g. *mitterandismo* (the base is a proper name, 'Mitterandism'), *assolutismo* (the base is an adjective, 'Absolutism'), *trasformismo* (the base is a verb, in biology 'evolutionism', in politics 'transformism'), *altruismo* ('altruism'), *egoismo* ('egoism');

2) social phenomena: e.g. *abusivismo* 'tendency to consider wrongful acts a behavioural norm', *analfabetismo* 'alphabetism', *dantismo* 'study or cult of Dante, word or locution coined by Dante' and the subset of sporting activities, *alpinismo* 'alpinism';

3) medical terms (diseases, anomalies): e.g. *alcolismo* 'alcoholism', *reumatismo* 'rheumatism';

4) linguistic characteristic, peculiarity: e.g. *anglicismo* 'Anglicism', *arabismo* 'Arabism'.

First, this approach surely does not account for the polysemy of some *-ismo* forms (e.g. *dantismo* can be interpreted as 'study of Dante or imitation of Dante') clearly identifiable within a context of occurrence, or the relation to the base. Furthermore, a category where *dantismo* and *alpinismo* are put together may seem somehow rough-and-ready.

We will take a short look at the study of Roché (2007) where the French *-isme* forms are analysed. Roché is confronting the notion of *modèle de construction des mots* with the notion of rules of formation, and adds restrictions and two frequently neglected parameters to his model: the influence of the existing lexicon, on the one hand, and phonological restrictions of well-formedness, on the other. He illustrates the possible interference of existing forms (in the lexicon) with morphological circumstances and phonological restrictions. In opposition to purely referential classifications, Roché subdivides the formations with *-isme* into three models capable also of capturing the formations with *-iste* respectively:

- Model 1) is a so-called axiological relation (see e.g. Greimas 1969) and the basis is referred to and evaluated *via* the three traditional axes (good, beautiful, true): *être favorable à l'esclavage* 'to be in favour of slavery' (*esclavagisme* = *le fait d'...* 'slaverism', *esclavagiste* = *la personne qui est favorable...* 'defender of slavery'), *tout ramener à soi* (*egoisme*, *egoiste* 'egoism', 'egoist'). *Fédéralisme* 'federalism' which is not a quality noun but '*le fait de privilégier ce qui est fédéral*'. The bases are mostly nouns, adjectives or verbs.
- Model 2) instead forms process nouns (*nom processif*) in parallel with agent nouns (sometimes only one of both): *exorciser* → *exorcisme*, *exorciste* 'exorcism, exorcist', *parachute* → *parachutisme*, *parachutiste* 'parachuting, parachutist'. The base is a verb or a noun denoting a participant in the process (e.g. instrument).

Within models 1 and 2 the formations are doubly motivated, on the one hand by the relation to the base, on the other by the relation of the derivatives with *-isme* with those with *-iste*.

- Model 3) captures formations with *-isme* that are quality nouns formed on the base of adjectives or nouns referring to a person who does not have a respective formation with *-iste*: *parallélisme* 'parallelism', *dilettantisme* 'amateurism, dilettantism'.

Model 3) is similar to de-adjectival nouns denoting a characteristic/an attribute and quality nouns formed on the base of person denotations with the suffixes *-ie*, *-erie*, *-ise*, *-itude*, *-at*. Model 2) is similar to action nouns formed with *-age*, *-ement*, *-ion* as far as *-isme* is concerned, and *-eur*, *-ier* for *-iste*. Model 1) finally, has only equivalents with *pro-* and *anti-* derivatives.

In our opinion, the criteria used for classification are too much based on interpretation and do not pay enough attention to derivational processes, that is to the morphosyntactic relationships between *-ismo* nouns and their lexical bases. Furthermore, these criteria rely only on dictionary indications; needless to say, often the forms in question do not have only one meaning, as already mentioned above.

As far as Ancient Greek is concerned, grammarians notice the correlation between *-ismós/-istés* formations and verb forms in *-ízō*; such as in the case of *lakōnismós* ‘imitation of the Lacedaemonian manner; acting in the Lacedaemonians’ interest’, *lakōnistés* ‘one who imitates the Lacedaemonians; one who sides with the Lacedaemonians’ and *lakōnízō* ‘to imitate Lacedaemonian manners’. Leaving aside this correlation, grammarians do not mention other morpho-lexical properties of these classes: in particular, they do not underline the important point concerning the different lexical values which *-ismós* noun forms show with respect to their lexical bases. This point will be dealt with in what follows.

### 1.3. Italian and Ancient Greek: first comparative remarks

The first morphological comparative aspect to underline is that both languages show parallel derivations from the same lexical base, but also derivations from *-ismo* → *-ista* and vice versa cannot be excluded (for It., see Grossmann & Rainer 2004: 257f.). Interestingly, a linear co-occurrence of both suffixes is never found (neither *X-ismista* nor *X-istismo*). The same holds for the corresponding AGr. suffixes *-ismós* and *-istés* (neither *X-ismistés*, nor *X-istismós*).

From the morpho-lexical point of view, the most surprising aspect is the polysemy correlated to the derivational processes involving both Italian and Ancient Greek suffixes, particularly the suffixes It. *-ismo*, AGr. *-ismós*. This aspect is not stressed enough in literature, in our opinion. In order to show this, let us consider words such as It. *dantismo* and *petrarchismo* which are both characterized by proper names as their lexical base, designating two Italian poets. Nevertheless, their morpho-lexical values are not the same, and these different values spring from their syntactic combinations. In the dictionary Zingarelli 2008, these two words are glossed:

- (1) *dantismo*: 1. Studio, imitazione di Dante; 2. Parola o locuzione coniata da Dante.<sup>2</sup>  
 (2) *petrarchismo*: 1. Imitazione dello stile di Petrarca; 2. Corrente poetica diffusa per secoli in Europa, ispirata alla lirica del Petrarca.<sup>3</sup>

According to the dictionary, these two words both have two different meanings, but the different meanings of the first word do not correspond to the two different meanings of the second word. If we join to the comparison the word *manzonismo*, the puzzle becomes even more complicated:

- (3) *manzonismo*: 1. Imitazione dello stile letterario del Manzoni; 2. Teoria linguistica del Manzoni per cui il fiorentino parlato dalle persone colte era da scegliere come modello di lingua nazionale italiana.<sup>4</sup>

The same holds for the Ancient Greek *-ismós* formations. Let us compare the following lexemes and their glosses, taken from the *Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell, Scott & Jones:

- (a) *attikismós* ‘siding with Athens, loyalty to her’, from *Attikós* ‘Attic, Athenian’ (see also, for a different meaning, *attikistés* ‘one who affects or collects Attic expressions’);  
 (b) *dōrismós* ‘speaking in the Doric dialect’, maybe from *Dōrieús* ‘Dorian, descendant of Dorus’;  
 (c) *lakōnismós* ‘imitation of the Lacedaemonian manner; acting in the Lacedaemonians’ interest’, from *Lákōn* ‘Laconian or Lacedaemonian’;  
 (d) *krētismós* ‘Cretan behaviour, i.e. lying’, from *krés*, *krētós* ‘Cretan’;

<sup>2</sup> ‘Dantism: 1. study, imitation of Dante; 2. word or idiom coined by Dante.’

<sup>3</sup> ‘Petrarchism: 1. imitation of Petrarch’s style; 2. poetic movement widespread in Europe for centuries inspired by Petrarch’s lyric poetry.’

<sup>4</sup> ‘Manzonism: 1. imitation of Manzoni’s literary style; 2. Manzoni’s linguistic theory that implies that the Florentine spoken by educated people has to be chosen as a model for the national Italian language’.

(e) *kilikismós* ‘Cilician behaviour, i.e. drunken butchery’, from *Kílix, Kílikos* ‘Cilician’. All these *-ismós* forms are related to lexical bases which designate the name of a people, but their glosses differ from each other, involving a political party, a linguistic device, general behaviour.

