The Intensifying Prefix *pre-* in a Corpus of Bulgarian and Ukrainian Parallel Texts

Ivan Derzhanski, Olena Siruk

Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria
iad58g@gmail.com, olebosi@gmail.com

Abstract. The subject of this study is the intensifying (elative) adjectival prefix *pre-* in Bulgarian and Ukrainian. The material comes from a bilingual corpus of parallel texts. The results demonstrate that the productivity of this prefix in the two languages is superficially similar, but its use shows significant mismatches, often motivated by structural and semantic peculiarities. The study also reveals some unexpected aspects of elative derivation in Ukrainian.

Keywords: Prefix *pre-*, Elative, Reduplication, Parallel Corpus, Bulgarian Language, Ukrainian Language

1   The Intensifying Prefix in Grammatical Tradition

The Bulgarian and Ukrainian traditions of grammatical description have a shared origin, so it is natural that their treatment of the prefix *пре-*, which is phonologically the same and semantically close in the two languages, is also fundamentally similar, though not identical as one might have expected.

1.1   The Prefix *пре-* in Bulgarian

The use of the elative-excessive prefix *пре-* (Old Bulgarian *прѣ-*) 'very; too' with adjectives and adverbs has characterised the Bulgarian language over its entire known history. It has been classified variously as pertaining to inflexion, as a marker of the 'absolute' superlative degree, or to derivation. The latter is supported by the tendency for some such formations to be lexicalised, as noted by Vaillant (1948) with respect to Old Bulgarian a.k.a. Old Church Slavonic:

> With some adjectives this amplifier has somewhat special religious functions: **прѣсвѧтъ** 'most holy' is chiefly said of the persons of the Trinity and of the Virgin; **прѣмѫдръ**, from **мѫдръ** 'skilful, wise', denotes particularly Christian or philosophical wisdom; **прѣподобьнъ**, from **подобьнъ** 'appropriate, worthy', renders Greek ὅσιος 'venerable, saint' (Vaillant, 1948, p. 134, §91 'Expression of the superlative').

Among the arguments for the former, along with the productivity of the model and the semantic proximity of the *пре-* derivatives to the superlative degree, is their double accentuation, with stress on both the prefixed degree marker and the stem (thus *предобър* 'very/most good' just like *по-добър* 'better' and *най-добър* 'best'). This can serve as a criterion for the degree of lexicalisation of *пре-* adjectives and adverbs. The history of this phenomenon is of no little interest. In Tikhonravov's Damaskin (17th c.) there are 42 unabbreviated forms of adjectives with intensifying *прѣ-*, and among them only 2 have stress marked on the prefix, 28 on the stem, 1 on the ending and 11 have no stress indicated; this seems to indicate a state of flux (Dyomina, 2012, pp. 792–815). Gerov only mentions and marks stress on the prefix (Gerov, 1901, p. 329, s. v. **Прѣ**).

The semantic connexion of the intensifying prefix *пре-* in adjectives and adverbs to the preverb *пре-* which derives verbs of the majorative-resultative mode of action (Ivanova, 1974, p. 50) is obvious. The question of its applicability to other parts of speech is more complex:

> **прѣ-** […] is an amplifier which is attached to adjectives (§91), to nouns: **препогыбѣль** 'complete destruction, *πανωλεθρία*' Ham. 488⁸ and to verbs: **пречюдив ся** 'being overly astonished, *ὑπερθαυμάσας*' Ham. 487⁴ (Vaillant, 1948, p. 323).

> **ПРЕ- I.** […] **II.** Nominal prefix for deriving adjectives and nouns from other adjectives or nouns with the meaning: One who has or a thing which contains a supreme degree of the quality expressed by the basic word, e. g.: *преблаг* 'most kind', *предобър* 'most good', *премъдър* 'wisest', *прескъп* 'dearest', *преумора* 'overstrain', *пренаселеност* 'overpopulation', etc. (Krumova-Tsvetkova & Pernishka, 2008).

