Development and spread of augmentative suffixes in the Mediterranean area
Nicola Grandi

1. Introductory remarks[1]

All the typological surveys in the field of the so-called evaluative morphology agree in asserting that "augmentatives represent a marked category opposed to the unmarked category of diminutives" (Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994: 430). Mediterranean languages seem to confirm this generalization. Grammars reveal that augmentatives are considerably less widespread than diminutives: they productively occur only in some Romance languages (Italian, Catalan, Spanish and Portuguese), in Modern Greek and in South Slavonic languages (except for Slovenian),[2] while diminutives are attested in all the languages spoken in this area, even if with different degrees of productivity. Moreover, the formal and semantic behaviour of augmentatives appears to be less homogeneous than that of diminutives: as far as the languages of the Mediterranean area are concerned, augmentatives display various derivational patterns, with different interpretations, as can be seen in (1):

1)[3]   a. **Na > Na**
It.   gatt(o)-one
         cat:N$_{[+ anim]}$.M-AUG.N$_{[+ anim]}$.M / 'big cat'
         barc(a)-one
         boat:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-AUG.N$_{[- anim]}$.M / 'big boat'
Sp.   hombr(e)-ón
         man:N$_{[+ hum]}$.M-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'hulk of a man'
         caj(a)-ón
         case:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-AUG.N$_{[- anim]}$.M / 'large case'
Port.   aban(o)-ão
         shock:N$_{[-anim]}$.M-AUG.N$_{[-anim]}$.M / 'great shock'
         ceir(a)-ão
         woven basket:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-AUG.N$_{[- anim]}$.M / 'large woven basket'
M.Gr.   κλεφτ(ης)-αράς
         thief:N$_{[+ hum]}$.M-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'big thief'
         κεφαλ(ι)-άς
         head:N$_{[- anim]}$.NTR-AUG.N$_{[- anim]}$.M / 'big head'

---

[2] As it will appear in § 4, data suggest that also French, Maltese and Moroccan Arabic are probably developing some kinds of augmentative suffixes.
[3] Data presented and discussed in this paper are from the following grammars and monographies: **French:** Weber (1963); **Italian:** Ratti *et al.* (1988); **Portuguese:** Allen (1941); **Rumanian:** Lupi (1949), Mallison (1986); **Spanish:** Ambruzzi (1955), Green (1988), Falco & Cecchini (1957), Lázaro Mora (1999); **Modern Greek:** Sotiropoulos (1972), Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton (1987, Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton (1997), Daltas (1995); **Latin and Ancient Greek:** Chantraine (1933), Schwyzer (1953), Lazzeroni (1963), Leutmann (1977), Gaide (1988); **Bulgarian:** Feuillet (1996), Scatton (1984); **Macedonian:** Foulon-Hristova (1998); **Old Church Slavonic:** Nandriş (1965²); **Slavonic Languages** in general: Vaillant (1974); **Maltese:** Krier (1976), Borg & Alexander-Azzopardi (1997); **Moroccan Arabic:** Caubet (1993).

      b. **N/A/V > N$_{[+ hum]}$.M**

It.   fif(a)-one
      fear:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'a frightened person'
      facil(e)-one
      easy:A-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'a superficial person'
      brontol(are)-one
      to grumble:V-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'grumbler'

Sp.   barrig(a)-ón
      belly:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-N.AUG$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'big-bellied person'
      ric(o)-ón
      rich:A-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'a very rich person'
      com(er)-il-on
      to eat:V-INTF-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'hearty eater'

Port.   gargant(a)-ão
      throat:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-N.AUG$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'glutton'
      beat(o)-ão
      blessed:A-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'great hypocrite'
      mand(ar)-ão
      to command:V-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'one who likes to command'

M.Gr. γλωσσ(α)-άς
      tongue:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'chatter box, loquacious person'
      καθάστ(ος)-ακας
      seated:A-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'lazy bone'
      φον(άζω)-ακλάς
      to shout:V-AUG.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'one who shouts a lot'[4]

The label 'augmentative' does not describe the way the suffixes in (1) (It. –*one*, Sp. *-ón*, Port. *-ão* and M.Gr. –άς) work in a satisfactory way. In fact, only words listed in (1a.)[5] comply with the two specific properties of evaluative morphology: categorial neutrality (that is, evaluative suffixes do not change the syntactic category of the base) and alteration (vs. change) of the conceptual meaning of the base (this means that the base word and the 'evaluated' word always have the same referent).[6] The other words ending in –*one*, *-ón*, *-ão* and –άς, listed in (1b.),[7] exhibit a different but otherwise regular behaviour: they designate human beings characterized by a showy property (physical or not) or used to doing some form of despicable or exaggerated action. In this case, we are dealing with typical derivational suffixes: in fact they always form masculine animate nouns, often changing the category of the base, and they always introduce a new human referent.

