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Abstract
In this paper we address the question of base selection in Word Formation (henceforth WF), for French -iser suffixed verbs with seemingly adjectival bases. The issue discussed here is illustrated by the constructed meaning of 380 deadjectival verbs ending with -aliser or -ariser (hereafter XaRiser), coming from dictionaries and online documents. Although the verb stem is always that of an adjective, the analysis of these data shows that the verb itself seems to instantiate three constructional patterns: some verbs are genuinely deadjectival (UNIVERSALISER [UNIVERSALIZE] = ‘make something become UNIVERSEL [UNIVERSAL]’), others have a denominal interpretation (LOCALISER [LOCALIZE] = ‘determine something’s LIEU [PLACE]’), and in other cases the adjectival base bears an anaphoric function, namely it refers to a “N A” phrase, in which A matches the verb base (MURALISER [MURALIZE] = “make a FRESQUE MURALE [FRESCO]”). Moreover, XaRiser verbs may have more than one reading, depending on the context. The paper examines the conditions under which each verb reading arises, and then explores several possibilities leading to a unitary analysis for these various verb interpretations. In this way, we attempt to provide an answer to the question of the nature of the morphological process that forms XaRiser verbs.

1 Introduction*

The issue addressed in this paper concerns two morphological phenomena of discrepancy between form and meaning: over-marking and under-marking, illustrated in French with XaRiser verbs, i.e. -iser suffixed verbs (apparently) derived from -al and -aire ending denominal adjectives. There is under-marking when the form of a word is incomplete with regard to its meaning and over-marking when it contains more phonological material than needed.

* We gratefully acknowledge many helpful comments and suggestions that we have received from several anonymous reviewers. The development of this paper has benefited substantially from their comments.
Most of the data we are interested in here are concerned with over-marking, and an important amount of them are characterized by both under- and over-marking. We propose to give a common analysis to these phenomena.

First, we have to define them with respect to the canonical situation where form and meaning match exactly. Within the tradition of several morphological frameworks, mainstream principles assume form and meaning to co-vary in complex words: the relation between a derived word and its base shows up on the derivative simultaneously through a formal marking, and some additional semantic complexity, with respect to the base.

However, many data contradict these principles: on complex words, morphological marking is not systematically correlated with a semantic variation. Sometimes, over-marking can be found, that is, a sequence marking the derivative but not correlated with semantic information, and called “null affix” within the Item and Arrangement framework, cf. (Hockett 1954). This is what happens in e.g. some Romance languages with the so-called parasynthetic constructs. For instance, in the adjective INTRACELLULAIRE [INTRACELLULAR] (= ‘which is within a CELL’) the semantic information (‘which is within N’) seems correlated to two formal marks: intra- and -aire (see also Roché 2010). The opposite case is that of under-marking: the form of the derivative is insufficient to account for its meaning. Leaving aside the conversion process, which assigns the derivatives a semantic information but no formal marking (e.g. in English, SAWV = ‘cut with a SAW’), another type of under-marking phenomenon is to be found when one and the same formal mark corresponds to two semantic contents: the complex word is then polysemous. This is the case of ethnic property nouns, inasmuch as they may equally refer to a toponym or to its inhabitants. Whether the base refers to a toponym (BELGIQUE [BELGIUM] → BELGICITÉ [BELGIUM-ITY]) or to an ethnonym (BELGE [BELGIAN] → BELGITÉ [BELGIAN-ITY]) has no impact on the meaning of the property noun: ‘character proper both to those who belong / are related to Belgium and / or to Belgium itself’.

As we said above, the data we are exploring in this paper instantiate a word formation rule (hence WFR), which has to do with both situations: they are both under- and over-marked. In fact, following a previous study proposed in Namer (2009), we focus on the issue of the constructed meaning of 380 verbs ending with -aliser or -ariser (hereafter XaRiser), seemingly adjective-based. These verbs come either from the TLF dictionary or from online documents. Semantically, these verbs realize three interpretative schemata, illustrated in (1) to (3). Some are genuinely deadjectival (1), and thus comply with the canonical meaning / form correlation principle. Others have a denominal interpretation (2), which places them among the over-marked verbs set; some others are under-marked, since their base is a part of
a collocation (3); others, finally, are ambiguous (4), and belong to the under-marked verb set too.

In example (2), whereas PATRONAL [EMPLOYER-AL] may refer to a property (e.g. “une attitude très patronale” is an “attitude very similar to that of an employer”), PATRONALISER [EMPLOYER-AL-IZE] is exclusively linked to the noun PATRON [EMPLOYER]: the /al/ sequence is not related to the property concept. In (3), the adjectival base bears an anaphoric function, namely it refers to a “N A” phrase, in which A matches the verb base, which constitutes a case of under-marking: the verb reading involves the semantic content of a noun whose stem is not realized within the verb. Finally, in (4), only the context helps distinguishing between the situations in which the ambiguous verb AMICALISER [FRIENDLY-IZE] is formed on the property AMICAL [FRIENDLY], and those in which it is semantically based on the human noun AMI [FRIEND].

(1) a. POPULARISER [POPULARIZE]: make [something] become POPULAIRE [POPULAR]
   Populariser ce site Web
   [Popularize this Web site]
   b. UNIVERSALISER [UNIVERSALIZE]: make [something] become UNIVERSEL [UNIVERSAL]
   Universaliser la distribution de l’eau au Vénézuela
   [Universalize water distribution in Venezuela]

(2) PATRONALISER [EMPLOYER-AL-IZE]: assign [something] to the PATRON [EMPLOYER]
   Le précédent gouvernement a patronalisé ces cotisations.
   [The previous government assigned these contributions to employers]

(3) MURALISER [MURALIZE]: make a (FRESQUE) MURAL [MURAL FRESCO]
   Ce sentiment de “créer” de laisser une “trace” visible, sont autant d’éléments qui le motive à muraliser
   [This feeling of “creating” of letting a visible “trace”, are as many elements that motivate him to make mural frescos]

---

1 Each numbered example comprises: the French verb (in small caps) with its literal, stem-suffixes decomposed, transcription in English (in italic small caps), the verb paraphrase with respect to its base, an example in French (in italics) and its translation in English (in square brackets), where the verb and its translation are highlighted in boldface.
(4) **AMICALISER [FRIENDLY-IZE]:**
   a. make [someone] become AMICAL [FRIENDLY]
      
      *Les cadeaux servent à amicaliser les tribus non-amicales.*
      [Gifts help make unfriendly tribes Friendly]
   b. add [someone] to a AMIC [FRIEND] list
      **Amicalise-moi sur Facebook**
      [Friend me on Facebook]

After a brief reminder of the literature devoted to -iser (and the equivalent English suffix -ize), we explain how our data, as well as their context, have been collected (§2). Then, we detail (§3) the four types of results illustrated in examples (1) to (4). Our next step is the comparison of several theoretical hypotheses we try to apply in order to analyze these verbs, and thus, to explain how they are formed and how they get their meaning. None of these models being ideally suited for our data, we finally propose a WF pattern accounting for over- and under-marked XaRiser verbs as well as for the canonically (i.e. genuinely adjective-based) marked ones (§4).