Whilst it is true that nouns containing the intensifying prefix *пре-* (incidentally, unstressed in them) exist, this derivational model has never been productive, especially in light of the fact that such nouns can virtually always be derived from adjectives (participles, verbs) with such a prefix (e. g., *[пренасел(я) + -ен] + -ост* 'overpopulat(e) + -ion' is no worse an analysis of *пренаселеност* than *пре- + населеност* 'over- + population'). In Tikhonravov's Damaskin the only noun with no derivational link to an adjective or verb and with the meaning 'great ~' is *прѣкурва* 'great libertine' (Dyomina, 2012, p. 803);[1] Gerov defines *прѣкурва́ръ* 'libertine' (Gerov, 1901, p. 357) as a perfect synonym of the same word without the prefix (Gerov, 1897, p. 433), which had already lost its semantics here.

There is also room for ambiguous interpretation of participles such as *преучен* (*преу́чен* 'most learnèd' = *пре- + учен* or *преучен* 'retrained' = *[пре- + уч(а)] + -ен*), *презрял* (*презря́л* 'very ripe'; *презрял* 'overripe') and the like, except when the place of the stress is known or the potential source verb does not exist (*презаслужил* 'most distinguished' = *пре- + заслужил*, because there is no verb *презаслужа*).

---

[1] In the text *прѣ́ку́рвы* (*ни̏ ку́рвы, ни̏ прѣ́ку́рвы ни̏ пиа́ници, ни̏ присмѣхꙋлци … цр͠ство бж͠їе не мо́гꙋть да наслѣ́деть* 'neither libertines nor great libertines nor drunkards nor mockers … can inherit the Kingdom of God') with an intriguing stress on the prefix.

If the source adjective or the semantic connexion to it is lost, the derivate may cease being felt as an elative and move to the class of ordinary adjectives; this has happened to *прекрасен* 'beautiful, fine', whose source word *красен* is now obsolete.[2]

1.2   The Prefix *пре-* in Ukrainian

In Ukrainian the elative prefix *пре-*, having come from Old Bulgarian (Melnyčuk, 2003, p. 558) together with the religious texts, is used with adjectives and adverbs as a marker of very high degree, whereas the domestic prefix *пере-*, of the same origin as the Old Bulgarian prefix and with similar semantics (Melnyčuk, 2003, pp. 338–339), chiefly accompanies verbs.

Starting with the second half of the 18th century and until the mid-19th century, with the formation of a new Ukrainian literary language based on the vernacular, the frequency of the use of prefixes of Church Slavonic origin drops sharply: they are mostly used for stylisation in the spirit of the old Ukrainian language (Nimčuk, 1978, p. 252). But the adjectival prefix *пре-*, unlike the verbal one, remains relatively widespread and common in Ukrainian to this day (mostly in fiction and in speech).

The views on the placement of *пре-* adjectives in the grammatical and the lexical system of the Ukrainian language generally follow the dichotomies 'semantic *vs* lexical and grammatical category', 'derivation *vs* inflexion', 'morphosyntactic derivate *vs* part of the paradigm, *viz.* absolute superlative degree'.[3] The first item in each pair reflects the view of university grammar, and the second, of the academic grammar.

The first approach places the prefix *пре-* within the semantic category 'intensity of the manifestation of the quality' (Mojsijenko, 2013, p. 327). Derived words denoting a high degree are formed by suffixation, the prefix *пре-*, or reduplication.

Within the second approach the prefix *пре-* is presented as one of the adjectival prefixes which produce synthetic forms in the context of the category 'irrelative measure of the quality of the object' (Bilodid, 1969, pp. 154–155). This lexical and grammatical category is materialised in adjectives through a system of intensity forms which express the measure of the concentration of the quality in the object without comparing it to the same quality of another object. The types of intensity of the quality (insufficient, moderate, and excessive) do not correspond to the degrees of comparison, but both have analytic and synthetic forms with the same scope (*грубуватий — трохи грубий* 'roughish, a little rough', *грубезний — надзвичайно грубий* 'extremely rough', cf. *грубіший — більш грубий* 'rougher', *найгрубіший — найбільш грубий* 'roughest') (ibid., 1969, p. 169). At the same time the analytic forms are said to be able to express