So, in general terms, we observe that most Mediterranean augmentative suffixes are productively used to derive both typical evaluative forms, whose interpretation corresponds to the paraphrase 'big X', and animate nouns with

---

[4] Moden Greek has a set of various augmentative suffixes ending in –άς: -ακλάς, -ακας, -άρας, etc… It is beyond the aim of this paper to investigate the origin of each single suffix and the nature of the items preceding the suffix –άς (-ακλ, -άσ-, -αρ-, etc…). So, I will consider them as 'complex variants' of the simple suffix –άς.

[5] Which, in my database, are approx. the 20 % of the whole set of words ending in –*one*, *-ón*, *-ão* and –άς.

[6] For a exhaustive survey of specific properties of the so-called evaluative morphology see Stump (1993) and Bauer (1997).

[7] Approx. the 80 % of the whole.

a pejorative meaning, the semantic reading of which can be represented by the paraphrase 'one who is/has/makes X to a high degree'. This particular polysemy seems to be a specific peculiarity of languages spoken around the Mediterranean and, in a typological perspective, appears to be very rare among world's languages[8]. So, one can legitimately wonder if this phenomenon allows us to identify if not a Mediterranean linguistic area as a whole, at least a Mediterranean sub-area. The main aim of this paper will be to answer this question, analysing extensively the available data.

2. From Latin to Romance Languages and from Ancient Greek to Modern Greek

To begin with, it is necessary to understand the relation between the 'typical' evaluative meaning in (1a.) and the derivational-pejorative meaning in (1b.). To solve this problem, it is essential to have a look at the history of the suffixes involved. So, in this section I will draw a parallel sketch of the evolution of the three previously mentioned Romance suffixes (It. *–one*, Sp. *-ón*, Port. *–ão*), which are the outcome of a single Latin suffix, *-(i)o, -(i)ōnis*, and of Modern Greek augmentative suffixes in –ᾶς, which are the result of two closely related Ancient Greek suffixes, -ᾶς and –ίας.

Neither in Latin nor in Ancient Greek 'typical' augmentative suffixes were attested. So, for example, in Latin it was impossible to say 'big dog' by adding a suffix to the word for dog. However, both Latin and Ancient Greek had some very productive derivational suffixes at their disposal, Lat. *-(i)o, -(i)ōnis* and A.Gr. -ᾶς and —ίας, attested in different formations with different semantic readings. In the great majority of their occurrences, these suffixes were used to form masculine animate nouns designating human beings with a particular, often physical, characteristic or with the habit of making an action in an exaggerated way:

2)   a. **N[-anim]-PEJ > N[+ hum].M**[9]
Lat.   gānĕ(a)-o
        tavern:N[- anim].F-PEJ.N[+ hum].M / 'guzzler, a dissolute person'
        ment(um)-o
        chin:N[- anim].NTR-PEJ.N[+ hum].M / 'person with protruding chin'
A.Gr.   κορυζ(α)-ᾶς
        snot, mucus from the nose:N[- anim].F-PEJ.N[+ hum].M / 'whipper-snapper'
        πωγων-ίας

---

[8] Cf. Bauer (1997) and (1999).

[9] In complex words listed in (2) and in the following data, suffixes which express the paraphrase 'one who is/has/makes X to a high degree' are glossed as pejoratives even if their function seems to be more derivational than evaluative. Nevertheless. I think that the label 'pejorative' represents their meaning in the best way.

beard:N$_{[- anim]}$.M-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'bearded person'

b. V-PEJ > N$_{[+ hum]}$.M

Lat. err(āre)-o
to ramble, to wander about:V-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'rambler, vagabond, wanderer; deserter'
mand(ěre)-o
to bite, to chew:V-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'hearty eater'

A.Gr. καταφαγ(εῖν)-ᾶς
to eat, to devour, to squander:V-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'squanderer'

c. A-PEJ > N$_{[+ hum]}$.M

Lat. mīr(us)-ĭo
wonderful, marvellous:A-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'monstre'
miscell(us)-io
mixed, various:A-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'muddler, bungler'

A.Gr. γυναικ(εῖος)-ίας
womanly, feminine:A-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'womanish man'

The semantic reading of data in (2) can be brought back to the paraphrase 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree'. The use of these suffixes in onomastics, and specifically in the formation of *cognomina*, proper names of mask-characters and nicknames, is a consequence of their meaning:

3) Latin:
a. *cognomina:*
Nās(us)-o
nose:N$_{[- anim]}$.M-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Nasone' (lit. 'who has a particular nose')
pēs[10] > Pěd-o
'foot'   foot:N$_{[- anim]}$.M-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Pedone' (lit. 'flat-footed person')
Tūběr-o
excrescence:N$_{[- anim]}$.NTR-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Tuberone' (lit. 'herniated person; person with an excrescence')
b. proper names of mask-characters and actors:
Bucc(a)-o
mouth; cheek:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Bucco' (a character of *fabulae Atellanae*; lit. 'silly, insolent')
Turp(is)-ĭo
ugly, repulsive:A-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Turpione' (name of a comic actor)