2 **State of the Art and Data Collection**

French -iser suffix is generally known as a verbalizer, namely a verb-forming suffix selecting a noun or an adjective as a base. When they are noun based, the verb derivatives express a range of concepts, as the verbal predicate can be causative, resultative, locative, inchoative, performative, etc.: many authors agree to assign several interpretative patterns to the -iser suffixed verbs (as well as to the corresponding suffixed verbs in other languages, e.g. the English -ize). To account for this wide range of interpretative patterns, Plag (1999:125) proposes the following classification, which here is adapted and extended to French data. In column 3, X stands for the verb base, and y and w stand for the verb arguments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Semantic pattern</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Factitive</td>
<td>y make w (more / very) X</td>
<td>y banaliser, dynamiser [banalize, dynamize] w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Locative</td>
<td>y put w (into X)</td>
<td>y hospitaliser [hospitalize] w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ornative</td>
<td>y provide w with X</td>
<td>y ioniser [ionize] w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Subjection</td>
<td>y subject w to X</td>
<td>y islamiser [islamize] w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Resultative</td>
<td>y make w into X</td>
<td>y substantiviser, carboniser [substantivize, carbonize] w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following Lieber’s and Plag’s terminology, respectively in Lieber (2004:71-89) and Plag (2003:118), *-ize* is polysemous; in Plag’s opinion, cf. (Plag 1999:121-194), *-ize* (or *-iser*) derivational pattern verbal outputs are semantically underspecified. Moreover, still according to Plag (1999), the expected meaning of a newly coined *-ize* suffixed verb results from many interactions, among which the base semantic features, pragmatic factors, and the pressure of the attested lexicon. The French *-iser* suffixation rule alternates with other derivation rules, such as *-ifier*, *en*, *a*- . The mechanisms that govern this competition are examined from a semantic viewpoint in Dal & Namer (2000) or Roger (2003), and in an NLP perspective in Namer (2002) and Sagot & Fort (2009). The morphophonological perspective is described for English in Plag (1999), and for French in Lignon (this volume). Let us add that the *-ize / -iser* verb potential polysemy is reflected also in the large amount of categories the verb base may belong to. The following is but a short sample from what can be found in French on the Internet.

### Table 1: Semantic Classification of *-ize* verbs, from (Plag 1999:125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base category</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Performative</td>
<td>you do / perform X</td>
<td>algébriser, ironiser [<em>algebraicize, be ironic</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Similative</td>
<td>you act as X (on w)</td>
<td>staliniser [<em>stalinize</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Stative</td>
<td>you be at X</td>
<td>agoniser, nomadiser [<em>be dying, be a nomad</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Instrumental</td>
<td>you use X on w</td>
<td>chloroformiser [<em>chloroformize</em>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A peculiar fact seems to emerge from the above-mentioned studies: when

### Table 2: Base categories to *-iser* verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base category</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N N</td>
<td>CHOU-FLEUR [<em>CAULIFLOWER</em>]</td>
<td>CHOU-FLEURISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N pdet N</td>
<td>MORT-AUX-RATS [<em>RAT POISON</em>]</td>
<td>MORT-AUX-RATISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N p N</td>
<td>BOUCHE-À-BOUCHE [<em>MOUTH-TO-MOUTH</em>]</td>
<td>BOUCHE-À-BOUCHISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeral</td>
<td>MILLION</td>
<td>MILLIONNISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronym</td>
<td>Amélie Poulain</td>
<td>AMELIPOULINISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A N</td>
<td>cinquième république [<em>fifth Republic</em>]</td>
<td>CINQUIEMEREPUBLICANISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiom</td>
<td>chacun pour sa gueule [<em>every man for himself</em>]</td>
<td>CHACUN-POUR-SA-GUEULISER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>casse toi pauv’con [<em>get lost dumbass</em>]</td>
<td>CASSE-TOI-PAUV-CONNISER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Base categories to *-iser* verb

A peculiar fact seems to emerge from the above-mentioned studies: when
the base is an adjective, the so-called factitive -iser suffixed verb (class 1 in Table 1) is either causative or inchoative, and expresses a change-of-state affecting the patient, whose final state is characterized by the property described by the adjective base. In other words, this adjective, which refers to a property, has to be a predicate (cf. Wisniewski & Love 1998 for more details).

The results exposed in this paper are focused on French adjective-based -iser verbs, and force us to dispute the claim according to which, in French adjective-based -iser verbs, adjectives denote properties. The dataset we have gathered, and which leads us to challenge this assumption, has been collected in two steps. The initial subset of -iser ending verbs has been extracted from the TLF dictionary. This dictionary records 904 -iser suffixed verbs, among which 190 end with -aliser or -ariser. Once verbs suffixed on simplex adjectives are discarded (BANALISER ← BANAL [TRIVIAL]), as well as prefixed deadjectival verbs (REVITALISER ← VITALISER [VITALIZE]), the remaining denominal adjective-based verb corpus contains 99 types.

The rest of the verb corpus comes from Web documents. First, a list of 2118 invented verbs is produced by adding the “iser” sequence to the stem of the adjectives ending with -al, -el and -aire that are contained in the TLF, e.g. doctoraliser from DOCTORAL [DOCTORAL], or alimentariser from ALIMENTAIRE [DIETARY]. Each of these pseudo-verb is looked for in the Web through the Yahoo Search Engine, with the help of a Yahoo Search Engine API-based tool (Namer 2003). The 535 sequences matching at least one Web indexed page are manually checked, in order to remove ungrammatical, misspelled, etc. forms. As a result, we ended up with 281 attested forms missing from the TLF. Each verb is examined with respect to either its dictionary definition or the Web contexts in which it is used.