---

[2] This is a recent development: Gerov interprets **прѣ́краснъй** as „Тврьдѣ много краснъй“ 'very much fair' and cites as an example *Бѣло ми лице красно прѣкрасно* 'my white face, fair, most fair' (Gerov, 1901, p. 356); both the stress on the prefix in the headword (which incidentally is poorly compatible with the metre of the folk song from which the example is taken) and the reduplication show that the word was still perceived as an intensive derivate.

[3] These are essentially the same approaches as we saw in the grammars of Old Bulgarian (Church Slavonic) and Modern Bulgarian; this is to be expected, because the grammatical traditions have common roots. But some Ukrainian grammarians develop this approach further, postulating irrelative measure of the quality of the object as a separate category.

a wider range of nuances than the suffixal ones (ibid., p. 174), evidently because the suffixal models do not apply to all lexemes, unlike the adverbial (syntactic) ones.

The various ways of expressing an elative meaning (prefixation, suffixation, adverbs of quantity, the pronouns *такий* 'such a …' and *який* 'what a …') can be regarded as synonymous (though not always interchangeable).

As in Bulgarian, in Ukrainian the elative with *пре-* freely co-occurs with reduplication for expressing an even greater degree of the feature or quality.

2   On the Corpus

The bilingual Bulgarian–Ukrainian corpus (CUB) consists of parallel texts available in electronic libraries or obtained by us from paper editions through scanning, optical character recognition and error correction by *ad hoc* software tools and by hand. For this reason, the corpus is composed of fictional works, mostly of novels, which dominate in such sources.

Because original and translated parallel texts for Ukrainian and Bulgarian are hard to come by, especially in online-accessible computer-readable form, we also use Bulgarian and Ukrainian literary translations from other languages as corpus material. The current version of CUB includes eleven sectors, each of which covers parallel Bulgarian and Ukrainian texts with the same original language:
- original Bulgarian and Ukrainian texts, as well as translations from English-1 (by authors from the British Isles), English-2 (by authors from the United States), French, German, Italian, Russian-1 (stories about the past and present), Russian-2 (stories about the future), and French—approx. 2 million words in each of the ten sectors (in the two corpus languages counted together; for various reasons the ratio tends to be about 53:47);
- the Bible, in canonical translations from Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek into Bulgarian and Ukrainian—1⅓ million words.

The total size of the corpus is 10 million words in Ukrainian (and 11½ million in Bulgarian). The Bible is aligned by verse, and the other texts (mostly) by sentence.

3   On the Experiment

All uses of adjectives and adverbs with the prefix *пре-* '[too] much' in either language in the corpus were located and counted. Participles of verbs with the preverb *пре-*, as well as nouns formed from adjectives with the prefix *пре-* (such as Bg *премъдрост*, Uk *премудрість* 'wisdom'), were not included.

Special attention was paid to reduplicated constructions of the form *A-преA* in both languages (Bg *точно-преточно* 'exactly precisely', Uk *місто велике-превелике* 'exceeding great city') and in Bulgarian also *A преA* (*дългите предълги списъци* 'the long, very long lists'), *A, преA* (*дълга, предълга черна свиня* 'a long, very long black pig'), *A и преA* (*скъпо и прескъпо* 'dearly, very dearly').

The unusually frequent lexeme *прекрас(-ен/-ний)* 'beautiful, fine' forms a class of its own: it is derived from an adjective which is very rare in contemporary Ukrainian

and practically out of use in Bulgarian,[4] so it is not felt as an elative but as an ordinary adjective of quality and is the only *пре-* derivative with regularly used comparative and superlative degree forms. Not unlike is the case of *преподоб(-ен/-ний)* 'reverend', which has lost its semantic connexion to the source lexeme *подоб(-ен/-ний)* 'similar'. These two words were counted apart when the results were analysed.

