

# Adverbial diminutives and Contrastive Reduplication in Curaçao Dutch: Evaluative morphology in a multilingual setting

Cora Cavirani-Pots & Stefan Grondelaers

University of Cambridge & Meertens Institute

[cp679@cam.ac.uk](mailto:cp679@cam.ac.uk) & [stef.grondelaers@meertens.knaw.nl](mailto:stef.grondelaers@meertens.knaw.nl)

This paper reports on a study into two morphological structures often encoding evaluative meaning in a variety of Dutch which is spoken on the Caribbean island Curaçao. The two structures under consideration are adverbial diminutives (henceforth AD) and Contrastive Reduplication (henceforth CR). In Dutch, the canonical nominal diminutive suffix *-je* can appear on adverbials (with an additional *-s*, see Corver 2019 for discussion); the addition of this diminutive suffix triggers an evaluative interpretation – compare (1a) and (1b).

- (1) a. Je moet dat **straks** doen.                      b. Je moet dat **straks-je-s** doen.  
You must that later do                      You must that later-DIM-S do  
'You should do that later.'                      'You should do that later (I would really prefer that).'

AD is a relatively old phenomenon in Dutch spoken in the Netherlands and Belgium (Diepeveen 2012), however, its existence and use has never been investigated in Curaçao Dutch.

Contrastive Reduplication (CR) is a very new phenomenon in Netherlandic and Belgian Dutch (Cavirani-Pots & Dirix 2024), which seems to be a recent borrowing from English (see e.g. Gomeshi et al. 2004). In CR, contrastive focus is placed on the reduplicant, triggering a semantic interpretation of 'typical/real'. A nominal and verbal example is given in (2) and (3). In Dutch, CR is perceived as an evaluative and expressive morphological strategy (Cavirani-Pots & Dirix 2024).

- (2) Zij is op zoek naar een **JOB job**.                      (3) Je moet dat boek **LEZEN lezen**.  
She is up look at a job job                      you must that book read read  
'She is looking for a real job                      'You should really read the book  
(e.g. from 9am-5pm, with benefits)'                      (not just skim through'

The use of CR has also not yet been investigated in Curaçao Dutch. Given the recent rise of this phenomenon in Netherlandic/Belgian Dutch, it might be that CR does not exist in Curaçao Dutch – the majority of the speakers are not in intense contact with the European varieties of the language. On the other hand, reduplication is a very productive morphological strategy in Papiamentu, the very vivid Portuguese-based creole spoken by all layers of the Curaçao society (Kauwenberg & LaCharité 2015).

This study reports on the first findings into AD and CR in Curaçao Dutch. The data are currently being collected in a fieldwork stay, by means of a task in which the speakers have to evaluate spoken stimuli which contain several instances of AD and CR, as well as indicate which emotion they perceive in the spoken stimuli. For the first subtask, acceptability judgments are made using a 7-point Likert scale. For the second subtask, the informants make use of the Two-Dimensional Affect and Feeling Space (2DAFS, Lorette 2021), which was developed to rate perceived emotion. Besides this main task, the interviewer also executes a social network survey with the informants, in which the use of their multiple native languages is tracked and investigated. This latter survey will allow us to understand the amount of contact between Dutch and the other languages spoken on the island, namely Papiamentu, Venezuelan Spanish and Caribbean English, which in turn will help understand the potential variation in AD and CR, and their evaluative meaning component between Curaçao Dutch and the European varieties of this language.

## References

- Cavirani-Pots, C. & Dirix, P. 2024. On contrastive reduplication: Adding Dutch to the West Germanic typology. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 104, 38-61
- Corver, N. 2019. Adverbial -s as Last Resort: *n* and *a* get their support. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 40, 1023–1073
- Ghameshi, J., Jackendoff, R., Rosen, N. and Russell, K. 2004. Contrastive focus reduplication in English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 22, 307-347
- Kauwenberg, S. & LaCharité, D. 2015. Arbitrariness and iconicity in total reduplication: Evidence from Caribbean Creoles. *Studies in Language*, 39(4), 971-991
- Lorette, P. (2021). Investigating emotion perception via the two-dimensional affect and feeling space: An example of a cross-cultural study among Chinese and non-Chinese participants. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 662-610

## A corpus study of *wannabe* and *feikki* in Finnish

Daniel Ebner, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

[daniel.ebner@hu-berlin.de](mailto:daniel.ebner@hu-berlin.de)

This paper discusses the use of the English loans *wannabe* and *feikki* ‘fake’ in Finnish. Both are approximative morphemes since they denote resemblance, imitation and fakeness, in part also with a depreciative meaning (for a list of values within approximation, cf. Masini et al. (2023: 10–14)). *Wannabe* and *feikki* can occur in different constructions, among them independent use (i.e. as a noun or adjective, cf. (1) and (2)) and use in compounds (or: collocations)<sup>1</sup> with other lexical elements (cf. (3) and (4)).

(1) *wannabe* as noun

*Suomenkin Twitter-skenessä vaikuttavat [...] muut wannabet* [fiTenTen24]

The Finnish Twitter scene is influenced by [...] other **wannabes**

(2) *feikki* as adjective

*kun se purskahtaa todennäköisesti aika feikkiin itkuun* [fiTenTen24]

when s/he probably bursts into a pretty **fake cry**

(3) *feikki* collocation

*Realistisiin feikkivideoihin liittyy paljon riskejä* [fiTenTen24]

Realistic **fake videos** come with a lot of risks

(4) *wannabe* collocation

*Olipa kerran epätoivoinen keskustalainen wannabe-poliitikko* [fiTenTen24]

Once upon a time there was a desperate Centre party **wannabe-politician**

Using a random sample of 500 hits of each *wannabe* and *feikki*, drawn from the Finnish Web 2024 (fiTenTen24) corpus at Sketch Engine (Kilgarrieff et al. 2014), this paper addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: In what construction types are *wannabe* and *feikki* used? Are the construction types distributed similarly across both samples?

RQ2: In collocational use, which collexemes are found for *wannabe* and *feikki* and which of those are distinctive?

RQ3: How productive are collocational constructions with *wannabe* and *feikki*?

RQ4: How do *wannabe* and *feikki* compete as approximative morphemes?

*Feikki* appears to be better integrated into the Finnish lexicon than *wannabe* and it can be surmised that *feikki* is also better integrated into the Finnish morphological system, thus possibly allowing for more variety within its construction types than *wannabe* (RQ1), for which collocational use has been argued to be predominant (Norde et al. fc.). This is reflected in the data sample especially in adjectival use: comparative inflection (*feikimpi* ‘more fake’) and case concord (as in example (2)) can be found for *feikki*, but not for *wannabe*.

With respect to the collexemes in collocational structures (RQ2), *wannabe* and *feikki* share certain semantic fields (such as e.g. brand names), but differences are found in the most frequent types: while the most frequent collocates of *wannabe* are professions and social groups (such as *wannabe-kirjailija* ‘wannabe author’ and *wannabegootti* ‘wannabe goth’), the most frequent collocates of *feikki* are technically mediated items (such as *feikkiprofilili* ‘fake profile’ and *feikkivideo* ‘fake video’). This is in line with the different aspects of inauthenticity presented by these two morphemes: aspiration to be someone or something (for *wannabe*) and deception (for *feikki*). The distinctive collexemes are determined using the distinctive collexeme analysis (Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004) and the productivity of collocational constructions (RQ3) is measured by Type Token Ratio and Potential Productivity (Baayen 2009).