4) Ancient Greek:
a. nicknames:
Μηνόδωρος > Μηνᾶς
Νικομήδης > Νικομᾶς
b. epithets:
Λοξ(ός)-ίας
oblique, ambiguous:A-PEJ.N$_{[+ anim]}$.M / 'oblique' (epithet of Apollon; probably because of the ambiguity of his oracles)
c. Proper Names:
᾽Αμυν(α)-ίας
defence:N$_{[- anim]}$.F-PEJ.N$_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Aminia' (lit. 'ready to defend himself')

---

[10] Genitive: *pĕdis.*

As usual, a particular characteristic gives rise to a nickname that afterwards can 'crystallize'; in this way it no longer designates a single person, but his (or her) entire family.

Latin and Ancient Greek data in (2) can thus be completely assimilated to the data regarding Romance and Modern Greek in (1b.): all the suffixes involved share the same pejorative meaning and the same formal behaviour (they all form masculine human nouns).

On the basis of this consideration and of the fact that Latin and Ancient Greek did not have 'typical' augmentative suffixes, it can be asserted that the original meaning of present-day Romance and Modern Greek augmentative suffixes in (1) is that expressed by words in (1b.): it carries on the original semantic value of Latin and Ancient Greek suffixes in (2), (3) and (4). The passage to the evaluative function is intuitively clear: the suffix no longer designates the possessor of an unusual property, but it identifies the property itself.[11] So, a word such as Latin *căpĭto* (from the noun *caput* 'head') originally indicated a 'big-headed person' and, then, in late Latin, just a 'big head'. So, Romance and Modern Greek augmentative suffixes are the result of derivational suffixes originally used to form animate (often human) nouns. The polysemy of Romance and Modern Greek data in (1) synchronically represents two different stages in the process of this transformation and reveals that there is a close link between augmentatives and animacy. This link is confirmed by the fact these suffixes are very often found in onomastics.

3. The link between augmentatives and animacy

In a typological perspective, the process outlined above seems to be a very rare strategy among world's languages. The polysemy 'big X' ~ 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree', which represents a clear consequence of the link between 'augmentation' and animacy, seems not to be attested outside the area corresponding approximately to regions where Latin and Ancient Greek were spoken.

This situation gives rise to other important questions. First of all, it is necessary to understand why this phenomenon is restricted to this area. Secondly, we must wonder whether the semantic similarities between Romance and Modern Greek augmentative suffixes are the result of a single evolutive path or are due to parallel developments.

---

[11] For Latin, cf. Gaide (1988: 126): "[l]e sème augmentatif («virtuel») que présente le suffixe dans ce type est à l'origine d'une évolution fonctionnelle du suffixe du latin aux langues romanes: dans la Romania du Sud après base substantivale le

To shed light on these issues, a further brief premise is necessary. In fact, the sketch of Ancient Greek derivational suffixes with a possible pejorative meaning outlined above is not yet complete. Ancient Greek also had at its disposal the highly productive suffix –(ί)ων, which is closely related to Latin *-(i)o, –(i)ōnis*, since both of them belong to the broad family of Indoeuropean **-ōn-* suffixes: "[i]l est bien établi que la plupart des grands groupes de l'ensemble indo-européen présentent des dérivés en **-e/on-*, qui désignent le plus souvent des êtres vivants ou des «agissants»" (Gaide 1988: 17).[12]

Also the suffix –(ί)ων was used to form masculine animate nouns (5), the meaning of which is related to the paraphrase 'one who is/has/makes X to a high degree', and proper names (6):[13]

5)   a. $N_{[-anim]}$ - **ων > $N_{[+ hum]}$.M**
ϰέντρ(ον)-ων
goad:$N_{[- anim]}$.NTR-PEJ.$N_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'person scarred by *kéntron*; tortured scoundrel'
πέδ(η)-ων
chain, shackles:$N_{[- anim]}$.F-PEJ.$N_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'shackled slave'
b. **A–ίων > $N_{[+ hum]}$.M**
δείλαϰρ(oV)-íwn
poor:A-PEJ.$N_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'poor person'
μάϰρ(ός)-ίων
big, long:A-PEJ.$N_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'long-headed person'

6)   <u>proper names of mask-characters, actors and parasites:</u>
Γνάθ(ος)-ων
jaw:$N_{[- anim]}$.M-PEJ.$N_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Gnatóne' (name of a parasite; lit. 'hearty eater')
Πλάτ(ύς)-ων
large:A -PEJ.$N_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Platone' (lit. 'large-shouldered person')
Χείλ(ος)-ων
lip:$N_{[- anim]}$.M-PEJ.$N_{[+ hum]}$.M / 'Cheilone' (lit. 'big-lipped person')