4   Principal Results

Most of our observations are on the numbers of adjectives and adverbs with *пре-* found in the corpus, the variety of lexemes from which they are formed, their frequencies and correspondences between the two languages.

4.1   Derivatives with *пре-*: Matches and Mismatches

As Table 1 shows, the total number of occurrences of *пре-* is approximately equal in the texts in the two languages, but the distribution is not. The bulk (81% in Bulgarian and 63% in Ukrainian) is accounted for by *прекрасен*. Bulgarian uses this word (in the positive degree) as well as *преподобен* much more, but loses to Ukrainian at using elatives of live adjectives and adverbs (this is unexpected, because the prefix is of South Slavic origin).

Table 1. Distribution of the *пре-* derivatives in the texts in the two languages.

	Bulgarian	**Ukrainian**
преподоб(-ен/-ний) 'reverend'	101	24
прекрас(-ен/-ний) 'beautiful', positive	2232	1597
comparative	39	51
superlative	80	78
others with reduplication	22	61
with the conjunction *и*	20	
others without reduplication	403	942
total	**2897**	**2753**

From Table 2, which shows the quantity of adjectives and adverbs among the Bulgarian derivatives with *пре-* other than *преподобен* and *прекрасен* and the Ukrainian ones different from *преподобний*, it is evident that the elative adverbs with reduplication (in Bulgarian with the conjunction *и*) have a frequency significantly higher than chance.

---

[4]   Of the Bulgarian corpus texts, it is only found in the translation of *The Knights of the Cross* by H. Senkiewicz, where *Walgierz Wdały* is called *Валгеж Красни*, and in the Bible (*красен венец* 'garland of grace' in Proverbs and *Красните врата* 'the Beautiful gate' in Acts of the Apostles). In the Ukrainian texts there are 142 occurrences, half of them in Ukrainian authors (mostly O. Kobylianska) and a quarter in the set expression *красн(еньк)о дякувати* 'to thank kindly'.

The same is true of the adverb *прекрасно* in Ukrainian.[5] Henceforth in this study we will count the adverbs together with the adjectives from which they are derived if such exist, except for Ukrainian *багато* 'much', which has moved away semantically from its source adjective *багатий* 'rich'.

On 1011 occasions the *пре-* words in the two languages correspond to one another; the remaining 1886 Bulgarian and 1742 Ukrainian *пре-* words do not have a match with *пре-* in the text in the other language.

Table 2. Quantities of adjectives and adverbs in each language.

	Bulgarian		**Ukrainian**	
	adjectives	**adverbs**	**adjectives**	**adverbs**
прекрас(-ен/-ний, -но)	(1867)	(365)	1335	262
others with reduplication	17	4	52	9
with the conjunction *и*	10	11		
others without reduplication	307	96	873	69

Table 3 shows the correspondences between the Bulgarian adjective *прекрасен*, the Ukrainian *прекрасний* and the rest of their matches.

Table 3. *Прекрас(-ен/-ний)* 'beautiful, fair'.

Bulgarian \ Ukrainian	*прекрасний*	*презарний*	*пречудовий*	*препишний*	*премилий*	*прехороший*	*пречудовний*	по *пре-*	total
прекрасен	800	44	19	1	3	1	1	1482	**2351**
пречуден			3						**3**
преобожаем	1								**1**
no *пре-*	925	130	45	19	9	4	1		**1133**
total	**1726**	**174**	**67**	**20**	**12**	**5**	**2**	**1482**	

It is noteworthy that Bulgarian *прекрасен* matches in Ukrainian, in addition to *прекрасний*, two more *пре-* adjectives relatively frequently and four occasionally, whereas Ukrainian *прекрасний* has no other Bulgarian counterparts with *пре-* except

---

5   The extent to which this is so in Bulgarian is hard to determine because of the homonymy of the adverb and the indefinite singular neuter form of the adjective (this is why the numbers in the corresponding cells of the table are tentative), but in any case it is hard for *прекрасно* to stand out as frequent against the background of two other highly frequent adverbs, on which anon.

