

On the interaction between semantics and phonetic iconicity in evaluative morphology*

Angeliki Efthymiou

The aim of this paper is to focus on three aspects of connotative suffixes (i.e. suffixes that can simultaneously encode descriptive and expressive meaning), namely their relation with phonetic iconicity, their semantics and their morphological properties. Evidence comes from three Modern Greek suffixes which follow the so-called glide formation rule and carry evaluative connotation, namely -iázo, -iá and -iáris. It is shown that a) the evaluative domain is not homogeneous, since it contains prototypical and non-prototypical members, b) connotative suffixes tend to have related sound shapes, which signal their deviation from formality, and c) aspectual and quantificational suffixes seem to have expressive functions.

Keywords: Aktionsart, boundedness, connotative suffixes, evaluative morphology, Modern Greek, palatalization, phonetic iconicity, quantification, semelfactivity, sound-symbolic submorphemic elements

1. Introduction

Although evaluative morphology has been widely investigated from many perspectives in the literature (see for example Scalise 1984, Stump 1993, Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994, Bauer 1996, Grandi 2005, Steriopolo 2008, Gregová et al. 2010, Fortin 2011), there are as yet many unresolved issues concerning evaluative affixes, including the relationship between phonetic iconicity and evaluative morphology, the interaction between descriptive and expressive meaning, the relationship between evaluative morphology and the main grammatical categories etc. The aim of this paper is to focus on three aspects of connotative suffixes (i.e. suffixes that can simultaneously encode descriptive and expressive meaning; cf. Fortin 2011:143), namely their relation with phonetic iconicity, their semantics and their morphological properties. Evidence comes from three Modern Greek suffixes which follow the so-called glide formation (or synizesis) rule and carry an evaluative connotation, namely -iázo, -iá and -iáris:

1. The suffix -iázo attaches to nominal and adjectival bases and derives [-learned] verbs, which express various meanings: e.g. *tsuvaÁázo* ‘to bundle into a sack’, *ritiðjázo* ‘to wrinkle, become wizened’ (cf. Efthymiou 2010, 2011, Charitonidis 2011).
2. The suffix -iáris creates denominal adjectives which attribute a degrading quality to a noun in a permanent way: e.g. *kokaÁáris* ‘skinny person’ (cf. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1997).
3. The suffix -iá creates deverbal, deadjectival and denominal nouns which express various meanings such as ‘single instantiation of an action’, ‘blow’, ‘typical action of someone’, ‘familiarity towards the speaker’, ‘collectivity’, etc.: e.g. *sproksçá* ‘an instance of jostling’, *babesçá* ‘treachery, an instance of treachery’, *angoná* ‘blow with an elbow’, *kafedjá* ‘coffee_{FAM}’, *zitçaná* ‘beggarhood, typical behavior of a beggar’ (cf. Efthymiou 1999).

Given that the results of linguistic experiments (cf. Rytting 2005) suggest that Greek speakers have awareness of the connection between glide formation and informality, the following questions can be addressed:

1. Is the negative connotation of these suffixes related to their [–learned] phonetic shape (cf. Efthymiou 2010)? Is there a tendency towards phonetic iconicity in the connotative domain?
2. Does the evaluative domain contain marginal members? What is the morphological status of the suffixes that express, apart from evaluative meanings, other semantic categories? (cf. the various meanings of *-iá*, *-iázo*). Is it possible to propose, in line with Grandi (2005), that some suffixes have a partial evaluative character? Are aspectual (i.e. Aktionsart) affixes inherently expressive (cf. Fortin 2011)?

As will be shown in the rest of the paper, a) the evaluative domain is not homogeneous, since it contains prototypical and non-prototypical members, b) connotative suffixes tend to have related sound shapes which signal their deviation from formality, and c) evaluative morphology is far more pervasive than has been traditionally claimed, since aspectual and quantificational suffixes seem to have expressive functions.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the main properties of the suffixes under investigation, while section 3 discusses the morphological status of connotative suffixes. In section 4, evidence is brought on the relation between the negative connotation of the suffixes and their [–learned] phonetic shape. In section 5 it is suggested that both expressivity and Aktionsart can be different (and sometimes interconnected) manifestations of the quantificational meaning. Finally, in the last section the main findings of the paper are summarised.

2. The main properties of *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris*

In this section the properties of the Modern Greek suffixes *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris* are outlined on the basis of the analysis provided in Anastassiadis-Symeonidis (1986), Charitonidis (2011) and Efthymiou (2010, 2011). For the semantic description of the derived verbs in *-iázo* the labels and glosses found in Plag (1999), namely causative/resultative ‘cause to become x/turn into x’, ornative ‘make x go to/in/on something’, locative ‘make something go to/in/on x’, and inchoative ‘become x’, will be used.