---

<sup>1</sup> The term ‘collocation’ is preferred to ‘compound’, as certain defining properties of Finnish compounds, such as “only one main stress [...] on the first syllable” (Hyvärinen 2019: 310), cannot be deduced with certainty from the written data.

## References

- Baayen, R. Harald (2009): Corpus linguistics in morphology: Morphological productivity. In Anke Lüdeling & Merja Kytö (ed.), *Corpus linguistic. An international handbook*, 899–919. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gries, Stefan Th. & Anatol Stefanowitsch (2004): Extending collocation analysis: A corpus-based perspective on ‘alternations’. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 9(1). 97–129. doi:10.1075/ijcl.9.1.06gri.
- Hyvärinen, Irma (2019): Compounds and multi-word expressions in Finnish. In Barbara Schlücker (ed.), *Complex Lexical Units*, 307–335. De Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110632446-011.
- Kilgariff, Adam, Vít Baisa, Jan Bušta, Miloš Jakubíček, Vojtěch Kovář, Jan Michelfeit, Pavel Rychlý & Vít Suchomel (2014): The Sketch Engine: ten years on. *Lexicography* 1(1). 7–36. doi:10.1007/s40607-014-0009-9.
- Masini, Francesca, Muriel Norde & Kristel Van Goethem (2023): Approximation in morphology: A state of the art. *Zeitschrift für Wortbildung / Journal of Word Formation* 7(1). 1–26. doi:https://doi.org/10.21248/zwjw.2023.1.100.
- Norde, Muriel, Kristel Van Goethem, Francesca Masini & Daniel Ebner (fc.): Wannabe approximatives. Creativity, routinization or both? In Sabine Arndt-Lappe & Natalia Filatkina (ed.), *Dynamics at the lexicon-syntax interface: creativity and routine in word-formation and multi-word expressions*.

## Exploring Non-Prototypical Evaluative Constructions: Characteristics and Types in Modern Greek

Angeliki Efthymiou  
Democritus University of Thrace, Greece  
[aeftym@eled.duth.gr](mailto:aeftym@eled.duth.gr)

This paper explores non-prototypical evaluative constructions, using evidence from Modern Greek, with the goal of identifying their characteristics and types. Based on the relevant literature (e.g. Grandi 2005; Grandi & Kortvelyessy 2015), a construction is considered evaluative if it fulfills two conditions. The first condition indicates that an evaluative construction must have the function of assigning a value, which is different from the ‘standard’. The second condition indicates that an evaluative construction must include at least the explicit expression of the standard and an evaluative mark. This definition allows a form like MGr *karekl-áci* ‘small chair’ (from *karékla* ‘chair’ + the diminutive suffix *-áci*) to be included in the field of evaluation, since a base form expressing the standard meaning and a morphological item that expresses an evaluative value are both clearly recognizable. Nevertheless, as Grandi (2005) himself admits, along with words which are clearly evaluative, there are also some lexical items for which the picture is less clear cut. For example, in the Greek words *spir-járis* ‘pimply’ (< *spirí* ‘pimple’), *mit-arás* ‘a person with a big nose’ (*míti* ‘nose’) and *jinek-ás* ‘womanizer’ (< *jinéka* ‘woman’), it is not always easy to recognize the expression of the standard form in the base-word. The base of *spirjáris* ‘pimply’ is the noun *spirí* ‘pimple’, which does not express the standard meaning (i.e. a person with a small number of pimples or no pimples at all). Similar remarks can be made about the words *mitarás* ‘a person with a big nose’ and *jinek-ás* ‘womanizer’. Another important aspect of these words is that they simultaneously encode both evaluative and descriptive meanings (e.g. possessive or agentive meanings), as the suffixes *-ás* and *-járis* create derivatives with the meaning ‘someone who has the property of the base in excess’ or ‘someone who tends to do something or has a very strong inclination for something, which exceeds the norm’ (e.g. Melissaropoulou & Manolessou 2009; Efthymiou 2013; Kallergi et al 2023). Given such or similar examples, Grandi (2005) and Grandi & Kortvelyessy (2015) argue that it is essential to treat ‘evaluation’ as a category with an internal structure, where different levels of membership can be recognized. This includes prototypical members as well as those in ‘marginal’ positions, who, although not excluded, are less central to the category.

Although several studies have been published on the prototypical evaluative constructions in Modern Greek (e.g. Efthymiou 2015, 2024; Melissaropoulou 2009; Melissaropoulou & Ralli 2008; Litsos 2020; Vassilaki 2019) there are no detailed analyses of the peripheral ones. To this end, the aim of this paper is to investigate: a) What are the characteristics of the affixes that are involved in these types of formations? and b) Are all evaluative semantic classes represented to the same extent? After a brief review of the relevant literature and an analysis of the characteristics of these formations, it is demonstrated that in these constructions, some semantic classes are more prevalent than others. Moreover, it is shown that there is an asymmetry in the distribution of prefixes and suffixes in the expression of non-prototypical evaluative meanings. Ultimately, the analysis of the characteristics of these formations reveals the heterogeneity of this peripheral area of evaluative morphology and aligns with the claim by Grandi & Kortvelyessy (2005) regarding the varying degrees of membership within the class of evaluative constructions.

## References

- Grandi, Nicola. 2005. Sardinian evaluative morphology in typological perspective. *Language Typology and Universals* 58: 188–209.
- Grandi, Nicola & Livia Körtvélyessy. Introduction: why evaluative morphology? In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 3–20. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Efthymiou, Angeliki. 2013. On the interaction between semantics and phonetic iconicity in evaluative morphology. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(1): 152–166.
- Efthymiou, Angeliki. 2015. Modern Greek diminutive and augmentative adjectives (in a cross-linguistic perspective). *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 21(1): 57–71.
- Efthymiou, A. 2024. Diminutive formation in Modern Greek: Variation and competition. In Aleksandra Bagasheva, Akiko Nagano & Vincent Renner (eds.), *Competition in Word-Formation*, 178–207. John Benjamin. Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (LA).
- Kallergi, Haroula, Katsouda Georgia, Konstantinidou Magdalene & Tasos, Tsangalidis. 2023. A. Expressivity in Modern Greek: some morphological mechanisms for the expression of emotions. In J. P. Williams (ed.), *Expressivity in European Languages*, 123–227. Cambridge: Cambridge, University Press.
- Litsos, Athanasios. 2020. The suffix *-ídio* in Modern Greek [in Greek]. *Studies in Greek Language* 40: 643–553.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2009. Augmentation vs. Diminution in Greek dialectal variation: an optimal system. In: F. Montermini, G. Boyé, and J. Tseng, eds., *Selected Proceedings of the 6th Décembrettes*, Somerville, 125–137. MA–Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra & Ioanna Manolessou. 2011. Theoretical and diachronic aspects of augmentation: evidence from Greek. In A. Ralli, G. Booij & S. Scalise, eds., *On-line proceedings of the 7th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, 63–77.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra & Angela Ralli. 2008. Headedness in diminutive formation: Evidence from Modern Greek and its Dialectal Variation. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55 (1–2): 138–204.
- Vassilaki, Sophie. 2019. Suffixation diminutive et individuation: le suffixe *-áki* du grec moderne. Individuation et référence nominale à travers les langues. In Christine Bonnot, Hélène de Penanros & Outi Duvallon (eds.), *Individuation et référence nominale à travers les langues*, 105–129. Paris: Lambert-Lucas.

