Modern Greek diminutive and augmentative adjectives (in a cross-linguistic perspective)

Angeliki Efthymiou

Although diminutive and augmentative adjectives are very frequent in Modern Greek, there is no detailed treatment of these morphological evaluative means, with the exception of a few in-depth analyses of several specific sub-themes (cf. among others, Delveroudi and Vassilaki 1999; Efthymiou 2003; Melissaropoulou and Ralli 2008; Efthymiou, Fragaki and Markos 2013; Efthymiou and Fragaki 2014; Gavriilidou 2013). This study aims at describing the diminutive and augmentative (i.e. intensifying) deadjectival adjectives in Modern Greek (e.g. nostim–útsik(os) 'tasty-DIM, kont-úl(is) 'short-DIM, penda-nóstim(os) 'AUGM-tasty', kát-aspr(os) 'AUGM-white') and discussing the asymmetry in the distribution of prefixes and suffixes in the expression of diminution and augmentation (i.e. diminution is expressed by both prefixes and suffixes, while intensification is mostly expressed by prefixes or prefixoids). My claims will be exemplified on the basis of ca. 400 adjectives, which were collected from three Modern Greek dictionaries (Triandafyllidis 1998; Babiniotis 2002; Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek 2002).

Keywords: *adjectives, augmentative, diminutive, evaluative morphology, Modern Greek, intensification, attenuation, prefixes, suffixes*

1. Introduction

In this paper I will attempt to describe the diminutive and augmentative deadjectival adjectives in Modern Greek by focusing on the verification of Grandi and Montermini's (2005) claim that the meanings SMALL and BIG are (almost) always expressed both by prefixes and suffixes in European languages, and specifically that the meaning GOOD (i.e. appraisal, affection, intensification) is (almost) always expressed by prefixes and the meaning BAD (i.e. contempt, attenuation) is always expressed (if expressed morphologically) by suffixes. Furthermore, I will discuss the assumption that augmentatives are less widespread than diminutives (cf. Grandi 2005; Štekauer, Valera and Körtvélyessy 2012; among others). The findings of this study are exemplified by reference to 400 deadjectival adjectives, collected from three Modern Greek dictionaries (Triandafyllidis 1998; Babiniotis 2002; *Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek* 2002). The following section is dedicated to a brief overview of the relevant literature on evaluative morphology.

2. Evaluative morphology in linguistic theory

Evaluative morphology, which prototypically refers to diminutive, augmentative, endearing and pejorative morphemes, has been widely investigated from many perspectives in the literature (see, for example, Scalise 1984; Stump 1993; Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994; Bauer 1996, 1997; Jurafsky 1996; Grandi 2005; Melissaropoulou and Ralli 2008; Steriopolo 2008; Fortin 2011; Körtvélyessy 2014), with the emphasis of research lying on the question of its position in grammar as well as its semantic properties, its structural characteristics, and

its expression cross-linguistically. This section discusses the place of evaluative morphology within the system of morphology, as well as its semantic properties.

2.1 *The position of evaluative morphology in grammar*

The position of evaluative affixes within morphology has been hotly debated and no consensus has been reached. It appears that evaluative formations are considered to be derivational, inflectional, or of an intermediate nature depending on the language in question. Anderson (1992), for example, reports that evaluative affixes in languages like Fula and Kikuyu are inflectional. Scalise (1988) also argues that evaluative affixes have a special status and that they are situated between derivational and inflectional affixes. On the other hand, Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi (1992: 21) claim that evaluative suffixes, even though they are of derivational nature, cannot be considered as prototypical instances of derivational affixes. They also argue that there is no sufficient evidence to assume that evaluative suffixes are located in an autonomous and distinct class. Stump (1993) also includes evaluative morphology in the field of derivation, maintaining that evaluative rules, even though they are category-preserving, are not so peculiar as to require their own subcomponent. Finally, Melissaropoulou and Ralli (2008), adopting Bybee's (1985) idea of a morphological continuum with pure inflection and pure derivation at the two poles, suggest that evaluative suffixes are positioned in between, and that being closer to the one pole or the other is a matter of the properties of the particular language and the suffix one deals with. Along the same line of reasoning, Körtvélyessy (2014: 300) maintains that the place of evaluative morphology is language specific. In some languages evaluative affixes are closer to the derivation side, while in others they are closer to the inflection side of the derivation-inflection continuum.