2.1 *The suffix -iázo*

Historically, according to the Triandafyllidis Dictionary (1998), the Modern Greek verb-forming suffix *-iázo* developed from the Ancient Greek suffixes *-ázo/iázo* and *-iό¹*. As already mentioned in the introduction, *-iázo* attaches to nominal and adjectival bases and derives verbs; these express various meanings, such as causative, inchoative, ornative and locative. *-iázo* is stylistically restricted and derives mainly [–learned] words with negative or pejorative connotations (cf. Efthymiou 2010, 2011, Charitonidis 2011). Interestingly, the most robust semantic pattern of *-iázo* verbs is the inchoative-ornative meaning ‘become saturated by many unwanted entities’ (cf. Efthymiou 2010; 2011a). Some examples of *-iázo* derivatives are given in (1):

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) a. <i>ritiðjázo</i> ‘to wrinkle’ | <i>ritída</i> ‘wrinkle’ |
| b. <i>karafáázo</i> ‘to become bald’ | <i>karafłós/karáfla</i> ‘bald’/‘baldness’ |
| c. <i>tsuvaáázo</i> ‘to bundle into a sack’ | <i>tsuváli</i> ‘sac’ |

d. <i>skurjázō</i> ‘to rust’	<i>skurjá</i> ‘rust’
e. <i>spirjázō</i> ‘to be covered with pimples’	<i>spirí</i> ‘pimple’
f. <i>psorjázō</i> ‘to become infected with scabies’	<i>psóra</i> ‘scabies’
g. <i>θrojázō</i> ‘to enthrone’ (ironically)	<i>θrónos</i> ‘throne’

As shown in Efthymiou (2010) and Charitonidis (2011), the suffix *-iázo* usually attaches to [–learned] bases denoting something negative, unpleasant or dangerous (e.g. illnesses, external imperfections on the body, negative qualities, etc). Discussing some cases, in which the base does not express anything negative (see for example 1.c and 1.g), Efthymiou (2010) argues that the pejorative meaning of the *-iázo* verbs is both selected and assigned by the suffix and reveals the interplay between the meaning of the base, the suffix and the intention of the speaker. In other words, the meanings of the base and the suffix match; the suffix selects the meaning of the base that best matches the meaning of the derivation, i.e. a negative side of the meaning of the base, and the base is sensitive to the meaning of the suffix.

It is interesting to note that the suffix *-iázo* is not preferred in formal speech (cf. Efthymiou 2010). Moreover, it has been found to be quite unproductive in two studies, a study of tokens and types in a corpus of Modern Greek schoolbooks (Efthymiou 2010, 2011) and a corpus-based study of Greek suffix productivity in 4,143,583 words (Efthymiou, Fragaki & Markos 2012). According to Efthymiou (2010) and Efthymiou et al. (2012), the suffix’s pejorative connotations and its preference of occurring in informal registers may account for its low productivity.

2.2 The suffix *-iáris*

Etymologically, the Modern Greek suffix *-iáris* originates from the Latin suffix *-arius* (cf. Triandafyllidis Dictionary 1998). According to Anastasiadis-Symeonidis (1997), the suffix *-iáris* creates denominal adjectives which attribute a degrading quality to a noun in a permanent way: e.g. *kokaíaris* ‘skinny person’. More specifically, the suffix *-iáris* usually attaches to bases denoting something negative, unpleasant or undesirable (e.g. illnesses, external imperfections on the body, negative qualities, etc.) and derives adjectives which denote human characteristics (Anastasiadis-Symeonidis 1997). Interestingly, the pejorative value of the adjectives in *-iáris* seems to be related to quantificational or aspectual meanings (e.g. collectivity, iterativity; see the examples in 2 and section 2.1 for similar remarks about *-iázo*):

(2) a. <i>grijárís</i> ‘a persistently nagging person’	<i>gríja</i> ‘moan, nagging’
b. <i>arostçáris</i> ‘someone who is always ill’	<i>aróstça</i> ‘illness’
c. <i>saíaris</i> ‘slobbery’	<i>sáío</i> ‘saliva’
d. <i>spirjárís</i> ‘pimpily’	<i>spirí</i> ‘pimple’
e. <i>psorjárís</i> ‘itchy, mangy’	<i>psóra</i> ‘scabies’

It should be noted that, according to Anastasiadis-Symeonidis (1997), the adjectives derived with *-iáris* are subjective, since they reflect (a) the speaker’s perspective, and (b) the fact that the speaker takes position against the referent. Therefore the suffix *-iáris* is not preferred in formal speech, but is expected to be used in informal, colloquial language.

2.3 The suffix *-iá*

Etymologically, the Modern Greek suffix *-iá* originates from the Ancient Greek suffixes *-iá* and *-ía* and the Hellenistic Greek suffix *-éa* (cf. Triandafyllidis Dictionary 1998). As already mentioned in the introduction, *-iá* creates denominal, deadjectival and deverbal nouns which express various meanings such as ‘single instantiation of an action’, ‘negative quality’, ‘blow’, ‘typical action of someone’, ‘quantity’, ‘tree’, ‘familiarity towards the speaker (and the referent)’, ‘collectivity’, ‘period of time’, etc. (cf. Efthymiou 1999). It is interesting to note that a) some of the meanings exhibited by *-iá* nouns (e.g. period of time) are restricted to a limited set of words and seem to be no longer productive, and b) a large number of *-iá* nouns are stylistically connoted as colloquial/informal lexical items. According to Efthymiou’s (1999) study of *-iá* derivatives in the *Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek*², it seems that a) the vast majority of *-iá* nouns are derived from nouns or adjectives, and b) *-iá* prefers deriving nouns which belong to the following semantic domains: ‘blow’ (i.e. a single, short and fast instantiation of an action), ‘tree’, ‘familiarity towards the speaker and the referent’, ‘negative quality’, ‘typical action of someone’ and ‘quantity’ (cf. Efthymiou 1999)³. Some examples of denominal nouns in *-iá* are given in (3):