## Evaluative Morphology in Language Contact: Comparative Insights from Basque, Maltese, and Griko

Luca Gál

University of Cambridge

[lg567@cam.ac.uk](mailto:lg567@cam.ac.uk)

Evaluative Morphology (EM) – morphological processes that express objective and subjective evaluations through diminutives, augmentatives, pejoratives, and amelioratives (Grandi & Körtvélyessy, 2015) – provides a unique perspective on the dynamics of language contact and the mechanisms shaping linguistic innovation. Prior research has demonstrated that EM is susceptible to replication, yet the circumstances shaping its replication across typologically diverse languages remain profoundly underexplored. Drawing on the comparative analysis of corpus data, this study investigates the integration of Romance EM into Basque, Maltese, and Griko, three typologically diverse languages that have been in extensive contact with various Romance varieties and display varying degrees of EM-replication. These replica languages, each characterised by distinct typological features, sociolinguistic contexts, and native EM-strategies, provide a comparative framework for analysing the interplay of typological and sociolinguistic factors in shaping contact-induced morphological change (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Gardani, 2008; Melissaropoulou & Ralli, 2008; Seifart, 2014).

Basque, in contact with Ibero- and Gallo-Romance varieties, has only replicated diminutive *-ilo/-ila* (e.g. *gizonilo* ‘man.DIM’) and *-(i)ño/-(i)ña* (e.g. *haurño* ‘child.DIM’), introducing rudimentary gender distinctions, which highlights EM’s innovative potential in contact. In Maltese, contact with Sicilian and Tuscan Italian has resulted in the replication of diminutive, augmentative and pejorative suffixes. Instances of diminutive *-inu/-ina* and *-etta* applied to native roots (e.g. *mejdina* ‘table.DIM’, *ħarsetta* ‘look.DIM’) contradict Grandi’s (2002, 2017) claim that Maltese lacks replicated diminutives due to typological inhibition. Augmentative *-un* occurs exclusively in reduplicative patterns (e.g. *kedda keddun* ‘great annoyance’), while pejorative *-azz/-azza* is sporadic (e.g. *ħmarazz* ‘donkey.PEJ’). Griko, influenced by Salentino (Italo-Romance), illustrates how typological differences can be resolved by retaining native typological features. Replicated diminutive *-uḍḍi* (e.g. *anemuḍḍi* ‘wind.DIM.N’), *-eḍḍa* (e.g. *cateredḍa* ‘daughter.DIM.F’), and augmentative *-una* (e.g. *peduna* ‘child.AUG.M’) are adapted into Griko’s tripartite gender system, preserving the native tendency for gender-determining EM-suffixes, e.g. via attributing neuter gender to *-uḍḍi* (*liko* ‘wolf.M’ > *likuḍḍi* ‘wolf.DIM.N’). The findings suggest that typological distance does not inhibit the replication of either new or existing EM-functions; nevertheless, sociolinguistic factors might inhibit the diffusion of these replicated morphemes. Furthermore, the presence of grammatical gender (in Romance vs. Basque) and gender-related typological features (Griko gender-determining vs. Romance gender-neutral suffixes) determine how replicated suffixes are treated with respect to gender, regardless of whether these dominant features occur in the ML or RL. Finally, there emerges a hierarchy in the replicability of EM-functions (diminutives > augmentatives > pejoratives). These insights contribute to a broader understanding of EM as a dynamic site of morphological innovation in contact settings. By analysing the diverse trajectories of EM replication and adaptation in Basque, Maltese, and Griko, this study sheds light on the interplay between EM and language change, providing a nuanced perspective on the evolution of EM in multilingual settings. Additionally, it explores the factors shaping whether replicated evaluative morphemes become fully integrated into recipient language grammars or remain peripheral instances of replication – if not merely surface in lexical borrowings. These considerations contribute to broader discussions on the limits of morphological transfer in contact scenarios and the diachronic stability of evaluative morphology in contact.

## References

- Borg, A., & Azzopardi-Alexander, M. (1996). *Maltese*. London: Routledge.
- Drake, S. (2018). The form and productivity of the Maltese morphological diminutive. *Morphology*, 28, 297-323.
- Gardani, F. (2008). *Borrowing of inflectional morphemes in language contact*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Gardani, F. (2012). Plural across inflection and derivation, fusion and agglutination. In L. Johanson, & M. I. Robbeets (Eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology* (pp. 71-97). Leiden: Brill.
- Gardani, F. (2018). On morphological borrowing. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 12(10).
- Grandi, N. (2002). *Morfologie in contatto: le costruzioni valutative nelle lingue del Mediterraneo*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Grandi, N. (2017). *Malta come laboratorio di contatti interlinguistici*. In R. Bombi, *Nuovi spazi comunicativi per l'italiano nel mondo*. (pp. 81-92). Udine: Forum.
- Grandi, N., & Körtvélyessy, L. (2015). *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hualde, J.I. (2003). Derivation. In J. I. Hualde, & J. Ortiz de Urbina (Eds.), *A Grammar of Basque* (pp. 328-351). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Melissaropoulou, D. (2006). *The morphological process of diminution in Greek dialectal variation- Comparison with Standard Modern Greek*. [Unpublished Master's Dissertation: University of Patras].
- Melissaropoulou, D., & Ralli, A. (2008). Headedness in diminutive formation: Evidence from Modern Greek and its dialectal variation. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 55(1-2), 183-204.
- Morosi, G. (1870). *Studi sui dialetti greci della terra d'Otranto, preceduto da una raccolta di canti, proverbi e indovinelli nei dialetti medesimi*. Lecce: Editrice Salentina.
- Rohlf, G. (1950) *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento)*. München: H. Beck.
- Seifart, F. (2020). *AfBo: A world-wide survey of affix borrowing*. <http://afbo.info>. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology
- Segura Munguía, S. & Etxebarria Ayesta, J. M. (2001). Del latin al euskara= latinetik euskarara.
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.



## Pejorative and laudative prefixoids in Dutch

Jack Hoeksema  
University of Groningen  
[j.hoeksema@rug.nl](mailto:j.hoeksema@rug.nl)

Dutch compounding exhibits several subtypes that fall under the umbrella of evaluative morphology, including elative compounds (Hoeksema 2023), pejorative compounds (Napoli & Hoeksema 2009), and laudative compounds. Some compounds also function as diminutives or augmentatives—such as *mini-*, *micro-*, and *dwerg-* ('dwarf') versus *reuze-* ('giant'), *maxi-*, and *mammoet-* ('mammoth'). However, unlike standard diminutives, these forms primarily indicate size rather than carrying strong affective connotations.

When a noun is systematically used in an evaluative, intensificational, or diminutive capacity while its original lexical meaning fades, it can be classified as an affixoid (cf.