преобожаем in one instance.[6] Among the counterparts to *прекрасен* which do not contain the prefix *пре-* one notes *чудовий* (537), *гарний* (112) and *чарівний* (109); to *прекрасний*, one finds *хубав* (226) and *красив* (160). The Bulgarian set expression *един прекрасен ден* 'one fine day' and its variations (… *сутрин*, *утро* 'morning') occur 33 times, on 17 occasions with *одного чудового дня* (or *ранку*) as their Ukrainian correspondence.

Table 4 presents in a similar way *преподоб(-ен/-ний)* 'reverend' and several adjectives with similar semantics. As one can see, Bg *преподобен* most often corresponds to Uk *превелебний* (in particular, in all translations from English; on 41 of 61 occasions *преподобен* : *превелебний* is Reverend Sykes from *To Kill a Mockingbird* by H. Lee). The frequency order of the remaining three Ukrainian lexemes in the table is the opposite to that of their Bulgarian etymological counterparts.

Table 4. *Преподоб(-ен/-ний)* 'reverend'.

Bulgarian \ Ukrainian	*превелебний*	*пречистий*	*пресвятий*	*преподобний*	по *пре-*	total
преподобен	61			13	27	**101**
пресвят		4	11	1	29	**45**
пречист		8			1	**9**
по *пре-*	17	34	24	10		**85**
total	**78**	**46**	**35**	**24**	**57**	

The next Table 5 summarises the number of correspondences of several pairs (or triples) of lexemes which correspond only or almost only to one another (in the middle column) or to an expression without *пре-* (in the peripheral columns). We say 'almost' because Bg *преголям* 'most big' corresponds to Uk *пребагато* 'very much' once, as does Bg *прескъп* 'most expensive' to Uk *превеликий* 'most great' (apart from this, Bg *прескъп* is found 8 times without a match with *пре-* in the Ukrainian text). This is how the table should be read: Bg *пресветъл* 'most bright' is used without a matching Uk elative 4 times and corresponds 10 times to *пресвітлий*, which in turn has no match 7 times. This unusually large number of matches is due to the fact that the Venetian Republic is styled so in P. Zahrebelny's *Roxolana*. On the other hand, it is no rare thing for the cases of mutual correspondence of etymologically matching adjectives or adverbs with *пре-* to be numbered on the fingers of the hands, which suggests considerable semantic and/or structural divergence.

---

[6] Namely Bg *О, обожаема Линайна! Преобожаема дори, която заслужаваш най-скъпоценните неща в света*, Uk *Мила Леніно, найпрекрасніша, найдорожча в світі!*, in the English original *Admired Lenina, [...] indeed the top of admiration, worth what's dearest in the world* (A. Huxley, *Brave New World*).

Table 5. Matches and mismatches of translation equivalents.

Bg : —	Bg	Bg : Uk	Uk	— : Uk
14	*преголям*	1	*превеликий*	280
	превелик	1		
105	*премного*	1	*пребагато*	1
77	*предостатъчен*	2	*предосить*	
15	*премъдър*	8	*премудрий*	34
7	*преславен*	4	*преславний*	21
18	*предълъг*	4	*предовгий*	7
		1	*предовжелецький*	
4	*пресветъл*	10	*пресвітлий*	7
	престар	1	*престарий*	3
1	*престрог*	1	*престрогий*	

Of 283 uses of Uk *превеликий* 222 are in expressions of the type of *на превелик(ий) подив* (*жаль*, *радість*, etc.) 'to one's greatest surprise (regret, joy)', 16 others of *з превеликим задоволенням* (*подивом* etc.) 'with the greatest satisfaction (surprise)'; of the 45 which are not part of set expressions 16 are from *The Decameron* and 14 from the Greek-language part of the Old Testament (many times as a translation of πολὺ σφόδρα) and their high frequency may reflect the translator's stylistic preferences in the former case and the tradition in translating religious literature in the latter. The Bulgarian adverb *премного* 'very/too much/many' corresponds on 40 occasions to *надто* 'too much/many', followed by *забагато* ditto (13), *занадто* ditto and *дуже* 'very' (12 each) and *багато* 'much, many, plenty' (5). Both here and with the adjective *преголям* 'most big' the variety of correspondences is partly caused by the fact that the Bulgarian *пре-* words frequently mean 'too …', whereas the Ukrainian ones are more tightly bound to 'very …'.