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| (3) | a. <i>agónjá</i> ‘blow with an elbow’ | <i>agónas</i> ‘elbow’ |
| | b. <i>maçerjá</i> ‘stub’ | <i>maçéri</i> ‘knife’ |
| | c. <i>γajðurjá</i> ‘typical action of a donkey’ | <i>γajdíuri</i> ‘donkey’ |
| | d. <i>tsandjá</i> ‘blow with a bag,
quantity contained in a bag’ | <i>tsánda</i> ‘bag’ |
| | e. <i>kutaLá</i> ‘spoonful’ | <i>kutáli</i> ‘spoon’ |
| | f. <i>lemojná</i> ‘lemon tree’ | <i>lemóni</i> ‘lemon’ |
| | g. <i>kafedjá</i> ‘coffee _{FAM} ’ | <i>kafés</i> ‘coffee’ (<i>kafédes_{NOM.PL}</i>) |
| | h. <i>pandelojná</i> ‘trousers _{FAM} ’ | <i>pandelóni</i> ‘trousers’ |
| | i. <i>rocá</i> ‘rock song _{FAM} ’ | <i>rok</i> ‘rock music’ |
| | j. <i>zitçajná</i> ‘beggarhood’ | <i>zitçános</i> ‘beggar’ |
| | k. <i>xrojná</i> ‘year’ | <i>xrónos</i> ‘time, year’ |

According to Efthymiou (1999: 125-129), the suffix *-iá* conveys expressive meanings (i.e. it expresses an informal relationship between the speaker and the addressee) when it attaches to nominal bases which denote certain semantic categories (e.g. concrete nouns denoting drinks, clothes, kinds of music, etc.). Such examples are given in 4 (see also the examples in 2g-i):

- (4) a. *Oréa pantelojná !*
‘Nice trousers !’ (It can also be used ironically)
b. *Páme na aγorásume mia bufajná.*
‘Let’s buy a (nice) jacket’

Interestingly, as shown in Efthymiou (1999: 131-143; cf. also the examples in 4), *-iá* expressive nouns are semantically restricted in such a way that the speaker’s specific ‘point of view’, which is denoted by the noun, is related to a specific communicative situation event. Therefore, these nouns cannot be accompanied by the definite article (or by the null article) in the generic meaning (cf. example 5).

- (5) *I ándres siníthos foráne padelóna/*padelónés*
 ‘Men usually wear trousers’

Furthermore, when the suffix *-iá* is deadjectival, it usually behaves similarly to *-iázo* and *-iáris*, since it tends to attach to evaluative (and also gradable, usually dispositional) adjectives which denote negative or undesirable human properties. Interestingly, these properties are usually conceived actualized through concrete events (cf. Efthymiou 1999). Examples of deadjectival nouns in *-iá* are given in 6:

- (6) a. *tembeáá* ‘laziness’ *tembélis* ‘lazy’
 b. *pseftchá* ‘falsehood, deceit’ *pséftis* ‘liar’
 c. *amjhalá* ‘foolishness’ *ámjalos* ‘brainless, fool’

It is also interesting to note that deadjectival nouns in *-iá* do not exclusively express properties, but can also refer to occurrences of events (cf. example 7). In other words, deadjectival nouns in *-iá* give rise to eventive readings (cf. Efthymiou 1999; on the eventive readings of deadjectival nouns see, among others, Martin 2010, Arche & Marin 2012):

- (7) *Afto pu ekane o Nikos ine tsigupá/ponirjá*
 ‘What Nikos did is an act of stinginess/ slyness’

Deverbal *-iá* nouns seem to share with the deadjectival *-iá* nouns (and also with many denominal nouns: cf. the examples in 2) the (eventive) meaning ‘single instantiation of an action’⁴. As shown in 8, deverbal *-iá* nouns are usually based on verbs denoting physical actions and denote individual or instantiated events, visible results or quantity (for a detailed discussion, see Efthymiou 1999):

- (8) a. *vutchá* ‘a single act of dipping, diving’ *vutó* ‘to dip, dive’
 b. *vrischá* ‘a single act of insulting’ *vρίζo* ‘to swear’
 c. *rufikschá* ‘a single act of sipping,
 a small mouthful of liquid’ *rufó* ‘to sip, sup’
 d. *γratzupá* ‘scratch, abrasion’ *γratzunízo* ‘to scratch’
 e. *pidikschá* ‘a single act of jumping’ *πιδό* ‘to jump’

Interestingly, as examples 2-8 indicate, the vast majority of *-iá* nouns either denotes an individual or instantiated event (e.g. a single act, a typical acts of someone) or can be conceived as temporally delimited or associated to a specific event (e.g. quantity, behaviour familiarity, etc.). To put it in other words (see also the glosses of the examples in 8), the suffix *-iá* seems to create nouns that have quantitative (i.e. individuating) properties and carry a particular aspectual value, i.e. they carry semelfactive Aktionsart⁵. This is not surprising, given that in the literature the general consensus is that there is a connection between boundedness and countability (see among others Mourelatos 1978, Jackendoff 1991; on the aspectual properties of deverbal nouns see, among others, Alexiadou et al. 2010, Ferret, Soare & Villoing 2010, Fabregas & Marin 2012). It has also been noted in the literature (cf. for example Rainer 1993, Fortin 2011, among others) that there is a connection between boundedness and expressivity. This means that, in general, connotative suffixes ‘require’ a

bounded referent for their bases and also add boundedness to the meanings of the derivatives (for detailed discussion see Fortin 2011: chapter 4). Interestingly, this generalization holds also for the *-iá* nouns and the meanings of their nominal, adjectival and verbal bases (for discussion see Efthymiou 1999; on the notion of boundedness in adjectives and its association with gradability see Paradis 2001)⁶.