Stevens 2005; Booij & Hüning 2014; Ralli 2020). In elative compounds, affixoids primarily serve an intensifying function. This paper, however, focuses on pejorative and laudative prefixoids, which contribute to negative and positive evaluations, respectively. While elative compounds are typically adjectives, pejorative and laudative compounds are predominantly nouns.

Notably, the number of pejorative affixoids in Dutch has been steadily increasing. This paper examines their origins, which include taboo words (*klote* 'bollocks,' *kut* 'cunt,' *schijt* 'shit'), disease terms (*kanker* 'cancer,' *tering* 'tuberculosis,' *pokken* 'smallpox'), inherently negative words (*rot* 'rotten'), and a few idiosyncratic cases (*snert* 'pea soup'). Interestingly, these affixoids can carry slightly different shades of pejoration: for example, while a *flutfilm* ('lousy film') is dismissed for its poor quality (as in *flutroman*, *flutrol*, etc.), a *kutfilm* ('cunt film') might be objectionable for reasons beyond quality—such as its content or its director.

Using a corpus of naturally occurring examples, I explore the distributional patterns of these affixoids, including their preference for non-neutral nouns over neutral ones. For instance, generic nouns like *man* ('man') and *vrouw* ('woman') rarely appear with pejorative or laudative affixoids, whereas informal or derogatory terms such as *vent* ('guy, bloke') and *wijf* ('woman') are much more common. Notably, when *wijf* is combined with laudative affixoids, its derogatory connotation fades, though it retains its informal register.

Both pejorative and laudative prefixoids compete with evaluative adjectives. Given that both appear before the modified noun, prefixoids can sometimes be reanalyzed as adjectives, leading to a so-called debonding process ([NN] → A N; cf. Norde & van Goethem 2018). While this phenomenon is not the main focus of the paper, I will briefly compare the behavior of evaluative affixoids and adjectives. The availability of evaluative adjectives renders the prefixoids entirely superfluous. This may explain why many languages (including closely related ones such as English, or medieval Dutch) do not have them. The rich diversity of evaluative expressions resembles that of degree markers. Apparently, we as language users crave a rich variety of stylistic means to express how much, how awful, or how wonderful.

Finally, I assess the productivity of various affixoids using corpus-based measures (Baaijen 1992), shedding light on their expanding role in Dutch evaluative morphology. One finding is that pejorative affixoids as a group are more productive and more prevalent than laudative affixoids.

## References

- Baayen, H. 1992. Baayen, H. (1992). Quantitative aspects of morphological productivity. In: G. Booij, J. van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1991*, 109-149.
- Booij, G.E. & M. Hüning, 2014. Affixoids and constructional idioms: Extending the scope of construction-based grammar. In: R. Boogaart, T. Coleman & G. Rutten (eds.), *Extending the scope of construction grammar*, 77–105. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hoeksema, J., 2023. Elative Compounds, in: P. Ackema, S. Bendjaballah, E. Bonet, A. Fábregas (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Morphology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Napoli, D.J. & J. Hoeksema, 2009. The grammatical versatility of taboo terms. *Studies in Language* 33(3), 612-643.
- Norde, M. & K. Van Goethem, 2018. Debonding and clipping of prefixoids in Germanic: constructionalization or constructional change? In: G.E. Booij (ed.), *The construction of words: Advances in Construction Morphology*, *Studies in Morphology* 4, 475-518. Cham: Springer International.
- Ralli A., 2020. Affixoids: An Intriguing Intermediate Category. In: L. Körtvélyessy & P. Štekauer (eds.), *Complex Words: Advances in Morphology*, 217-238. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevens, C. M. 2005. Revisiting the affixoid debate. On the grammaticalization of the word. In T. Leuschner, T. Mortelmans & S. de Groodt (eds.), *Grammatikalisierung im Deutschen*, 71-83. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

## Rivalry in Italian intensifying prefixation: an analysis of discriminative features

Ivan Lacić, University of Bologna

[ivan.lacic2@unibo.it](mailto:ivan.lacic2@unibo.it)

This study investigates affix rivalry, namely the competition between affixes that form words of identical or similar semantic types (Huyghe & Varvara, 2023), within the realm of Italian evaluative morphology (EM). Given that in EM formal economy constraints do not hold (Grandi, 2015), it presents itself as a particularly suitable domain for exploring affix rivalry. The research focuses on six Italian intensifying prefixes – *arci*, *extra*, *iper*, *stra*, *super*, and *ultra* – in their usage as adjectival intensifiers, addressing a gap in the literature which has predominantly analyzed these prefixes in isolation or through contrastive lens, often neglecting their competitive interactions and polyfunctional nature.

To address prefix polyfunctionality, derivatives formed with the six prefixes were annotated by five annotators according to two semantic macro-values: INTENSIFICATION and NON-INTENSIFICATION. Only derivatives labeled as INTENSIFICATION were further analyzed, resulting in a dataset comprising 48,069 tokens.

Subsequently, to explore the constraints that may be pertinent in shaping the rivalry landscape, a random sample of 450 occurrences per prefix was annotated for ten (extra)linguistic features. Given the scarcity of indications on discriminating factors regarding rivalry within EM, this study analyzes an array of potentially relevant features. These features include: (i) unidirectional base-to-prefix association, (ii) base age, (iii) base frequency, (iv) base semantic class, (v) base emotionality, (vi) derivative syntactic function, (vii) base length, (viii) base stress, (ix) base initial sound, and (x) the manner of articulation of the initial consonant.

To assess the influence of these features on prefix selection, a machine learning classification approach was implemented. The most complex model achieved an accuracy of 0.79. However, due to the model's complexity, further analysis to identify the most efficient feature set was necessary. Consequently, a set of 39 models was developed. Assuming classifier accuracy mirrors the predictive capacity of the explanatory variables, it was found that optimal prediction is reliant on two-member combinations of three non-canonical features: base-to-prefix association, base emotionality, and base frequency. Notably, base-to-prefix association (operationalized through  $\Delta P$  values (Ellis & Ferreira-Junior, 2009)) emerged as the strongest predictor, accounting for the distributional niches (Aronoff, 2023) the prefixes occupy.

Beyond providing localized insights into the factors governing the choice among the six intensifying prefixes, this study contributes to a broader understanding of competition within EM. It demonstrates that more nuanced contextual factors, often overlooked in favor of formal considerations, play a significant role in shaping affix rivalry.

## References

- Aronoff, M. (2023). Three ways of looking at morphological rivalry. *Word Structure*, 16(1), 49–62.
- Ellis, N. C., & Ferreira-Junior, F. (2009). Constructions and their acquisition: Islands and the distinctiveness of their occupancy, *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 7(1), 188–221.
- Grandi, N. (2015). The place of evaluation within morphology. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*, pp. 74–90. Edinburgh University Press.
- Huyghe, R., & Varvara, R. (2023). Affix rivalry: Theoretical and methodological challenges. *Word Structure*, 16(1), 1–23.

## The evaluative function of *-a* in Hebrew feminine formation

Lior Laks

Bar-Ilan University

[Lior.Laks@biu.ac.il](mailto:Lior.Laks@biu.ac.il)

This study examines variation in Hebrew feminine formation with respect to the evaluative function of the suffix *-a*. This is demonstrated in the two pairs of example below.