So, faced with all these different meanings in both languages, the question is: how can these different meanings be explained? The answer we will try to give in this paper is, that the different meanings are effects of the different lexical-syntactic combinations, so the different meanings furnished by the dictionaries are only the most superficial effect of combinative processes which involve syntax, lexicon and morphology.

#### 1.4. Aims and methodology of analysis

Our study aims to describe the morphological processes involved in the derivation of It. *-ismo/-ista* and AGr. *-ismós/-istés* formations, making a contribution to synchronic and intra-linguistic morphology on the one hand, and diachronic and contrastive phenomena on the other hand. In fact, our approach to the two languages under analysis will be twofold and diverse in this study. The analysis of Ancient Greek will be undertaken mainly from a synchronic point of view, while the part for Italian will adopt a diachronic perspective. These different approaches are motivated by various arguments. First of all, the differences can be found in language itself: in the case of Ancient Greek, we are faced with an ancient language with a closed corpus, whereas for Italian we are facing a modern living language with an open corpus. For Ancient Greek no neologisms, new formations or native speakers can be found, for Italian every day new formations can show up, but in contrast with Italian we have a close relation with verbs in *-ízō* in Ancient Greek as we will see (therefore not only the couple of *-ismós/-istés* but also *-ízō* has to be taken into consideration, whereas in Italian we find the etymological continuation of *-ízō*, the suffix *-eggiare*, but there is no comparable relationship to *-ismo* and *-ista* as in Ancient Greek). In order to deal with a huge number of modern forms (deriving from manifold sources, e.g. Ancient Greek borrowings, loanwords from other languages, Italian formations, erudite formations of e.g. scientific terminology) we need to disentangle first the Italian development – therefore our study of Italian will here be limited to Old Italian. Furthermore, Ancient Greek represents the origin of the Italian suffixes. But not only, for, as we will see, a great number of these forms are borrowed from Ancient Greek directly or *via* other languages (e.g. French, English, German). So Ancient Greek has to be analyzed as the model for new formations from the beginning until now. Ancient Greek is the starting point, but also remains a parallel means for borrowings until the present.

## 2. It. and AGr.: morphological similarities and differences

In both languages, *-ismo/-ista* and *-ismós/-istés* are combined with different types of lexical bases and are highly productive:

- ✓ Nouns: It. *abolizionismo* ‘abolitionism’, *abolizionista* ‘abolitionist’ (*abolizione* ‘abolition’); AGr. *oiōnismós* ‘omen from the flight or cries of birds’, *oiōnistés* ‘one who foretells from the flight and cries of birds’ (*oiōnós* ‘bird’), *tokismós* ‘usury, the business of the usurer’ (*tókos* ‘interest, profit, fruits’), *ptualismós* ‘ptyalism’ (*ptúalon* ‘saliva’), *melismós* ‘dismemberment’ (*mélos* ‘member, part’), *andrismós* ‘virility’ (*anér, andrós* ‘man’);
- ✓ Proper Names: It. *bonapartismo* ‘Bonapartism’, *bonapartista* ‘bonapartist’ (*Bonaparte*); AGr. *philippismós* ‘siding with Philip’ (*Phílippos* ‘Philip’), *akkismós* ‘affectation’ (*Akkó* ‘Acco’, name of a woman in Plutarch), *antisthenismós* ‘life according to the doctrine of Antisthenes’ (*Antisthénēs* ‘Antisthenes’);

- ✓ Adjectives: It. *ambientalismo* ‘environmentalism’, *ambientalista* ‘environmentalist’ (*ambientale* ‘environmental’); AGr. *psellismós* ‘stammering’, *psellistés* ‘stammerer’ (*psellós* ‘stammering’), *homalismós* ‘levelling, smoothing, uniformity’ (*hómalos* ‘flat, level, equal’);
- ✓ Adverbs: It. *pressappochismo* ‘superficiality’, *pressappochista* ‘careless, inaccurate, sloppy person’ (*pressappoco* ‘roughly, about’); AGr. *badismós* ‘walking, going’, *badistés* ‘goer’ (*bádēn* ‘step by step’), *opsismós* ‘slowness, tardiness’ (*opsé* ‘late’);
- ✓ Compound words: It. *terzomondismo* ‘Third-worldism’, *terzomondista* ‘Third Worlder’ (*terzo mondo* ‘Third World’); AGr. *tetrapodismós* ‘a going on all fours’, *tetrapodistés* ‘one who goes on all fours’ (*tetrápous* ‘quadruped’), *allophulismós* ‘adoption of strange/foreign customs’ (*allóphulos* ‘stranger, foreign’);
- ✓ Idioms: It. *cerchiobottismo* ‘in journalism: attitude of expressing appreciation and criticism at the same time versus two contrasting positions’, *cerchiobottista* ‘someone showing *cerchiobottismo*’ (based on the idiom *dare un colpo al cerchio e uno alla botte* ‘to give a hit to the hoop and one to the barrel’), *panciafichismo* (‘derogatory for neutralism during the First World War, based on the idiom *salvare la pancia per i fichi* ‘to save the belly, stomach for the figs’); AGr. *skorakismós* ‘contumely’ (*es kórakas* ‘go and be hanged’, lit. [go] to the ravens’), *koinismós* ‘mixture of various dialects’ (*koiné diálektos* ‘ordinary language’).

Concerning It. only:

- ✓ Numerals: *diciannovismo* ‘complex of phenomena characterizing the political phase immediately following the First World War’, *diciannovista* ‘participator in the Fascist Party from its beginning’ (*diciannove* ‘nineteen’, i.e. 1919, year of the foundation of the Fascist Party);
- ✓ Prepositions: *dietrismo* ‘tendency to sense hidden intrigues and manoeuvres everywhere’, *dietrista* ‘someone sensing hidden intrigues and manoeuvres everywhere’ (*dietro* ‘behind’);
- ✓ Whole phrases: *menefreghismo* ‘couldn’t-care-less attitude, so-what attitude’, *menefreghista* ‘person who could not care less’ (*me ne frego* ‘I don’t give a damn’);
- ✓ Abbreviations and acronyms (only for *-ista* formations): *aclista* ‘member of the ACLI’ (*ACLI* = *Associazioni cristiane lavoratori italiani* ‘Christian associations of Italian workers’), *ciellenista* ‘supporter of the CLN’ (*CLN* = *Comitato di liberazione nazionale* ‘National committee for the liberation of Italy’), *piduista* ‘member of the secret P2 Masonic lodge’ (*P2* = *Propaganda due* ‘Propaganda two’).

This variety of possible bases is in neat contradiction with the Unitary Base Hypothesis of Aronoff (1976), i.e. the idea that derivational suffixes are limited to bases of one lexical category. The suffixes analyzed here are not the only contradictions to the UBH, e.g. the Italian modifying suffixes (diminutive, augmentative and pejorative suffixes) combine with various lexical categories; whereas the presented richness of our suffixes is unique, exceeding even the modifying suffixes.