2.2 *The semantics of evaluative morphology. Recent cross-linguistic approaches*

Grandi (2005) proposes a theoretical background of evaluative morphology and states that the meaning of an evaluative construction can be represented by four semantic primitives, SMALL, BIG, GOOD and BAD. Moreover, he identifies two perspectives of evaluative morphology: the objective/ descriptive or quantitative perspective, represented by diminutives and augmentatives (i.e. the semantic primitives SMALL vs. BIG), and the qualitative or subjective perspective that includes a whole range of meanings such as intensification, endearment, attenuation, contempt (i.e. the semantic primitives GOOD vs. BAD).

Based on Grandi's description of evaluative morphology as the morphological expression of semantico-functional relationships along the two axes SMALL vs. BIG and GOOD vs. BAD, Grandi and Montermini (2005) propose that evaluative affixes seem to disregard the suffixing preference (i.e. the fact that suffixes are largely preferred to prefixes), favouring a sort of 'prefix-suffix neutrality': the same semantic categories can be expressed cross-linguistically either by suffixes, prefixes or even by both types of affixes within the same language. More specifically, these authors suggest that what they call 'prefix-suffix neutrality' concerns the 'quantitative' axe of evaluation (SMALL vs. BIG), but not the 'qualitative' one (GOOD vs. BAD). As regards the qualitative side, they claim that the meaning GOOD (i.e. appraisal, affection, intensification) is (almost) always expressed by

prefixes and the meaning BAD (i.e. contempt, attenuation) is always expressed (if expressed morphologically) by suffixes.

Although Grandi's approach aims to capture the meaning of evaluative formations comprehensively by combining both the quantitative and the qualitative perspective, it raises the question of what belongs to objective (i.e. quantitative) and what to subjective (i.e. qualitative) evaluation (Körtvélyessy 2012). As Szymanek rightly observes (1988: 170), the cognitive concepts SMALL and BIG often co-occur with elements of emotional and attitudinal meaning (good, dear, etc. vs. bad, hostile, etc.). To illustrate this, in a form such as Modern Greek *spit–ác(i)* 'house $_{\text{DIM}}$', it is obviously difficult to discriminate between a purely descriptive (or denotational) interpretation ('small size of the house') and a qualitative (or connotative) interpretation, capable of expressing the emotion of the speaker ('the endearing attitude of the speaker toward the house' or 'the speaker's contempt or negative attitude irrespective of the size of the house'). Similarly, forms such as Italian *sorellina* 'dear little sister' and *donnotta* 'fine, stout woman' may express more than one semantic value, the purely descriptive aspect not being easily distinguishable from the qualitative one (Grandi 2005: 189; examples from Stump 1993: 1). These examples do not only show that the same evaluative formation may express more than one semantic value (Grandi 2005: 189), but also reveal a) that the borderline between a purely descriptive and a qualitative interpretation is particularly fuzzy and b) that the meaning of evaluative formations is closely related to the specific speaker and the context (Körtvélyessy 2012).

More recently, Körtvélyessy's (2012) proposes a new approach to the semantics of evaluative morphology. Her cognitive model is founded on the idea of evaluative morphology as a continuum in which prototypical cases express the meaning of quantity under or above the default value, with the concept of default quantity being a relative one: the default value is language specific, influenced by many factors such as culture, traditions of a speech community, and one's knowledge and experience. The evaluation process is implemented within four basic cognitive categories, SUBSTANCE, ACTION, QUALITY, and CIRCUMSTANCE. This establishes four basic categories of evaluative morphology, in particular, the Quantity of Substance, the Quantity of Action, the Quantity of Quality, and the Quantity of Circumstance. These cognitive categories may be expressed by nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and also pronouns.

More specifically, the process of evaluation starts in extra-linguistic reality. The point of departure is a need in a speech community to evaluate an object of extra-linguistic reality. This need is reflected at the cognitive level. At this level, quantification is implemented in terms of the basic cognitive categories (Quantity of Substance, Quantity of Action, Quantity of Quality, and Quantity of Circumstance). If there is a need for qualitative evaluation, based on the metaphorical shifts SMALL IS CUTE and BIG IS NASTY, the quantitative evaluation can be shifted to qualitative evaluation, e.g. pejoratives, ameliorative, hypocoristics, etc. At the level of the language system, cognitive categories are expressed by semantic categories like diminutive, augmentative, pejorative, ameliorative, pluractionality, attenuation, intensification, Aktionsart, etc. Concrete realization of these semantic categories comes into existence by means of the markers of evaluative morphology. The output leaves the level of langue and enters the level of parole where it can obtain various additional shades of emotive colouring, depending on the specific context, e.g. admiration, contempt, etc. Finally, the relation between diminutives and augmentatives, is viewed as that of a scale: both diminutives and augmentatives are viewed as deviations from the prototypical value in any of the cognitive categories SUBSTANCE, ACTION, QUALITY and CIRCUMSTANCE and the various

meanings (attenuation, intensification, multiplicity, iterativity, frequentativity, distributiveness, approximation, size, etc.) of evaluative morphology 'radiate' from each of these categories.