So, the formal and and semantic behaviour of –(ί)wn is very similar to that of Latin *-(i)o, –(i)ōnis* and of Ancient Greek –ᾶς / –ίας: it displays a link with animacy, which is confirmed by its frequent use in onomastics. However, it is necessary to point out that while derived words in **-ōn-* are attested in many Indoeuropean languages, this particular pejorative meaning is a distinguishing feature of Romance languages and Modern

---

suffixe a généralement une valeur augmentative (de «virtuel» le sème augmentatif est devenu «denotatif»; la valeur de «caractérisation» s'est effacée)".
[12] For data from Germanic languages, cf. Ramat (1988[2]: 103).
[13] Ancient Greek suffix –(ί)ων was used in other derivational patterns too (i.e. to form locatives (see data in (15), names of professions and jobs, etc…).

Greek.[14] Therefore it is necessary to investigate whether these remarkable similarities between Latin and Ancient Greek suffixes are due to parallel developments or due to the contact between the languages concerned. There is evidence in favour of this second solution: some situations suggest that Latin *–(i)o, -(i)ōnis* has been under the influence of Ancient Greek -(ἱ)ων and -(ἱ)ας / -ᾶς . Firstly, Latin words which reveal a clear Greek origin are highly widespread:

7)   a. <u>calques:</u>
Lat.   verbĕr-ō
        whip:N$_{[-\text{anim}]}$.NTR-PEJ.N$_{[+\text{hum}]}$.M / 'a man who must to be whipped, rascal'
        built on
A.Gr.   μάστιξ   >   μαστιγ-ίας
        'whip'   whip:N$_{[-\text{anim}]}$.F-PEJ.N$_{[+\text{hum}]}$.M / 'a man who must to be whipped, rascal'

Lat.   cŏmĕd(ere)-ō
        to eat, to devour, to squander:V-PEJ.N$_{[+\text{hum}]}$.M / 'squanderer'
        built on
A.Gr.   καταφαγ(εῖν)-ᾶς
        to eat, to devour, to squander:V-PEJ.N$_{[+\text{hum}]}$.M / 'squanderer'

        b. <u>loanwords:</u>
Lat.   lătrō   <   A.Gr.   Látrwn
        'mercenary soldier'[15]
Lat.   sălăcō   <   A.Gr.   salákwn
        'braggart, conceited person'   'one who gives oneself airs, conceited person'

        c. <u>hybrid formations (Greek base and Latin suffix):</u>
A.Gr.   φαγεῖν   >   Lat.   phăgō
        'eat'   'hearty eater'[16]
A.Gr.   τόκος   >   Lat.   tocullĭō
        'interest on a loan'   'usurer'[17]

Secondly, a survey of Latin literary texts shows that the occurrence of words in *–(i)o, -(i)ōnis* is high especially in the works of authors influenced by Greek comedy (where words in –(ἱ)ων and –(ἱ)ας / -ᾶς are very widespread): Plautus, Terence, Horace, Petronius, Varro (mainly in *Saturae Menippeae*), etc... Finally, even in Latin *cognomina* formed by the addition of *–(i)o, -(i)ōnis* we find many Greek names. Therefore, in conclusion, all these situations induce us to agree with Lazzeroni (1963: 38), who states that "la fortuna di una classe di sostantivi in *-ōn-* dal significato peggiorativo […] dipende, in latino, dall'influenza greca esercitatasi attraverso la

---

[14] Cf. Lazzeroni (1963: 13).

[15] The Greek word is a proper name. The Latin word is attested both as a common and a proper name.

[16] In this case it is necessary to assume an hybrid formation, since the Greek form *φάγων is not attested.

commedia, la farsa, il mimo e l'onomastica." The main result of this interaction between Ancient Greek and Latin suffixes is the link between 'augmentation' and animacy, outlined above and revealed by the polysemy 'big X' ~ 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree'.

4. The link between augmentatives and animacy in the other Mediterranean languages.

The diachronic path described above explains the restricted distribution of the polysemy exemplified by data in (1): it is part of Ancient Greek and Latin heritage and, as a consequence, it can be easily foreseen that its spread coincides approximately with regions where these two languages were spoken.

Now, it is necessary to answer the question left unanswered at the end of § 1: does this specific feature allows us to identify a Mediterranean linguistic (sub-)area ? This question becomes even more relevant if we consider that, as it is well-known, Latin and Ancient Greek were not spoken only in present-day Italy, Spain, Portugal or Greece, but they were used in a broader area, including many other Mediterranean countries. Therefore, in the next section of this paper I will take into consideration some other Mediterranean languages in order to understand if the correlation between 'augmentation' and animacy has other attestations in the area that I am investigating.