3 Describing Xariser verbs

The collected data can be divided into four subsets, depending on the verb interpretation: they can denote a change-of-state and thus be derived from a qualifying adjective base (§3.1); they can be exclusively related to a base referring to an entity (§3.2); their interpretation can be that of a collocation (§3.3); finally, they can be polysemous (§3.4). We submitted each verb to a set of syntactic and semantic tests, in order to determine whether the interpretation of its base is that of a qualifying adjective, or that of a (concrete or abstract) noun. Tests (given in Table 3) consist of U1 ⇒ U2 implications (col. 2), meant to provide each Xariser verb with the most suitable interpretation and type (col. 1). The U1 part indicates the transitivity of Xariser, and U2 is a statement inferable from U1, involving X or XaR and one of Xariser arguments, i.e. either A or B. The consequence of a successful
test (col. 3) is the most likely category value of X or XaR: qualifying adjective, concrete or abstract noun. For instance, PATRONALISER [EMPLOYER-AL-IZE] matches test T4: the verb is transitive: ‘A patronalise B’, cf. example (2), and implies the utterance schema ‘B is allocated to X’ (in example (2): ‘contributions are allocated to employers’). PATRONALISER belongs thus to the class of subjection verbs, with a (concrete) base noun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Base category type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facticive</td>
<td>T1) A XaRise B → B becomes</td>
<td>Qualifying adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(very) XaR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>T2) A XaRise B → B is LOC X</td>
<td>Concrete noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornative</td>
<td>T3) A XaRise B → X is LOC B</td>
<td>Concrete noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental / subjection</td>
<td>T4) A XaRise B → B is subject</td>
<td>Concrete or abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ allocated / devoted to X</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative</td>
<td>T5) A XaRise B → B is</td>
<td>Concrete or abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transformed into X</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>T6) A XaRise → A is at X</td>
<td>Abstract noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performative</td>
<td>T7) A XaRise → X is done by A</td>
<td>Abstract noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similative</td>
<td>T8) A XaRise → A is similar to X</td>
<td>Concrete noun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Syntactic-semantic Tests

3.1 The base refers to the adjectival property XaR

Adjective-based change-of-state -iser verbs are claimed in the literature to be the default case (cf. §2). However, when it comes to XaR adjectives, this situation is far from being the most frequent. Actually, it concerns 23.3% of the TLF verbs, and only 11% of the verbs found online. Since their base adjective denotes a genuine property, they react positively to test T1 in Table 3, while they fail all the others. Besides TLF verbs (UNIVERSALISER, or POPULARISER, cf. (1)), the following examples come from the Internet:

---

2 When appropriate, the first line of each example includes the U2 utterance resulting from the test in brackets, and instantiated according to the context in the following line.
the swimmer become horizontal

En augmentant sa vitesse de nage le nageur va s’horizontaliser grâce à l’accroissement de la force de portance

By raising its swimming speed, the swimmer is going to become horizontal by increasing lift strength

Par ailleurs, on m’a dit de ne pas confidentialiser le dossier

[Besides, I have been told not to make the file confidential]

3.2 The base refers to an either concrete or abstract \( X_N \)

34.3% of the \( \text{XaRiser} \) verbs recorded in the TLF are derived from an exclusively relational, non-qualifying, denominal \( \text{XaR} \) base adjective (Fradin 2008), e.g. (7). Correspondingly, the meaning of the derived verb directly depends on that of the noun \( X \) from which the base adjective is derived. In (8a), \( \text{SCOLARISER} \) passes test T2 of Table 3, and, \( \text{INSTRUMENTALISER} \) (8b) succeeds in test T5. Both fail test T1:

(7) ÉCOLE \( \rightarrow \) SCOLAIRE: related to school

\[ \text{SCHOOL} \rightarrow \text{SCHOOL-AR (academic, educational)} \]

INSTRUMENT\( _N \) \( \rightarrow \) INSTRUMENTAL: related to an instrument

\[ \text{INSTRUMENT} \rightarrow \text{INSTRUMENT-AL (instrumental)} \]

(8) a. SCOLARISER [\( \text{SCHOOL-AR-IZE} \)]

\( \ast \)children become (very) academic, educational

La loi permet de scolariser les enfants de 2 ans

[The law enables 2 years old children to enter school]

b. INSTRUMENTALISER [\( \text{INSTRUMENT-IZE} \)]

\( \ast \)this problem becomes (very) instrumental

Certains hommes politiques ont instrumentalisé ce problème

[Some politicians used this problem as an instrument]

Similar data extracted from the Internet (newspapers, articles, forums, blogs, etc.) amount to 60.9% of the whole \( \text{XaRiser} \) verb set obtained online. Example (9) passes test T7 but fails test T1.
(9) CATÉGORIALISER [CATEGORICAL-IZE]  
(T7) categories are made  
(*T1) *It becomes (very) categorical
Il faut une faculté capable de procéder à un tri, de sélectionner, de catégorialiser.
[A faculty is needed, able to sort, to select, to make categories]

Among the XaRiser verbs with a potentially nominal base, two cases have to be distinguished: when \(X\) is a concrete noun, the verb-base category is straightforwardly identified (§3.2.1). On the contrary, when \(X\) is an abstract noun, we must examine whether it passes test T1 because it denotes a property, (in that case, the identity between \(X\) and XaR comes down to putting the XaRiser verb into the first subset, cf. §3.1), or whether it succeeds in one of the tests T4, T5, T6 or T7: in such cases, the verb is kept within the “noun-based verbs” subset.

3.2.1 \(X_N\) is a concrete noun

The straightforward denominal interpretation of XaRiser, when \(X\) is a concrete noun, is strongly related to the fact that French Xal and Xaire adjectives are primarily true relational adjectives, i.e. they refer to entities (Fradin 2008). In addition to (8a, b) above, the following examples are illustrations of verbs whose bases refer to an entity. Example (10) comes from TLF, and passes only test T3; example (11) has been found online, and succeeds in test T5.