Körtvélyessy's approach to the semantics of evaluative morphology crucially differs from that of Grandi in that a) it includes Aktionsart, pluractionality, attenuation and intensification in the quantitative domain (i.e. the supercategory of Quantity), and b) it establishes four basic categories of evaluative morphology, the Quantity of Substance, the Quantity of Action, the Quantity of Quality and the Quantity of Circumstance.

The next section is dedicated to a brief overview of the relevant literature on diminutive and augmentative adjectives.

3. Diminutive and augmentative adjectives

The prototypical domain of deadjectival adjective formation is represented by gradable (qualitative) adjectives: e.g. dimensional, evaluative, colour adjectives (cf. Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994: 120). More specifically, diminutive adjectives can either express attenuation (e.g. It. *altino* 'less high' than *alto*, It. *piccolino* 'less small than' *piccolo,* It. *azzurino* 'blue-ish') or have other pragmatic meanings, such as subjective evaluation or mitigation, etc. As regards the pragmatic meanings of diminutive adjectives, the example of It. *piccolino* 'small-DIM is characteristic: "*piccolino* is not intended to refer to denotative smallness, but has a pragmatic meaning of mitigation or attenuation of negative aspects of smallness" (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994: 117-118).

As regards diminutive colour adjectives, Nieuwenhuis (1985: 65) states that "With colour terms, the diminutive suffix is usually equivalent to Eng. -ish. It expresses similarity […] At the same time, it serves to attenuate the original quality".

Similarly, augmentative adjectives can either express intensification or subjective evaluation, emphasis, exaggeration, commitment, etc. (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994: 415-524). In particular, according to Körtvélyessy's model, diminutive adjectives realize the semantic category of Attenuation within the cognitive category of QUALITY (e.g. MGr. *aspr–úl(is)* 'whitish', *nostim–útsik(os)* 'quite tasty') and deviate from the default value by indicating attenuation, i.e. a reduced QUALITY (Körtvélyessy 2014: 306-307). Taking the Qualification path, the same adjectives can also realize other semantic categories such as affection or subjective evaluation. At the level of parole, these adjectives can also obtain various additional shades of 'emotive' meaning, depending on the specific context, e.g. mitigation of the force of the utterance, politeness, irony, etc. Similarly, augmentative adjectives realize the semantic category of Intensification within the cognitive category of Quality (MGr. *olokáθaros* 'extremely clean', *θeótrelos* 'totally crazy') by indicating a higher quantity of a quality. Taking the Qualification path, the same adjectives can also realize other semantic categories such as exactness or subjective (positive or negative) evaluation. At the level of parole, these adjectives can also obtain various additional shades of emotive meaning, depending on the specific context, e.g. emphasis, commitment, empathy, exaggeration, irony, etc.

Based on Körtvélyessy's analysis, the meanings of the diminutive and augmentative adjectives can be summarized in Table 1:

		Diminution	Augmentation
Langue	Quantitative evaluation	attenuation (deintensfication), precision, etc.	intensification exactness, etc.
	Qualitative evaluation	affection subjective evaluation (positive or negative)	subjective evaluation (positive or negative)
Parole	Emotive/pragmatic meaning	mitigation of the force of the utterance, politeness, intimacy, irony, etc.	emphasis, commitment, empathy, exaggeration, irony, etc.

Table 1 *The meanings of diminutive and augmentative adjectives*

As regards the relation between intensification and attenuation (or deintensification), Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi (1994: 417; 427, 430-431) report the unanimous assumption that augmentatives represent a marked category opposed to the unmarked category of diminutives (see, e.g., Grandi 2005; Štekauer, Valera and Körtvélyessy 2012). They also assume markedness reversal of intensification vs. deintensification, maintaining that a) 'intensification is unmarked, deintensification marked' and that b) 'intensifiers are more frequent than deintensifiers'.

The following section is concerned with the description of Modern Greek diminutive and augmentative (i.e. intensifying) deadjectival adjectives.

