

Features of evaluative morphology in Bulgarian

Alexandra Bagasheva

The paper reviews the morphological properties and core semantics of the available, prototypical, morphological evaluative resources in a south Slavic language, Bulgarian. The possibilities for widening the category of evaluative morphology by novel morphotactic patterns and the recognition of further attitudinal values are discussed. A noteworthy asymmetry of a suffixal preference for nouns contrasting with a prefixal preference for verbs for encoding evaluative meanings in the language is briefly touched upon. It is shown that the semantics of evaluative morphology in Bulgarian is well-captured by the new radial model of the semantics of evaluative morphology proposed by Körtvélyessy (to appear).

Key words: *evaluative morphology, morphological properties, semantics, Bulgarian*

*“If language is to be used as a means of communication there must be agreement not only in definitions but, queer as this may sound, agreement in judgements also”
(Wittgenstein 1953)*

1. Introduction

Evaluative (expressive morphology) has remained a problematic and challenging area of research ever since it was emancipated as different from plain morphology (Scalise 1984). Beard’s (1995) “mysterious type” still poses contentious questions in relation to its status as inflection, derivation, or a morphological type of its own kind (“third morphology”), and its prototypical core semantics and even the possibility of establishing such are extensively debated. Without aiming to launch into theoretical debates on any of the above, the current paper presents an overview of the basic, prototypical features of evaluative morphology in the South Slavic language, Bulgarian. To this end the paper is structured as follows: in part two the nature of evaluation in language and the role of morphological means in the process are discussed; part three reviews the possibility of widening the category beyond traditional gradation, diminution and augmentation; part four touches upon the prototypical features of evaluative meanings of diminutives and augmentatives in Bulgarian; part five raises a few relevant discussion points and in part six a few conclusions and venues for further research are outlined.

2. Evaluation and language

As suggested by the caption of the part, it does not deal with general theories of affect, emotion and cognition which account for evaluative attitudes, but to concentrates on those aspects of evaluation which are driven by or encoded in language. The encoding of evaluative meanings in language is a rigorous area of interdisciplinary research, encompassing at least semiotic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, semantic and morphological research agendas.

Evaluation (appraisal) is considered to be an indissoluble unity of cognitive and affective dimensions, regulated linguistically through a category dubbed *stance* by functional linguists. *Stance* is used here as defined by Du Bois “a public act by a social actor, achieved through overt means, of evaluation, positioning, and alignment, with respect to any *salient dimension* of the sociocultural landscape” (Du Bois 2002). Evaluative language is that language which *indexes the act of evaluation* or the act of stance-taking (Du Bois 2007). It expresses *an attitude* towards a person, situation or other entity and is both subjective and located within a societal value-system (Hunston 1994: 210). In the overview presented here, naturally the focus falls on evaluative semantic dimensions that reveal more cultural systems of evaluation (social representations, ideologies, etc.), rather than ones dependent on narrow pragmatic contexts or personal factors.

The most frequent and ubiquitous expression of evaluation in language is through lexical means, i.e. linguistic means which are denotatively (descriptively) evaluative (Cruse 2000: 48-60). Linguistic expressions have different modes of signification, i.e. they provide different routes of access to conceptual and emotive content, both of which are indispensable for the purposes of evaluation. In some linguistic expressions evaluation is direct and is a default feature of the conceptual content and part of the representational function of the lexical item (*good, pleasant, captivating*, etc.), in other words, evaluation is part of the descriptive dimension of such linguistic expressions.

In others, evaluation is secondary or derived via some associative mechanism, for example metaphor, euphemisms, dysphemisms, stylistically marked synonym or is marked via morphological means. The formers’ mode of signification triggers first and foremost a seemingly untinted description (e.g. *large*), where in the lexical concept center-stage is preserved for describing features of objective properties (*large* – size; *wooden* – material), which may contextually be overridden and encode evaluative meanings (e.g. *She is large.* or *You’d say his head is wooden.*, implying a derogatory or depreciative attitude). The latter are best exemplified by ameliorative or pejorative affixes, which cross-linguistically are prototypically coextensive as a set with diminutive/augmentative suffixes (e.g. *Toy e golyam mǎžaga* (He is a big manAUG), expressing approval or admiration).

In choosing a specific linguistic form a speaker commits him/herself to an “aptness” consideration, how *fit* a given signifier is to be the expression of a particular meaning in a specific communicative context. An evaluatively marked signifier functions as a blue-print for *(re)arranging the properties of the referent in terms of salience* and establishing the dimension along which the referent is judged or suggests a specific attitude/ stance, taken by the speaker choosing it. Stance-taking (or evaluation) resources in languages are quite diverse (starting from discourse structures and ending with particular morphemes), but our attention from here onwards will be narrowed down to morphological evaluative resources.

Many languages possess morphological rules which serve to express diminution or augmentation, endearment or contempt [...]. Because of the possibility of interpreting diminution and augmentation in *affective* rather than purely *objective* terms [...] morphological expressions of diminution or augmentation are not always discrete from those of endearment or contempt; that is, *diminutives* and *augmentatives* are frequently used as expressions of *endearment* or *disdain* (Stump 1993: 1; emphasis added).

For this reason it has become customary for the morphological means in a language employed for augmentation and diminution to be recognized as the prototype of morphological evaluation, which is, in keeping with our understanding of evaluative linguistic resources, derived, secondary, relational evaluation, arising out of some manipulation of the particular lexical item which in its primary mode of signification doesn't have the cognitive motivation to evaluate. Thus to produce secondary evaluative linguistic items, people frequently rely on morphological resources. As Jurafsky claims, "the diminutive function [...] defined as *any morphological device* which means at least 'small' is among the grammatical primitives which seem to occur universally or near-universally" (Jurafsky 1996: 534; emphasis added).