4.1. French suffix *–ard*

All French grammars agree in asserting that French lacks augmentative suffixes. Nevertheless some data indicate that it is possible to adopt a different and less radical position regarding this matter and that French is now developing at least an augmentative suffix. It is interesting to check the origin of this suffix, since it is well-known that the French form resulting from Latin *–(i)o, -(i)ōnis* (that is the suffix *–on*) has a diminutive and singulative meaning.[18] Consequently, when French begins grammaticalizing the category 'augmentation', some centuries later than neighbouring Romance languages, the most natural candidate to fill this function is no more available. Nevertheless, in spite of this initial obstacle, French has taken an evolutive path which parallels that described above for Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Modern Greek: it is turning into augmentative a suffix used to form masculine (often human) nouns the meaning of which corresponds to the paraphrase 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree'.

---

[17] It seems necessary to recontruct a diminutive form *τοκύλλιον as an intermediate stage between the Greek base and the Latin derived word.

[18] Cf. for example *ânon* 'small donkey' (< *âne* 'donkey') and *grêlon* 'hailstone' (< *grêle* 'hail').

The suffix involved is –*ard*; its original meaning is that expressed by complex words in (8):

8)   pleur(er)-ard
        to cry-AUG / 'moaner'
        corn(e)-ard
        horn-PEJ / 'deceived husband'

The result of its semantic transformation appears from words such as (9):

9)   meul(e)-ard
        grindstone:F-AUG.M / 'large grindstone'

These data lead to the following three considerations. Firstly, it is possible to make the hypothesis that this transformation has begun due to the the pressure of neighbouring Romance languages. Secondly, once again animacy plays a crucial role in the development of an augmentative suffix. Finally, the suffix involved is Germanic, therefore not of Latin origin. Regarding this matter, it essential to put emphasis on the fact that the polysemy 'big X' ~ 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree', attested in its French occurrences, is not attested in Germanic languages, in which, however, the suffix retains some productivity. This situation seems to suggest that the link between 'augmentation' and animacy is a specific feature of Mediterranean area.

4.2. Rumanian suffix –*an*

The suffix –*an* is of Slavic origin and in Slavonic languages (i.e. in Bulgarian) it is used to derive animate nouns whose pejorative meaning can be brought back to the paraphrase 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree'.[19] Therefore, the suffix inherently correlates with animacy. This meaning is attested in Rumanian words such as

10)   lung-án
        long:A-AUG.N$_{[+\ um]}$. M / 'lanky fellow'

It is extremely intriguing that in Rumanian (but not in Slavonic languages !) the suffix can form also some augmentative nouns:

11)   beţiv-án
        drunkard-AUG / 'great drunkard'
        şoim-an
        hawk-DIM / 'large hawk'

Consequently, it is possible that the convergence of the semantic reading 'big X' on a suffix expressing the meaning 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree' may be an innovation determined by the passing of the suffix from Slavonic languages to a Romance language, since, as stated above, among Romance languages this semantic matching is largely attested.

4.3. The suffix –*ište* in Bulgarian

Nevertheless, this last statement does not mean that Slavonic languages lack suffixes which can express the two meanings under investigation. On the contrary, among South Slavonic languages a few suffixes that show the polysemy 'big X' ~ 'one who is/makes/has X to a high degree' are attested.

The Slavic suffix –*ište* is augmentative in Bulgarian and Macedonian and, outside the Mediterranean area, in Russian, Polish and Czech:

12)   Blg.   det(é)-ište
                child-AUG / 'big child'
                žen(á)-íšte
                woman-AUG / 'big, hefty woman'
        Mac.   čovek >   čoveč-ište
                'man'   man-AUG / 'huge man'

According to Vaillant (1974: 422), this suffix is the outcome of a Common Slavonic locative suffix: "en vieux slave ce suffixe se tire en principe de substantifs et fournit des noms qui indiquent le lieu". This meaning was attested in Old Church Slavonic and has been retained in Modern Slavonic Languages:

13)   OCS   grobište
                        'cemetery'
        Rus.   gúl'bišče
                        '(public) walk'
        Slov.   brodíšče
                        'place from which ferry-boats pass'

---

[19] Cf. Blg. *golemán* 'person who has greatness mania' (< *golemeja* 'to increase, to enlarge').