In order to account for the fact that *-iá* nouns express, apart from evaluative meanings, several other semantic categories, Efthymiou (1999), following Corbin's (1987) theoretical model, proposed a unitary treatment of their diverse meanings. More specifically, she proposed that the global semantics of these nouns can be reduced to the basic meaning of individuation: the suffix produces nouns, which express the speaker's specific 'point of view' and denote cognitively salient entities viewed as [+bounded, -internal structure]. Furthermore, she argued that the suffix *-iá* interacts with the semantics of its bases and imposes its own (semantic) specification on them. In other words, according to this approach, the diverse meanings of *-iá* nouns (e.g. 'single act', 'quantity', 'familiarity', etc.) are viewed as by-products of the interaction between the suffix and the meanings of the bases. For example, the aspectual information of *-iá* is viewed as the manifestation of individuation in the verbal domain. Interestingly, the Greek suffix *-iá* seems to be comparable to the Italian suffix *-ata*, which, according to Gaeta (2000), has inherent quantitative properties, specifically as a packaging operator (i.e. it temporarily bounds the situation expressed by the base verb). Finally, the individuating properties of *-iá* nouns can be better explained if we compare them to those of the nouns in *-íði* (see the examples in 9):

- (9) a. *tufekíði* 'fusillade' vs. *tufecá* 'a rifle shot' (*tuféci* 'rifle')
 b. *vrisíði* 'series of insulting' vs. *vrischá* 'a single act of insulting' (*vriízo* 'to swear')

As highlighted in the above example, *-iá* and *-íði* functionally differ in their aspectual profile: *-iá* nouns denote a single act, whereas nouns in *-íði* denote an iteration of events. In the next section I will try to investigate whether *-iá* (and also *-iázo* and *-iáris*) can be regarded as inherently expressive suffixes.

3. The morphological status of connotative suffixes

As shown in section 2, the suffixes under investigation express, apart from evaluative meanings, various semantic categories. Therefore one might question their status as inherently evaluative suffixes. In this section I will try to show that the Modern Greek suffixes *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris* can be considered to be evaluative. There are several arguments in favour of this claim:

1. The derivatives in *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris* can function as an index of an emotional involvement of the speaker, i.e. they communicate something about the speaker's subjective perspective. Interestingly, this argument accords with Schneider's (2003) definition of diminutives, which involves two components, a semantic one (i.e. smallness) and a pragmatic (i.e. the fact that the speaker chooses to represent the referent as small). In other words, according to this definition, the decoding of the meaning of a given evaluative suffix is tied to

a specific communicative situation and, more specifically, to the speaker's communicative intention (for similar remarks see also Dressler & Merlini-Barbaresi 1994; see also Pott's 2007 criterion of *Non-displaceability*, according to which 'Expressives predicate something of the utterance situation').

2. It is not always possible to give them explicit descriptive paraphrases that fully capture their emotive or attitudinal content. Note that this argument is in line with Pott's (2007) criterion of *Descriptive ineffability*: Speakers are never fully satisfied when they paraphrase expressive content using descriptive terms.

3. The derivatives in *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris* are (in their vast majority) stylistically connoted as colloquial/informal lexical items⁷. Interestingly, according to the literature, a central feature of evaluative morphology is that it is informal. For example, Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi (1994) argue at great length that a kind of informality is its *defining* characteristic, and that evaluative affixes introduce a global discourse feature [nonserious] (for discussion on this subject, see also Schneider 2003).

On the other hand, the suffixes under investigation do not display all the formal characteristics of evaluative morphology (cf. among others Scalise 1984, Stump 1993, Grandi 2005). For example, according to Grandi (2005), a construction can be defined as evaluative if it satisfies two conditions. The first condition indicates that an evaluative construction must have the function of assigning a value, which is different from the 'standard'. The second condition indicates that an evaluative construction must include at least the explicit expression of the standard and an evaluative mark (i.e. a linguistic element that expresses at least one of the following semantic values: BIG, SMALL, GOOD, BAD). This definition allows a form like It. *scarpina* 'small shoe' (from *scarpa* 'shoe' + the diminutive suffix *-ina*) and MGr *karekl-áci* 'small chair' (from *karékla* 'chair' + the diminutive suffix *-áci*) to be included in the field of evaluation, since a base form expressing the standard meaning and a morphological item that expresses an evaluative value are both clearly recognisable. Nevertheless, as Grandi (2005) himself admits, along with words which are clearly evaluative (such as It. *scarpina*, etc.), there are also some lexical items for which the picture is less clear cut. For example, in the Italian word *mangione* 'heartly eater' or the Greek derivatives in *-iázo* and *-iáris*, it is not always easy to recognise the expression of the standard form in the base-word. The base of *mangione*, which can be glossed as 'a person who overeats' is the verb *mangiare* 'to eat', which does not express the standard from which the evaluation derives (i.e. 'a person who eats moderately'). Similar remarks can be made about the Greek derivatives in *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris* (e.g. *spirjáris* 'pimply', *spirjázo* 'to be covered with pimples'). For example, the base of *spirjáris* 'pimply' is the noun *spirí* 'pimple', which does not express the standard meaning (i.e. a person with a small number of pimples or no pimples at all).