### 3. The role of Latin

It is well known that diachronic relationships between AGr. and It. have to be described *via* Latin. Is it true for It. *-ismo/-ista* and AGr. *-ismós/-istés* formations as well? So, Lt. *barbarismus*, *cynismus*, *exorcismus*, *iconismus*, *iudaismus*, *priapismus* – which are directly connected with It. *barbarismo*, *cinismo*, *esorcismo*, *iconismo*, *giudaismo*, *priapismo* – are to be considered as Lt. loanwords from AGr. *barbarismós* ‘use of a foreign tongue, barbarism’, *kunismós* ‘Cynical philosophy or conduct’, *exorkismós* ‘administration of an oath’, *eikonismós* ‘delineation, description’, *ioudaismós* ‘Judaism’, *priapismós* ‘priapism’. It is the same for Lt. *-ista* formations such as *citharista* ‘a player on the cithara’, *evangelista* ‘an evangelist’, *exorcista* ‘an exorcist’, *panegyrista* ‘a eulogist’, *psalmista* ‘a composer of

psalms', which are Lt. loanwords from AGr. *kitharistés* 'player on the cithara', *euangelistés* 'bringer of good tidings, evangelist', *exorkistés* 'exorcist', *panēguristés* 'one who attends a *panēguris*, i.e. a national or general assembly', *psalmistés* 'psalmist', subsequently occurring also in It. *citarista*, *evangelista*, *esorcista*, *panegirista*, *salmista*. Unlike Ancient Greek and Italian, Lt. *-ismus/-ista* formations are not productive, as Werner (1980: 492) points out: "das Suffix [...] im antiken Latein wohl nicht produktiv gewesen und wahrscheinlich ebensowenig im Mittellatein". Actually, only 42 *-ismus* and 48 *-ista* formations were found in the on-line Latin dictionary by Lewis & Short (<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.04.0059>). Mostly, they are loanwords from Ancient Greek, and Latin therefore did not have any productive word-formation rule involving *-ismus/-ista* suffixes. Consequently, the huge productivity of both It. *-ismo/-ista* and AGr. *-ismós/-istés* formations may not be explained *via* Latin, and has to be described first from a synchronic point of view, with respect to the two different linguistic systems (i.e. Ancient Greek and Italian), then, as far as Italian is concerned, from a diachronic point of view, which is important in order to account for the relationship between inherited forms and new formations. According to this diachronic point of view, the present research will be focused on Old Italian texts (see § 6). We start with a synchronic survey of Ancient Greek.

## 4. Ancient Greek

### 4.1. Paradigmatic relationships: *-ismós*, *-istés*, *-ízō*

The most interesting paradigmatic relationship concerning *-ismós/-istés* noun formations is the one with *-ízō* verb forms: with few exceptions (which might be due also to gaps in AGr. documentation) *-ismós/-istés* nouns are paralleled by *-ízō* verb forms. Morphologically, both formations appear to be composed starting from lexical bases which are variable from a categorial point of view (nouns, adjectives and so on: cf. § 2). As far as the semantic value is concerned, both noun and verb formations show similar relationships with their lexical bases. The case of the couple *xenismós* / *xenízō* is a well-suited example because both derived forms show two different meanings: *xenismós* (a) 'hospitality', (b) 'strangeness'; *xenízō* (a) 'to host', (b) 'to behave, to talk like a stranger'. These different meanings depend obviously on the different meanings of the lexical base *xénos* (a) 'host', (b) 'stranger', but it is important to underline that the two different meanings of the derivatives are created in the syntactic combinations in which these forms occur, therefore derivational processes are to be described from a morphosyntactic point of view. The following examples are extracted from AGr. literary texts and show occurrences of *xenismós* (a) 'hospitality' (ex. 1), (b) 'strangeness' (ex. 2) and *xe(i)nízō* (a) 'to host' (ex. 3), (b) 'to behave, to talk like a stranger' (ex. 4).<sup>5</sup>

- (1) *tòn gàr toû Hērakléous xenismòn próiēn hēmîn en poiématí tini diéiei, hōs dià tèn toû Hērakléous suggéneian ho prógonos autôn hupodéxaito tòn Hērakléa* (Pl. *Ly.*205c7)  
'Only two days ago, he was recounting to us in some poem of his the **entertainment** of Hercules, how on account of his kinship with Hercules, their forefather welcomed the hero'
- (2) *Tà gàr huperaíronta tèn koinèn sunétheian tôn par'eniois ethismôn, hótan mèn autopathôs dóxēi gínesthai dià tò mégethos tôn sumptómátōn, éleon ekkaleítai pará*

<sup>5</sup> English translations of all Ancient Greek literary examples are drawn from the website: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection:Greco-Roman>

*toîs horôsi kai toîs akouousi, kai sugkineî pōs hékaston hēmôn ho xenismós* (Plb. XV 17,1)

‘Manifestations of emotion which go beyond what is customary among a particular people, if they are thought to be the result of genuine feeling evoked by extraordinary disasters, excite pity in the minds of those who see or hear them; and we are all in a manner moved by the **novelty** of the spectacle.’

(3) *Toûton kai xeínizete kai eû poieûntes pháinesthe* (Hdt. 9,89)

‘It is for you to **entertain** him, and show that you do him good service’

(4) *diabeblékasi gár mou tôn patéra, hōs exénizen [...] hōsper dè déon hēmâs di’ekeínas tās atukhías apolésthai, tò xenízein autoû katēgorékasin* (Dem. 57,18)

‘They have maliciously asserted that my father **spoke with a foreign accent**. [...] but just as though it were right that I should be brought to ruin on account of his misfortunes, they have made his foreign accent the basis of a charge against him’

#### 4.2. Derivational processes: at the interface of morphology and syntax

These examples clearly show that (a) there is a close relationship between *-ismós* and *-ízō* forms, as far as the derivational processes are concerned, and (b) different lexical meanings of *-ismós* (and *-ízō*) forms are surface effects of different morphosyntactic processes. The above examples illustrate two different derivational processes involving *-ismós* and *-ízō*:

1. A sort of “transitivizing” derivational process: with regard to the lexical base, *-ízō* verb forms may be paraphrased as ‘to cause to be X’ and *-ismós* noun forms as ‘the fact of causing to be X’, where X designates the lexical base. This transitivizing derivational process correlates with the occurrence of a new subject concerning the argument structure of the lexical base: this subject may be interpreted as ‘who gives hospitality, who causes to be a host’.
2. A derivational process which is, in contrast with the preceding, “non-transitivizing” and in which *-ízō* verb forms may be interpreted as ‘to behave like X, to pretend to be X’, and *-ismós* noun forms as ‘the fact of behaving like X, of pretending to be X’. Also in this second kind of derivational process there is a new subject function, which is interpreted as ‘who behaves like X, pretends to be X’. The difference between the two morphosyntactic processes concerns the syntactic combinations in which the lexical bases occur as nouns, adjectives and so on. We will not dwell on this point. Suffice it to say that AGr. *-ízō* verbs are correlated, from an etymological point of view, with the It. *-eggiare* verb forms (cf. Tronci 2010 for a survey on AGr. *-ízō* verbs). Beyond etymological correspondences, AGr. *-ízō* and It. *-eggiare* verb forms show interesting similarities as regards syntactic and textual values. Both verb formations (for It. *catoneggiare*, *americaneggiare* and so on, for AGr. *xenízō* in the main text) may show, among others, the semantic value ‘to behave like X, to pretend to be X’ (where X is the lexical base). In some studies of La Fauci (2006, 2007, 2008), firm evidence can be found to support the idea that in the derivational process with *-eggiare* antonomasia is involved. We can assume that antonomasia is at work also in the AGr. derivational process concerning the *-ízō* verbs described here.

Also other *-ismós* noun forms show the same paradigmatic correlation with *-ízō* verb forms, on the one hand, and the same morphosyntactic and lexical variability, on the other hand. Among others, we may mention the formations derived from *sōphrōn* ‘wise’: *sōphronismós* (a) ‘correction, admonition, warning, hint’, (b) ‘temperance, wisdom’, which is paralleled by the verb form *sōphronízō* (in the active voice) ‘to cause to be wise, to correct’ and *sōphronízomai* (in the middle voice) ‘to be getting wise, to be temperate’.



Other forms testify only the first derivational process: from the adjective *kátharos* ‘pure’, the noun *katharismós* ‘purification’ and the verb *katharízō* ‘to purify’, from the adjective *kainós* ‘new’, the noun *kainismós* ‘renewal’ and the verb *kainízō* ‘to renew, to cause to be new’, from the comparative adjective *neōteros* ‘newer’, the noun *neōterismós* ‘innovation, political revolution’ and the verb *neōterízō* ‘to make innovations’, from the noun *spádōn* ‘eunuch’, the noun *spadonismós* ‘weakening (of a sound etc.)’ and the verb *spadonízō* ‘to cause to be weak and slack’. Most of these *-ismós* forms are paralleled also by *-istés* forms, such as *sōphronistés* ‘corrector, one who moderates’, *kainistés* ‘renovator’, *neōteristés* ‘innovator’ and so on. All *-istés* forms sharing these morphosyntactic relationships show the same lexical interpretation: they refer to the new subject involved in the derivational process, so they express ‘one who V-ízō / one who makes N-ismós’.