(10) VAISSEAU [VESSEL] → VASCULAIRE [VASCULAR] → VASCULARISER [VASCULARIZE]  
(T3) vessels are on the bladder
Ces deux vaisseaux s’obstruent après avoir vascularisé la vessie  
[These two vessels get blocked after having vascularized the bladder]

(T5) the old man is transformed into a pope (i.e. ‘is given the pope function’)  
Au contraire, c’est l’usage de papaliser un vieux  
[On the contrary, the custom is to make an old man into a pope]

3.2.2 \(X_N\) is an abstract noun

On the other hand, when \(X\) is an abstract noun, determining whether the verb
base refers to an entity or to a property is a non-trivial decision. Two situations can occur: first, both X and XaR denote properties. The verb instantiates a change-of-state predicate (12) and belongs to the adjective-based verb set (§3.1). Otherwise, the abstract noun X may denote an activity (COMMERCE [MARKET]), or can refer to a spatial coordinate (CENTRE [CENTER]), to the result of a mental process (CONCEPT [CONCEPT]), or to an expertise domain (JURIDICTION [JURISDICTION]) etc. In those circumstances, we assume XaR to be interpreted as a relational adjective, and the verb interpretation is directly related to the noun meaning, according to tests T2-T8 of Table 3. In the examples below, successful tests are test T2 (13), T4 (14, 15) and T5 (16), respectively.

(T1) the population becomes (more) egalitarian
scolariser les enfants pour égalitariser la population
[get children to school in order to make the population (more) egalitarian]

(13) CENTRE [CENTER] → CENTRAL → CENTRALISER [CENTRAL-IZE]
(T2) the offices are at the center
centraliser les bureaux d’étude à Paris
[centralize the design offices in Paris]

(14) COMMERCE [MARKET] → COMMERCIAL [MARKET-AL] → COMMERCIALISER [MARKET-AL-IZE]
(T4) drugs are allocated to the market
Comment encourager l’industrie à commercialiser des médicaments
[How to encourage industry to market drugs]

(15) JURIDICTION [JURISDICTION] → JURIDICTIONNEL [JURISDICTIONAL] → JURIDICTIONNALISER [JURISDICTIONAL-IZE]
(T4) HALDE is allocated to a jurisdiction
sa volonté de juridictionnaliser la HALDE en transmettant davantage de dossiers au parquet
[his will to jurisdictionalize HALDE by transmitting more files to the prosecution]

HALDE was an independent high authority designed to fight against discrimination.
(16)  CONCEPT → CONCEPTUEL [CONCEPTUAL] → CONCEPTUALISER [CONCEPTUALIZE]
(T5) the experiment is transformed in concept
Conceptualiser une expérience
[Conceptualize an experiment]

3.3 The base refers to a collocation

In some cases (5% of the TLF verbs, 4% of the Web ones), XaRiser fails each and every test in Table 3. In these cases, the verb meaning can be paraphrased by means of a “N A” sequence, where A matches the XaR verb base. For instance, in (17), the adjectival base NATUREL of NATURALISER [NATURAL-IZE] does not express the quality of being natural, neither does it refer to Nature. The only possible interpretation of the verb is that of a change-of-location, the final place for the predicate patient being a new MILIEU NATUREL [NATURAL ENVIRONMENT]. Similarly in (18), the base of VITALISER [LIFE-AL-IZE] refers to the term CARTE VITALE (the name of a health insurance card).

(17)  NATURE → NATUREL[NATURAL] → NATURALISER [NATURAL-IZE]: assign
[something] to a (new) MILIEU NATUREL [NATURAL ENVIRONNEMENT]
Pour naturaliser une plante, on réunit d’abord tous les renseignements possibles sur son climat natal
[to place a plant a new natural environment, first gather all the possible information on its native climate]

(18)  VIE [LIFE] → VITAL [LIFE-AL] → VITALISER [LIFE-AL-IZE]: submit
[someone] to the CARTE VITALE [HEALTH INSURANCE SMART CARD]
Une taxe pour « vitaliser » définitivement les médecins réticents
[A tax, to definitively submit reluctant doctors to the ‘carte vitale’ health insurance card]

The adjective base corresponds to the expansion of a collocation, whose nominal head may be sometimes mentioned elsewhere in the text. Otherwise, the expansion is sufficiently determining for the reader/listener to retrieve immediately the head the adjective usually modifies in the collocation.

The adjective can be seen as a sort of anaphora, which partially refers back to the collocation or idiomatic antecedent. Indeed, this antecedent is sometimes a frozen “N A” expression. For instance, carte vitale is the term used to name the patient’s health insurance card practitioners are supposed to check at each visit. When “N A” is not a multi-word expression, it is a
collocation with a strong mutual attachment level between A and N: actually, the “N” and “A” elements in the “N A” collocations our XaRiser refer to are all characterized by a high mutual information measures in the freely available newspaper database *Les Voisins de Le Monde* (Bourigault 2002).

### 3.4 The base is ambiguous

Very often, a given XaRiser verb has several uses. More precisely, 31.4% verbs from the TLF and 22% of those found online are polysemous: depending on the context, the base is either a true qualifying adjective (19a, 20a, 21a) or a noun (19b, 20b, 21b).

(19) **INSTITUTION → INSTITUTIONNEL [INSTITUTIONAL] → INSTITUTIONNALISER [INSTITUTIONALIZE]**:

a. (T1) students mobility becomes **institutional**
   Erasmus a contribué à *institutionnaliser* la mobilité des étudiants
   [Erasmus helped to *institutionalize* students mobility]

b. (T2) Patients suffering from Alzheimer are in an **institution**
   Ces malades d’Alzheimer sont *institutionnalisés*
   [These patients suffering from Alzheimer are *put in an institution*]

(20) **PROVINCE → PROVINCIAL → PROVINCIALISER [PROVINCIALIZE]**:

a. (T1) Writers’ language becomes **provincial**
   La langue des écrivains s’est créolisée, *provincialisée*, barbarisée
   [Writers’ language has got creole, **provincial**, barbaric **features**]

b. (T4) these competences are allocated to the **province**
   *Ne faudrait-il pas plutôt *provincialiser* ces compétences ?*
   [Should not we rather **allocate** these competences to the **province**?]