Moreover, in Bulgarian (but not in Russian, Polish and Czech !) a few animate nouns ending in *–ište* and expressing the meaning 'one who is/has/makes X to a high degree' do occur:

14)   Blg.   čúdo   >   čudó-v-ište
                'wonder'   wonder:N$_{[- anim]}$.NTR-INTF-AUG.N$_{[+ anim]}$.NTR / 'monster'[20]

Therefore, like in other Mediterranean languages, even in Bulgarian the two meanings 'big X' and 'one who is/has/makes X to a high degree' can be expressed by means of a unique suffix. In this case, we have a 'threefold polysemy': the suffix *–ište* forms locatives, augmentatives and a few animate nouns with a pejorative nuance. It is beyond the aim of this paper to investigate how the augmentative (and even the animate / pejorative) meaning might have developed from the original locative interpretation. However, I want to put emphasis on the fact that this 'threefold' polysemy is not a *unicum* in Mediterranean area. In fact an equivalent situation was attested in Ancient Greek, where the suffix -(ἰ)ων (cf. (5) and (6) above) was used to derive locatives too:

15)   ᾿ελαία   >   ᾿ελαι-ών
       'olive tree'   olive tree-LOC / 'olive grove'
       οἶνος   >   οἰν-ών
       'wine'   wine-LOC / 'wine-cellar'
       ἵππος   >   ἱππ-ών
       'horse'   horse-LOC / 'stable'

These data suggest that it is possible to find traces of Greek influence in the development of the Bulgarian polysemous augmentative suffix.[21] Therefore, it is important to stress that, among Slavonic languages, only those languages historically related to Latin and Greek have developed polysemous suffixes displaying the link between 'augmentation' and animacy, which clearly represents an indication of Latin and Greek influence.

4.5. Maltese and Moroccan Arabic

Semitic evaluative morphology is usually said to be quite complex, but unproductive. Moreover, it seems to be limited to diminutives. Some data from Maltese and Moroccan Arabic reveal that exceptions to this statement do exist. In fact, in Maltese and Moroccan Arabic there is a suffix *–un*, clearly related to Romance forms resulting

---

[20] Note that this derived word is [+ animate], even if it is neuter.

from Latin *-(i)o, -(i)ōnis*. It can be used both as a 'typical' augmentative suffix (19) and as a derivational suffix designating human beings characterized by a showy property (physical or not) or used to doing a some form of despicable or exaggerated action (20):

16)	Mrc.Ar.	sbaɛ-ūn	
		lion-AUG / 'enormous lion'	
		šəms-ūn	
		sun-AUG / 'sun shining intensely'	
	Mlt.	ġiebia >	ġibj-un
		'basin'	basin-AUG / '(big) well'

17)	Mrc.Ar.	dbaɛ >	dəbɛ-ūn
		'hyena'	hyena:$N_{[+ \text{anim}][- \text{hum}]}$-AUG.$N_{[+ \text{hum}]}$.M / 'an awful, bad person'
		ẓləṭ >	ẓəlṭ-ūn
		'poverty'	poverty:$N_{[- \text{anim}]}$-AUG.$N_{[+ \text{hum}]}$.M / 'a very poor person'
		ṭləq >	ṭəlq-ūn
		'to let s.o. go'	to let s.o. go:V-AUG.$N_{[+ \text{hum}]}$.M / 'a confirmed bachelor'

Of course, Maltese and Moroccan Arabic suffix *–un* represents a case of borrowing from Romance languages (probably from Italian or Sicilian). The meaningful point of this phenomenon is that in complex words listed in (19) and (20) this Romance suffix is used in combination with Semitic bases; in other words, we are dealing with hybrid formations very similar to those presented in (7c.). This demonstrates that Maltese and Moroccan native speakers do not feel the suffix *–un* as an unusual or foreign linguistic item; on the contrary it seems to be completely integrated into the language system. As a consequence, we can legitimately assert that in a few Semitic languages augmentative suffixes do exist and, moreover, they display the link with animacy revealed by the polysemy 'big X' ~ 'one who is/has/makes X to a high degree'.[22] It is probably not by chance that the only two Semitic languages in which polysemous augmentatives are attested are spoken in the Mediterranean area.

5. Parallel developments or areal contact ?

Data presented in § 2., § 3. and § 4 demonstrate that the link between 'augmentation' and animacy is not strictly restricted to the regions in which Romance languages and Modern Greek are spoken, but that it has a (quite limited) cross-linguistic spead, as can be seen from the following map:

---

[21] It is important to note that the influence of Latin is probably high in Slovenian and Serbo-Croat augmentative and pejorative suffixes in *–on- / -un-* (i.e. Slov. *bahûn* 'boaster' < *bahati* 'to boast'; Scr. *tŕbonja* 'big bellied person' < *tŕbuh* 'belly').

[22] The link of the suffix *–un* with animacy is confirmed by its occurrence in Moroccan nicknames: *hindūn* (< *Hind*), *ḥəmdūn* (< *ḥməd* 'Ahmed'), *saɛdūn* (< *Saad*), *yisrūn* (< *yāsīr* 'Yassir').