The same kind of relationship between *-ismós* and *-istés* formations may be observed also in the second type of derivational process. In this case as well, the noun’s formation is “mediated” by means of *-ízō* verb forms. So, *-ismós* nouns take the intransitive syntax of the verb and its antonomastic value ‘the fact of behaving like X, of pretending to be X’ (X = lexical base), and *-istés* nouns are correlated with the expression of the subject of the corresponding *-ízō* verb forms ‘one who behaves like X, one who pretends to be X’. The morphological process of this second type applies preferably to lexical bases which may be involved in antonomasia: in particular, proper names, such as *Puthagóras*, which is the lexical base for the series *puthagorismós* ‘Pythagorean doctrine’, *puthagoristés* ‘follower of Pythagoras’, *puthagorízō* ‘to be a disciple of Pythagoras’, people names, such as *Lákōn* ‘a Laconian, Lacedaemonian’, which is the lexical base for the series *lakōnismós* ‘imitation of Lacedaemonian manner’, *lakōnistés* ‘one who imitates the Lacedaemonians’, *lakōnízō* ‘to imitate Lacedaemonian manners’, but also appellative nouns which syntactically became proper names, by means of antonomasia, such as the case of *xénos* ‘stranger’, for the series discussed above.

#### 4.3. How may the relationship between *-ismós/-istés* and *-ízō* be explained?

The paradigmatic relationship between *-ismós/-istés* nouns and *-ízō* verb forms is a matter of fact, as we have shown above. The few gaps could be caused by lack of attestation or by loss in literary transmission, which are the usual risks we always run in linguistic research on closed corpora. Leaving aside these gaps, we might affirm that each *-ismós/-istés* noun is paralleled by an *-ízō* verb form, and this morphological parallelism is supported by the syntactic-semantic value of all derivatives, according to systematic derivational rules. It is true, however, that AGr. literary texts give evidence for the assumption that both *-ismós/-istés* and *-ízō* forms were created ad hoc and were often short-lived; sometimes they are documented in only one text. An adequate example is the couple *philippismós* ‘siding with Philip’ and *philippízō* ‘to be on Philip’s side, in his party’. These two words are presumably created on the occasion of a political dispute between Demosthenes and Aeschines, and are documented in their works *De corona* and *In Ctesiphontem*, respectively. Obviously, these two lexemes refer to the political attitude of the Macedonian king Philip, who tried to expand his own political power at the expense of Athens. Demosthenes was against Philip’s political attitude, whereas Aeschines was in favour of it. So, from a linguistic point of view, the proper name Philip undergoes an antonomastic process and is thus ready to occur as a lexical base for *-ismós* and *-ízō* forms, belonging to the second derivative process described here, as the following examples show:

- (5) *allà tí taût’epitimô, pollôi skhetliôter’álla katēgorēkótos autoû kai katēpseusménou? hōs gàr emoû philippismón, ô gê kai theoí, katēgoreî, tí hoûtos ouk àn eípoi?*(Dem.18,294)

‘But why reproach him for that imputation, when he has uttered calumnies of far greater audacity? A man who accuses me of **Philippism** – Heaven and Earth, of what lie is he not capable?’

- (6) *ou perì toutōn Ameiniádēs mèn proulegen eulabeîsthai kai pémpsein eis Delphoús eperēsoménous tôn theòn hó ti khrè práttein, Dēmosthénēs dè antélege philippízein tēn Puthían pháskōn, apaídeutos òn kai apolaúōn kai empimplámenos tēs dedoménēs huph’humōn autōi exousías?* (Aesch. *In Ctesiph.* 130)

‘In view of this did not Ameiniades warn you to be on your guard, and to send messengers to Delphi to inquire of the god what was to be done? And did not Demosthenes oppose, and say that the Pythia **had gone over to Philip**? Boor that he was, gorged with his feast of indulgence from you!’

In the light of the situation illustrated above, we could challenge the status of the derivational suffix *-ismós*. According to a simple morphological procedure, such as that suggested by grammarians, *-ismós* noun forms appear to be created by means of the noun morpheme *-mó-* joined to the *-ízō* verbal lexical bases. So, from a strictly morphological point of view, *-ismós* forms are deverbal nouns, as Chantraine (1933: 138f.) underlines saying that “Sauf quelques exceptions notées au passage ces dérivés sont tirés de verbes en *-ízō*”.<sup>6</sup> In the AGr. grammar by Schwyzler (1953: 493) the same morphological point of view is suggested. In this perspective, the affixes *-ismós* and *-isté́s* are therefore to be interpreted as a combination of the verbal affix *-íz-* and the nominal affix *-mo-/-té́s-*. It is true, however, that these two morphological processes – the one which gives birth to *-ismós/-isté́s* noun forms and the one which creates *-ízō* verb forms – appear to be related to each other, but they do not depend mechanically on each other, from a synchronic point of view. First, there are some *-ismós/-isté́s* noun forms which do not show corresponding *-ízō* verb forms, so they appear to be created independently. Nouns such as *antisthenismós* ‘way of life according to the teaching of Antisthenes’, *koinismós* ‘mixture of dialects’, *alophulismós* ‘adoption of foreign customs’, *kuphōnismós* ‘punishment by the *kúphōn*’ and others do not correlate with *-ízō* verb forms, from the morphological point of view. Obviously, this may be caused by gaps in the texts’ tradition, but it may also be evidence for an “autonomization” of the noun suffix *-ismós*. Further, it must be added that the nominal suffix *-mo-* is not productive in Ancient Greek (see Ciacci 1999/2000 and Ronzitti 2006). Both underline that the nominal suffix *-mo-* occurs in many nominal formations – in Ancient Greek and in Sanskrit as well – but these nouns are not morphologically analyzable because their meaning is no more compositional. Combined with the verbal suffix *-íz-*, the nominal suffix *-mo-* appears to be highly productive, as we have shown. It may thus be suggested that the high productivity of *-ismós* formations does not depend on the productivity of the nominal suffix *-mo-*, but, rather, on the combination of the two suffixes, that is on *-ismós*. This means that between *-ismós/-isté́s* noun forms and *-ízō* verb forms, there is a morphosyntactic relationship but this relationship does not yield a mechanic adjunction of affixes. It may be suggested that already in Ancient Greek (at least in some chronological phases) a process of morphological reanalysis has taken place: *-ismós* nouns are reanalyzed as nouns derived from the same lexical bases as *-ízō* verb forms. The two derivatives do not depend on each other, but they are in a paradigmatic relationship.

## 5. First conclusions

<sup>6</sup> It is true, however, that Chantraine (1933: 138ff.) is very ambiguous on this topic: on the one hand, he affirms that *-ismós* nouns spread together with, and are derived from *-ízō* verb forms, on the other hand, he points out that it is *-ismós* which gives birth to a great amount of derivatives in Attic and Hellenistic works.