Given that, as argued previously, the suffixes *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris* can simultaneously encode descriptive and expressive meaning, I propose, following Grandi (2005), that it is necessary to suppose that 'evaluation' is a linguistic category with an internal structure in which different levels of membership can be recognised: there are prototypical members and members which are placed in 'marginal' positions (such as connotative suffixes, e.g. It. *mangione*, MGr *spirjáris* 'pimply', etc.), without however being excluded from this category⁸.

Finally, it is interesting to note that two of the Greek connotative suffixes (i.e. *-iázo* and *-iáris*) share an additional characteristic which indicates their special status. Both *-iázo* and *-iáris*, unlike the vast majority of the evaluative affixes, change the category of the base words, i.e. they are not characterized by the so-called 'categorical neutrality' (on this subject

see among others Bauer 1997, Grandi 2005, Steriopolo 2008). In the next session, I discuss the relation between the phonetic shape of the suffixes and their evaluative meaning.

4. The [-learned] phonetic shape

An interesting fact about the suffixes under investigation is that they follow the so-called glide formation (or synizesis) rule (for the glide formation rule see, among others, Kazazis 1968, Setatos 1974, Warburton 1976, Nyman 1981, Rytting 2005, Baltazani & Topintzi to appear). More specifically, the application of the glide formation rule has the following consequences:

- a) [i] turns into a palatal glide to avoid hiatus
- b) the sequence [ia] is pronounced as one syllable
- c) the consonant of the base or [i] is palatalized: i.e. depending on the environment, the glide can surface as [ç], [ɲ], [ʎ] or [j] (see also the examples in 1-3).

It must be noted here that in the Greek literature hiatus and synizesis are usually considered to be two opposing forces reflecting the stylistic difference between high and low register or, in other terms, between Katharevousa (i.e. the artificial, ancient-looking form of Greek developed by scholars in the 19th century) and Dhimotiki (i.e. the vernacular). More specifically, words with [ia] in hiatus are usually associated with Katharevousa, whereas glide formation is usually considered a productive rule which does not apply to katharevousa elements (cf. among others Kazazis 1968, Setatos 1974, Warburton 1976, Nyman 1981, Rytting 2005). Moreover, the results of linguistic experiments (cf. Rytting 2005) suggest that Greek speakers have awareness of the connection between glide formation and informality. Given the [-learned] phonetic shape and the negative connotation of the suffixes under investigation, as well as the fact that the speakers are aware of their special stylistic status, it can be suggested that the distribution of the [glide + a] sequence is not accidental, and that the negative connotation of the suffixes is related to their [-learned] phonetic shape (cf. also Efthymiou 2010).

Furthermore, it can be argued that the [glide + a] sequence occurring in all three suffixes under investigation can be considered a sound-symbolic submorphemic element, which occupies a special place in the overall system of phonetic expressivity in Greek. Interestingly, this suggestion is in line with previous studies, which provide evidence for the cross-linguistic sound-symbolic value of palatalization (cf. Dressler & Merlini-Barbaresi 1994, Ohala 1994, among others).

It should also be noted that similar observations are also made by Joseph (1994) in his study of Modern Greek [ts] and [dz]. According to him, words with [ts] or [dz] in general have a marked stylistic status, in that they are generally expressive, whereas words without these sounds are generally not (Joseph 1994: 232). More specifically, he shows that there are some groups of semantically related lexical items in which [ts] or [dz] function as phonesthemes. Interestingly, two of these groups display similar characteristics to those of the derivatives in *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris*:

a. In one such group, [ts] is the consonantal nucleus for a series of suffixes having a diminutive or affective value: e.g. the adjectival suffix *-útsikos* (*γλικός* 'sweet'-*γλικútsikos*

‘sweetish’), the feminine diminutive suffix *-ítsa* (*lemonjá* ‘lemon tree’-*lemonítsa* ‘little lemon tree’)

b. In another group, [ts] and [dz] occur in words denoting physical deficiencies of one sort or another: e.g. *kutsós* ‘lame’, *tsímbla* ‘eye-mucus’ (cf. also the derivative *tsimbljárís* ‘bleary-eyed’)

It must be noted that according to Joseph (1994: 223), even though the sounds [ts]/[dz] also occur in non-expressive lexical items (e.g. *tsiméndo* ‘cement’, *dzaz* ‘jazz’), their disproportionate representation in expressive domains is striking and reveals something significant about their status in the phonological system. Moreover, as the same author states (Joseph 1994: 232), the stylistic dimension of [ts] and [dz] is also evident in the case of synonymous pairs, e.g. *astráyalos* vs. *kótsi* ‘ankle’, *xolós* vs. *kutsós* ‘lame’, *ðoreán* vs. *tzámba* ‘free’, where the word with [ts]/[dz] is felt by Greek speakers to be ‘slangier’⁹.

To sum up, the discussion in this section suggests that there is a tendency towards phonetic iconicity in the connotative domain and that Greek expressive suffixes tend to have related sound shapes, which signal their deviation from formality. Interestingly enough, as mentioned in section 4, informality is considered to be a defining characteristic of evaluative morphology.