18)[23]

The area in which this phenomenon is attested has quite clear-cut borderlines: in the North, Germanic languages do not have augmentative suffixes; in the East, Slavonic languages such as Russian and Polish have some augmentatives, but they do not correlate with animacy, while neither Turkish nor the Semitic languages in the South have any augmentative form.

Therefore, it is necessary to establish if the areal distribution of this phenomenon is due to parallel (possibly by chance) developments or whether it represents evidence of language-contact. The following considerations seem to favour the latter solution.

Firstly, the cross-linguistic spread of these polysemous suffixes cannot be explained by means of genetic inheritance from Proto-Indoeuropean, although some of them belong to a broad family of Indoeuropean *-on-* suffixes. In fact, if the phenomenon were due to genetic inheritance, we would expect it to occur in all Indoeuropean languages in which *-on-* suffixes are attested. As stated above, this does not happen: the link between 'augmentation' and animacy is a distinguishing feature of some Romance languages and Modern Greek.

Secondly, within the Mediterranean sub-area in which the link between animacy and 'augmentation' is attested, we can clearly identify a focal area, from where the phenomenon originated and in which it still exhibits a high degree of productivity. This focal area, indicated on the map by the intermittent line, includes most of the regions

in which Latin and Ancient Greek were spoken, except the Gallo-Roman zone and Sardinia. Besides, we can locate a spread area, marked by dotted line on the map, which includes French, Rumanian, South Slavonic languages, Maltese, and Moroccan Arabic. The diffusion of the link between 'augmentation' and animacy among these languages, probably due to the pressure exerted by languages of the focal area, has taken place in different periods; However, on average, we are dealing with quite recent processes: this explains the low degree of productivity of polysemous augmentative suffixes in the spread area.

Thirdly, the diffusion of these polysemous augmentative suffixes, which originated from the interaction between Ancient Greek and Latin,[24] does not appear as an isolated and marginal process. On the contrary, it is an aspect of a more complex typological convergence between these two linguistic systems. According to Banfi (1999), during the Imperial age, Latin and Ancient Greek began developing some common typological features and in the following centuries gave rise to a sort of cultural *koiné*, which spread all over Christian Europe.[25] Consequently, we can suppose that the spread of polysemous augmentative suffixes originated from the propulsive power of this cultural *koiné*. As to this matter, it is noteworthy that the link between animacy and 'augmentation' took its first steps in comedy, satire and mime, in which the relation between Latin and Ancient Greek was more pronounced.

In conclusion, as far as the spread of polysemous augmentative suffixes is concerned, an areal motivation can hardly been denied: the phenomenon we have intestigated in this paper is probably a consequence of the contact among languages spoken all around the Mediterranean. In this process, Latin and Ancient Greek played the crucial role. Of course, the existence of a contact-phenomenon in a specific region does not imply that this region represents a linguistic area, since "in order to speak of linguistic areas it is necessary to have a bundle of common features" (Ramat 1998: 228). Nevertheless, the process sketched in this paper suggests that, among Mediterranean regions, it is legitimate to identify a 'sub-area' where the influence of Latin and Ancient Greek still exists.

Abbreviations:
A(djective), A(ncient) / M(odern) Gr(eek), Alb(anian), anim(ate), AUG(mentative), Blg (Bulgarian), Brb (Berber) Tam(azight) / Kab(yle), Cat(alan), Fr(ench), It(alian), Cz(ech), F(eminine), Grm (German), hum(an), INTF

---

[23] The intermittent line (- - -) indicates the languages in which the convergence of the two conceptual categories 'big X' and 'one who is/has/makes X to a high degree' displays a plain productivity. The dotted line (. . .)indicates the languages in which the same phenomenon is attested, but with a lower degree of productivity.
[24] Cf. § 2 and § 3 above.
[25] Cf. Banfi (1999: 23): "l'Europa linguistica alto-medievale […] conosceva due sole grandi lingue di cultura, il latino e il greco: due lingue che, a partire dall'età imperiale, avevano sviluppato in forza di un processo simbiotico fondato sulle comuni matrici cristiana e romano-imperiale, significativi tratti tipologici comuni. Le due lingue, infatti, pur utilizzando 'materiali' diversi, erano giunte ad un livello di convergenza tipologica assai alto e costituivano la base essenziale per una koiné culturale che legava, in modo saldo, tutta l'Europa cristiana."