4. Modern Greek diminutive and augmentative deadjectival adjectives

Modern Greek has a quite large number of diminutive and intensifying prefixes, prefixoids, and suffixes at its disposal, the most typical and productive of which are given in 4.1 and 4.2. However, not all suffixes, prefixes and prefixoids are equally productive (see 4.1 and 4.2). It must also be noted that Modern Greek diminutive and augmentative adjectives are part of a rich paradigm of evaluative formations, which also includes suffixed, prefixed and compound nouns, verbs and adverbs (cf. Melissaropoulou forthcoming). This indicates that Bauer's (1997: 540) hierarchy of base types for augmentivization and diminutivization 'nouns > adjectives and verbs> adverbs > numerals, pronouns and interjections> determinatives' also holds for Modern Greek and means that diminutive and augmentative formation from adjectives is conditioned in Modern Greek by the existence of diminutives and augmentatives formed from nouns (on the hierarchy of word classes, see also Nieuwenhuis 1985: 64; 216).

4.1 *Suffixes*

The most typical diminutive suffixes are *-útsikos*, *-úli*, *-úlikos*, *-ulós*, *-opós*, and *-iδerós*.

i) diminutives

-útsikos$_{masc}$, *-útsici/ca*$_{fem}$, *-útsiko*$_{neut}$

(1) a. *nostim–útsik(os)* ‘tasty-DIM’
b. *akriv–útsik(os)* ‘expensive-DIM’
c. *malak–útsik(os)* ‘soft -DIM’
d. *fresk–útsik(os)* ‘fresh-DIM’
e. *psil–útsik(os)* ‘tall-DIM’
f. *aspr–útsik(os)* ‘white-DIM’

The Modern Greek suffix *-útsikos* originates from the Italian suffix *-ucc(io)*. It can attach to any qualitative adjective ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denotes dimension, age, colour, human propensity, physical property, speed, value, difficulty or position, in order to create diminutive adjectives. However, it does not attach to [+learned] bases. Given that the suffix contains the phonestheme [ts] (Joseph 1994: 232), the adjectives in *-útsikos* have a marked stylistic status.

-úlis$_{masc}$, *-úla*$_{fem}$, *-úliko/úli*$_{neut}$

(2) a. *kond–úl(is)* ‘short-DIM’
b. *lept–úl(is)* ‘thin-DIM’
c. *aspr–úl(is)* ‘white-DIM’
d. *δroser–úl(is)* ‘cool-DIM’
e. *ponir–úl(is)* ‘cunning-DIM’

The Modern Greek suffix *-úlis* attaches to qualitative adjectives ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denote dimension, age, colour, human propensity or physical property and creates adjectives that have an affective rather than a diminutive value.

-úlikos$_{masc}$, *-úlici/ca*$_{fem}$, *-úliko*$_{neut}$

(3) a. *ponir–úlik(os)* ‘cunning-DIM’
b. *aspr–úlik(os)* ‘white-DIM’
c. *kond–úlik(os)* ‘short-DIM’
d. *γlik–úlικ(os)* ‘sweet-DIM’

According to Triandafyllidis Dictionary (1998), the suffix *-úlikos* developed from the combination of the suffixes *-úlis* and *-ikos*. It attaches to qualitative adjectives ending in *–os* or *-ós* that denote dimension, age, colour, human propensity or physical property, and creates adjectives that tend to have an affective value.

-ulós$_{masc}$, *-ulí*$_{fem}$, *-ulό*$_{neut}$

(4) a. *pax-ul(ós)* ‘fat-DIM’
b. *farδ-ul(ós)* ‘wide-DIM’
c. *makr-ul(ós)* ‘long-DIM’
d. *aspr-ul(ós)* ‘white-DIM’

The suffix is not productive in Modern Greek. According to Triandafyllidis Dictionary (1998), the suffix developed from the diminutive nominal suffix *-úla*. It usually attaches to qualitative adjectives that denote dimension, colour, human propensity or physical property. *-ulós*$_{masc}$ can co-occur with *-útsikos*, especially with adjectival bases ending in *-ís* (e.g. *paç(ís)* 'fat', *makr(ís)* 'long'):

(5) a. *makr-ul-útsik(os)* 'long-DIM-DIM'
    b. *pax-ul-útsik(os)* 'fat-DIM-DIM'

-opós$_{masc}$, *-opí*$_{fem}$, *-opó*$_{neut}$

(6) a. *kocin-op(ós)* 'red-DIM'
    b. *prasin-op(ós)* 'green-DIM'
    c. *griz-op(ós)* 'grey-DIM'
    d. *aɣur-op(ós)* 'unripe-DIM'

The suffix *-opós* is not productive in Modern Greek. It usually attaches to qualitative adjectives ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denote colour, human propensity or physical property, and creates adjectives which express approximation or similarity.

-iδerós$_{masc}$, *-iδerí*$_{fem}$, *-iδeró*$_{neut}$

(7) a. *aspr-iδer(ós)* 'white-DIM'
    b. *mavr-iδer(ós)* 'black-DIM'

The suffix is not productive in Modern Greek. It only combines with colour adjectives ending in *-os* or *-ós* and creates adjectives which express approximation or similarity.

ii) <u>augmentatives</u>

The only augmentative suffix is the so-called elative or absolute superlative suffix *-tatos*.