3. The scope of morphological evaluative resources

Even if we recognise beyond doubt the prototypicality of diminutive and augmentative resources as the most natural source for evaluative meanings, this leaves a wide margin for identifying the morphological devices subsumed under the still debated term evaluative morphology. Thus for example, in Bulgarian linguistic circles, besides the prototypical processes subsumed under diminution, encompassing augmentation, (i.e. affixation and compounding) minor modifications of form (such as clipping and suffixal univerbation whose status as word-formation processes proper has been contested) are classified as "expressive morphology" (see Avramova 2003, Pernishka and Krumova-Tsvetkova 2013, Radeva 2007). From a pragmatic and sociolinguistic point of view, these can be accepted as marginal members of the category of evaluative morphology, if we take into consideration the biuniqueness of the sign and the avoidance of synonymy strategy operating in linguistic ecology.

Space considerations and coherence of argumentation do not permit us to go into the details of such marginal (if recognized at all) means and strategies for marking one's stance. Yet two of these will be discussed because they are directly related to either Jurafsky's (1996) diachronic model of the evaluative prototype or to the original (and widely accepted) scope of evaluative morphology suggested by Scalise (1984: 132-3) *affissi valutativi / evaluative affixes*.

The first of the two processes utilizes the affix *-ka*, which is prototypically used to derive forms of nouns for female referents (e.g. names of professions and role nouns: *lekar-ka* [doctor-kaFEM], *pisatelk-ka* [writer-kaFEM], *director-ka* [director-kaFEM], etc.). Sitting on the fence as regards the possibility for a polysemy or homonymy interpretation of the suffix, it invariably renders the resultant noun feminine. Bauer and Huddleston (2002: 1677) directly associate the suffix for marking "female sex" with "small size" and "imitation". This is confirmed by the phenomenon of suffixal univerbation in Bulgarian has the effect of degrading/pejoration and the words resulting from this word-formation process are derogatory – *маршрутно такси* [maršrutno taksi, route taxi] > *маршрутка* [marshrutka], *кабелна телевизия* [kabelna televiziya, cable TV] > *кабеларка* [kabelarka], *патрулна кола* [patrulna kola, patrol car] > *патрулка* [patrulka], *дигитална версия* [digitalna versiya, digital version] > *дигиталка* [digitalka], *матричен принтер* [matričen printer, matrix printer] > *матричарка* [matricharka], etc. The substantive source base is entirely morphotactically absent, with the modificational structure including only the adjectival (property) base. The addition of the suffix *-ka* invariably

adds the meaning ‘possessing the mentioned properties to a lower degree/something resembling X’. All novel univerbates (arising in the past 30 years in the language) are pejoratives in comparison to the neutral source nominal phrases. They also invariably express the speaker’s subjective negative attitude. Thus we observe both change in form and modification in meaning (on the evaluative markedness of univerbates in Bulgarian see Avramova 2003, Pernishka and Krumova-Tsvetkova 2013, Radeva 2007). Although the suffix *-ka* is not traditionally recognized as a diminutive or evaluative one, it has started developing evaluative (pejorative) meanings.

The second phenomenon relates to the dynamic process of acquiring marked pejorative meanings by originally neutral suffixes. Noteworthy are two suffixes that have acquired marked negative evaluative meanings – a process nominalization one (actually a suffix cluster of two) – *-изация* [-izaciya], e.g. *мутризация* [mutrizaciya, *the spreading of novo riche values and ways of life in society*], *чалгизация* [čalgizaciya, *the permeation of low culture in everything*] and an agentive one *-джия* [-džiya], *кабелджия* [kabeldžiya, *cable man*] *таксиджия* [taksidžiya, *cabbie*], *жичкаджия* [žičkadžiya, *electrician*], etc. The negative attitudes associated with these suffixes have heterogeneous sources. In the former case the semantic feature ‘saturation with too much of X’ is denotatively attributed, but the overall pejorative effect is dependent on the lexical base. If the process is valued positively by society, then only the meaning of quantitative gradation is encoded, e.g. *компютързация* [kompyutârizciya, *mass installment/use of computers*]. In the latter case, the pejorative meaning is derived from the fact that the suffix *-джия* [-džiya] is Turkish in origin and was initially associated with low status occupations (on the nature and fate of Turkish lexis and morphological formants see Stamenov 2011). Today, the suffix encodes ‘propensity towards certain behaviours and hobbies’ rather than professional occupations. Besides, most of these morphological products relating to professional occupations have neutral counterparts, some of which compounds, such as *таксиметров шофьор* [taksimetrov šofyor, *taxi driver*] vs. *таксиджия* [taksidžiya, *cabbie*], *електротехник* [elektrotehnik, *electric engineer*] vs. *жичкаджия* [zhichkadžiya, ‘wireman’], etc., where the compound is evaluatively neutral, while the one with the *-džiya* suffix is derogatory or pejorative.

4. Evaluative morphology in Bulgarian

4.1 *The morphotactics of evaluative morphology*

Affixation, it appears, is the prototypical device for performing Jurafsky’s “diminutive” function or for encoding evaluation through morphological means. Like most Slavic languages, Bulgarian displays a rich system of diminutive and augmentative affixes, diminution being the more highly productive process. Nouns, adjectives, numerals, adverbs, and verbs are diminutivized or augmented by means of affixation. The greatest richness and diversity of purely evaluative affixation is associated with nouns. The distribution of diminutive and augmentative affixes is subject to categorial restrictions, i.e. they select bases of a certain lexical category (Krâstev 1976), and besides sets of affixes attach to nouns of different genders. But neatness or full paradigmaticity is not, alas, a property of human languages. To contravene this categorial

specialization of evaluative affixes, comes Nicolova's claim (2013) that an important characteristic of diminutives in Bulgarian is that they violate Aronoff's (1976) Unitary Base Hypothesis, since they are formed from bases which belong to different part-of-speech categories and more than one affix can attach to the same base with slight or no changes in semantics.