Although containing an intensifying prefix, Bg *предостатъчен* tends to mean no more than *достатъчен* 'sufficient', and its Uk counterparts reflect this. With Bg *премъдър* and Uk *премудрий* 'most wise' the situation is similar. Uk *преславний* 'most glorious' matches Bg *прославен* on 9 occasions, and Bg *предълъг* 'most long' matches Uk *довжелезний* on 11 (including 7 in Ukrainian originals).

Of the 30 Bulgarian lexemes that do not match a Ukrainian *пре-* word even once, the most frequent is *преспокоен* 'most calm' (19), then *предоволен* 'most satisfied', *предостоен* 'most worthy' (14 each), *пребогат* 'most rich' (12), and *прелюбезен* 'most amiable' (5). Among the 62 Ukrainian lexemes with no *пре-* counterpart in Bulgarian the leaders are *предивний* 'most wondrous' (30), *препоганий* 'most bad' (29), *пребагатий* 'most rich', *предобрий* 'most good', *пречорний* 'most black' (7 each), and *препаскудний* 'most vile' (6). The rest occur less than 5 times each.

As a general regularity, the elative prefix *пре-* combines much more readily with adjectives and adverbs with positive than with negative semantics (cf. *премного* 'very much' и ?*премалко* 'very little', *предълъг* 'most long' и ?*прекъс* 'most short'), with

positive rather than negative emotional evaluation and with high or neutral stylistics. Deviations have always been rare, even though already in Codex Suprasliensis *пръскврьньнъ* 'most foul' and *пръскръбьнъ* 'most sad' are found as translations of Greek παμμίαρος and πανώδυνος, respectively (Tseitlin, Večerka, & Blagova, 1994, p. 550). In Ukrainian at the time of the forming of a modern literary language on the basis of the vernacular (18–19 cc.) the prefix *пре-* begins being used with low-register adjectives as well: *пресучий гетьман* 'most bitchlike hetman' (Čaplenko, 1970, p. 54). In the corpus along with 48 elatives with meliorative and 10 with neutral semantics one finds 25 with pejorative semantics, including stylistically low ones, but they are relatively rare: *препоганий* (10th by frequency) occurs 29 times,[7] *препаскудний* (20th) 6 times, *препаршивий* 'most lousy' 3 times. In Bulgarian the 'loftiness' of the prefix *пре-* is shattered to a lesser degree: next to 31 meliorative and 5 neutral lexemes we only find 8 pejorative ones, and the top ones – *преглупав* 'most stupid' and *прескръбен* 'most sad' – have 2 occurrences each and rank within the third decade by frequency.

4.2 Elatives with Suffixes and Reduplication in Ukrainian

Six of the Ukrainian *пре-* derivatives in the corpus texts also contain a suffix with additional evaluative and expressive semantics (*превреднючий* 'most spitefullest', *прегарненький* 'most prettiest', *предовжелецький* 'most longest', *премалесенький* 'most smallest', *преточнісінький* 'most precisest', *прехудющий* 'most slimmest'). The academic grammar considers these suffixes characteristic markers of two categories: absolute measure of the quality and subjective evaluation. They differ in whether the evaluation is positive (*-еньк-*, *-есеньк-*, *-ісіньк-*) or negative (*-елецьк-*, *-юч-*, *-ющ-*), and whether they express a reduced measure of the quality (*-еньк-*) or a more intensive one (the others). With the prefix *пре-*, however, they all emphasise and enhance its semantics of high intensity of the feature.