-tatos$_{masc}$,*-i*$_{fem}$,*-o*$_{neut}$

(8) a. *malak-ótat(os)* 'very soft'
    b. *θreptik-ótat(os)* 'highly nutritious'
    c. *varí-tatos* 'extremely heavy/grave'
    d. *ɣlicítatos* 'most kind/sweet'
    e. *oreó-tatos* 'very nice'

It should be noted that *-tatos* originates from a suffix that has been used for the formation of superlative forms since Ancient Greek, while its derivational status is not a clear-cut case (cf. Chila-Markopoulou 1996; Kallergi 2013; among others). For instance, in most traditional grammars, the suffix is considered as inflectional rather than derivational. On the other hand, according to Joseph and Philippaki (1987); Chila-Markopoulou (1996) and Kallergi (2013), *-tatos* should not be considered as an inflectional, but rather as a derivational suffix. More specifically, according to Kallergi's analysis, *-tatos* carries a [+learned] feature, attaches to

adjectives stressed in the ultimate (but see also counterexamples e.g. *apésios* 'awful' - *apesiótatos* 'awful-AUGM') and appears in a number of lexicalized adjectives, i.e. it exhibits a number of idiosyncrasies, which establish its status as derivational, rather than inflectional, unlike, e.g., the Italian elative suffix *-issimo*, which is claimed to be more inflectional in nature (see Dressler and Barbaresi 1994: 495-496). Furthermore, *-tatos* is used to express certainty or appreciation or 'an opposite view' on the part of the speaker (from Kallergi 2014).

(9) A: *To kreas ðe m' aresi, ine skliro* "I don't like the meat, it's hard".
B: *To kreas ine malak-ótato* "(No,) the meat is most soft"

Finally, it should be noted that *-tatos* displays a property which is different from that of MGr diminutive suffixes: *-tatos* does combine colour adjectives. This characteristic is possibly related to the fact that the comparative and superlative degree of MGr colour adjectives is expressed periphrastically, not inflectionally.

4.2 *Prefixes & Prefixoids*

i. <u>diminutives</u>

In the domain of deadjectival adjectives, MGr has one typical diminutive prefix, *ipo-*, and one prefixoid, namely *psilo-*.

ipo-

(10) a. *ipó-lefk(os)* 'DIM-white'
b. *ipo-cítrinos* 'DIM-yellow'
c. *ipo-stróngil(os)* 'DIM-round'

The [+learned] prepositional prefix *ipo-* 'under' is of limited productivity. It is usually used in neological loan translations, especially in scientific and technical domains (e.g. *ipoγónimos* 'subfertile'), and creates adjectives which express the notion of 'less than normal or desirable' without any emotional overtones. It usually attaches to bases ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denote physical property or colour.

psilo-

(11) a. *psilo-áðj(os)* 'DIM-empty'
b. *psilo-jemát(os)* 'DIM-full'
c. *psilo-kócin(os)* 'DIM-red'
d. *psilo-ilíθi(os)* 'DIM-idiot'
e. *psilo-apótom(os)* 'DIM-abrupt'

The [-learned] prefixoid *psilo-* 'a bit' creates adjectives which express the meanings of mitigation, attenuation and imprecision (Xydopoulos 2009). It can attach to any qualitative adjective that denotes dimension, age, colour, human propensity, physical property, speed, difficulty, value or position, in order to create diminutive adjectives. It avoids attaching to

[+learned] bases (cf. Savvidou 2012). *psilo-* can co-occur with diminutive suffixes in order to mitigate negative evaluation:

(12) *psilo-xaz-úl(is)*
DIM-fool-DIM

ii. augmentatives

iper-

(13) a. *iper-órim(os)* 'AUG-ripe'
b. *iper-politel(ís)* 'AUG-luxurious'
c. *iper-plír(is)* 'AUG-full'
d. *iper-evésθit(os)* 'AUG-sensitive'
e. *ipér-lambr(os)* 'AUG-brilliant'

The [+learned] prepositional prefix *iper-* 'above, over, beyond' creates adjectives which express the notions of 'very X' or 'X in excess' ('more than normal or desirable'). It usually combines with gradable adjectives associated with a closed scale in order to denote 'excess' (*iper-órim(os)* 'overripe'), but can also combine with gradable adjectives associated with an open scale in order to express reinforcement (*iper-politel(ís)* 'super luxurious', *ipérleptos* Adj. 'ultrafine, hyperfine'; see Efthymiou 2003; Efthymiou, Fragaki and Markos 2013; Gavriilidou 2013; Efthymiou and Fragaki 2014). *iper-* often appears in neological loan translations, especially in scientific and technical domains (e.g. *iper-órimos* 'overripe'). In some cases, *iper-* can co-occur with diminutive suffixes in order to maximize quantitative and qualitative evaluation:

(14) *iper-ɣlik-úl(is)* 'AUG-sweet-DIM'

kata-

(15) a. *kata-kócin(os)* 'AUG-red'
b. *katá-mavr(os)* 'AUG-black'
c. *katá-mon(os)* 'AUG-alone'
d. *katá-kser(os)* 'AUG-dry'
e. *katá-ksanθ(os)* 'AUG-blonde'

The prepositional prefix *kata-* 'down(wards), towards, completely' combines with both positive and negative bases ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denote colour, human propensity, age or physical property (Efthymiou 2003: 524). For example, *kata-cénurj(os)* 'brand new' is an instance of prefixation with a positive base, whereas *katá-kser(os)* 'totally dried-out, bone dry' is a case involving a negative base. With relatively neutral bases, such as *kát-aspr(os)* 'totally-white' and *kata-cítrin(os)* 'totally-yellow', the meaning of the derived adjective depends on the particular context of use. It usually combines with gradable adjectives associated with a closed scale in order to denote 'absolute completeness' (see also Gavriilidou 2013). According to Kallergi (2013) *kata-* can also express an exaggeration or overstatement.

olo-

(16) a. *oló-mavr(os)* ‘AUG-black’
b. *oló-fresk(os)* ‘AUG-fresh’
c. *oló-isç(os)* ‘AUG-straight’
d. *olo-káθar(os)* ‘AUG-clean’
e. *olo-cénurj(os)* ‘AUG-new’

The prefixoid *olo-* ‘all-’ tends to combine with positive bases ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denote colour, age or physical property (Efthymiou 2003: 524): *olokáθaros* ‘extremely clean’, *olóisços* ‘extremely straight’, *olocénurjos* ‘brand new’ (cf. also Delveroudi and Vassilaki 1999; Gavriilidou 2013).

θeo-

(17) a. *θeó-ftox(os)* ‘AUG-poor’
b. *θeó-kuf(os)* ‘AUG-deaf’
c. *θeó-murl(os)* ‘AUG-nuts’
d. *θeo-nístik(os)* ‘AUG-hungry’

The prefixoid *θeo-* ‘god’ attaches to bases denoting negative properties and creates words that easily acquire negative connotations (see e.g. Efthymiou 2003: 524) or express an exaggeration or overstatement: *θeoskótinos* ‘completely dark’, *θeótrelos* ‘totally crazy’, *θeójimnos* ‘totally naked’ (Kallergi 2013; see also Symeonidis 1985; Anastasiadi-Symeonidi 2008; Gavriilidou 2013). It avoids attaching to [+learned] bases (Savvidou 2012). Finally, it must be noted that the majority of these adjectival bases ending in *–os* or *-ós* denote human propensity or physical property. In particular, Symeonidis (1985: 117) notes that it is often used to form words that denote physical or mental dysfunction: e.g., *θeó-kutsos* ‘absolutely lame’. He also argues that *θeo-* expresses “something more intense” than *kata-* and *olo-* (ibid: 113).

pan-

(18) a. *pan-árçe(os)* ‘AUG-ancient’
b. *pan-éksipn(os)* ‘AUG-clever’
c. *pan-ákriv(os)* ‘AUG-expensive’
d. *pam-pónir(os)* ‘AUG-cunning’
e. *pál-lefk(os)* ‘AUG-white’
f. *pan-éfkol(os)* ‘AUG-easy’

The prefixoid *pan-* ‘all, every’ usually attaches to bases that denote age, difficulty, value or human propensity and creates adjectives that express the meanings ‘very X’ or ‘absolute completeness’ (see Efthymiou 2003; Gavriilidou 2013). The prefixoid avoids attaching to [-learned] bases. It avoids attaching to colour adjectives with the exception of the [-learned] adjective *lefk(os)* ‘white’.

penda- and *tetra-*

(19) a. *penda-káθar(os)* 'AUG-clean'
b. *pendá-morf(os)* 'AUG-beautiful'
c. *pendá-rfan(os)* 'AUG-orphan'
d. *penda-nóstimos* 'AUG-tasty'

(20) a. *tetrá-pax(os)* 'AUG-fat'
b. *tetrá-psil(os)* 'AUG-tall'
c. *tetra-δístix(os)* 'AUG-miserable'