- 1) from nouns: *хляб* [hlyab, *bread*] – *hleb-če*DIM, *hleb-ec*DIM; *гора* [gora, *forest*] – *gor-ičk*DIM-a, *gor-ic*DIM-a;
- 2) from adjectives: *тъп*, [tap, *stupid*] – *tap-ič*DIM-ak, *tap-ovat*DIM;
- 3) from adverbs: *бързо* [barzo, *quickly*] – *barz-ičk*DIM-o, *barz-ešk*DIM-ata, *barz-ešk*DIM-om;
- 4) from verbs: *тичам* [tičam, *run*] – *tič-k*-DIM-am, *po*DIM-tičam; *плача* [plača, *cry*] – *plač-k*DIM-am; *po*DIM-plača
- 5) from cardinal numerals in the range 1 to 4: *две* [dve, *two* (number of inanimate entities, children or women)] – *dve-č*kDIM-i, *dve-nki*DIM // *двама* [dvama, *two* (this indicates the number of male persons or of a man and a woman, it is the masculine personal form)] – *dvam-k*DIM-a, *dvam-c*DIM-a;
- 6) from some pronouns: *нещо* [nešto, *something*] – *nešt-ičko*DIM, *nešt-ice*DIM.

There seems to be almost unanimous agreement (Krâstev 1976, Manova 2011, Nicolova 2008, Radeva 2007) that diminutive and augmentative affixes in Bulgarian should be classified as displaying properties positioning them closer to the derivational end of the inflection-derivation cline, although some plural diminutive formations raise some doubts (see Deržanski 2005). The derivational status of Bulgarian evaluative affixes is ascribed on the basis of their position within the skeleton of the word, the multi-grade recursivity (second and third grade diminutives), the nature of their meaning contribution, the relation with gender marking and other prototypical grammatical features (number, aspect, grading, etc.).

Gender of source word			Gender in resultant diminutive		
masculine (prototypical suffixes)	feminine (prototypical suffixes)	neuter (prototypical suffixes)	masculine (prototypical suffixes)	feminine (prototypical suffixes)	neuter (prototypical suffixes)
<i>-ec, -le, -če;</i>	<i>-ica, -čica, -ka, -ička,</i>	<i>-(i)če, -ce, -ence, -ice</i>	<i>-ec</i>	<i>-ica, -čica, -ička, -ka</i>	<i>-e, -le, -če, -ce; -ice, -ence</i>

Table 1 *Nominal diminutive suffixes and gender in Bulgarian*

Diminutive suffixes in Bulgarian are gender determining, which means that they are not transparent in relation to the gender feature of the base (Stump 1993). They do not seem to follow what can be identified as a uniform evaluative rule. They assign their gender value to the derived lexical item. This property can be considered as expressing headedness (in accordance with Booij 2007: 53), i.e. strengthening the derivational status stand.

The behaviour of Bulgarian diminutives in relation to number is not uniform. As for number, most, but by far not all, diminutives allow the formation of regular plurals, e.g. *брат* brat ('brother') – *bratja* (Pl.), *brat-ec* (Dim) – \emptyset (Dim, Pl), *but brat* – *bratja* :: *bratce* – *bratceta*

(DIM, PL); *хляб* [hljab, *bread*] – *hljab-ove* (PL) :: *hleb-ec* (DIM) – \emptyset // *hleb-če* (DIM) – *hleb-če-ta* (DIM, PL); *народ* [narod, *a people*] – *narod-i* (PL) :: *narod-ec* (DIM) – \emptyset // *narod-če* – *narod-ce-ta* (DIM, PL). A few masculine and a number of neuter nominal diminutives display reverse defectiveness. They have *only* diminutive plural forms, without a corresponding diminutive, singular form: e.g. *морков* [morkov, *carrot*] – *morkov-i* (PL) :: *morkov-č-e* (DIM) – *morkov-č-e-ta* (DIM, PL) // \emptyset – *morkov-k-i* (DIM, PL); *крак* [krak, *leg*] – *krak-a* (PL) :: *kra-č-e* (DIM) – *kra-č-e-ta* (DIM, PL) // \emptyset – *kra-čk-a* (DIM, PL); *ухо* [uho, *ear*] – *uši* (PL) :: *uš-e* (DIM) – *uš-e-ta* (DIM, PL), *uš-ence* (DIM) – *uš-enca* // \emptyset – *uši-čk-i* (DIM, PL) (see a full discussion of these asymmetries in Deržanski 2005, Nicolova 2013). These facts undermine the derivational status of diminutives and raise questions about the cycle of application of diminutive derivation and number inflection but these are beyond the scope and space limitations of the current presentation. Overall, on the basis of their semantic contribution and their prototypical morphological behaviour, diminutive and augmentative affixes in Bulgarian tend to display properties closer to derivation.

Gender of source word			Gender in resultant augmentative		
masculine (prototypical suffixes)	feminine (prototypical suffixes)	neuter (prototypical suffixes)	masculine (prototypical suffixes)	feminine (prototypical suffixes)	neuter (prototypical suffixes)
-aga, -yaga, - čaga, -iše, - iya	-iše	-iše	-aga, -yaga, - čaga	-iya	-iše

Table 2 *Nominal augmentatives and gender in Bulgarian*

In the remaining classes (adjectives, verbs, adverbs and numerals) evaluative affixes seem to display more consistent derivational properties with more markedly pronounced attitudinal meanings. In a couple of summary tables we can see the distribution of the most productive evaluative affixes per lexical category of the base.

Adjectival		Adverbial		Numeral	Verb	
DIM	AUG	DIM	AUG	DIM	DIM	AUG
-ičák, - ikav, -ovat, -av,	váz-, svrâh-, ultra-, super-, pre-	-ička, -ičko, -kata, -ička, po-	váz-, svrâh-, ultra-, super-, pre-	-ičák,/-ičk-, -nki, -ka, -ca,-ica	-k-, - uka/ uška-, -ička- po-, pod- za-	iz-, váz-, pri-, pre-, zad-,ob-, na-, nad-, za-, zad-, ot-, izpo-, izpona-
Combination of DIM and AUG: e.g. <i>vázkiselíčák</i> (polite or ironic)		Combination of DIM and AUG: e.g. <i>vázkiselíčko</i> (polite or ironic)				
Adjectives and adverbs are freely graded by						

analytical means, the particles <i>po</i> and <i>nay</i> . Even suffixally diminutivized adjectives and adverbs can be graded. Augmented ones cannot.		
---	--	--

Table 3 *Summary of diminutives and augmentatives per word class excluding nouns*

As a rule diminutives and augmentatives in Bulgarian are recognized as a modificational onomasiological category via which the source concept is modified by morphological means in terms of size and/or an attitude is expressed by the speaker. Furthermore, any evaluation thus expressed can be descriptive/objective (based on communal, default cultural values and accepted standards) or qualitative/subjective (projecting individual attitudinal stance which is extremely context-sensitive and cannot be generalized).