---

(21) \text{ARTÈRE [ARTERY] $\rightarrow$ ARTÉRIEL [ARTERIAL] $\rightarrow$ ARTÉRIALISER [ARTERIAL-IZE]}:

a. (T1) Venous blood becomes arterial
   
   \text{Arterialiser le sang veineux, c’est en modifier l’oxygénation}
   
   [To make venous blood arterial means to modify its oxygenation]

b. (T5) The radial veins is transformed into an artery
   
   \text{Il est préférable d’arterialiser la veine radiale}
   
   [It is better to turn the radial vein into an artery]

Polysemy may involve an anaphoric verb interpretation as well. For instance, \text{VITALISER} has two readings: the one in example (18) above, and a denominal ornative meaning (22). In the same way, the meaning of \text{MENSUALISER [MONTHLY-IZE]} in (23a) is that of a change-of-state predicate, whereas in (23b) the adjectival base \text{MENSUEL} refers to the phrase \text{SALAIRE MENSUEL [MONTHLY SALARY]}. Consequently, the verb paraphrase in (23b) is ‘provide [someone] with a monthly salary’:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(22)] \text{VITALISER (T3) seeds are provided with life}
    
    \text{M. arrive à vitaliser des graines par une hibernation artificielle.}
    
    [M. manages to give life to seeds by means of an artificial hibernation]

  \item[(23)] \text{MOIS [MONTH] $\rightarrow$ MENSUEL [MONTHLY] $\rightarrow$ MENSUALISER [MONTHLY-IZE]}:
    \begin{itemize}
    \item[(a)] (T1) Income taxes become monthly
      
      \text{Mensualiser l’impôt sur le revenu convient aux contribuables en quête de tranquillité.}
      
      [To make income taxes monthly suits tax-payers looking for peace and quiet]
    \item[(b)] The childminder is provided with a monthly salary
      
      \text{Vous devez mensualiser votre assistante maternelle}
      
      [You have to give your childminder a monthly salary]
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

3.5 Partial conclusion

Table 4 sums up \text{XaRiser numeric} distribution according to the verb source and following the four interpretation subsets that have been described above. In decreasing order, we see that the preferred verb readings are respectively, (i) connected to a noun base, (ii) ambiguous, and (iii) adjective-based.
Phrasal (*i.e.* collocational) interpretations are by far the less frequent ones. Given that they have been recorded for a longer time, it is not surprising that the *XaRiser* verbs in TLF are proportionately more polysemous than the ones found online (31.4% vs 22%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Unique Interpretation</th>
<th>Polysemy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLF: 99</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3: 281</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 380</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 380</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: *XaRiser* distribution, according to both source and interpretation

As we saw, ambiguity is due to the fact that the verb stem is related to two possible bases: the property-defining adjective, and the relation adjective, semantically identical to its own base noun. This is what happens for instance in (21) with the *artérial* sequence, in ARTERIALISER.

In the next section we expose several analysis models in order to give an explanation to why *-iser* verbs accept regular marking easily (when the /XaR/ verb stem corresponds to the property XaRA), as well as over-marking (when the /XaR/ verb stem corresponds to XN) and under-marking (when the verb is polysemous).

### 4 Analysis models

Several WF models, which are examined hereafter, are available to account for the multiple interpretations exhibited by *XaRiser* verbs. Actually, they have to explain why verb bases look like adjectives, even when they refer to entities, and consequently, why the verbs are potentially polysemous: this implies that verbs are often lexically ambiguous, and have an underspecified meaning, revealed only by the context.

#### 4.1 Formal explanation

Among the 904 TLF-recorded *-iser* verbs, 405, that is 44.8%, are seemingly
derived from adjectives (at least, the stem is that of an adjective), and 263 of them are noun based (29%). As for the other verbs, their formation is due to a prefixation rule: \textit{VALEUR} → \textit{VALORISER} \textit{[PROMOTE]} → \textit{REVALORISER} \textit{[RE-PROMOTE]}. In other cases, -\textit{iser} is a simple morphological marker: \textit{HUMAIN} \textit{[HUMAN]} → \textit{DÉHUMANISER} \textit{[DESHUMANIZE]} (see Roché 2009 for a detailed analysis of these prefixed verbs).

So, in the existing lexicon, almost half of the -\textit{iser} verbs stems are adjective-shaped. Now, we can claim without any doubt, that, when he / she wants to coin an -\textit{iser} verb, the speaker / writer is sensitive to the most selected base category, within stored verbs. This preference has to do with what Hathout (2011) calls “category transparency constraint.” According to this constraint:

\begin{quote}
The optimal form allowing the lexical position of a derivative to be identified, is formally as close as possible to one of the forms of a word which is morphologically as close as possible to the derivative’s base.\textsuperscript{5}
\end{quote}

In other words, this constraint favors the selection of adjective stems by the -\textit{iser} WFR. More precisely, it primarily selects -\textit{al}, -\textit{el} and -\textit{aire} ending adjective bases, as they constitute, single-handedly, 171 of the 405 verb adjective bases, \textit{i.e.} 42.2\% (see also Lignon, this volume). The pressure exerted by the existing lexicon (\textit{i.e.} the TLF dictionary) on the coinage process thus partly explains the attraction of -\textit{iser} for \textit{XaR} adjective bases.

To be complete, our explanation has also to account for the semantic parameter. In other words, it must give an answer to the following questions: what is in the speaker’s or writer’s mind, when he / she produces an \textit{XaRiser} verb, and what are the consequences of the verb polysemy on its lexical representation?

Tentative answers can be given through various analyses that have already been suggested for similar phenomena. We examine in turn each of these attempts, that is:

1) \textbf{Syncretism} (the verb base borrows its stem from another existing, lexically related word).

2) \textbf{One rule, one meaning} (ambiguous output verbs actually correspond to distinct words, each of them resulting from a distinct rule).

3) \textbf{Underspecified input} (verbs are built out of underspecified inputs; their actual meaning is defined according to the context).

\textsuperscript{5} “la forme optimale permettant l’identification de la position lexicale d’un dérivé est formellement la plus proche possible de l’une des formes d’un mot qui est morphologiquement aussi proche que possible de la base du dérivé” (Hathout 2011: 274)
4) **Paradigmatic mechanism** (nouns, verbs and adjectives are related to each other in a paradigmatic structure).

### 4.2 Syncretism

Different authors proposed to account for several WF phenomena with an analysis that seems to fit, at a first sight, also to XaRiser verbs such as in (8), i.e. to explain how an XaRiser verb is derived from the adjective XaR, although it is interpreted with respect to the noun X.