(1) a. ani eyze **snob-*it***

'I am some snob' (<http://www.tapuz.co.il/blogs/viewentry/371153>)

b. ani eyze **snob-*a***

'I am some snob'

(<https://stips.co.il/ask/4988953/%D7%A9%D7%90%D7%9C%20%D7%A9%D7%9E%D7%91%D7%99%D7%9F-%D7%AA%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%A9>)

(2) a. himcet et ze be-acmec ya **šakran-*it***

'You made it up yourself, you liar' (<https://sports.walla.co.il/item/3071716>)

b. ze rak od xaci šaa ya **šakran-*it-a***

'It's only in half an hour, you liar' (<https://www.starmed.co.il/forum-67/msg-2649006>)

The loanword 'snob' takes both feminine suffixes *-it* (1a) and *-a* (1b). The native word *šakran* 'liar' takes the suffix *-it* in (2a), while in (2b) it takes *-a* in addition to *-it*, yielding an apparent over-marking. Why does this variation occur? I will show that in both cases the suffix *-a* serves an evaluative function of depreciation (see Scalise 1984, Stump 1993, Grandi & Körtvélyessy 2015, Amiot & Stosic 2022).

### Feminine forms of loan words

Hebrew has three feminine suffixes: *-a*, *-it*, *-et*. Suffix selection is predictable based on properties of the base, but is subject to irregularity. *-et* is the least productive and is not discussed here. Competition is mainly between *-a* and *-it*. *-a* consists of the unmarked vowel *a* and is attached to a variety of stems. *-it* is the default suffix in acronyms and loanwords (Schwarzwald 1984, 2002, 2013 Faust 2013). While most loanwords take *-it*, there is a noticeable variation with some words. Most of these words are derogative, e.g. *debil* 'stupid' and *babun* 'baboon (ugly)'. Hebrew has feminine loanwords with no masculine base, and the majority of them have negative meaning e.g. *pustema* 'blockhead' (\**pustem*), *kunefa* 'ugly' (\**kunef*). These words end with *-a*, and this makes this suffix more typical of negative words. *-a* is more accessible as a marker of such meaning, and therefore it is attached to other words, competing with *-it*. When selecting *-a* (1b), speakers mark words as negative, and the suffix does not only mark gender, but also has an evaluative function. In contrast, loanwords without negative meaning only take *-it*, e.g. *larj* – *larj-it*/\**larj-a* 'large (generous)'.

### Over-marking of feminine forms of native words

Words that end with *-an* (whether it is a suffix or part of the *CaCCan* pattern) systematically take the feminine suffix *-it*, e.g. *ʔaclan* – *ʔaclan-it* 'lazy'. Some of them take *-a* together with *-it* (2b). This apparent over-marking seems random at first glance. However, examination of the data reveals that it only occurs with words with negative meaning, e.g. *xucpan* – *xucpan-it/xucpan-it-a* 'insolent', *paxdan* – *paxdan-it/paxdan-it-a* 'coward'. The addition of *-a* aims at emphasizing the negative meaning of the word, while *-it* only marks gender. Words that end with *-an* and do not have negative meaning, do not take *-a*, e.g. *šakdan* – *šakdan-it*/\**šakdan-it-a* 'industrious'.

The study sheds light on morphological variation and change with respect to evaluative morphology. The two case studies reveal that *-a* has become partially associated with the evaluative function of expressing negativity and depreciation in both loan and native words; in one case it competes with the default suffix *-it*, and in another *-a* is added to words that already take *-it*, and in both cases it serves the same function.

## References

- Amiot, D. & D. Stosic. 2022. Evaluative morphology: From evaluation to approximation and semi-categorization. In H       Vassiliadou & Marie Lammert (eds.), *A Crosslinguistic Perspective on Clear and Approximate Categorization*, 53–94. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Faust, N. 2013. Decomposing the Feminine suffixes of Modern Hebrew. *Morphology* 23(4), 409-440.
- Grandi, N. & L. K  rtv  lyessy (eds.). 2015. *The Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Scalise, S. 1984. *Generative Morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Schwarzwald, O. R. 1982. Feminine Formation in Modern Hebrew". *Hebrew Annual Review* 6, 153-178.
- Schwarzwald, O.R. 2002. *Hebrew Morphology*. 12 Study units. Tel Aviv: The Open University. (In Hebrew)
- Schwarzwald, O.R. 2013. The typology of nonintegrated words in Hebrew. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10(1), 41-53.
- Stump, G. 1993. How Peculiar is Evaluative Morphology? *Journal of Linguistics* 29, 1-36.

## On the borrowability of evaluative markers and categories: insights from the Greek dialectal landscape

Dimitra Melissaropoulou  
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki  
[dmelissa@itl.auth.gr](mailto:dmelissa@itl.auth.gr)

One of the widely accepted assumptions in contact studies is that derivation is subject to transfer more frequently than inflection (see Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Weinreich 1953 among others). It is worth noting, however, that even though research has worked intensively on inflection, no comparable amount of work exists on derivation (see, however, Seifart 2013, 2015; Matras and Sakel 2007; Melissaropoulou 2016, 2019; Gardani 2020 on a state-of-the-art). Seifart (2013, 2015), based on data collected so far, concludes that among derivational categories, adjectivizers, diminutives and nominalizers (forming agent nouns) are more prone to borrowing, perhaps due to constituting more concrete categories ((Sapir, 1921: 204) thesis, on the diffusion of derivationally concrete categories). On the other hand, Gardani (2020: 116) formulates the following working hypothesis to be tested empirically: prototypical affixes and/or categories are predicted to be more susceptible to borrowing than non-prototypical ones (diminutives included). Based on the above, this paper addresses evaluative derivational borrowability drawing data from Modern Greek dialects that have evolved under different contact settings to examine whether and if so to what extent contact is a favorable parameter for the transfer of evaluative markers and/or categories. To this end, Modern Greek varieties evolving under different contact settings, e.g., Asia Minor Greek on the one hand, while Italiot and Heptanesian varieties on the other are put under scrutiny. Interestingly, what our dialectal data set shows is that the borrowability of evaluatives varies inter-dialectally and cannot be directly linked to or be accounted for only in terms of intense long-lasting contact. For example, neither Pontic nor Cappadocian display a borrowed evaluative suffix from Turkish, while, on the other hand, both Italiot varieties (Grico and Greco) have replicated several derivational markers such as *-uts/ʃi* (e.g. *'aloʝo* 'horse' > *alo ʝuts/ʃi* 'small/cute horse'), *-uɖɖi* (e.g. *'liko* 'wolf.M' > *li ʝuɖɖi* 'small wolf') and *-una* (*'jilo* 'lip' > *ʃi l-una* 'big lip') (Melissaropoulou 2006). In order to account for the occurring divergence, we appeal to both intra-linguistic mechanisms and extra-linguistic parameters. Namely, we propose that apart from structural reasons, the range of qualitative readings of the evaluative markers and their overall productivity in the model language in combination with the fact that diminutive markers in non-standard replica language forms, may function as a flag of local identity (or in other words social salience or indexicality, see Mansfield et al. 2022; Levon and Buchstaller 2015; Rácz 2013), play an important role in the (non-) transfer of evaluative markers outranking concreteness, or the notion of non-prototypicality. We aspire that our findings will open new avenues on the study of evaluative morphology in contact settings.