The prototypical morphological evaluative resources in Bulgarian, diminutives and augmentatives, are characterized by a rich range of meanings, and are recognized as polysemous. Besides the unavoidable polysemy, they are usually subdivided into two major types: the conceptual (or denotative) and the expressive (or connotative) with the difference lying in the prevalence of descriptive or expressive/attitudinal meaning of the form in particular context. The prevalence of descriptive meaning focuses on the “relationship between a linguistic unit (especially a lexical item) and the non-linguistic entities to which it refers”, while the prevalence of expressive meaning (characteristic of so-called connotative diminutives and augmentatives) brings to the fore “the emotional associations (personal or communal) which are suggested by, or are part of the meaning of, a linguistic unit, especially a lexical item” (Crystal 1997: 82–83).

Zidarova (2008) makes a further distinction between diminutive forms (denotative and connotative diminutives) and diminutive words or lexicalized diminutives, encoding a novel concept, e.g. *легенче* [legenče, renal pelvis], *ваничка* [vanička, hypo bath], *чехълче* [čehâlče, paramecium], etc.).

4.2 *The morphosemantics of evaluative morphology*

Fortin (2011) contends that the key to understanding evaluative morphology, including its pragmatics, its sociolinguistic peculiarities, and morphological properties is its synchronic semantics. But if the morphotactics of evaluative morphology is still problematic, its semantics remains even more controversial, despite numerous viable suggestions (Bauer 1997; Fortin 2011; Grandi 2005, 2011; Jurafsky 1996; Körtvélyessy to appear; Prieto 2005, Ruiz de Mendoza 1996; Wierzbicka 1984, 1991; among others), not to mention purely pragmatic accounts of the meaning and communicative contribution of evaluative markers (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994, 2001). Despite substantial differences in the separate models, there seems to be converging agreement that the semantics of evaluative morphology is heterogeneous but can be captured in a core-and-periphery model encompassing two dimensions that can roughly be dubbed *size* and *perceived quality*. Grandi for example (2011: 6) states that morphological evaluation implies two different perspectives: objective, descriptive or quantitative, represented by the semantic primitives SMALL and BIG and qualitative or subjective represented by the semantic primitives GOOD and BAD. Ruiz de Mendoza (1996) overcomes the heterogeneity problem by accounting for the morphosemantic properties of diminutives and their recurrent pragmatic effects by

defining them as attitudinal term operators that codify *axiological relatedness* between speaker and referent and other salient participants/dimensions of the immediate communicative context. Körtvélyessy (to appear) proposes a unified, radial model of the semantics of evaluative morphology, where the core meaning is QUANTITY projected in four conceptual spaces SUBSTANCE, QUALITY, ACTION, and CIRCUMSTANCE. Added to this generalized meaning is the further theoretical specification that the scalar concept of QUANTITY is projected from a default value (communally shared standard) either to a positive or to a negative extreme. Thus applied to different conceptual spaces, the core meaning will create relevant individuated senses such as size, age-marked member, insignificant member, affection, etc. in the SUBSTANCE space, exactness, attenuation, intensity, etc. in the QUALITY space, pluriactionality, multiplicity, intensity, etc. in the ACTION space and proximity, attenuation, manner, etc. in the CIRCUMSTANCE domain.

For the purposes of the description provided below, it is assumed that the core semantics of evaluative morphology in Bulgarian can be summarily defined as “gradational quantification of objects and events in all three spatial dimensions and the temporal one (when animate entities or events/activities are named) and of properties of objects and events” (Nicolova 2013: 153). When embedded in actual communicative context, this semantic core is pragmatically attuned to encode axiological attitudinal stance as suggested by Ruiz de Mendoza (1996). This is possible, because nominal and adjectival diminutives and augmentatives are characterized by evaluative underspecification. This attitudinal and axiological underdeterminacy does not undermine the possibility for establishing the prototypical denotative meaning of evaluative markers from which pragmatic effects are derived, ranging from ludicity, “meiosis, diminutivum puerile, child/lover/pet-centred speech situations, emotivity, familiarity and intimacy, sympathy and empathy” (Crocco-Galeas 2002:153) to derogation, dismissal, pejorative attitude, etc.

Evaluative markers in the conceptual space ACTION, on the other hand, are characterized by more stable but multifarious denotative senses and fewer attitudinal possibilities. The prototypical meanings of prefixal diminution and augmentation include various types of pluriactionality, attenuation (temporal, aspectual, intensity, spatial, etc.), inchoativity, causality, degree of completion of the event (in relation to affected entities), etc. Suffixal verbal diminution has predominantly connotative meanings and is prototypically used by adults in their communication with children.

4.2.1 Notes on QUANTITY in SUBSTANCE

Within the Bulgarian linguistic tradition, Zidarova (2005, 2008) claims that nominal diminution in Bulgarian is generally associated with predominantly denotative semantic contribution on the part of diminutive affixes, while in the derivative diminutives from bases that belong to other lexical classes the emotive-evaluative predominates due to the specific nature of the concepts denoted by other word classes (Zidarova 2008: 1). The distinction between denotative and connotative diminutives can be summarized in the opposition between using diminutives to designate one of the core denotative components of diminution – smallness, whereas connotative ones are used with a variety of pragmatic effects. The diminutive suffix *-če* is when used denotatively encodes actual smallness of denotata: *краче* [krače, *leg*DIM), *столче* [stolče, *chair*DIM], *палче* [palče, *thumb*DIM], etc. In appropriate contexts this suffix is associated with

positive connotations, expressing affection and positive attitude. However, when used with names of professions the objective semantics of smallness is totally absent, and smallness is metaphorically transposed along the purely evaluative, attitudinal dimension, to encode is the predication of inadequate or insufficient professional qualities of the specific referent with a pejorative pragmatic effect and a derogatory attitude. When describing someone as *докторче* [doktorče, *doctor*DIM], *писателче* [pisatelče, *writer*DIM], *журналистче* [žurnalistče, *journalist*DIM], *даскалче* [daskalče, *teacher*DIM], *професорче* [profesorče, *professor*DIM], etc. a speaker does not mean that someone of young age is practicing the profession. Rather the emotive intention is to express disregard, low esteem or a slighting attitude to the practitioner of the profession. This interpretation is harmonious with Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi's (1994: 144ff.) formulation of the basic morphopragmatics meaning of diminutives, "the feature [non-serious], which relates to the morphosemantic feature [non-important], which is related via metaphor to the morphosemantic denotation [small]".