This model assumes that the XaRiser verb base borrows its stem from another existing word, which is generally morphologically related to this base. This mechanism is sometimes called “syncretism”, this name being inspired from inflection (see *e.g.* Aronoff 1994; Baerman 2007), where it designates the fact that a morphological marker, usually related to a given function, is diverted in favor of another use. Various authors in WF adopt the term of syncretism; for instance, Koehl (2009) or Dal & Namer (2010) hold this line of argument to account for the -ité noun formation in French. Koehl (2009) remarks that, although -ité suffixed nouns usually have a property adjective as their base, some of these nouns are noun based, and the -ité derived noun refers to a measure: the base noun surfaces as the form of the adjective morphologically related to the noun. For instance, the semantic base of MORTALITÉ [MORTALITY] is the noun MORT [DEATH] under the form /mɔʁtal/ borrowed from the adjective MORTEL [MORTAL]. In Dal & Namer (2010) the reasoning is quite similar: for ethnic property nouns, the default base is an adjective, *e.g.* ITALIEN → ITALIANITÉ [ITALIAN → ITALIAN-ITY]. However, in given circumstances, the stem of the morphologically related toponym replaces the adjective. So, we have PORTUGAIS → PORTUGALITÉ [PORTUGUESE → PORTUGAL-ITY] instead of the unattested *PORTUGAISITÉ [PORTUGUESE-ITY]. For Koehl (2009) and Dal & Namer (2010), this substitution is purely formal: the base word diverts to its own profit the default stem of another word belonging to its morphological family (a similar approach is used in Booij 1997 for the analysis of Dutch toponym / ethnonym / adjective triplets).

All in all, adopting the syncretism solution amounts to assuming that, for instance, INSTRUMENTALISER is based on the noun INSTRUMENT, surfacing as the suppletive stem /ɪstrɪmətal/ borrowed from the related adjective INSTRUMENTAL.

At first sight this solution is appealing, because it solves the semantic mismatch issue between the verb and its apparent base. So, it accounts in (8) for the fact that SCOLARISER does not mean ‘makes something become academic / educational’, and in (24) that the meaning of the online attested
DÉMONIALISER [DEAMON-AL-IZE] can only be constructed from the noun DÉMON [DAEMON], according to test (T5).

(24) Comment ne pas démonialiser des gens qui prescrivent des amphéétamines aux petits enfants
    [How not to turn into daemons people who prescribe amphetamine to little children]

4.3 One rule, one meaning

The solution suggested in the previous section is, however, insufficient. In fact, it does not explain why, for almost a third of the whole XaRiser verb set (according to Table 4), the same verb form may have either a denominal meaning or a deadjectival one, not to mention its possible idiomatic interpretations, depending on the context in which it occurs. We have to examine other solutions, able to account for this large proportion of polysemous verbs.

We could put forth the hypothesis that these output verbs are not polysemous, but that there are as many lexemes as there are verb interpretations. So, if we look at examples in (20), we would admit that there are two verbs PROVINCIALISER. The former would be defined with respect to the noun PROVINCE "allocate to the PROVINCE", which refers to the final destination of the verb patient referent. The latter would be adjective-based and describe the transition leading the patient to the property of 'being PROVINCIAL'. The same line of argument would also apply to ARTÉRIALISER (21). One of the verb lexemes would describe a process consisting in "turn a blood vessel into an ARTERY". The other one would refer to the fact of 'providing something with ARTERIAL features'.

Nevertheless, assuming pairs of XaRiser verbs with identical form is undesirable, and not only because of the large number of ambiguous verbs. Actually, for each XaRiser, this hypothesis is odd, because it basically consists in taking two formally and semantically distinct bases to build homonymous verbs. Moreover, this device would operate despite the fact that other better-suited morphological means are available to avoid polysemy. For instance, instead of ARTÉRIALISER in (21), the non-existing "ARTÉRIFIER [ARTERIFY]" could have been coined, following the same pattern as the attested MOMIFIER [MUMMIFY] meaning "turn something into a MOMIE [MUMMY]".
4.4 Underspecified bases

Therefore we have to turn to another solution that accounts for both the formal approximation of the verb base, and the possible polysemy of the derived verb. So, the next assumption is that the meaning of these particular verb forms is decided within speech utterances, and that the selected base is semantically underspecified. This hypothesis is close to what is proposed in Roché (2008), and goes against the conclusions stated in Fradin & Kerleroux (2003), which argue for a fully specified semantic content of any lexeme as soon as it is selected as a base by a WFR.

This new hypothesis is driven by the fact that whatever the verb meaning is, it is detected within the utterance context. When the verb base is unambiguous, the verb interpretation is straightforward, and the role of the context is minimal. Otherwise, its role is critical. This solution provides an interesting pointer to the formal uncertainty that characterizes the XaRiser base: is it a true adjective as in examples (1), (5) and (6), a true noun ((8) and (9)), an idiom ((3) and (17)) or are several interpretations possible ((21) and (23))? With a semantically underspecified base, the verb meaning is supposed to correspond to any of the available interpretative schemata given in Table 3. So, the whole range of XaRiser possible meanings are equally reachable by the message receiver, who will be able to identify the right verb meaning thanks to the context.

The drawback of this solution is that it assumes the speaker / writer to produce an underspecified message deliberately, by means of the use of a verb formed on a base with undetermined semantic content. From a cognitive point of view, this is implausible: any speaker or writer aims at transmitting meaningful messages. What distinguishes he / she who produces XaRiser verbs, is that they have a precise meaning to formulate, and, at the same time, they let (or even want) the resulting message to look ambiguous for those who listen to (or read) it.

5. Our analysis

5.1 Observation

None of the previous analysis proposals is fully satisfying: syncretism (§4.2) fails to account for ambiguous verbs, the one rule one meaning approach (§4.3) does, but too expensively, and the underspecification hypothesis (§4.4) does not consider the fact that the speaker / writer wants to deliver a specific message, and, at the same time, he / she wants to allow uncertainty to persist
in the verb meaning. Our analysis aims to preventing these problems.

The speaker / writer knows exactly what he / she wants to say when he / she coins the verb that instantiates the given meaning. However, from the listener / reader, this verbalization brings about two or three different readings. This leads to three questions about the ambiguous verb meaning, and the answer to these questions is crucial in order to provide the right analysis to these verbs:

- Is this ambiguity required by the speaker / writer?
- Is it disturbing for the listener / reader?
- Is it avoidable?

The speaker’s intention is a parameter whose value is obviously impossible to measure. Nevertheless, it is unquestionable that the speaker aims at producing a specific message in the first place, which contradicts the seemingly voluntary ambiguity assumed in §4.4. At the same time, online examples show that sometimes writers seek complicity with their readers: when needed, they point out to the existence of several interpretations for the coined verb, and this is shown by the use of comments or quotation marks. For instance, the base of SANITARISER in (25) refers to the MINISTÈRE DE LA SANTÉ [HEALTH MINISTRY], and the verb meaning is “allocate [something] to the Health Ministry”. The presence of quotation marks helps to get the verb appropriate interpretation: otherwise, the default one could have been ‘make osteopathy healthier’.