Such cumulation of the shades of meaning, but without a highlighted emotional and evaluative component, is also achieved by reduplication, in particular the one that incorporates an elative. It is interesting that five of the six elatives mentioned above (all except *прегарненький*) are used with reduplication.[8]

The enhancement of the feature by reduplication is an analytic counterpart of yet another synthetic way of enhancing the feature, namely by forming the elative from another derivative rather than the base. This is exemplified in the corpus by the forms *преподобніший* and particularly *преподобнійший* 'topmost reverend', which are not characteristic of present-day literary Ukrainian. The suffixes *-ьш-* and *-ѣйш-* here are

---

[7] It is interesting that 18 of these 29 uses are in translations from English. Space limitations prevent us from expanding upon the relation between the original language and the use of the elative prefix in the translation.

[8] E. g., Uk *Після сніданку я перекинув торбу через плече і вивів із стаєнки нашу **вреднючу-превреднючу** сиву кобилу, яка тримає в синіх очах настороженість*, Bg *След закуска преметнах торбата през рамо и изведох от конюшнята нашата **опака-преопака** сива кобила, в чиито сини очи винаги се таи някакво дебнене* 'After breakfast I threw my bag over my shoulder and led our **topmost malignant** grey mare with the ever-alert blue eyes out of the stall' (M. Stelmakh, *The Geese and Swans Are Flying*).

relics of Old Ukrainian and while the first now lives in the inflexional morphology of adjectives, being used in forming the superlative, the latter only survives in some south-western dialects. The combination of the prefix *пре-* and a superlative suffix within a single word is another way of enhancing the intensity of the feature.

The co-occurrence of degree of comparison suffixes (and prefixes) with elative pre-fixes, particularly *пре-*, is actually not rare in Ukrainian historic texts, e. g.: *наоуку пренайвыборнѣйшоую* 'topmost exquisite lore' (1607), *пренайдорожшей кръви* 'of topmost precious blood' (1632), *пренайс(вя)тѣйшїй сакраментъ* 'topmost holy sac-rament' (1686) (Nimčuk, 1978, p. 215).

At the present stage of the development of the language the derivation of these ad-jectives can be twofold: they may be formed 1. by prefixation—from stems of adjec-tives which already contain suffixes with evaluative and/or intensive semantics (***пре**вреднючий* < *вреднючий*, ***пре**гарненький* < *гарненький*, etc.); 2. by expressive and evaluative suffixation—from adjectives with *пре-* (*превредн**ючий*** < *превредний*, *прегарн**енький*** < *прегарний*, etc.). The first path seems more logical from the point of view of its historical and structural motivatedness: as we see from the monuments cited above, the Old Bulgarian prefix *прѣ-* was added to the positive (uninflected for degree) form of the adjective of quality as well as comparative and superlative forms (although this is a very rare thing in contemporary Ukrainian according to the corpus evidence). The formation of an elative of the type of *пренайдорожчий* assumes the most probable variant of the derivational chain *пренайдорожчий ← найдорожчий ← дорожчий ← дорогий* (deriving an elative from a superlative).

In Bulgarian there is no counterpart to the phenomenon described in this section.[9]

5 Conclusions

The intensifying prefix *пре-* in Bulgarian and Ukrainian has shared roots and similar historical fate. At first a means of expression of the literary language, it has entered both vernaculars, expanding the limits of its use along the way. Its semantics is similar but not identical (elative-excessive in Bulgarian and more strictly elative in Ukrainian); the constructions with reduplication that it participates in are likewise similar but not completely the same; there are certain differences in its productivity in the two lan-guages and in the quantity of expressive means that can replace it or combine with it. These reasons explain many of the mismatches in its use in parallel texts. The investi-gation also reveals some unexpected aspects of elative derivation in Ukrainian, namely the compatibility of *пре-* with suffixes of similar semantics and the richness of the spec-trum of reduplicated forms.