The prototypical augmentative suffixes in the conceptual domain of SUBSTANCE in Bulgarian are *-ище* [-iše], e.g. *женище* [ženiše, *woman*AUG], *момчище* [momčiše, *boy*AUG] and *мъжище* [măžiše, *man*AUG] and *-ага* [-aga]. The first suffix attaches to bases from all three genders and the connotation is invariably associated with the idea of increase in quantity and pejoration/derision in evaluation, although sometimes the attitude can be one of admiration. The second suffix is not as productive as the first one, attaches to masculine bases and has prototypical positive connotations, expressing approval, e.g. *юнак* [yunak, *stalwart*] – *юнач-ага* [stalwartAUG], *мъж* [man] – *мъж-ага* [manAUG].

4.2.2 Notes on QUANTITY in QUALITY and CIRCUMSTANCE

Evaluation in the conceptual space of QUALITY is exceptional in relation to the other evaluative morphological resources as it is fully grammaticalized. Two 'particles' are used to express degrees of comparison (comparative and superlative) on most quality and some relational adjectives. These are regularly applied to express enhanced QUANTITY of QUALITY in relation to some established standard (be it societally recognized or agreed upon in immediate communicative settings), e.g. *хубава*, *по-хубава*, *най-хубава* [hubava, po-hubava, nay-hubava, *nice*, *nicer*, *nicest*]. Even graded adjectives can be preceded by degree adverbs which results in further augmentation, e.g. *далеч по-хубава* [daleč po-hubava, *far more beautiful*] in the comparative degree. The point of interest in what is otherwise an almost fully grammaticalized phenomenon is the fact that even adjectives marked for diminution can be graded (which by implication means that diminutives do not mark an end scale in any cognitive dimension), e.g. *по-киселичък*, *най-киселичък* [po-kiseličâk, *more sourish*; nay-kiseličâk, *most sourish*]. Augmented adjectives, on the other hand, do not allow the application of the degrees of comparison, e.g. *vâzkisel, suggesting that they imply an endpoint.

Besides grading, which is supposedly denotative in nature and is used to indicate surplus (measurement) QUANTITY of a QUALITY, evaluation is most frequently marked in the conceptual space of QUALITY by diminutive or augmentative affixation. The most frequent prefixes are *въз-* [vâz-], *пре-* [pre-] and *при-* [pri-]. The prefixes have quantitatively augmentative meanings and express pejoration or disapproval. The most productive diminutive suffix is *-ч(ъ)к/a/o* [-č(â)k_m/a_f/o_n]. An augmentative prefix and a diminutive suffix can be

combined on a single base to produce a mixed pragmatic effect, e.g. *възгрозничък* [vâzgrozničâk, *a little bit too ugly*].

Adjectival diminutives derived in the area of subjective valuations of taste from bases denoting unpleasant tastes have marked positive evaluative effects especially in answering a host's questions concerning the served food: *киселичък* [kiseličâk, *sourDIM*], *горчивичък* [gorčivičâk, *bitterDIM*], *соленичък* [soleničâk, *saltyDIM*]. The guest is experiencing discomfort but politeness requirements invite them to approach the issue in a delicate manner by belittling the unpleasantness of the experience. In non-committal expression of opinion or appreciation of objects diminutives function as indicators of lack of specific interest. These are derived from positive lexical bases – *интересничък* [interesničâk, *interestingDIM*], *хубавичък* [hubavičâk *prettyDIM*], *приятничък* [priyatničâk, *pleasantDIM*]. The communicative function of such diminutives is not to indicate objective lowering of the property possessed by an entity, but to indicate disinterested attitude on the part of the speaker.

In the conceptual spaces of QUALITY and CIRCUMSTANCE augmentatives are derived by prefixation. Both adjectives and adverbs (which can be graded) tolerate the augmentative prefixes *въз-* [vâz-], *пре-* [pre-] and *при-* [pri-], e.g. *възскромно* [vâzAUG-skromno, *a bit too modestly*] *преподробно* [preAUG-podrobno, *in too much detail*], etc. Their connotations are more frequently pejorative.

4.2.3 Notes on QUANTITY in ACTION

Purely evaluative morphological means in the conceptual space of ACTIVITY are restricted to suffixation exclusively. The prototypical suffix *-kⁱ* is attached to the verbal word stem and the resultant diminutive verb expresses the lower extent or lower intensity of an activity indicated by the lexical base, e.g. *тичам* [tičam, *run*] – *тич-к-ам* [tič-k-am, *runDIM*] with the sense '*run lightly or for a short time*', invariably accompanied by connotations of lightness, approval or endearment and frequently used in child-directed speech.