(25) SANTÉ [HEALTH] → SANITAIRE [SANITARY] → SANITARISER
   [SANITARIZE] ‘osteopathy is allocated to the Health Ministry’
   Les experts recommandent de « sanitariser » l’ostéopathie pour en contrôler la pratique.
   [Experts recommend to allocate osteopathy to the Health Ministry]

The second issue is related to the cognitive faculties the reader / listener is supposed to have. So, here again, it is hard to give a positive answer. However, the role played by the context is certainly conclusive. In fact, most of the time, context allows to resolve the ambiguity on the verb meaning.

To provide an answer to the third question, it is necessary to examine which morphological means the speaker / writer has at their disposal, other than -iser suffixation, to derive verbs from nouns and adjectives without producing ambiguous sequences. As we are going to see, though admittedly -iser is not the only way to derive a verb from an adjective base or stem, this rule is the more likely to be chosen by speakers, because it is the one that depends on the lowest number of constraints.
In French, several morphological means are available to derive a verb from an adjective or a noun. First, as far as -iser verbs are concerned, we have seen that a nominal base X\(_N\) can surfaces as the stem /Xi/, irrespectively of the fact that X\(_N\) is related to an XaR adjective. For instance in (26), ADVERBISER is found besides ADVERBIALISER (both mean ‘make [something] into an adverb’), even though the relative frequency of the two verb forms is clearly in favor of the latter, with the /XaR/ stem. This result is only the reflex of the crucial role played by the existing lexicon, in the decision taken by the speaker / writer to privilege the adjectival stem (§4.1).

(26) ADVERBIALISER (1930 pages) = ADVERBISER (16 pages) = ‘make [something] into an adverb’

Apart from -iser, French adjective-to-verb and / or noun-to-verb derivation rules include -ifier suffixation (HUMIDE\(_A\) [DAMP] → HUMIDIFIER [DAMPEN]), CODE\(_N\) → CODIFIER [CODIFY]), a- prefixation (PAUVRE\(_A\) [POOR] → APPAUVRIR [IMPOVERISH], SOIF\(_N\) [THIRST] → ASSOIFFER [GIVE THIRST]), en- prefixation (LAI\(_D\) [UGLY] → ENLAIDIR [MAKE LOOK UGLY], GRASSE\(_N\) [FAT] → ENGRAISSER [FATTEN]), and conversion (SAOUL\(_A\) [DRUNK] → SAOULER [MAKE SOMEONE DRUNK], SCIE\(_N\) [SAW] → SCIER\(_V\) [SAY]). However, each of these rules applies under precise conditions. For example (27), -ifier suffixation prefers monosyllabic bases, irrespectively of their category or semantic features, cf. (Lignon 2011); most of en- prefix verbs realize either locative or ornative predicates (28), and a few of them only are adjective-based. a- prefixation WFR seems unproductive nowadays, and A-to-V conversion is reluctant to select -al or -aire ending adjective bases. Only N-to-V conversion seems to undergo none of these restrictions (29), cf. (Tribout 2010). In examples (27)-(29), the page counts given in brackets correspond to the number of URLs returned by the Yahoo Search engine for each verb\(^6\).

(27) MOINIFIER [MONK-IFY] (26 pages) = MONACALISER [MONASTIC-IZE] (100 pages): ‘make [someone] into a monk’
(28) ENSECTER [IN-SECT\(_V\)] (9 pages) = SECTARISER [SECTARIAN-IZE] (3310 pages): ‘put [someone] into a sect’
(29) ADVERBER [ADVERB\(_R\)] (1 page): ‘make [something] into an adverb’

To sum up, the examples above show that -iser is not the only verbalizer.

---

\(^6\) Queries made during spring 2011.
But at the same time, the page counts seem an indication that -iser is probably preferred to the other verb formation rules, be they constrained (27, 28) or not (29). From what has been previously said, it follows that the writer / speaker has to satisfy several constraints:

- -iser suffixation is favored by the lexical pressure (XaRiser verbs are 21% of the whole TLF -iser verbs set),
- it is encouraged by the lack of an alternative, for adjective-based verbs,
- it is enabled by the neutrality of -al and -aire as denominal adjective markers, insofar as any relational noun-based adjective has, by definition, the same semantic content as its base noun.

On the one hand, the speaker / writer knows exactly what to say. On the other hand, the WFR he / she spontaneously turns to is one of the available means that is, simultaneously, the most productive, the less coercive both formally and semantically, and the less specific in terms of semantic content. The pattern we propose accounts for this set of conditions.

5.2 Ternary Relation

In order to meet the above-mentioned set of constraints imposed on XaRiser verb formation, we propose an analysis mechanism in the form of the ternary representation given in Fig. 1, in a notation adapted from that in Fradin (2003). It links up a noun X, the qualifying or relational adjective XaR connected to X by the bidirectional WFR-1 arc, and the verb XaRiser. The noun formal dimension contains two stems: besides the default stem /X/, an additional, non-autonomous stem /XaR/ is borrowed from the related XaR adjective, according to the syncretism principle described in §4.2. This principle can be formulated here as follows:

an additional stem may be supplied to a noun by the relational adjective the noun is related to, and the frequency of which makes it easily accessible in the speaker’s mental lexicon.

Semantic content is given in a (simplified) predicate logic. X’s semantic content refers to an entity (instantiated by the parameter x) belonging to the class of entities X’. When the qualifying adjective XaR denotes a property, its semantic content defines a predicate named XaR’ and applied to the parameter x that refers to the entity qualified by the property in question. Otherwise, the XaR adjective’s semantic content is shared with that of the base noun.
The verb formal structure results from phoneme concatenation between the /XaR/ stem and the /iz/ sequence: the stem comes either from XN, or from XaRa.

Fig. 1 shows that the derived verb has two possible inputs: from a semantic point of view, it is either adjective-based (arc WFR-3) or noun-based (arc WFR-2). WFR-2 relates the X noun semantic content to an underspecified verbal predicate P' which brings into play the entity X': P'(...y,...) & X'(y). P' value is defined at phrasal level, and is the realization of one of the semantic classes 2 to 9 given in Table 1. As for WFR-3, it leads to a change-of-state caused by w and affecting the patient y. The derived verb belongs to class 1 in Table 1. The patient (y) final state is described by the adjectival predicate XaR': cause(w, XaR'(y)).