5. Are Aktionsart affixes inherently expressive?

In section 2.3, it was shown that the suffix *-iá* produces nouns which express the speaker’s specific ‘point of view’ and denote cognitively salient entities viewed as [+bounded, -internal structure]. Furthermore, it was argued that the suffix seems to have inherent quantitative (individuating) properties and that its aspectual (i.e. semelfactive) information can be seen as a manifestation of individuation in the verbal domain. To put it in other words, *-iá* nouns were shown to denote bounded, individuated entities and to have both aspectual and expressive functions. Similar remarks were also made for the suffixes *-iázo* and *-iáris* and (see 2.1. and 2.2 respectively). In particular, it was claimed that the expressive value of the derivatives in *-iázo* and *-iáris* is interconnected with quantificational or aspectual meanings (plurality or iterativity). Interestingly, a kind of correlation between aspectual affixes and expressivity has also been found in other studies (see, among others, Filip 1999, Hampe 2002, Fortin 2011). For example, the Russian prefixes *pere-*, *pro-* and *ob-* do not only produce *Aktionsarten* effects but also have expressive functions (e.g. intensifying, pejorative, etc.), as shown in (10) below, adapted from Fortin (2011).

- (10) a. *pere-varít* ‘overcook something’
b. *ob-est* ‘overeat’
c. *pro-merít* ‘measure incorrectly’

Similarly, Modern Greek (among other languages) has types of prefixes with both aspectual and expressive functions (see examples in 11):

- (11) a. *kata-céo* ‘to burn all over’
b. *para-káno* ‘to overdo’
c. *apo-treléno* ‘to drive somebody completely mad’

Given that a considerable number of affixes seem to have both Aktionsart and expressive functions, the natural conclusion would be that this ‘co-occurrence’ cannot be accidental and that aspectual affixes may have inherent expressive qualities (cf. Fortin 2011 for similar suggestions). Furthermore, it could be suggested that the interplay between evaluative and Aktionsart meanings might be better explained if we consider that both meanings are somehow related to the speaker’s specific ‘point of view’. Interestingly, although Aktionsart (i.e. lexical or inner aspect) is often contrasted to grammatical aspect (also called viewpoint or outer aspect), one can admit, following Croft (2012: 32), that events do not have just an inherent aspectual type, but may be viewed from different aspectual perspective or viewpoints (for discussion on the interconnection of aspect and Aktionsart and the problems of their distinction see among others Štekauer, Valera & Körtevelyessy 2012: 28).

On the other hand, one could suggest in line with Štekauer, Valera and Körtevelyessy (2012: 30) that some subcategories of Aktionsart fall under the subcategory of quantity (cf. also Jackendoff 1991, who suggests that boundedness can be encoded in the same way for events and things), and thus, the aspectual contribution of affixes can be considered a by-product of their quantization semantics (cf. Efthymiou 1999 and Filip 1999 for similar suggestions on the Russian prefixes and the Modern Greek suffix *-iá* respectively; for discussion on the analogies between expressivity, aspect and quantification see also Grandi 2009). In this view, it can be suggested that quantificational affixes (i.e. which are sensitive to the feature of boundedness) may have inherent expressive qualities and that both expressivity and Aktionsart can be derived from the interactions with the semantic properties of the base, i.e. they can be different (and sometimes interconnected) manifestations of the quantificational meaning (cf. for example, Efthymiou’s (1999) analysis of *-iá* nouns in 2.3, Fortin’s (2011) multidimensional account of connotative affixes; see also Athanasiadou’s 2007 analysis of intensifiers as means of indexing the speakers’ perspective). Needless to say, the above claims are only tentative and require a finer-grained analysis and cross-linguistic investigation.

6. Conclusion

This paper has focused on three aspects of connotative suffixes in Modern Greek (i.e. the suffixes *-iázo*, *-iá* and *-iáris*), namely their semantics, their relation with phonetic iconicity and their morphological properties. It was shown that the status of connotative suffixes may be considered controversial with respect to the plain/evaluative morphology divide. The fact that some suffixes have a partially evaluative character implies that, as with other word-formation processes, the boundary between plain and evaluative morphology may be fuzzy. Furthermore, it was found that Modern Greek connotative suffixes tend to have related sound shapes, which signal their informal character. Finally, it was suggested that quantificational affixes may have inherent expressive qualities and that both expressivity and Aktionsart can be different (and sometimes interconnected) manifestations of the quantificational meaning.