As far as AGr. is concerned, the morphological processes which lead to *-ismós/-istés* forms are to be described as two derivational processes, applied subsequently. Nouns such as AGr. *barbarismós*, *kunismós*, *exorkismós*, *eikonismós*, *ioudaismós*, *priapismós* and the corresponding *-istés* forms (*exorkistés* ‘exorcist’, *eikonistés* ‘registrar’) stand in a derivational relationship with *-ízō* verb forms: *barbarízō* ‘to behave or speak like a barbarian’, *kunízō* ‘to live like a Cynic’, *exorkízō* ‘to administer an oath’, *eikonízō* ‘to copy from a pattern’, *ioudaízō* ‘to side with or imitate the Jews’, *priapízō* ‘to be lewd’. The affixes *-ismós* and *-istés* are therefore to be interpreted as a combination of the verbal affix *-íz-* and the nominal affix *-mo-/-tés-*, as Schwyzer (1953: 493) underlines. The two morpho-lexical processes, involving *-ízō* verbs and *-ismós/-istés* nouns, are both productive and related to each other. In It. there exist two morpho-lexical processes which are etymologically related to those of AGr., namely the one involving verbs ending in *-eggiare / -izzare* and the one involving nouns ending in *-ismo/-ista*, but there is no comparable systematic morpho-lexical relationship between them in Italian.

## 6. A closer look at Old Italian

### 6.1. Modern and Old Italian in view of the productivity of *-ismo* and *-ista* forms

In Modern It. we are faced with a huge amount of data to classify and systematize. A mere classification into semantically based classes is not satisfactory, as we have already pointed out discussing the approach of Grossmann & Rainer (2004). We therefore started the other way round by examining the origin and development of the variety and richness of formations in Italian.

In Modern It. *-ismo* and *-ista* show an extraordinary productivity. It was not the same in Old It., as confirmed by our research on texts ranging from Dante Alighieri (13<sup>th</sup> century) to Galileo Galilei (first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century) available at <http://www.liberliber.it/biblioteca/index.htm>. In these texts, we searched for the strings *-smo*, *-sme*, *-smi*, *-esim-*, for *-ismo* forms, and *-ista*, *-iste*, *-isti*, for *-ista* forms. No productive use of the suffix *-ismo* is found before the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and couples of *-ismo/-ista* forms such as *ateismo* ‘atheism’ / *ateista* ‘atheist’ are not found previously. During the 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> centuries, *-ismo* attested forms were related to Lt. or AGr., with a few exceptions, such as *incantesimo* ‘spell, enchantment’ (13<sup>th</sup> century) and *ruffianesimo* ‘whore-mongering, bootlicking’ (14<sup>th</sup> century). On the contrary, as regards *-ista* forms, the 13<sup>th</sup> century already presents *Arnaldisti*, *Leonisti*, *Speronisti* denoting supporters, disciples, followers of religious, heretical movements (a proper name is the morphological base in all three cases: *Arnaldo da Brescia*, *Lione*, *Ugo Speroni*).

Our research on the texts yields the following results: for *-ismo* roughly 40 types were found; for *-ista* about 90 types (both groups are variable as far as inflection and orthography are concerned, for *cristianesimo* we find *Christianesimo* / *Christianesimo* / *Cristianesimo* / *cristianismo* / *cristianesimo* or for *evangelista*: *Evangelista* / *Vangelista* / *guagnelisti* / *Evangelisti* / *Vangelisti* / *vangelisti* / *evangelisti*). From these types we excluded some forms for the following reasons: *battesimo* ‘christening’ and *battista* ‘Baptist’ since both are part of the vocabulary already before the analyzed period, they both have Latin/Ancient Greek origin and a possible base for derivation (the verb *battezzare* ‘to christen’) is documented much later; furthermore *battista* is mostly used as a proper name in the texts. In the case of *aforisma* ‘aphorism’, *cataclisma* ‘cataclysm’ and *sofisma* ‘sophism’ there is no possible base in Italian and the form is nowadays *-isma* not *-ismo*, whereas in our texts there are some variations with *-ismo*. In *algorismo* ‘algorithm’ which seems to be a variant of *algoritmo*, there is no suffix since the base is

the Arabian proper name *al-Huwarizmi*. Finally, *anacronismo* ‘anachronism’, *parossismo* ‘paroxysm’, *anabattista* ‘Anabaptist’, *antagonista* ‘antagonist’, *gimnosofista* ‘gymnosophist’, *grammatista* ‘grammatist’, *lanista* ‘lanista, owner and trainer of gladiators’, *petaurista* ‘flying phalanger, glider’ and *sofista* ‘sophist’ have no possible base. With the only exception of *algorismo*, all forms have Ancient Greek parallels.

The remaining types for *-ismo* are:

*anatematismo* ‘anathematism’, *antimacchiavelismo* ‘anti-Machiavellianism’, *arianismo* ‘Arianism’, *ateismo* ‘atheism’, *barbarismo* ‘barbarism’, *bardascismo* ‘male homosexual prostitution’, *Calvinismo* ‘Calvinism’, *catechismo* ‘catechism’, *Catolichismo* ‘Catholicism’, *cristianesimo* ‘Christianity’, *ebraismo* ‘Hebraism’, *epitetismi* ‘epithetisms’, *essorcismi* ‘exorcism’, *gentilesimo* ‘gentilism’, *Giudaismo* ‘Judaism’, *incantesimo* ‘enchantment’, *Iustinianismo* ‘Justinianism’, *luteranismo* ‘Lutheranism’, *Mahumetisimo* ‘Muhammadanism’, *Monachismo* ‘monasticism’, *ostracismo* ‘ostracism’, *paganesimo* ‘paganism’, *papismo* ‘papism’, *paralogismo* ‘paralogism’, *Peripatecismo* ‘Peripateticism’, *Piratismo* ‘piratism’, *profanismo* ‘profanism’, *puttanesimo* ‘behaviour like a whore’, *ruffianesimo* ‘whore-mongering, bootlicking’, *Schematismi* ‘schematism’, *sillogismo* ‘syllogism’, *soldanesimo* ‘Sultanism’, *solecismo* ‘solecism’, *stryanismi* ‘wizardries’, *trigonismo* ‘trigonism’.

And for *-ista*:

*abachista* ‘book-keeper, from abacus’, *Achitofellisti* ‘wise counselors like Ahitophel’, *albertista* ‘follower of Albertus Magnus’, *albichista* ‘Albigense’, *alchimista* ‘alchemist’, *algebrista* ‘algebraist’, *Arnaldiste* ‘followers of Arnaldo da Brescia’, *artista* ‘artist’, *ateista* ‘atheist’, *averroista* ‘Averroist’, *barzelletista* ‘writer of a frottola’, *cabalista* ‘cabalist’, *calvinista* ‘Calvinist’, *canonista* ‘canonist’, *casista* ‘casuist’, *chimista* ‘chemist’, *citarista* ‘citharist’, *computista* ‘book-keeper’, *conclavista* ‘conclavist’, *confessionisti* ‘confessionists’, *contista* ‘book-keeper’, *copernichista* ‘follower of Copernicus’ ideas’, *copista* ‘copyist’, *cronichista* ‘chronicler’, *donatisti* ‘Donatists’, *duellisti* ‘expert duellists’, *essorcisti* ‘exorcists’, *etimologisti* ‘etymologists’, *evangelista* ‘evangelist’, *figurista* ‘figurist’, *fisionomista* ‘physiognomist’, *fisionotomista* ‘physio-anatomist’, *flautista* ‘flutist’, *galenisti* ‘Galenists’, *galileista* ‘Galilean’, *gesuitista* ‘Jesuit’, *giuristi* ‘jurist’, *humanista* ‘humanist’, *ipocratista* ‘Hippocratist’, *legista* ‘jurist, legist’, *Leoniste* ‘followers of Peter Waldo, the Poor of Lyons’, *macchiavellista* ‘Machiavellian’, *Maumettisti* ‘Mohammedans’, *meteorista* ‘meteorologist’, *mineralisti* ‘mineralists’, *montanista* ‘Montanist’, *naturalista* ‘naturalist’, *Navarrista* ‘Navarrist’, *nobilista* ‘honoris cause’, *notomista* ‘anatomist’, *novellisti* ‘short story writers’, *organista* ‘organist’, *palacista* (*palazzista*) ‘lawyer’, *papalista* ‘papalist’, *papista* ‘papist’, *paulianisti* ‘Paulianists’, *persianisti* ‘persianists’, *priorista* ‘book where the priors are listed’, *priscillianisti* ‘Priscillianists’, *Problemista* ‘anonymous critic of Galilei and author of the problem *De lunarium montium altitudine*’, *prologhista* ‘prologist’, *pseudotomisti* ‘pseudo-Thomists’, *regolista* ‘persons obsessed with rule observation’, *ribichista* ‘player of a rebec’, *romanisti* ‘Romanists’, *salmista* ‘psalmist’, *scotista* ‘Scotist’, *scritturisti* ‘Scripturists’, *semplicista* ‘simplist’, *sommista* ‘summist’, *sorbonista* ‘Sorbonist’, *Speroniste* ‘followers of Ugo Speroni’, *spigolista* ‘puritan, sanctimonious person, bigot’, *Talmudista* ‘Talmudist’, *teoremisti* ‘writers of a theorem’, *Tomisti* ‘Thomists’, *umorista* ‘follower of humourism in medicine’, *vangelista* ‘female evangelist’, *viglefisti* ‘Wyclifists, followers of John Wyclif’.