Let us illustrate the way this model works from the listener’s point of view, i.e. with three analysis examples: that of HORIZONTALISER [HORIZONTALIZE] (cf. (5)), which follows the canonical one-to-one form-meaning correspondence, that of the over-marked CONCEPTUALISE [CONCEPTUALIZE] (cf. (16)), and that of the under-marked INSTITUTIONNALISER [INSTITUTIONALIZE] (cf. (19)). The only possible base for HORIZONTALISER is the qualifying adjective HORIZONTAL [HORIZONTAL]: in any listener’s mental lexicon, only the property reading is accessible. The adjective unique semantic value is the qualifying predicate horizontal'(x), so WFR-2 is blocked and only WFR-3 is activated. Consequently, the
disjunctive value, in the verb semantic content, is reduced to the causative change-of-state statement \( \text{cause}(w, \text{horizontal}'(y)) \): ‘make y horizontal’. The schema operates in a symmetric way with CONCEPTUALISER [CONCEPTUALIZE]. The mental lexicon records that CONCEPTUEL [CONCEPTUAL] is connected to CONCEPT exclusively by a relational link, which activates WFR-2 and blocks WFR-3. The verb semantic content is instantiated with the (still undetermined) value: \( P'(\ldots,y,\ldots) \& \text{concept}'(y) \), which, at a purely lexical, context-free level, can be paraphrased by ‘use a concept to do something’. Pragmatic knowledge and phrasal context help the listener to fully specify \( P' \) value into ‘transform something in a concept’. As for INSTITUTIONNALISER [INSTITUTIONALIZE], both WFR-2 and WFR-3 are activated, since both relational and qualifying readings are accessible for INSTITUTIONNEL [INSTITUTIONAL] with respect to INSTITUTION [INSTITUTION] in the listener’s lexicon. Consequently, the whole disjunctive verb semantic structure is instantiated: \( [P'(\ldots,y,\ldots) \& \text{institution}'(y)] \) or \( [\text{cause}(w, \text{institutionnel}'(y))] \), covering the whole range of interpretative schemata corresponding to the 8 verb types in Table 3, where \( X = \text{institution} \). Both the context and the knowledge that INSTITUTION denotes a place help the listener to reduce ambiguity to verb types 1 (factitive) and 2 (locative).

As these examples show, the ternary relation accounts for the semantic systematic under-specification of the derived verb, and meanwhile, for the speaker / writer’s awareness of the actual message content he / she wants to deliver: he / she applies either WFR-2 or WFR-3. However, the application result is generally unnoticeable without a context. Therefore the pattern in Fig. 1 predicts that the verb formation bears the following features: formally they derive from the /XaR/ stem; from a semantic and categorical point of view, they may be strictly noun-based, strictly adjective-based, or ambiguous.

6 Conclusions and further research

We have addressed here the issue of form / meaning discrepancy, and we have illustrated this question by means of a set of 380 XaRiser verbs in French. After having explored and rejected several analysis attempts, we proposed a ternary paradigm-like model that successfully accounts for these data in at least two respects: formally, verb bases always look like adjectives, and semantically, their base refers to a noun, an adjective or both.

In this study, we have put aside a further feature that characterizes the meaning of these verbs, namely the fact that the base can refer to a collocation or to a frozen expression. We are not sure whether this phenomenon has to be accounted for by WF, but surely this matter has to be
further examined. Among other issues, we must check whether idiomatic interpretation of adjectives used as bases does not occur within other kinds of complex words.

Another question that arises from the achieved results is the extension of the phenomenon described here. First, one wonders whether other French denominal adjectives used as verb bases bear similar characteristics as XaR adjectives. Most French noun based adjectives occurring in derived verbs are suffixed with -ique (PLATON [PLATO] → PLATONIQUE [PLATONIC] → PLATONISER / *PLATONICISER [PLATO / PLATONICIZE]), -ain (AMÉRICA [AMERICA] → AMÉRICAIN [AMERICAN] → *AMERICISER / AMERICANISER [AMERICANIZE]), -ais (FRANCE → FRANÇAIS [FRENCH] → FRANCISER / *FRANÇAISISER [FRENCH / FRANCEIZE]), -ien (TERRE [EARTH] → TERRIEN [TERRrestrial] → TERRISER / TERRIANISER [EARTHIZE]).

At first glance, the mechanisms involved are never exactly the same as with XaR adjectives. First, when selected as verb bases by -iser WFR, Xique stems undergo a truncation of their /ik/ final sequence, as pointed out in Lignon (this volume). So, whereas with XaRiser, noun bases may look as adjectives, with Xique based verbs, the opposite may happen: truncated adjectives are likely to look like nouns. For instance, the base of PLATONISER [PLATO-IZE] is either the noun PLATON [PLATO], or the adjective PLATONIQUE [PLATONIC]. Consequently, it means either ‘do as Plato’ (“les philosophes grecs avaient trop platonisé [greek philosophers acted too much as Plato]”) or ‘make sth platonic’ (“Je vais vous platoniser l’amour [I am going to make love platonic]”).

Ethnic adjectives raise a different issue: depending on the adjective forming suffix (-ain, -ien, -ais, -ois…), the derived verb either brings into play an XaRiser-like mechanism (AMERICISER), or it adopts a strategy similar to that of Xique based verbs (FRANCISER). In both cases, verbs are ambiguous, because their meaning equally refers to the toponym or to its inhabitants (cf. Dal & Namer 2010 for the investigation of a similar question, observed with ethnic property nouns in French). As far as non-ethnic, predicative Xien adjectives (TERRIEN [TERRrestrial], BALZACIEN [BALZACian]) are concerned (Lignon & Plénat 2009), further research is needed in order to determine whether they can serve as bases for polysemous derived verbs.

Finally, the question of the extension of the phenomenon observed with XaRiser can be addressed with completely different word formation means. French anti- prefixed adjectives analyzed in Hathout (2011), for instance, show aspects that can be accounted for by a model with features that are symmetrical to that of the ternary schema we proposed for XaRiser verbs: among others, these adjectives have a borrowed base stem (PAPE [POPE] → PAPAL → ANTI-PAPAL = ‘against the POPE’), and two formally different adjectives may share exactly the same meaning (ANTI-PAPE [ANTI-POPE] =
ANTI-PAPAL [ANTI-POPE-AL]). In fact, resemblances and differences between XaRiser verbs and anti- prefixed adjectives is an ongoing research project.
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