References

- ALEXIADOU, Artemis, IORDĂCHIOAIA, Giannina, SOARE, Elena. 2010. Number/aspect interactions in the syntax of nominalizations: A Distributed Morphology approach. In *Journal of Linguistics* 46.3, pp. 537-574.
- ANASTASIADIS-SYMEONIDIS, Anna. 1997. On Modern Greek Denominal Adjectives. In BOOIJ, Geert, RALLI Angela & SCALISE Sergio (eds.) *Proceedings of the 1st Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, University of Patras, 1997, pp. 29-40.
- ANASTASIADIS-SYMEONIDIS, Anna. 2002. *The Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek*. Thessaloniki: Institutouto Neoellinikon Spoudon, 2002. [in Greek]
- ARCHE, María, MARÍN, Rafael. 2012. Evaluative adjectives at the light of their nominalizations. Talk presented at the *Linguistic Symposium of Roman Languages*, 20-22 April 2012, University of Southern Utah. Available at:
http://www.academia.edu/1723944/Evaluative_adjectives_at_the_light_of_their_nominalizations
- ATHANASIADOU, Angeliki. 2007. On the subjectivity of intensifiers. In *Language Sciences* 29, pp. 554-565.
- BALTAZANI, Maria, TOPINTZI, Nina. On some phonetic and phonological properties of the Greek glide. to appear 2012. In GAVRIILIDOU, Zoe, EFTHYMIOY Angeliki, THOMADAKI, Evangelia and KAMBAKI-BOUGIOUKLI Penelope, (eds.) *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 1-4 September 2011, Democritus University of Thrace, Komotini, Greece. Available at: http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~topintzi/papers/Baltazani-Topintzi-ICGL10_final.pdf
- BAUER, Laurie. 1996. No phonetic iconicity in evaluative morphology. In *Studia Linguistica* 50.2, 1996, pp. 189-206.
- BAUER, Laurie. 1997. Evaluative morphology: in search of universals. In *Studies in Language* 21.3, 1997, pp. 533-575.
- CHARITONIDIS, Chariton. 2011. *Making Verbs Happen: Interviews on Greek verb endings*. München: Lincom Europa, 2011.
- COMRIE, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- CORBIN, Danielle. 1987. *Morphologie dérivationnelle et structuration du lexique*. 2 vol. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 2ⁿ ed. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1991.
- CROFT, William. 2012. *Verbs. Aspect and Causal Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- DRESSLER, Wolfgang, MERLINI-BARBARESI Lavinia. 1994. *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and Intensifiers in Italian, German and Other languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.
- EFTHYMIU, Angeliki. 1999. *Le suffixe -iá en grec moderne. La manifestation d'un degré maximal d'anthropocentricité*. Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1999, 2nd ed. Saarbrücken: Éditions Universitaires Européennes, 2012.
- EFTHYMIU, Angeliki. 2010. How many factors influence the meaning of denominal verbs? The case of Modern Greek verbs in *-(i)ázo*. Talk presented at the *Workshop 'Meaning and Lexicalization'*, 14th International Morphology Meeting, Budapest 13-16 May 2010.

EFTHYMIU, Angeliki. 2011. The Semantics of Verb forming Suffixes in Modern Greek. In the proceedings of the 19th *International Symposium of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 3-5 April 2009, School of English, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, pp. 174-184.

EFTHYMIU, Angeliki, FRAGAKI, Georgia, MARKOS Angelos. 2012. Productivity of verb forming suffixes in Modern Greek: A corpus-based study. *Morphology*. DOI: 10.1007/s11525-012-9202-4.

FABRÉGAS, Antonio, MARÍN, Rafael. 2012. The role of Aktionsart in deverbal nouns: State nominalizations across languages. In *Journal of Linguistics* 48, pp. 35-70.

FERRET, Karen, SOARE, Elena, VILLOING, Florence. 2010. Rivarly between French *-age* and *-ée*: the role of grammatical aspect in nominalization. In *Lecture notes in computer science* 6042/2010, pp. 284-294. Available at: DOI : 10.1007/978-3-642-14287-1_29.

FILIP, Hana. 1999. *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Nominal Reference*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group (Garland), 1999.

FORTIN, Antonio. 2011. *The Morphology and Semantics of Expressive Affixes*. Ph.D Thesis. Lady Margaret Hall: University of Oxford, 2011.

GRANDI, Nicola. 2005. Sardinian evaluative morphology in typological perspective. In PUTZU, Ignatio (ed.), *Sardinian in Typological Perspective*. Bochum. Dr. Brockmeyer University Press, pp. 188-209.

GRANDI, Nicola. 2009. *Restrictions on Italian verbal evaluative suffixes: The role of aspect and actionality*. In *York Papers in Linguistics Series 2 – Issue 10*, pp. 46-66

GREGOVÁ, Renáta, KÖRTVÉLYESSY, Livia, ZIMMERMANN, Július. 2010. Phonetic iconicity in the evaluative morphology of a sample of Indo-European, Niger-Congo and Austronesian languages. In *Word Structure* 3, pp. 156-180.

HAMPE, B. 2002. *Superlative Verbs: a Corpus-Based Study of Semantic Redundancy in English Verb-Particle Constructions*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2002.

JOSEPH, Brian. 1994. Modern Greek ts: beyond sound symbolism. In HINTON, Leanne, NICHOLS, Johanna and OHALA (eds), *Sound Symbolism*. Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 222-236.

KAZAZIS, Kostas. 1968. Sunday Greek. In *CLS 4*, Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago, pp. 130-140.

MARTIN, Fabienne. 2010. The Semantics of Eventive Suffixes in French, in ALEXIADOU, Artemis and RATHERT, Monica (eds.), *The Semantics of Nominalizations across Languages and Frameworks*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 109-140.

MARTIN Fabienne. to appear. Stage level and Individual level Readings of Dispositional Nouns. In HATHOUT, Nabile, MONTERMINI, Fabio & TSENG, Jesse (eds), *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Décembrettes: Morphology in Toulouse*.