Far more diverse in meanings and notably more numerous are prefixes that are less straightforwardly associated exclusively with connotative meanings. This stems from the highly polysemous nature of the prefixes themselves, which can encode semantic features such as adlocativity *при*тичам [pritičam, *to run close to*], distributivity *раз*пределя [razpredelya, *distribute*], causativity *по*добря [podobrya, *to make better*] or inchoativity *по*желая [poželaya, *to start wanting*]. The prefixes associated with heightened intensity of the verbal activity or a greater extent of accomplishment of the activity (i.e. QUANTITY of ACTION) include¹¹: *въз-* (*възгордея* [vâzgordeya, *get a swell head*]), *за-* (*заседея се* [zasedya se, *stay far too long*]), *на-* (*налудувам се* [naluduvam se, *rave, romp to the full*]), *над-* (*надиграя* [nadigraya, *play better than*]), *от-* (*отживея си* [otživeya si, *live in a grand style to one's full satisfaction*]), *пре-* (*премръзна* [premrâzna, *freeze to the bones*]), *изно-* (*изпочупя* [izpočupya, *break everithing*]). All the prefixes are plysemous and their other senses invariably contribute nuances of meaning besides the evaluative – expressive and subjective emotive strand of meaning. That is, unlike diminutive suffixes (irrespective of the lexical class they attach to), which have two basic dimensions of meaning QUANTITY and EVALUATIVE STANCE, evaluative verbal prefixes always encode a complex matrix of senses with each one taking the upper hand in different contexts.

As an illustration of the multiplicity of meanings as a form which is used as an evaluative morphological resource, the prefix *po-* will be used, which is classified as an attenuative one. Verbs with the prefix *po-* denote a shorter period for the manifestation of the activity and / or less intensity of the activity. One of the prefix's main meanings is that of attenuator (the inverse of intensifier). The prefix interacts with aktionsart, the mode of the activity in terms of rate of frequency, phase, lexical semantics of the base, or with the presence of additional prefixes (after or before it). It "lowers the degree of intensity of the following prefix" (Istratkova 2004: 314). For example, when *iz-*verb- 'completely' follows *po-*, it means 'almost completely': *po-iz-prodam* 'sell almost completely (Istratkova 2004: 315). Its basic sense as an evaluative suffix can be defined as digression towards a minimal limit in the accomplishment of the activity denoted by the non-prefixed base, e.g. *играя* [igraya, play] ~ *поиграя* [АТТplay], *легна* [legna, lie down] ~ *полегна* [АТТlie down], *усмихна се* [usmihna se, smile] ~ *поусмихна се* [АТТhalf-smile]. Ivanova (1974: 71, 77) claims that in all instance of use of the prefix two dimensions of meaning remain constant, "the attenuative manner of carrying out an activity" and "the delimitative temporal meaning of shortness". Other authors (Radeva 1991 and Chakarova 2003) maintain that the core meaning is attenuation and that other meaning such as limitations of duration, iterativity and multiplicity arise through semantic shifts from this. Thus they recognize a set of imperfective prefixed verbs as attenuative-iterative/multiple, which can be illustrated by *похавам* [pohavvam, eat bits and piece], *похърквам* [poharkvam, snore lightly but frequently], etc. It is arguable whether both quantitative meanings – temporal limitation and low intensity (degree) should be subsumed under evaluative semantics. Probably the temporal one is comparable to the meaning of smallness in denotative substantive diminutives, while the intensity one is more akin to the evaluative expressive meanings associated with connotative substantive diminutives. Due to the concepts they encode verbs can be 'measured' in terms of quantity (temporal limitation) and in terms of quality (intensity). No matter what the specific semantic volume is, attenuative suffixes always involve implicit comparison with the standard set by the base. This is reflected in the position such prefixes take in multiple prefix stacking series in verbs. Istratkova (2004: 318; emphasis added) proposes the following hierarchy for the stacking of prefixes in Bulgarian verbs, "attenuative PO- > ZA- > DO- > IZ- > distributive PO- > NA- > RAZ- > PRE- > superlexical prefix/semelfactive suffix > lexical prefix > VP."

The combination *iz-po-(iz-/na-)* is the most prototypical augmentative which encodes completion of the activity to the fullest encompassing all of a set of entities/the whole of an undifferentiated mass, e.g. *тръшкам* [trâškam, hurl down] ~ *изпонатръшкам* AUGhurl down everything/everyone]. The possibility for multiple prefix stacking and the complex interplay between expressivity and denotative diminutive/augmentative categories (provided for in Körtvélyessy's novel radial model) with numerous other verbal meanings makes the idea of exhaustive description preposterous. One thing is clear, evaluative morphology in the space of ACTION is ripe with diverse meanings and generalizations on the semantic scope of evaluative morphology in this conceptual space is best captured by Körtvélyessy's (to appear) novel radial model.

5. Discussion points

As Kryk-Kastovsky (2000: 173) aptly summarizes,

[D]iminution is a much more complex and multifarious process than has been believed so far. Languages whose word formation rules allow an almost unlimited derivation of diminutives are characterised by a high degree of semantic and pragmatic complexity.

Without even scratching the surface of this complexity in Bulgarian, we draw the reader's attention to one noteworthy fact about the morphotactics and semantics of evaluative morphology in Bulgarian, presented in the table below.

Substance	Action
Poor prefixal system (prefixoids of international character – <i>mega-</i> , <i>super-</i> , <i>mini-</i> , <i>hiper-</i> , etc.). No concatenation of prefixes.	Rich prefixal system (<i>po-</i> , <i>pod-</i> , <i>iz-</i> , <i>váz-</i> , <i>pri-</i> , <i>pre-</i> , <i>zad-</i> , <i>ob-</i> , <i>na-</i> , <i>nad-</i> , <i>za-</i> , <i>zad-</i> , etc.). Prefixes can be freely concatenated with various semantic results.
Rich suffixal system – <i>-ec</i> ; <i>-k-</i> ; <i>-ic-a</i> ; <i>-čic-a</i> ; <i>-ičk-a</i> ; <i>-c-e</i> ; <i>-enc-e</i> ; <i>-ic-e</i> ; <i>-l-e</i> ; <i>-č-e</i>	Just one highly productive suffix – <i>-k-</i> Less productive suffixes – <i>-uka-</i> , <i>-uška-</i> , <i>-ička-</i>
Much finer evaluative/emotive distinctions	More numerous nuanced denotative distinctions

Table 4 *Contrasts between evaluative resources in the Substance and Action domains*