The prefixoids *penda-* 'five' and *tetra-* 'four' are not productive in Modern Greek. They attach to bases ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denote physical property, dimension or human propensity and create adjectives that express the meanings 'very X' or 'absolute completeness' (see Fotiou 1998; Gavriilidou 2013).

tris-

(21) a. *tris-áθlios* 'AUG-wretched, miserable'
b. *tris-eftiçizmenos* 'AUG-happy'
c. *tris-xaritoménos* 'AUG-cute'
d. *tris-skótinos* 'AUG-dark'

The prefixoid *tris-* 'thrice' attaches to bases ending in *-os* or *-ós* that denote human propensity or physical property and derives adjectives that express the meanings 'very X' or 'absolute completeness' (Triandafyllidis 1998).

5. Prefix-suffix asymmetry in Modern Greek diminutive and augmentative adjectives: discussion and conclusion

The discussion of the properties Modern Greek diminutive and augmentative deadjectival adjectives can be summarized in Tables 2 and 3 that follow:

diminutive adjectives	
prefixes/prefixoids	Suffixes
ipo-	*-útsikos*
psilo-	*-úlis*
	-úlikos
	-ulós
	-opós
	-iδerós

Table 2 *Prefix-suffix asymmetry in diminutive adjectives*

augmentative adjectives	
prefixes/prefixoids	Suffixes
iper-	*-tatos?*
olo-	
kata-	
θeo-	
pan-	
tetra-	
penda-	
tris-	

Table 3 *Prefix-suffix asymmetry in augmentative adjectives*

The information in Tables 2 and 3 and the detailed description in section 4 seem to suggest a number of points. First, in Modern Greek deadjectival diminutive and augmentative adjectives the meaning of augmentation (intensification) is (almost) always expressed by prepositional prefixes or prefixoids and the meaning of diminution (attenuation) is almost always expressed by suffixes. Second, the only augmentative suffix of MGr is *-tatos*, i.e. a suffix with ambiguous morphological status. Third, in MGr evaluative adjectives affection is always expressed by suffixes (e.g. *-úlis*, *-úlikos*). Fourth, not all augmentative or diminutive MGr prefixes and suffixes express qualitative evaluation. This usually holds with [+learned] or non-productive affixes like *ipo-*, *-iδerós* and *-opós*.

These findings reveal an asymmetry in the expression of diminution and augmentation, but do not verify Grandi and Montermini's proposal that the meaning GOOD (i.e. appraisal, affection, intensification) is (almost) always expressed by prefixes and the meaning BAD (i.e. contempt, attenuation) is always expressed (if expressed morphologically) by suffixes. Another interesting remark about MGr deadjectival adjectives is that the so-called 'marked' category of augmentatives is expressed by the 'less preferred/marked' category of prefixes. However, it should be noted that the data on the prefixes, prefixoids and suffixes in Tables 2 and 3 (8 diminutives vs. 9 augmentatives) cannot offer a basis for arguing that, in this particular domain, augmentatives are less widespread than diminutives or that 'intensification is unmarked, deintensification marked'.

Acknowledgments

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

References

ANASTASIADIS-SYMEONIDIS, Anna. 2002. *Reverse Dictionary of Modern Greek.* Thessaloniki: Institouto Neoellinikon Spoudon, 2002. [in Greek]

ANASTASIADIS-SYMEONIDIS, Anna. 2008. The morpheme *θeo-* in Greek. In *Festschrift for Prof. G. Babiniotis*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 2008, pp. 99-113.

ANDERSON, Stephen. 1992. *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

BABINIOTIS, George. 2002. *Dictionary of Modern Greek*. Athens: Lexicology Centre, 2002.

BAUER, Laurie. 1996. No phonetic iconicity in evaluative morphology. In *Studia Linguistica* 1996, vol. 50.2, pp. 189-206.

BAUER, Laurie. 1997. Evaluative morphology: In search of universals. In *Studies in Language* 1997, vol 21.3, pp, 533-575.

BYBEE, Joan. 1985. *Morphology. A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1985.

CHILA-MARKOPOULOU, Despina. 1986. *The Modern Greek Comparatives*. *A syntactic analysis of the comparative form of MGr adjectives and adverbs.* Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Athens, 1986. [in Greek]

DELVEROUDI, Rea, VASSILAKI, Sophie. 1999. Préfixes d' intensité en grec moderne: *para-*, *kata-*, *poly-* et *olo-*. In A. DESCHAMPS, J. GUILLEMIN-FLESCHER (eds.), *Les Opérations de Détermination: Quantification/Qualification*, 1999, Paris: Ophrys, pp. 149-167.