What are the lexical categories of bases that we find in these types? There are nouns (11 *-ismo*, 47 *-ista*, but 2 cases could also be deverbal), proper names (5 *-ismo*, 24 *-ista*), adjectives (3 *-ismo*, 6 *-ista*) and verbs (6 *-ismo*, 3 *-ista*, but 2 could be denominal, see above). In some cases (10 *-ismo*, 1 *-ista*) it is not easy to decide whether the base is nominal or adjectival, due to the easy shift from one category to another. So for the period observed, we have no examples with compounds, adverbs, idioms, numerals, prepositions, whole phrases or abbreviations as bases.

Some *-ismo/-ista* forms which are attested in texts dating back to the 13<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries are not found in Modern Italian dictionaries (Zingarelli, Devoto-Oli), as the following examples show (they occur in 16<sup>th</sup> century texts, excepting other indications): *Antimacchiavellismo* ‘anti-Machiavellianism’, *bardascismo* ‘male homosexual prostitution’, *epitetismi* ‘epithetisms’, *Iustinianismo* ‘Justinianism’, *Piratismo* ‘piratism’, *profanismo* ‘profanity’, *soldanesimo* (= *sultanismo* ‘Sultanism’), *stryanismi* (= *stregonismi*, *stregonismi*) ‘wizardries’, *trigonismo* ‘trigonism’; *Arnaldiste*, *ipocratista* ‘Hippocratist’, *Leoniste*, *Speroniste* (1200); *Maumettisti* ‘Mohammedans’ (1400); *Achitofellisti* ‘wise counselors like Ahitophel’, *albertista* ‘follower of Albertus Magnus’, *albichista* ‘Albigense’, *barzullettista* ‘writer of a frottola’, *contista* ‘book-keeper’, *galileista* ‘Galilean’, *gesuitista* ‘Jesuit’, *Navarrista* ‘Navarrist’, *nobilista* ‘honoris cause’, *palacista* (*palazzista* ‘lawyer’), *papalista* ‘papist’, *paulianisti* ‘Paulianists’, *priorista* ‘book where the priors are listed’, *Problemista* ‘anonymous critic of Galilei and author of the problem *De lunarium montium altitudine*’, *prologhista* ‘prologist’, *regolisti* ‘persons obsessed with rule observation’, *sorbonista* ‘Sorbonist’, *spigolista* ‘puritan, sanctimonious person, bigot’, *teoremisti* ‘writers of a theorem’, *viglefisti* ‘Wyclifists, followers of John Wyclif’ (1500). Most of them denote disciples of political or religious trends (this does not seem to be the case with *barzullettista*, *contista*, *Problemista*, *regolisti*, *spigolista* and *teoremisti*). As far as the lexical categories of bases are concerned, we find here mostly nouns or proper names, a clear sign of the productivity of these types.

## 6.2. Productivity at work

These above-mentioned forms are a clear sign of the suffix’s morphological productivity: each form may appear or disappear, but the morphological processes continue to be viable and productive and the forms are interpretable in the range of the productive processes – briefly, the possibility of forming *ad hoc* formations that are understandable. We will illustrate with two examples.

*Galileista* is found in a letter of Piero Dini to Galilei (1615):

- (7) *ma ne parlerò ancora al medico Fabii Fiammingo, che spesso è in casa mia et è gran Galileista e da’ dotti molto stimato;*  
‘but I will talk of it again to the doctor Fabii Fiammingo, who is often at my home and is a great **Galilean** and highly esteemed by the learned’  
(Zingarelli 2003 does not have *galileista*, but *galileiano*, first documented in 1745)

The form *Galileista* is used here in a letter to Galilei himself.

*Problemista* is found in a letter of Federico Cesi to Galilei (1612):

- (8) *et oltre il Problemista, scopro io qui in altri l’istesso affetto...*  
‘and apart from the **Problemist**, I find here in others the same affection’

The *Problemista* is an anonymous critic of Galilei and author of the problem *De lunarium montium altitudine*.

As far as the morpho-lexical relationship between *-ismo* and *-ista* is concerned, already OIt. texts show some couples of forms, e.g.: (*Antimacchiavellismo* / *macchiavellista* ‘Machiavellian’), *ateismo* ‘atheism’ / *ateista* ‘atheist’, *Calvinismo* ‘Calvinism’ / *calvinista* ‘Calvinist’, *essorcismi* ‘exorcisms’ / *essorcista* ‘exorcist’, *Mahumetisimo* ‘Mohammedanism’ / *maumettisti* ‘Mohammedans’, *papismo* ‘papism’ /

*papisti* ‘papists’. For example in the *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino* of Paolo Sarpi we find *papismo* and several times *papisti*:

- (9) *Dicevano che fosse un stabilimento totale del **papismo**; biasimavano sopra tutto la dottrina della giustificazione e che fosse posta in dubio la comunione del calice et il matrimonio de' preti.*  
‘they said that it was a complete establishment of the **papism**; they disapproved above all the doctrine of justification and that the communion of the chalice and the marriage of the priests have been doubted’
- (10) *Onde fece il re un editto, proibendo li nomi d'ugonotti e **papisti**, ordinando che, sotto pretesto di scoprir le congregazioni proibite per causa di religione, nissun potesse entrar né con pochi, né con molti in casa d'altri*  
‘therefore the king made an edict prohibiting the names of the Huguenots and **papists**, and ordered that, with the pretext of uncovering/revealing the prohibited congregations based on religion, nobody could come into someone else’s house either with few or with many’

Some types show either *-ismo* or *-ista* affixes only (but they are correlated with *-ista* and *-ismo* forms respectively, which are attested later in monolingual dictionaries indicated here according to Zingarelli) e.g.: *averroista* (*averroismo* ‘Averroism’ 1941), *catechismo* ‘catechism’ (*catechista* ‘catechist’ before 1603), *chimista* (*chimismo* 1863), *copernichista* (*copernicanesimo* 1956), *Cronichisti* (*cronachismo* ‘narration according to chronological order’ 1917), *donatisti* (*donatismo* 1830), *ebraismo* ‘Judaism’ (*ebraista* ‘Judaist’ 1911), *evangelista* (*evangelismo* ‘evangelism’ 1921), *galenisti* (*galenismo* 1834), *gesuitista* (*gesuitismo* 1668), *ipocratista* (*ippocratismo* ‘Hippocratism’ 20<sup>th</sup> century), *meteorista* (*meteorismo* 1788), *montanista* (*montanismo* 1891), *naturalista* (*naturalismo* 1849), *priscillianisti* (*priscillianesimo* 1835), *scotista* (*scotismo* 1960), *semplicista* (*semplicismo* 1904), *Tomisti* (*tomismo* 1749), *umanista* (*umanesimo* ‘Humanism’ 1891), *umorista* (*umorismo* 1875).