- MELA-ATHANASSOPOULOU, Elisabeth. 2007. Phono-semantically motivated lexical patterns: Evidence from English and Modern Greek. In the Selected Papers of the 6th International Conference on Greek Research, Modern Greek Department, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia. Edited by Elizabeth Close et al., Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia, pp. 223-243.
- MOURELATOS, Alexander. (1978). Events, Processes and States. In *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2, pp. 415-434.
- NYMAN, Martti. 1981. Paradigms and transderivational constraints: Stress and yod in Modern Greek. In *Journal of Linguistics* 17, 231-246.
- OHALA, John. 1994. The biological bases of sound symbolism. In *Sound Symbolism*. In HINTON, Leanne, NICHOLS, Johanna and OHALA (eds), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 222-236.
- PARADIS, Carita. 2001. Adjectives and Boundedness. In *Cognitive Linguistics* 12/1, pp. 47-65.
- PLAG, Ingo. 1999. *Morphological Productivity. Structural Constraints in English Derivation*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999.
- POTTS, Christopher. 2007. The expressive dimension. In *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2), pp. 165–197.
- RAINER, Franz. 1993. *Spanische Wortbildungslehre*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1993.
- RYTTING, Anton. 2005. An iota of difference: Attitudes to yod in lexical and social contexts. In *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 6, pp. 151-185.
- SCALISE, Sergio. 1984. *Generative Morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1984.
- SCHNEIDER, Claus, 2003, *Diminutives in English*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2003.
- SETATOS, Michalis, 1974. Phonology of Modern Greek Koine. Athens: Papazisis, 1974. [in Greek]
- SMITH, Carlota S. 1991. *The parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991.
- ŠTEKAUER, Pavol, VALERA, Salvador, KÖRTVÉLYESSY, Livia. 2012. *Word-Formation in the World's Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- STERIOPOLO, Olga. 2008. *Form and function of expressive morphology: a case study of Russian*. Ph.D thesis, University of British Columbia, 2008.
- STUMP, Gregory. 1993. How Peculiar is Evaluative Morphology? In *Journal of Linguistics* 29, pp. 1-36.
- TRIANDAFYLLIDIS Dictionary. 1998. *Standard Modern Greek Dictionary*. Institute of Hellenic Studies, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1998. [In Greek]
- XYDOPOULOS, George, IORDANIDOU Anna, EFTHYMIOU, Angeliki. 2011. Recent advances in the documentation of Greek slang: The case of www.slang.gr. In CHATZOPOULOU, Katerina, IOANNIDOU, Alexandra, YOON, Suwon (eds), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 29-31 October 2009, Chicago, Illinois, USA. Available at:

WARBURTON, Irene. 1976. On the boundaries of morphology and phonology: A case study from Modern Greek. In *Journal of Linguistics* 12, pp. 258-278.

Notes

*I would like to thank G. Fragaki for discussing earlier drafts of this paper.

¹ It should be noted that the picture with *-iázo* is a bit complicated. For example, the Triandafyllidis Dictionary (1998) has two different homonymous lemmas, one for [ázo/jázo] and a second for the learned [ázo/iázo]. Elaborating on the Triandafyllidis Dictionary's lemmatization, Efthymiou (2010) has suggested that *-jázo* and *-(i)ázo* should be analysed as two different quasi-homonymous suffixes: (a) one follows the glide-formation rule and has the [-learned] form *-jázo*. In this case, [ia] is pronounced as one syllable, and the consonant of the base or [i] is palatalized; (b) the other has the [+/-learned] form *-(i)ázo* and is pronounced [iázo] or [ázo]. In the rest of the paper I will only deal with the [-learned] suffix *-jázo*.

² Efthymiou's research covers a sample of 523 nouns taken from contemporary Greek dictionaries. More specifically, 276 of them are denominal, 173 are derived from deadjectival bases, and 74 are deverbal.

³ Although the productivity of *-iá* has not been studied yet, the suffix does not seem to be extremely productive in contemporary Greek.

⁴ Given that most bases of *-iá* nouns do not refer to events by themselves (e.g. *maçéri* 'knife', *γajdíri* 'donkey'), a plausible conclusion can be that the suffix *-iá* is the element that interacts with the meaning of the base and imposes the 'eventive' meaning (cf. Efthymiou 1999).

⁵ In the literature (cf. among others Comrie 1976, Smith 1991, Croft 2012, Štekauer, Valera and Körtvélyessy 2012) there is a well-known distinction between Aktionsart (also called lexical or inner aspect) and grammatical aspect (also called viewpoint or outer aspect). Aktionsart is a lexical-derivational property of verbs that covers various verb aspects of the denoted event (iterativity, inchoativity, telicity, semelfactivity, etc.). On the other hand, (grammatical) aspect is grammatically expressed by inflection or auxiliary verbs (and covers notions like perfectivity).

⁶ See also Efthymiou (2010) for a discussion on the meanings of *-iázo* verbs.

⁷ The informal character of these suffixes is further highlighted by the fact that they are highly preferred in Greek slang (cf. Xydopoulos, Iordanidou and Efthymiou 2011).

⁸ Alternatively, one could propose that the evaluative domain should be redefined, so as to include more subcategories.

⁹ It is interesting to note that this suggestion is in line with Mela-Athanasopoulou (2007), who proposes that Greek augmentative suffixes (e.g. *-ára*: *γinek-ára* 'beautiful woman', *amaks-ára* 'large, posh car', *-aros*: *pondik-aros* 'big rat') can be considered synaesthetic morphemes, which involve the generalization of a phonetic shape with a particular semantic effect (i.e. following a schema rather than a rule).

Angeliki Efthymiou
Democritus University of Thrace
Department of Elementary Education
Nea Hili, Alexandroupolis 68100
Greece
aeftym@eled.duth.gr

In *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* [online]. 2013, vol. 10, no. 1 [cit. 2013-02-04]. Available on web page <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL22/pdf_doc/09.pdf>. ISSN 1339-782X.