In a nutshell, in the conceptual space SUBSTANCE evaluative semantics is preferably attached after the base, while in the ACTION one it is attached to the front of the base. A possible explanation for this asymmetry between evaluative suffixation and prefixation preferences could be sought in the tendency of human beings to distinguish between relational profiling of interconnections (verbs) amounting to sequential cognitive scanning and the non-relational profiling of regions of interconnected entities (nouns) (Langacker 1991: 19-21). The ACTION cognitive space presupposes an ordered scanning strategy in conceptualization and the prefixal preference indicates a bias for positioning semantic clusters at the beginning so that all necessary parameters for sequential scanning will be available during the processing of the verbal meaning (be it for encoding or comprehension purposes). Moreover, being relational, verbs encode pluridimensional qualia structure and allow for more strands of meaning to be unified in a relational concept. The greater relevance of the beginning of a word for processing than of its end has been also acknowledged on psycholinguistic grounds (Cutler et al. 1985; Enrique-Arias 2002; Hawkins and Gilligan 1988; Ramskar 2013, etc.). Such a claim needs extensive empirical support and this is a promising venue for further research on the semantics of evaluative morphology in the conceptual spaces SUBSTANCE and ACTION in Bulgarian.

6. Concluding remarks

Evaluative morphology remains an understudied area of linguistic research despite the abundance of publications on the topic. It is problematic not only cross-linguistically but poses problems for its description and analysis within a single language. The major difficulty springs from the fact that besides the purely descriptive or propositional meanings encoded by evaluative morphological means (the prototypical diminutives and augmentatives), stance taking is unavoidable as they express non-propositional meanings encoding the degree or intensity and type - positive or negative emotion/attitude, as well as the orientation of the emotion or attitude - expressed. The brief review presented here of the rich resources of evaluative morphology in Bulgarian reveals that while the attitudinal values of evaluative morphology in Bulgarian are hard to enumerate, let alone pin down to a prototypical core, it seems that “approximative gradational quantification of objects, events and their properties” can be safely suggested as the prototypical semantic core of evaluative morphology in Bulgarian. This finding supports the new radial model of the semantics of evaluative morphology proposed by Körtvélyessy (to appear). The non-propositional meanings are, nonetheless, highly context sensitive and their specification for analytical purposes presupposes at least pragmatic and sociolinguistic approaches, including conversation analytical methods. The possibilities for widening the scope of the category by admitting new morphotactic patterns or recognizing novel attitudinal values open up venues for further fruitful research.

Notes

*My gratitude goes to Livia Körtvélyessy for her support, useful critical comments and guidance. All errors of fact, argument or expression are my own.

¹ This is considered a suffix and not an infix, since it is the last derivational element after which the inflectional markers for person, number and tense are attached. Infixation is supposed to work within a single morph and not at morpheme boundaries, let alone at the border between derivation and inflection. For these reasons, *-k-* is interpreted in the Bulgarian word-formation tradition as a suffix.

² The idiosyncratic semantics contributed by evaluative prefixes mark them apart from purely aspectual (supralexical and perfectivizing) verbal prefixes.

References

- ARONOFF, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1976.
- BEARD, Robert. 1995. *Lexeme-Morpheme Base Morphology: a General Theory of Inflection and Word Formation*. SUNY Series in Linguistics. Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1995.

-
- BAUER, Laurie, HUDDLESTON, Rodney. 2002. Lexical word-formation. In Huddleston, R. and G. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, pp. 1621-1723.
- BAUER, Laurie. 1997. Evaluative morphology: In search of universals. *Studies in Language*, 1997, vol. 21 (3), pp. 533-575.
- BOOIJ, Geert. 2007. *The Grammar of Words* (2nd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- CROCCO-GALÉAS, Georgi. 2002. A morphopragmatic approach to Greek diminutives. In Clairis. C. (ed.), *Recherches en Linguistique Grecque I*. Paris: L' Harmattan, 2002, pp. 151-154.
- CRUSE, Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- CRYSTAL, David. 1997. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1997.
- CUTLER, Ann, HAWKINS, John, GILLIGAN, Gary. 1985. The suffixing preference: a processing explanation. *Linguistics*, 1985, vol. 23, pp.723-758.
- DERŽANSKI, Ivan. 2005. On Diminutive Plurals and Plural Diminutives. In t Booij, G., Guevara, E., Ralli, A., Sgroi, S. and Scalise, S. (eds.): *Morphology and Linguistic Typology: On-line Proceedings of the Fourth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting* (MMM4); Catania, 21–23 September 2003, Università degli Studi di Bologna.
- DRESSLER, Wolfgang, MERLINI BARBARESI, Lavinia. 2001. Morphopragmatics of diminutives and augmentatives. In I. Kenesei and R.M. Harnish, (eds.), *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse: A Festschrift for Ferenc Keifer*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001, pp. 43-58.
- DRESSLER, Wolfgang, MERLINI BARBARESI, Lavinia. 1994. *Morphopragmatics: diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German, and other languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.
- DU BOIS, John. 2002. Stance and Consequence, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.
- DU BOIS, John. 2007. The stance triangle. In Englebretson, R. (ed.) *Stance taking in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007, pp. 139-182.
- ENRIQUE-ARIAS, Andrés. 2002. Accounting for the position of verbal agreement morphology with psycholinguistic and diachronic explanatory factors. *Studies in Language*, 2002, vol. 26, pp. 1-31.
- FORTIN, Antonio. 2011. The Morphology and Semantics of Expressive Affixes. at <http://ora.ouls.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid%3A88a23d7c-c229-49af-9fc9-2cb35fce9d54/datastreams/THESIS01> (last accessed 11 January 2015).

GRANDI, Nicola. 2011. Renewal and innovation in the emergence of Indo-European evaluative morphology. *Lexis 6: Diminutives and Augmentatives in the Languages of the World*, 2011, vol. 6, pp. 5-26. Retrieved from http://lexis.univ-lyon3.fr/IMG/pdf/Lexis_6.pdf.

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

HAWKINS, John, GILLIGAN, Gary. 1988. Prefixing and suffixing universals in relation to basic word order. *Lingua*, 1988, vol. 74, pp. 219-259.