### References

- Dressler, W. U. (1989), "Prototypical differences between inflection and derivation", *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42(1): 3–10.
- Dressler, W. U. (1997), "Universals, typology, and modularity in natural morphology", in *Language History and Linguistic Modelling: A Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, Vol. 2: *Language History and Linguistic Modelling*, edited by Raymond Hickey and Stanisław Puppel, 399–1421. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gardani, F. (2020), "Morphology and Contact-Induced Language Change", in A. P. Grant (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*, 96-122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Levon, E. / Buchstaller, I. (2015), "Perception, cognition, and linguistic structure: The effect of linguistic modularity and cognitive style on sociolinguistic processing", *Language Variation and Change* 27(3): 319–348.
- Mansfield, J. / Leslie-O'Neill, H./Li, H. (2022), "Dialectal differences and linguistic divergence: A cross-linguistic survey of grammatical variation", *SocArXiv*. April 7. [doi:10.31235/osf.io/tvx2y](https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/tvx2y)
- Matras, Y. / Sakel, J. (eds.) (2007), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Melissaropoulou, D. (2006), *The morphological process of diminution in Greek dialectal variation- Comparison with Standard Modern Greek*. [Unpublished Master's Dissertation: University of Patras].
- Melissaropoulou, D. (2016), "Variation in word formation in the light of the language contact factor: the case of Cappadocian Greek", *Journal of Language Sciences*, 55, 55-67.
- Melissaropoulou, D. (2019), "Accounting for morphological complexity vs. simplification in situations of language contact: Evidence from Cappadocian Greek", in Ch. Tzitzilis (ed.), *Language Contact in the Balkans and Asia Minor*, 321-336. Thessaloniki: INS.
- Rácz, P. (2013), *Salience in Sociolinguistics*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sapir, E. (1921), *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*, New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Seifart, F. (2013), *AfBo: A World-Wide Survey of Affix Borrowing*, Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://afbo.info>
- Seifart, F. (2015), "Does structural-typological similarity affect borrowability? A quantitative study on affix borrowing", *Language Dynamics and Change* 5(1): 92–113.
- Thomason, S. G. (2008), "Social and linguistic factors as predictors of contact-induced change", *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1): 42–56.
- Weinreich, U. (1953), *Languages in Contact, Findings and Problems*, New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.



## Combinability of intensifying prefixes/prefixoids in Modern Greek taboo nouns

Eva Sissamperi  
University of Patras  
[lit3049@ac.upatras.gr](mailto:lit3049@ac.upatras.gr)

Evaluative morphology includes a set of linguistic constructions performing various semantic functions (such as augmentation/diminution, intensification), expressed through several formal strategies (such as affixation, compounding) (Dressler & Merlini Barbaresi 1994, Grandi 2023, Scalise 1986: 131-133). In this study, intensification, i.e., the expression of a high degree (Rainer 2015: 1340), expresses only a qualitative evaluation, namely, evaluation based on subjective criteria of a speaker, and is related to semantic primitives GOOD/BAD (Grandi & Körtvélyessy 2015: 11-12). Taboo words describe the lexicon of offensive emotional language that may cause harm and provoke embarrassment or offense (Jay 2009: 153, Giannakis & Katsouda 2024). In Modern Greek (hereafter ModGr), several studies explore intensification through prefixes/prefixoids in general (Efthymiou 2003, 2019a, Gavriilidou 2016), and taboo vocabulary (Christopoulou 2016, Kallergi *et al.* 2023, Xydopoulos & Christopoulou 2011).

The present study examines the accumulation of intensifying prefixes/prefixoids in ModGr taboo nouns, addressing the questions: (a) What is the maximum number of prefixes/prefixoids attached to a base? (b) Are all available prefixes/prefixoids employed in combinations? (c) What are the patterns of combinations? (d) Are all the combinations equally possible and frequent? (e) What governs the order of prefixes/prefixoids in combinations? Combinations were collected through Google, social media platforms like X, online dictionaries for ModGr Slang ([slang.gr](http://slang.gr)) using the ‘morpheme by morpheme’ method (Manova & Winternitz 2011), and the snowball sampling technique. Data search resulted in 20 intensifying prefixes/prefixoids that can be grouped in two categories: prototypical intensifiers (i.e., *arxi-*), namely elements that have only this function, and pejorative intensifiers (i.e., *skato-*), namely elements that have both a pejorative and intensifying function. I found 39 combinations, each appearing in 1 to 10 different structures across 87 total structures. My results show that the maximum number of different prefixes/prefixoids (see 2) or same prefixes/prefixoids (see 3) stacked on a base is three, and the most frequent number is two (see 1). Regarding the intensifying prefixes/prefixoids found in combinations, it has been noticed that not all elements, namely 13, are available (e.g., *gamo-*), and those that appear do not all have the same frequency (i.e., *arxi-* and *kara-* are highly frequent). Moreover, these combinations exhibit either prototypical intensifiers (see 1-2) or pejorative intensifiers (see 4-5). Regarding the combinations, some are more frequent (see 1), less frequent (see 4), or found once (see 5). Concerning the order of prefixes/prefixoids in combinations, semantically transparent elements are placed first (see 1) (Melinger 2001: 8). Combinations may also reflect the order of elements in syntactic phrases (see 4) or can be freely selected (see 5) (Izert 2012: 443). This study aims to shed light on the understudied topic of intensifying prefix/prefixoids combinations in ModGr nouns and discuss the ordering of prefixes/prefixoids cross-linguistically.

- (1) *kara-kata-putána* ‘lit. extreme whore; insult for an immoral woman’  
INT-INT-whore.N
- (2) *arxi-iper-super-vlaks* ‘lit. extreme fool; person of limited intelligence’  
INT-INT-INT-fool.N
- (3) *kara-kara-kara-maláka(s)* ‘extreme asshole’  
INT-INT-INT-asshole.N
- (4) *palio-skato-karióla* ‘lit. extreme bitch’ (prefixoids: *palioskató* ‘lit. little shit’)  
INT-INT-bitch.N
- (5) *pusto-kolo-vromiári(s)* ‘lit. very very asswipe; insult for an unpleasant man’  
INT-INT-asswipe.N