---

[9] This does not imply that such pleonasm is alien to the Bulgarian language in principle; here is an example from Tikhonravov's Damaskin, in which a reduplicated construction is enhanced by a degree adverb: *защо̂ и' ѡновà дрѣ́во разȣ́мното [...] катȯ́ го иćпъдѝ гь̏ ѿ рáй та мȯ̏ се вѝдѣ **твⷬрьдⷮѣ гȯ́рⷦко и' прѣⷢгорⷦ́ко*** 'for likewise that tree of knowledge … when the Lord chased him out of Paradise and it seemed **(very bitter and) most bitter** to him' (Dyomina, 2012, p. 794).

The relation between the elative adjectival prefix *пре-* and the preverb *пре-*, as well as the Ukrainian prefix *пере-*, shall be a matter of our further studies.

References

Bilodid, I. K. (ed.). (1969). *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova. Morfolohija*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (Білодід, І. К. (ред.). (1969). *Сучасна українська літературна мова. Морфологія*. Київ: Наукова думка.)

Čaplenko, V. (1970). *Istorija novoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy (XVII st.–1933 r.)*. New York: Fremdsprachendruckerei Dr. Peter Belej, München 13. (Чапленко, В. (1970). *Історія нової української літературної мови (XVII ст.–1933 р.)*. Нью-Йорк: Fremdsprachendruckerei Dr. Peter Belej.)

Gerov, N. (1897). *Rěčnik na blŭgarskij jazyk s tlŭkuvanie rěči-ty na blŭgarsky i na russky*. Т. 2. Plovdiv. (Геровъ, Н. (1897). *Рѣчникъ на блъгарский языкъ съ тлъкувание рѣчи-ты на блъгарскъı и на русскъı*. Т. 2. Пловдив.)

Gerov, N. (1901). *Rěčnik na blŭgarskij jazyk s tlŭkuvanie rěči-ty na blŭgarsky i na russky*. Т. 4. Plovdiv. (Геровъ, Н. (1901). *Рѣчникъ на блъгарский языкъ съ тлъкувание рѣчи-ты на блъгарскъı и на русскъı*. Т. 4. Пловдив.)

Melnyčuk, O. S. (ed.). (2003) *Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy*. Т. 4. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (Мельничук, О. С. (ред.). (2003). *Етимологічний словник української мови*. Т. 4. Київ: Наукова думка.)

Ivanova, K. (1974). *Načini na glagolnoto dejstvie v sŭvremennija bŭlgarski ezik*. Sofia: BAN. (Иванова, К. (1974). *Начини на глаголното действие в съвременния български език*. София: БАН.)

Mojsijenko, A. K. (ed.). (2013). *Sučasna ukrajins'ka mova. Morfolohija*. Kyiv: Znannja. (Мойсієнко, А. К. (ред.). (2013). *Сучасна українська мова. Морфологія*. Київ: Знання.)

Nimčuk, V. V. (ed.). (1978). *Istorija ukrajins'koji movy. Morfolohija*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (Німчук, В. В. (відп. ред.). (1978). *Історія української мови. Морфологія*. Київ: Наукова думка.)

Krumova-Tsvetkova, L., & Pernishka, E. (eds). (2008). *Rečnik na bŭlgarskija ezik*. Т. 13. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN „Prof. Marin Drinov". (Крумова-Цветкова, Л., & Пернишка, Е. (ред.). (2012). *Речник на българския език*. Т. 13. София: Издателство на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов".)

Dyomina, E. I. (ed.). (2012). *Rečnik na knižovnija bŭlgarski ezik na narodna osnova ot XVII v. (vŭrhu teksta na Tihonravovija damaskin)*. Sofia: Valentin Trajanov. (Дьомина, Е. И. (ред.). (2012). *Речник на книжовния български език на народна основа от XVII в. (върху текста на Тихонравовия дамаскин)*. София: Валентин Траянов.)

Tseitlin, R. M., Večerka, R., & Blagova E. (eds). (1994). *Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X–XI vekov)*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk. (Цейтлин, Р. М., Вечерка, Р., & Благова Э. (eds). (1994). *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков)*. Москва: Русский язык.)

Vaillant, A. (1948). *Manuel du vieux slave*. Institut d'Études slaves, Paris.