HUNSTON, Susan. 1994. Evaluation and organization in a sample of written academic discourse. In Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge, 1994, pp. 191-218,

ISTRATKOVA, Vyara. 2004. On multiple prefixation in Bulgarian. In *Nordlyd*, CASTL, Tromsø, 2004, vol. 32 (2), special issue on Slavic prefixes, (ed.), Peter Svenonius, pp. 301-321. <http://www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/>.

JURAFSKY, Daniel. 1996. Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive. *Language*, 1996, vol. 72 (3), pp. 533-578.

KÖRTVÉLYESSY, Livia (to appear) Evaluative Morphology. In Grandi, N. and Körtvélyessy, L. (eds.) *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

KRYK-KASTOVSKY, Barbara. 2000. Diminutives: An Interface of word-formation, semantics and pragmatics. In Dalton-Puffer, Ch. and R. Nikolaus (eds.) *Words: Structure, meaning, function. A festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000, pp. 165-174.

LANGACKER, Ronald. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Descriptive Application*. Volume 2. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

MANOVA, Stela. 2011. Suffix order in double and multiple diminutives: with data from Polish and Bulgarian. *Studies in Polish Linguistics*, 2011, vol. 6, pp. 115-138.

NICOLOVA, Rusalina. 2013. The formation of diminutives from abstract bases in Bulgarian. *Јужнословенски филолог*, 2013, vol. LXIX, pp. 149-168.

PRIETO, Victor. 2005. Spanish Evaluative Morphology: Pragmatic, Sociolinguistic, and Semantic Issues. at http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0010940/prieto_v.pdf (last accessed 11 January 2015).

RAMSCAR, Michael. 2013. Suffixing, prefixing, and the functional order of regularities in meaningful strings. *Psihologija*, 2013, Vol. 46 (4), pp. 377-396.

RUIZ DE MENDOZA, Francisco. (1996) Some notes on the grammatical status of the Spanish -ito/-illo diminutives and their translation in English. Universidad de Cádiz, *Pragmalingüística*, 1996, vol. 3-4, pp. 155-172.

SCALISE, Sergio. 1984. *Generative Morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 1984.

STUMP, Gregory. 1993. How peculiar is Evaluative Morphology. *Linguistics Faculty Publications*. Paper 28. http://uknowledge.uky.edu/lin_facpub/28

WIERZBICKA, Anna. 1984. Diminutives and depreciatives: Semantic representation for derivational categories. *Quaderni di Semantica*, 1984, vol. 5, pp. 123-130.

WIERZBICKA, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.

АВРАМОВА, Цветанка. 2003. *Словообразователни тенденции при съществителните имена в българския и чешкия език в края на XX век*. София: Херон Прес. [Avramova, Tsvetanka (2003) *Word-formation tendencies in substantives in Bulgarian and Czech at the end of the 20th century*. Sofia: Heron Press, 2003.].

ЗИДАРОВА, Ваня. 2008. Деминутиви и лексикална номинация (at http://www.belb.net/personal/zidarova/deminutiva_lex.htm). [Zidarova, Vanya. 2008. Diminutives and Lexical Nomination) (accessed May 2010).

ЗИДАРОВА, Ваня. 2005. Лексикализация на деминутивите в съвременния български книжовен език. В: Стоянова, Ю, Дачева, Г., Павлова, Н., Михайлова, Н и Миланов, В. (съст.) *Littera Scripta Manet. Сборник в чест на 65-годишнината на проф. дфн Василка Радева*. София, Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“. [Zidarova, Vanya. 2005. Lexicalization of diminutives in contemporary Bulgarian. In Stoyanova, Yu., Dacheva, G., Pavlova, N., Mihayilova, N. and Milanov, V. (eds.) *Papers in Honour of Vasilka Radeva*. Sofia: Univeristy Publishing House “St. Kliment Ohridski” 2005.], pp. 601-608.

ИВАНОВА, Калина. 1974. *Начини на глаголното действие*. София: Наука и изкуство. [Ivanova, Kalina. 1974. *Ways of carrying out the verbal activity*. Sofia: Naouka i izkoustvo, 1974].
КРЪСТЕВ, Боримир. 1976. *Умалителността в българския език*. София [Krâstev, Borimir. 1976. *Diminution in Bulgarian*. Sofia, 1976.].

НИЦОЛОВА, Русалина. 2008. *Българска граматика. Морфология*. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“. [Nicolova, Rusalina. 2008. *Bulgarian grammar. Morphology*. Sofia: Sofia University Publishing House “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 2008.].

ПЕРНИШКА, Емилия и Лилия КРУМОВА-ЦВЕТКОВА. 2013. *Българска лексикология*. София: Академично издателство „Марин Дринов“. [Pernishka, Emiliya and Liliya Krumova-Tsvetkova, (eds.), 2013. *Bulgarian Lexicology*. Sofia Academic Publishing House “Marin Drinov”, 2013.].

РАДЕВА, Василка. 1991. *Словообразуването в българския книжовен език*. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“ [Radeva, Vasilka. 1991. *Word-formation in Modern Bulgarian*. Sofia: Sofia University Publishing House “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 1991.].

РАДЕВА, Василка. 2007. *В света на думите*. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“ [Radeva, Vasilka. 2007. *In the World of Words*. Sofia: Sofia University Publishing House “St. Kliment Ohridski”, 2007.].

СТАМЕНОВ, Максим. 2011. *Съдбата на турцизмите в българския език и в българската култура*. София: Изток-Запад. [Stamenov, Maxim. 2011. *The fate of Turkish loans in the Bulgarian language and culture*. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad, 2011.]

ЧАКЪРОВА, Красимира. 2003. *Аспектуалност и количество*. Велико Търново: Фабер. [Chakarova, Kr. (2003) *Aspectuality and quantity*. Veliko Turnovo: Faber, 2003.].

Alexandra Bagasheva
Department of English and American Studies
Sofia University St Kliment Ohridski
15 Tsar Osvoboditel Blvd
Sofia 1504
Bulgaria
abagasheva@gmail.com

In SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics [online]. 2015, vol. 12, no.1 [cit. 2014-01-25]. Available on web page <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL27/pdf_doc/02.pdf>. ISSN 1336- 782X.