## References

- Christopoulou, K. 2016. Μια λεξικολογική προσέγγιση στο περιθωριακό λεξιλόγιο της νέας ελληνικής [A lexicological analysis of slang vocabulary of Modern Greek]. PhD dissertation. Patras: University of Patras.
- Dressler, W. U. & L. Merlini Barbaresi. 1994. *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and Intensifiers in Italian, German, and Other Languages*. Berlin/Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Efthymiou, A. 2003. Προθήματα ή α' συνθετικά που δηλώνουν επίταση στη Ν.Ε. [Prefixes and first constituents denoting intensification in Modern Greek]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 23, 519-528.
- Efthymiou, A. 2019a. Η μορφολογική ποικιλία στα αξιολογικά επίθετα και ρήματα της Νέας Ελληνικής [Morphological variety in evaluative adjectives and verbs in Modern Greek]. In A. Archakis, N. Koutsoukos, G. Xydopoulos and D. Papazachariou (Eds.). *Γλωσσική ποικιλία: μελέτες αφιερωμένες στην Αγγελική Ράλλη* [Morphological variation: Festschrift in honor of Angela Ralli]. Athens: Kapa, 155–176.
- Gavriilidou, Z. 2016. *Όψεις Επίτασης στη Νέα Ελληνική* [Aspects of intensity in Modern Greek]. Thessaloniki: Kyriakides.
- Giannakis, G. K. & G. Katsouda. 2024. Taboos. In G. K. Giannakis (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Greek Language and Linguistics Online*. Brill.
- Grandi, N. 2023. *Evaluative Morphology in the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grandi, N. & L. Körtvélyessy. 2015. Introduction: Why evaluative morphology. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (eds.). *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 3-20.
- Izert, M. 2012. Prefixes extra- et supra comme intensificateurs de la propriété en Français Contemporain. *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 59(4), 437-446.
- Jay, T. 2009. The Utility and Ubiquity of Taboo Words. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 4(2), 153-161.
- Kallergi, H., Katsouda, G., Konstantinidou, M. & A. Tsangalidis. 2023. Expressivity in Modern Greek: Some morphological mechanisms for the expression of negative emotions. In J. Williams (Ed.). *Expressivity in European Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 123-228.
- Manova, S. & K. Winternitz. 2011. Suffix order in double and multiple diminutives: with data from Polish and Bulgarian. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 6, 115-138.
- Melinger, A. 2001. Morphological Complexity in English Prefixed Words: An Experimental Investigation. PhD dissertation. Buffalo: State University of New York.
- Rainer, F. 2015. Intensification. In P. O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen & F. Rainer (Eds.). *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Scalise, S. 1986. *Generative Morphology* (Second edition). Dordrecht: Foris.
- Xydopoulos, G. J. & K. Christopoulou. 2011. The morphological processes of diminution and augmentation in Modern Greek slang. *10th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Komotini: Democritus University of Thrace.

## Abbreviations

INT intensifier/intensifying, N noun

## The emergence of the evaluative prefixoids *homo-* and *ezo-* in Czech as a reflection of social attitudes

Jakub Sláma

Czech Language Institute, Prague, The Czech Republic

[slama@ujc.cas.cz](mailto:slama@ujc.cas.cz)

Evaluative morphology in Czech has not received systematic attention, with the exception of various studies of diminutives and Zima's (1961) study of expressiveness in Czech, which mentions morphological means of conveying notions such as endearment and pejoration. More generally, studies of evaluative morphology have often focused especially on the extension of abstract concepts such as size and size-grounded evaluation, hence the frequent focus especially on diminutives and augmentatives (e.g., Prieto 2015). I will show, however, that Czech does offer other morphological devices that are interesting from the point of view of evaluative morphology by focusing on the lexical prefixoids *homo-* and *ezo-*, associated with pejoration (see e.g. Sánchez Fajardo 2022).

The Czech prefixoid *homo-* has the original sense of 'sameness' (*homonyma* 'homonyms'), a relatively new relational sense, 'homosexual, relating to homosexuality/homosexuals' (*homosňatek* 'gay-marriage'), and also a new pejorative function (noted in Sláma, 2023), in which it simply conveys the notion of negative evaluation (e.g., *homokonec* 'gay-ending' was used, for instance, by a male speaker to refer to the too-romantic ending of a romantic comedy movie – which did not involve any gay characters). Using corpora of Czech, the sense 'homosexual' can be traced as a relatively recent development, and its even more recent pejoration is presumably still underway. Quantitative comparison of the data from an older web corpus (Araneum Bohemicum Maximum, data from 2013) and a more recent one (online1, data from 2017 to 2021) shows a significant increase in the proportion of pejorative uses of words with *homo-* (15% to 25%) and a corresponding decrease in the proportion of uses in the sense 'homosexual' (70% to 57%). Additionally, *homo-* can be used now in a variety of slurs, in which the second component has no effect on the meaning of the slur (e.g., *homokláda*, literally 'gay-log/tree-trunk,' is simply a slur, targeted typically (but not necessarily) at (presumably) gay men). The pejoration of *homo-* presumably reflects negative attitudes towards homosexuality of some speakers.

Similarly, the emergence of *ezo-* (based on *ezoterický* 'esoteric') is a recent development (noted in Sláma, 2018). While *homo-* also has non-pejorative senses, *ezo-* (similarly to the adjective *ezoterický*) is used in more or less pejorative contexts from the start. The second case study uses corpus data (and especially data from web corpora) to document how *ezo-* emerged and how its emergence was most likely affected by the immense notoriety of the Czech phone-in TV program *EZO.TV* and some of its hosts (e.g., the fortune-teller Jolanda). As illustrated by both web corpus data and data from the database of neologisms Neomat, *ezo-* seems to have been drifting away from the negative evaluation of practices such as fortune-telling towards the negative evaluation of the stereotype of (especially) a woman who is interested in alternative forms of parenting, wears hand-dyed clothes, is anti-vax, and the like.

In summary, both *homo-* and *ezo-* have pejorative functions based on the lexical senses 'homosexual' and 'esoteric,' respectively, reflecting negative attitudes of certain speakers towards certain social phenomena.

## References

- Prieto, V. M. (2015): The Semantics of Evaluative Morphology. In: N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Sánchez Fajardo, J. A. (2022): Pejorative Suffixes and Combining Forms in English. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sláma, J. (2018): K (polo)automatické excerpci neologismů [On Semi-Automatic Detection of Neologisms]. *Jazykovědné aktuality* 53(3–4): 34–46.
- Sláma, J. (2023): *Haluzárna, bafačky a homokonec*: Neologismy na webu Československé filmové databáze a relevance neologismů (nejen) pro popis slovotvorby [*Haluzárna, bafačky and homokonec*: Neologisms on the Website of the Czech-Slovak Film Database and the Relevance of Neologisms (Not Only) for the Description of Word-formation]. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* 105(1): 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.14712/23366591.2023.1.2>
- Zima, J. (1961): *Expresivita slova v současné češtině: Studie lexikologická a stylistická* [The expressiveness of words in contemporary Czech: A lexicological and stylistic study]. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.

## Evaluative compounding: Insights from two Dutch case studies on its productivity and competition

Kristel Van Goethem (F.R.S.-FNRS & Université catholique de Louvain)

[Kristel.vangoethem@uclouvain.be](mailto:Kristel.vangoethem@uclouvain.be)

Štekauer (2015: 47) claims that affixation is “by far the most common strategy employed in evaluative morphology”. Accordingly, the primary focus of evaluative morphology (Grandi & Körtvélyessy 2015) has traditionally been on derivational processes, such as diminutive suffixes and intensifying prefixes (e.g., Dressler & Barbaresi 1994, Manova et al. 2023). Štekauer (2015: 51) also highlights an interesting paradox, noting that although compounding, along with suffixation, is one of the most widespread word-formation processes in general, this does not extend to evaluative formation.