(interfix), Lat(in), Lbn (Libyan) Ar(abic), M(asculine), M(odern) H(ebrew), Mac(edonian), Mlt (Maltese), Mrc (Moroccan) Ar(abic), N(oun), NTR (neuter), O(ld) C(hurch) S(lavonic), PEJ(orative), Pol(ish), Port(uguese), Rum(anian), Rus(sian), Scr. (Serbo-Croat), Slov(enian), Sp(anish), Srd (Sardinian), Srn (Syrian) Ar(abic), Tns (Tunisian) Ar(abic), Trk (Turkish), V(erb)

References:
ALLEN, JOSEPH H. D. Jr. (1941): *Portuguese Word-Formation with Suffixes*, in: *Language Monographs* 17, 2.
AMBRUZZI, LUCIO (1955): *Grammatica spagnola*, Torino, Società Editrice Internazionale.
BANFI, EMANUELE (1999): *Le coordinate storiche nella formazione dell'Europa linguistica: dal Mediterraneo al grande Nord*, in: BANFI, EMANUELE (ed.), *Percorsi socio- e storico- linguistici nel Mediterraneo*. Trento: Università degli Studi, Dipartimento di Scienze Filologiche e Storiche, 19-38.
BAUER, LAURIE (1997): *Evaluative morphology: in search of universals*, in: *Studies in Language* 21.3, 533-575.
BAUER, LAURIE (1999): *What you can do with derivation*, paper read at the 9th International Morphology Meeting, Vienna, 25-27/02/2000.
BORG, ALBERT & AZZOPARDI-ALEXANDER, MARIE (1997): *Maltese*. London and New York: Routledge.
CAUBET, DOMINIQUE (1993): *L'arabe marocain*, Tome I: Phonologie et morphosyntaxe. Paris-Louvain: Éditions Peeters.
CHANTRAINE, PIERRE (1933): *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Champion.
DALTAS, P. (1985): *Some patterns of variability in the use of diminutive and augmentative suffixes in spoken Modern Greek Koine (MGK)*, in: *Glossologia* 4, 63-88.
DRESSLER, WOLFGANG U. & MERLINI BARBARESI, LAVINIA (1994): *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German and other languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
FALCO, ALFONSO & CECCHINI, MARIO (1957): *La lingua spagnola*. Roma: Cremonese.
FEUILLET, JACK (1996): *Grammaire synchronique du Bulgare*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
FOULON-HRISTOVA, J. (1998): *Grammaire pratique du Macédonien*. Paris: Langues & Mondes – L'Asiathèque.
GAIDE, FRANÇOISE (1988): *Le substantifs masculins latins en …(I)Ō, …(I)ŌNIS*. Louvain-Paris: Éditions Peeters.
GREEN, N. (1988): *Spanish*, in: HARRIS M. & VINCENT NIGEL (eds.), *The Romance languages*. London: Croom Helm.
HOLTON, DAVID, MACKERIDGE, PETER & PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE (1997): *Greek: a comprehensive grammar of the modern language*. London and New York: Routledge.
JOSEPH, BRIAN D. & IRENE PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON (1987), *Modern Greek*. London: Croom Helm.
KRIER, FRANÇOISE (1976): *Le Maltais au contact de l'Italien*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
LÁZARO MORA, FERNANDO A. (1999): *La derivación apreciativa*, in: REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA (1999), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* (vol. 3: *Entre la oración y el discurso – Morfología*). Madrid: Espasa.
LAZZERONI, ROMANO (1963): *Per la storia dei derivati in -ōn- nelle lingue classiche*, in: *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 3, 1-48.
LEUMANN, MANU (1977): *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehere*. München: C. H. Beck's Verlagsbuchhandlung.
LUPI, GINO (1949): *Grammatica della lingua romena*. Roma: Angelo Signorelli Editore.
MALLISON, GRAHAM (1986): *Rumanian*. London-Syndey-Dover: New Hampshire.
NANDRIŞ, GREGORE (1965[2]): *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. London: The Athlone Press.
RAMAT, PAOLO (1988[2]): *Introduzione alla linguistica germanica*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
RAMAT, PAOLO (1998): *Typological comparison and linguistic areas: some introductory remarks*, in: *Language Sciences* 20.3, 227-240.
RATTI, DANIELA *et al.* (eds.) (1988): *Flessioni, rime, anagrammi. L'italiano in scatola di montaggio*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
SCATTON, ERNEST A. (1984): *A Reference Grammar of Modern Bulgarian*. Columbus (Ohio): Slavica Publishers.
SCHWYZER, EDUARD (1953): *Griechische Grammatik*. München: C. H. Beck's Verlagbuchhandlung.
SOTIROPOULOS, DIMITRI (1972): *Noun Morphology of Modern Demotic Greek*. Mouton: The Hague/Paris.
STUMP, GREGORY T. (1993): *How peculiar is evaluative morphology?*, in: *Journal of Linguistics* 29, 1-36.
VAILLANT, ANDRÉ (1974): *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, Tome IV: *La formation des noms*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
WEBER, MARCEL (1963): *Contributions à l'étude du diminutif en français moderne*. Zürich: Thèse de l'Université de Zürich, Imprimerie Otto Altorfer.