### 6.3. Classification of Old Italian forms

A first attempt to classify *-ismo* and *-ista* forms which are attested in the 13<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries may be based on their denotation; this leads to the following classes (but we repeat that this kind of classification is only an intermediate level; ongoing work will help us to go beyond this denotative classification):

#### A. *-ismo* forms<sup>7</sup>

1. IDEOLOGY, FIELD, CONCEPTION: *anatematismo, Antimacchiavellismo, arianismo, ateismo, Calvinismo, catechismo, Catolichismo, cristianesimo, ebraismo, gentilesimo, Giudaismo, iustinianismo, luteranismo, Mahumetisimo, Monachismo, paganesmo, papismo, Peripatecismo, soldanesimo*;
2. RHETORICAL DEVICE, LINGUISTIC PECULIARITY: *barbarismo, epitetismo, paralogismo, sillogismo, solecismo*;
3. BEHAVIOUR, ATTITUDE: *bardascismo, piratismo, puttanesimo, ruffianesimo, Schematismi*.

#### B. *-ista* forms<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Some forms do not fit in this classification, it is the case of: *essorcismi, incantesimo, ostracismo, profanismo, stryanismi* and *trigonismo*.

<sup>8</sup> Outside of this classification remain *duellisti, essorcisti, nobilista, priorista* and *vangelista* (female).

1. FOLLOWER, DISCIPLE, SCHOLAR (to A1.): *albertista, albichista, alchimista, algebrista, Arnaldiste, ateista, averroista, cabalista, calvinista, confessionisti, copernichista, Donatisti, galenisti, Galileista, Gesuitista, ipocratista, Leoniste, macchiavellista, maumettista, meteorista, mineralista, montanisti, naturalista, Navarristi, papalista, papista, paulianista, persianisti, priscillianisti, pseudotomisti, romanisti, scotista, sorbonista, Speroniste, Talmudista, Tomisti, (h)umanista, umorista, vinglefisti*;
2. PROFESSIONAL, EXPERT: *abachista, canonista, casista, chimista, contista, computista, conclavista, copista, etimologista, fisionomista, fisionotomista, giurista, legista, notomista, palacista, scritturista, semplicista*;
3. AUTHOR, PAINTER etc.: first of all we find the hypernym *artista*; *barzellettista, cronichista, evangelista, figurista, novellista, problemista, prologhista, salmista, sommista, teoremisti*;
4. MUSICIAN: *citarista, flautista, organista, ribichista*;
5. PERSON CHARACTERIZED BY BEHAVIOUR (to A3.): *Achitofellista, regolista, spigolista*.

From the beginning the denotation of religious movements (particularly heretical or non-Christian ones) and the related disciples shows up:

- religious movements: a) *cristianesimo – cattolicesimo*; b) non-Christian: *paganesimo, ebraismo, giudaismo, gentilesimo, mahumetismimo*; c) heretical: *arianesimo, calvinismo, luteranismo*
- disciples: a) *albertisti*; b) *maumettisti, talmudisti*; c) *arnaldisti, leonisti, speronisti, albichisti, calvinisti, confessionisti, donatisti, montanisti, paulianisti, priscillianisti, vinglefisti*.

A short look reveals the chronological distribution of the forms within the classes, first for *-ismo* (table A) then for *-ista* (table B):

Table A

	A-1	A-2	A-3
13 <sup>th</sup> century <sup>9</sup>	<i>cristianesimo, paganesmo</i>	<i>barbarismo, sillogismo, solecismo</i>	
14 <sup>th</sup> century			<i>ruffianesimo</i>
15 <sup>th</sup> century <sup>10</sup>			
16 <sup>th</sup> century <sup>11</sup>	<i>anatematismo, Antimacchiavellismo, arianismo, ateismo, Calvinismo catechismo, Catolichismo, ebraismo, gentilesimo, Giudaismo, iustinianismo, luteranismo, Mahumetisimo, Monachismo, papismo, Peripatecismo, profanismo, soldanesimo</i>	<i>epitetismo, paralogismo</i>	<i>bardascismo, piratismo, puttanesimo, Schematismi</i>

<sup>9</sup> Unclear: *incantesimo*.

<sup>10</sup> Unclear: *ostracismo*.

<sup>11</sup> The indication 16<sup>th</sup> century includes attestations until 1650 as indicated above. Unclear: *essorcismi* (act of *esorcizzare*), *stryanismi* (act of bewitching), *trigonismo* (mathematical concept).

Table B

	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	B-5
13 <sup>th</sup> century	<i>Arnaldiste,</i> <i>ipocratista,</i> <i>Leoniste, Speroniste</i>	<i>legista</i>	<i>artista,</i> <i>evangelista,</i> <i>salmista</i>	<i>citarista</i>	
14 <sup>th</sup> century	<i>alchimista</i>	<i>canonista,</i> <i>giurista</i>			
15 <sup>th</sup> century	<i>Maumettista,</i> <i>Talmudista,</i> <i>(h)umanista</i>	<i>notomista</i>	<i>cronichista</i>	<i>flautista</i>	
16 <sup>th</sup> century <sup>12</sup>	<i>albertista, albichista,</i> <i>algebrista, ateista,</i> <i>averroista, cabalista,</i> <i>calvinista,</i> <i>confessionisti,</i> <i>copernichista,</i> <i>Donatisti, galenisti,</i> <i>Galileista, Gesuitista,</i> <i>macchiavellista</i> <i>meteorista,</i> <i>mineralista,</i> <i>montanisti,</i> <i>naturalista,</i> <i>Navarristi, papalista,</i> <i>papista, paulianista,</i> <i>persianisti,</i> <i>priscillianisti,</i> <i>pseudotomisti,</i> <i>romanisti, scotista,</i> <i>sorbonista, Tomisti,</i> <i>umorista, vinglefisti</i>	<i>abachista,</i> <i>casista, chimista,</i> <i>contista,</i> <i>computista,</i> <i>conclavista,</i> <i>copista,</i> <i>etimologista,</i> <i>fisionomista,</i> <i>fisionotomista,</i> <i>palacista,</i> <i>scritturista,</i> <i>semplicista</i>	<i>barzellettista,</i> <i>figurista,</i> <i>novellista,</i> <i>problemista,</i> <i>prologhista,</i> <i>sommista,</i> <i>teoremisti</i>	<i>organista,</i> <i>ribichista</i>	<i>Achitofellista,</i> <i>regolista,</i> <i>spigolista</i>

No formations of A-3 'behaviour, attitude' occur until the 14<sup>th</sup> century, and B-5, which is the correlated *-ista* formation, is documented only in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. A control in Zingarelli 2008 and Devoto & Oli (2009) confirmed that there are no attested forms in relation to these classes. The only form cited for *-ista* is: *moralista* (first documentation indicated before 1492 by Z., 15<sup>th</sup> century by D&O) not found in our texts, but it is unclear when *moralista* came to be interpreted as a person behaving like a moralist and when as a follower of a moralist norm (i.e. belonging to A-1).

## 7. Conclusions and outlook

In this paper we have suggested some reflections on two classes of nominal suffixes which are closely related to each other from the morpho-lexical point of view: AGr. *-ismós/-istés* and It. *-ismo/-ista*. The comparison of these two languages has allowed us to describe two different derivational processes, both productive in the two languages. Furthermore, we have taken into consideration the diachronic relationship between the two languages, which is mediated by means of Latin. For this reason, our research on Italian *-ismo/-ista* formations has concerned first of all Old Italian texts, in order to verify whether these derivational processes were productive also in Old Italian.

<sup>12</sup> The indication 16<sup>th</sup> century includes attestations until 1650 as indicated above. Unclear *duellisti*, *essorcisti*, *nobilista* (scuola nobilista, a nobilista), *priorista* (book where the priors are registered), *vangelista* (feminine).