DRESSLER, Wolfgang U., MERLINI BARBARESI, Lavinia. 1992. Italian diminutives as non-prototypical word formation. In TONELLI, L., DRESSLER, W. (eds.), *Natural morphology - Perspectives for the Nineties*. Padova: Unipress, 1992, pp. 21-30.

DRESSLER, Wolfgang, MERLINI-BARBARESI Lavinia. 1994. *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and Intensifiers in Italian, German and Other languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.

EFTHYMIOU, Angeliki. 2003. Prefixes or first elements denoting intensification in Modern Greek. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 2002, pp. 519-528 [in Greek].

EFTHYMIOU, Angeliki, FRAGAKI, Georgia, MARKOS, Angelos. 2013. On the meaning and productivity of the Modern Greek prefix *iper-*: A corpus-based study. Paper presented at the *11th International Conference of Greek Linguistics*, 26-29 September 2013, University of the Aegean, Rhodes, 2013.

EFTHYMIOU, Angeliki, FRAGAKI, Georgia. 2014. Exploring the polysemy of the Modern Greek prefix *iper-*. Paper presented at "*the Semantics of Derivational Morphology: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Modeling" Conference*, Düsseldorf, Germany, 30 June-1st July 2014.

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

FOTIOU, Nikolaos. 1998. *Augmentative prefixation and intensification in Modern Greek*. Unpublished MA thesis. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1998. [in Greek]

GAVRIILIDOU, Zoe. 2013. *Aspects of Intensity in Modern Greek.* Thessaloniki: Kiriakidis, 2013. [in Greek].

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

GRANDI Nicola, MONTERMINI, Fabio. 2005. Prefix-suffix neutrality in evaluative morphology, in BOOIJ, G., *et al.* (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th Mediterranean Meeting of Morphology*. Available at: http://mmm.lingue.unibo.it/mmm-proc/MMM4/143-156-Grandi-Montermini-MMM4.pdf

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

JURAFSKY, Daniel. 1996. Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. *Language* 1996, vol. 72.3, pp. 522-578.

KALLERGI, Haritini. 2013. *Reduplication at the word level: The Greek facts in a typological perspective.* Ph.D. Thesis. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2013.

KÖRTVÉLYESSY, Lívia. 2012. *Evaluative morphology from cross-linguistic perspective*. Budapest: Habilitationsschrift: ELTE, 2012.

KÖRTVÉLYESSY, Lívia. 2014. Evaluative derivation. In R. LIEBER, P. ŠTEKAUER (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 296-316.

MELISSAROPOULOU, Dimitra, RALLI, Angela. 2008. Headedness in diminutive formation: Evidence from Modern Greek and its dialectal variation. In *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 2008, vol. 55, pp. 183-204.

MELISSAROPOULOU, Dimitra. forthcoming. Modern Greek. In GRANDI, N., KÖRTVÉLYESSY, L. (eds.), *Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

NIEUWENHUIS, Paul. 1985. *Diminutives*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation: University of Edinburgh, 1985

SAVVIDOU, Paraskevi. 2012. Mitigation and intensification with the use of the morphemes θeo- and psilo-. A corpus-based analysis. In GAVRIILIDOU, Z., A. EFTHYMIOU, E. THOMADAKI & P. KAMBAKIS-VOUGIOUKLIS (eds.), *Selected Papers of the 10th International Conference of Greek Linguistics.* Komotini, Greece: Democritus University of Thrace, 2012, pp. 1090-1099. [in Greek]

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

SCALISE, Sergio. 1988. The notion of 'head' in morphology. In G. BOOIJ, J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1988*, Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 229-246.

ŠTEKAUER, Pavol, VALERA, Salvador, KÖRTVÉLYESSY, Lívia. 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* 1993, vo. 29, pp. 1-36.

SYMEONIDIS, Charalambos. 1985. Contribution to the interpretation of Modern Greek compounds with *θεο-* as first constituent. In *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 1985, vol. 5, pp. 111-120. [In Greek]

SZYMANEK, Bogdan. 1988. *Categories and Categorization in Morphology*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1988.

TRIANDAFYLLIDIS Dictionary. 1998. *Standard Modern Greek Dictionary*. Institute of Hellenic Studies, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1998. [In Greek]

XYDOPOULOS, Georgios. J. 2009. *Psilo-*: Exploring the case of a 'diminutive' in Modern Greek. In Tsangalidis, A. (ed.) *Selected Papers from the 18th International Symposium of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*. Thessaloniki: Monochromia, 1009, pp. 397-405.

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

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/04.pdf>. ISSN 1336- 782X.