In certain languages, however, compounding serves as a highly productive source of evaluative morphology. This paper aims to provide evidence for this claim by presenting two case studies of evaluative compounding in Dutch, with particular attention to its productivity and competition with corresponding evaluative phrasal constructions. The first case study will focus on Dutch nominal ameliorative compounds with corresponding expressive binominal phrasal constructions. Specifically, we will compare the morphological and phrasal constructions involving *pracht* (‘beauty’), *droom* (‘dream’), and *wonder* (‘wonder’) (e.g., *een prachtvrouw* ‘lit. a beauty-woman; a beautiful woman’ vs. *een pracht van een vrouw* ‘lit. a beauty of a woman; a beautiful woman’). The second case study will concentrate on adjectival evaluative compounds that express intensification through comparison, also called “similes” or “elative compounds” (Hoeksema 2012), as well as their phrasal counterparts (e.g., *apetrots* ‘lit. monkey-proud’ / *zo trots als een pauw* ‘lit. as proud as a peacock; very proud’). The differences and similarities between the evaluative compounds and their corresponding phrases will be determined through a detailed corpus analysis of their semantic and formal properties, as well as their productivity. The corpus data will be taken from the Dutch Web Corpus 2020 (nlTenTen20), available on SketchEngine (Kilgariff et al. 2014).

On a theoretical level, the case studies will allow us to address the question of whether the evaluative compounds and their corresponding phrasal patterns are complementary or in competition with each other. Our studies will show that some subpatterns form good alternates (e.g., [*een pracht*-N] vs. [*een pracht van een N*]), while others are used in quite divergent ways ([*een droom*-N] vs. [*een droom van een N*]).

## References

- Dressler, W. U., & Barbaresi, L. M. (1994). *Morphopragmatics. Diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German, and other languages*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grandi, N., & Körtvélyessy, L. (Eds.). (2015). *The Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hoeksema, J. (2012). Elative compounds in Dutch: Properties and developments. In G. Oebel (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic comparison of intensified adjectives and adverbs* (pp. 97-142). Hamburg: Kovač Verlag.
- Kilgariff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubiček, M., Kovař, M., Michelfeit, J., Rychly, P., & Suchomel, V. (2014). The Sketch Engine: Ten years on. *Lexicography*, 1, 7-36.
- Manova, S., Grestenberger, L., & Korecky-Kröll, K. (Eds.). (2023). *Diminutives across languages, theoretical frameworks and linguistic domains*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Štekauer, P. (2015). Word-formation processes in evaluative morphology. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology* (pp. 43-60). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

## Evaluative Morphology in the Languages of Northeastern Eurasia: Typological Peculiarities

Daria Vladimirovna Savina, Maria Ilyinichna Satina  
Lomonosov Moscow State University,  
[savinadaria1804@gmail.com](mailto:savinadaria1804@gmail.com); [mazzshasatina@gmail.com](mailto:mazzshasatina@gmail.com)

The linguistic material from the area of Northeastern Eurasia, which is often overlooked in typological works on evaluative morphology, can provide valuable insights into the ways in which typological predictions for the distribution and functioning of the evaluative affixes can be contradicted.

The data from the following languages will be discussed: Nivkh (Paleo-Siberian language isolate), Northern Mansi (Ob-Ugric < Uralic), Kazym Khanty (Ob-Ugric < Uralic) and Tundra Nenets (Samoyedic < Uralic).

The phenomena under discussion are the following:

1. The distribution patterns of the diminutives in Northern Mansi and Nivkh contradict the implicational hierarchy proposed by (Bauer 1997: 540):

NOUNS > ADJECTIVES/VERBS > ADVERBS/NUMERALS/PRONOUNS/INTERJECTIONS > DETERMINERS

In Northern Mansi the diminutive markers *-rie* and *-kwe* are of transcategorial nature and seem to be equally productive in the nominal and verbal domain, although it is unusual for the same affix to attach to bases belonging to different word classes (Štekauer 2015: 58). The same can be observed in Lamukhin Even (North Tungusic < Tungusic) (Pakendorf 2017: 156). In Nivkh, as noted in (Gruzdeva 2015), the distribution of the attenuative marker *-jo* is virtually limited to the verbal domain.

2. The attenuative markers in the languages of Northeastern Eurasia seem to share a common trait of exhibiting the comparative-attenuative polysemy and occurring in comparative constructions as comparison markers (our data for Northern Mansi, (Décsy 1966: 59) for Nenets, (Winkler 2001: 41) for Udmurt, (Sinytsina 2023: 673–675) for Hill Mari), although it is claimed in (Stassen 2013), (Treis 2018: 2) that the use of such markers is a typologically rare phenomenon. We assume that in comparative contexts cross-linguistically attenuation takes place not in regard to the quality encoded by the base word, but rather the difference value.
3. Both in Northern Mansi and Kazym Khanty the diminutive suffixes, when used in the verbal domain<sup>1</sup>, act as inflectional rather than derivational markers and seem not to modify the meaning of the base verb *per se*, as would be expected of the verbal diminutive in its canonical understanding (Audring, Leufkens, van Lier 2021), but to put one of the participants of the situation described in the sentence in empathy focus. We argue that the main factor influencing the choice of the participant to be put in empathy focus is discourse salience.

<sup>1</sup> Most of the instances of the Kazym Khanty diminutive marker *-ije* occurring on particles, verbs and adverbs, as in (4), are found in relatively old and mostly folklore texts (Solovar 2012); in modern KKh the diminutive markers are only productive in the nominal domain.

## References

- Audring, J., Leufkens, S., & van Lier, E. (2021). *Small events: Verbal diminutives in the languages of the world*. *Linguistic Typology at the Crossroads*, 1, 223-256.
- Bauer, L. (1997). *Evaluative morphology: In search of universals*. *Studies in Language*, 21(3), 533–575.
- Berezovskaya, P. (2020). *Comparing Comparatives: New Perspectives from Fieldwork and Processing*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Tübingen].
- Décsy, G. (1966). *Yurak chrestomathy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Grandi, N., & Körtvélyessy, L. (Eds.) (2015a). *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gruzdeva, (Eds.) (2015). *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. & Otaina, G. A. (2012). *Essays on the syntax of the Nivkh language*. Moscow: Znak.
- Panfilov, V. Z. (1965), *Grammatika nivxskogo jazyka. Tom 2* [Grammar of the Nivkh language: Volume 2], Moscow; Leningrad: Nauka.
- Pakendorf, B. (2017). *Lamunkhin Even evaluative morphology in cross-linguistic comparison*. *Morphology*, 27 (2), 123–158.
- Sinitsyna Y. V. (2023). *Comparative constructions* // In E. V. Kashkin (Ed.), M.-É. A. Winkler, T. I. Davidyuk, V. V. Dyachkov, V. A. Ivanov, D. D. Mordashova, P. S. Pleshak, & I. A. Khomchenkova (Eds.), *Elements of the Hill Mari language in typological perspective* (pp. 648–681). Moscow: Buki Vedi.
- Štekauer, P. (2015). *Word-formation processes in evaluative morphology*. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 43–60). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Solovar, V. N. (2012). *The ways of emotivity expression in Khanty language*. *Bulletin of Ugric studies*, 3, 62-63.
- Winkler, E. (2001). *Udmurt*. München: Lincom Europa.