In Ancient Greek, the *-ismós/-istés* formations are correlated with the *-ízō* verb forms. So, *-ismós/-istés* noun forms can be described – from the morphological point of view – as derivatives, by means of the *-mo-* suffix, from derived *-ízō* verb forms. We have shown that the nominal derivational process seems to become autonomous already in the synchrony of Ancient Greek, and consequently *-ismós/-istés* derivational suffixes can be recognized. Nevertheless, the *-ízō* verbs and the *-ismós/-istés* nouns remain closely related to each other, from the lexico-syntactic point of view. This relationship does not concern Italian forms, even if the etymologically corresponding *-izzare/-eggiare* verb forms are productive in Italian too. There seems to be no systematic relationship between nouns in *-ismo*, *-ista* and verbs in *-izzare/-eggiare* in either Old or Modern Italian<sup>13</sup>. In relation to our formations with *-ismo* and *-ista* in Old Italian texts, we find only some sporadic parallels to verbs. For the interpretation ‘behave like X’ for example we find only *paganeggiare* ‘to think or act according to pagan principles’, *pirateggiare* ‘to pirate, to commit piracy’, *puttaneggiare* ‘to whore, to play the whore’ and *ruffianeggiare* ‘to pimp, to pander’ attested in Zingarelli 2008, whereas for the interpretation ‘cause to be X’ we find *cattolicizzare* ‘catholicize’ and *cristianizzare* ‘to Christianize’ attested only in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, whereas *ebraizzare* ‘to Hebraize’ and *giudaizzare* ‘to Hebraize’ have Ancient Greek predecessors; the only interesting formation is *paganizzare* ‘to paganize’ coupling with *paganeggiare* to *paganesimo*. Even if the paradigmatic relationship to the verbal suffixes in Old Italian is not systematic as in Ancient Greek, the topic should be analysed extensively.

In Old Italian *-ismo* and *-ista* are productive suffixes, but they did not reach their complete wide range of formations and interpretations until the 16<sup>th</sup> century. As far as *-ismo* is concerned, a real productive use of the suffix is not documented in our texts until the 16<sup>th</sup> century, whereas for *-ista*, already the 13<sup>th</sup> century shows productive formations. This closer look at the development of such productivity based on concrete textual occurrences is, to our knowledge, a new perspective within the study of these suffixes, together with the comparative look at Ancient Greek, which resulted in new insights. Neither suffix exhibited its peculiarity as regards the richness of possible lexical bases: they are limited to nouns, proper names, adjectives and verbs (so they behave virtually like other derivational suffixes). It remains to be analysed when the first formations with the missing bases (i.e. compounds, adverbs, idioms, numerals, prepositions, whole phrases or abbreviations) enter the language. An extensive study of the subsequent periods (17<sup>th</sup> century until now) should fill the gaps. A surprising “gap”, in our opinion, is the lack of *-ista* forms denoting ‘one who behaves like X’ (B-5) until the 16<sup>th</sup> century. These interpretations clearly occur in Ancient Greek (e.g. *lakōnistés* ‘one who imitates the Lacedaemonians’) and the corresponding *-ismo* nouns (e.g. *ruffianesimo*) are documented already before the 16<sup>th</sup> century. A problem for the analysis of Old Italian (at least for the early periods) could also be the fact that the written language was still predominantly Latin.

Another point to be mentioned – and to be further investigated – concerns the fact that in both languages the great amount of *-ismo/-ista* and the *-ismós/-istés* forms appear to be created and therefore occur in “technical” that is philosophical, religious, historic, scientific, or rhetoric texts and are, by contrast, only rarely found in literary texts. An example is the one concerning the word *galileista* (§ 6.2 above). Other examples are AGr. lexemes *barbarismós* ‘use of a foreign tongue or one’s own tongue amiss, barbarism’, *iōtakismós* ‘doubling of ι as in *Troiia*’, *labdakismós* ‘a defect of pronunciation’, *soloikismós* ‘incorrectness in the use of language, solecism’, as far as rhetorical terminology is concerned. Thus, it is not by chance that Hellenistic culture, as regards Ancient Greek,

<sup>13</sup> The *-izzare* verb forms denote a meaning comparable to ‘cause to be X, render X’ but also ‘practice, make use of X’, whereas the *-eggiare* verb forms seem to have specialized in the interpretation ‘behave like X’: see La Fauci (2006, 2007, 2008).

and the 16<sup>th</sup> century, as regards Italian, are the two ages in which *-ismo/-ista* and *-ismós/-istés* show high productivity.

## References

- Aronoff Mark 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bauer Laurie 1997. Derivational paradigms. In Booij, Geert and Jaap van Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of Morphology 1996*, 243-256. Dordrecht, Boston & London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Braun Peter, Burkhard Schaefer and Johannes Volmert 2003. *Internationalismen II. Studien zur interlingualen Lexikologie und Lexikographie* (Reihe Germanistische Linguistik. Band 246). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Chantraine Pierre 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Champion.
- Ciacchi Serena 1999/2000. *I derivati in \*mo/a in greco ed in antico indiano: un esempio di nominalizzazione*. Università di Pisa: tesi di laurea.
- Dardano Maurizio 2009. *Costruire parole. La morfologia derivativa dell'italiano*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Devoto Giacomo and Giancarlo Oli 2009. *Il Devoto-Oli 2009. Vocabolario della lingua italiana*. Mondadori: Milano.
- Sabatini Francesco and Vittorio Coletti 1997. *DISC compact dizionario italiano Sabatini Coletti*. Ed. in CD-ROM, versione 1.1. Firenze: Giunti Multimedia.
- Greimas Algirdas Julien 1969. Eléments d'une grammaire narrative. *L'Homme* 9 (3): 71-92.
- Grossmann Maria and Franz Rainer 2004. *La formazione delle parole in italiano*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- La Fauci Nunzio 2006. Verbi deonomastici e sintassi: sul tipo *catoneggiare*. In D'Achille, Paolo and Enzo Caffarelli (eds.) *Lessicografia e onomastica. Atti delle Giornate internazionali di studio (Università di Roma Tre, 16-17 febbraio 2006)*, Quaderni Internazionali di RION 2, 3-15. Roma: Società Editrice Romana.
- La Fauci Nunzio 2007. Nomi propri, luoghi comuni. In: *Atti del XXII Congresso internazionale di Scienze onomastiche (Pisa, 28 agosto – 4 settembre 2005)*, vol. I: 605-13. Pisa: ETS.
- La Fauci Nunzio 2008. Antonomasie. In: Cresti, Emanuela (ed.) *Prospettive nello studio del lessico italiano. Atti del IX Convegno internazionale della SILFI (Firenze, 14-17 giugno 2006)*, vol. I: 279-83. Firenze: University Press.
- Lewis Charlton T. and Charles Short 1879. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Available on-line: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.04.0059>
- Roché Michel 2007. Logique lexicale et morphologie: la dérivation en *-isme*. In Montermini, Fabio, Gilles Boyé and Nabil Hathout (eds.) *Selected Proceedings of the 5th Décembrettes: Morphology in Toulouse*, 45-58. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Ronzitti Rosa 2006. *I derivati in \*-mo- della lingua vedica (Saṃhitā e Brāhmaṇa)*. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni.
- Schwarze Christoph 1995. *Grammatik der italienischen Sprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Schwyzer Eduard 1953. *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Tronci Liana 2010. Funzioni, forme, categorie. Una nota su costrutti con verbi in -ίζω. In Putzu, Ignazio, Giulio Paulis, Gianfranco Nieddu and Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.) *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*, 495-511. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Werner Jürgen 1980. Zum -ismus. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 33: 488-96.

## Corpus

- Buck Carl D. and Walter Petersen 1984. *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*. Hildesheim – Zürich – New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Liddell Henry G., Robert Scott and Henry S. Jones 1996 [1843]. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Zingarelli Nicola 2002. *Lo Zingarelli 2003. Vocabolario della lingua italiana*. Bologna: Zanichelli. [Zingarelli 2008 in CD-ROM, 2007].