Valoda: nozīme un forma / Language: Meaning and Form 13, 2022, 159–178.
https://doi.org/10.22364/vnf.13.11

A descriptive framework for evaluative morphology resources

Vērtējummorfoloģijas līdzekļu apraksta ietvars

Rafael Martín Calvo

Faculty of Translation Studies
Ventspils University of Applied Sciences
Inženieru iela 101A, Ventspils, LV-3601, Latvija
E-mail: *rafaels.kalvo@venta.lv, rafaelmartincalvo@gmail.com*

A thorough review of contemporary evaluative morphology (EM) research shows that descriptions of the EM resources available to languages tend to be unsystematic and lacking in thoroughness, given the absence of an established descriptive framework. The aim of this study is to propose a framework for the systematic description of the EM resources of natural languages. The discussion is structured according to various productivity indicators attested in the construction of evaluative forms (EVALs). The study reviews a previous proposal by Körtvélyessy (2015a), addressing some perceived shortcomings and expanding its scope. Notably, the proposed framework includes a description of a) all morphological processes involved in EVAL-formation, b) the availability of different word classes as bases in EVAL-formation, c) a set of semantic features for the dynamic interpretation of EVALs, and d) the recursive possibilities of evaluative markers. Aside from the description of EM resources, the proposed framework also suggests procedures for their numerical quantification, to obtain measurable indicators that may be further used in contrastive, typological and areal EM research.

Keywords: evaluative morphology; evaluative forms; evaluative markers; descriptive framework; diminutives.

Introduction

A feature attested in languages from all genealogical affiliations is that of conveying expressive and evaluative meanings (in addition to the merely referential) with a significant economy of morphological means. While so-called diminutives and augmentatives are the flagship forms of *evaluative morphology* (henceforth EM), the richness of forms and meanings of lexical units conveying evaluativity goes far beyond those prototypical forms. At the word level, the morphological modification of certain units to express a wide range of semantic features and pragmatic functions finds its realization in lexical units which in this study will be termed *evaluative forms*. Terms such as *expressive derivatives* (Stankiewicz 1954), *evaluative derivatives*

(Stump 1993, Böhmerová 2011), *evaluative formations* (Körtvélyessy 2015a) or *evaluative constructions* (Grandi, Körtvélyessy 2015b) have also been used previously to refer to the lexical units considered in this study. In most instances, those terms also encompass common derivatives, which is not the case in the present study. Throughout the study, *evaluative form* (henceforth EVAL) will be employed as an umbrella term covering all morphological constructions obtained by means of an *evaluative marker*, which, in turn, identifies morphs (affixal or not) carrying out an explicit evaluative role in their application via a morphological process, whereby a base acquires an additional evaluative dimension, which finds its realization in a variety of semantic features and/or pragmatic functions: e.g., SPA *casa* 'house' > *cas**ita*** 'house.DIM/APP'. (In the present article evaluative markers are indicated in bold, while the semantic gloss relies on the set of interpretative semantic features discussed in section 2.5. The language of each example is indicated according to the ISO 693-3 standard, the most comprehensive to date).

A problematic issue identified in EM research is that descriptive studies of EM resources in a language are rarely thorough in their approach and are often brief and lacking in systematicity. While the more than 50 single-language descriptions contained in Grandi and Körtvélyessy (2015a) – as well as in works such as Ettinger (1974) or Ponsonnet and Vuillermet (2018) – are an extremely valuable source of data and linguistic material, they are nonetheless very succinct and lacking in a unified approach. Some of the descriptions discuss mainly individual evaluative markers, while others focus on morphological processes or semantic features. The difficulty of establishing a reliable *tertium comparationis* is addressed by Körtvélyessy (2015c, 108), who argues that "the comparison of word classes that can be diminutivised or augmentivise in languages so distinct as are, for example, English, Hungarian, Slovak, Jingulu and Plains Cree seems to be rather complicated. Semantic categories do not offer a remedy, because of either the plethora of various theoretical approaches or, consequently, an absence of agreed and fixed terminology". Himmelmann (2017) also sums up the difficulty of achieving a widely accepted consensus, pointing out that "classifications can be based on syntactic (distributional), morphological, semantic, or pragmatic criteria [but] the resulting classifications often fail to correlate, with authors being divided as to how to deal with the incongruities".

1. Approaches to the description and quantification of a language's EM resources

It can be argued that studies addressing the description of a given linguistic feature in a language should strive to describe the said feature in a well-structured manner and, if possible, even to measure quantitatively the significance of the feature in the linguistic system where it appears. As proposed by Grandi (2011, 7), a typological grouping of languages according to their EM resources could be based on determining the presence or absence of diminutives, the presence or absence of augmentatives, and the four possible combinations among these options. This approach, however, is

not sufficient for a thorough description of EM resources, as it does not account for significant portions of the semantic features (or pragmatic functions) conveyed by EVALs, such as attenuation, pejoration, intensification, appreciation, excess, etc.

To carry out reliable and thorough descriptions of EM resources in a language, the implementation of a quantitative framework can be of substantial assistance. Structuring the investigation in accordance with a model that can provide objective and measurable parameters will result in several analytical advantages. From a descriptive perspective, it provides a template that researchers may follow to obtain well-structured and comprehensive descriptions. From a contrastive perspective, the quantification of difference may allow for a more accurate assessment of the significance of divergences encountered between two languages and more accurate predictions can be expected in terms of challenges related to activities such as language learning or translation. From a typological perspective, the quantification of various descriptive parameters allows for a subsequent distinction among groups of languages sharing similar numerical values.

The quantification of EM resources in a large and representative sample of the world's languages has been pioneered by Körtvélyessy, in her study *Evaluative morphology from a cross-linguistic perspective* (2015a). One of the explicit aims of Körtvélyessy's study is the calculation of an *EM saturation value* (S_{EM}) for each of the 132 languages considered in her survey (ibid., 55): "EM saturation is a mean of three values: word-formation value (V_{WF}), cognitive category value (V_{SC}) and word class value (V_{WC}). They are numerical representations of productive use of word-formation processes, cognitive categories, and word classes in evaluative morphology in a language: $S_{EM} = (V_{WF}+V_{SC}+V_{WC})$: 3". The results obtained from Körtvélyessy's analysis – based on data collected from informant surveys – show definite tendencies concerning the EM of languages in terms of the number of available morphological resources and semantic features conveyed using EVAL-forming processes. However, various objections vis-à-vis Körtvélyessy's approach are discussed in this section.

A preliminary and broad concern is Körtvélyessy's focus on the presence and/or absence of diminutives and augmentatives. On the one hand, this approach does not address the much richer and more varied semantic range conveyed by EVALs. On the other hand, these two traditional notional categories are, in many languages, morphosemantically intertwined to the point of near indiscernibility from categories such as pejoration, attenuation, intensification, honorific, etc. Consequently, it can be argued that an analysis based on specific interpretative features would be better suited to reflect the semantic diversity attested for EVALs in available EM descriptions.

Another matter requiring careful examination is the manner in which the numerical values obtained for each of the three aspects examined in Körtvélyessy's proposal can best reflect the relevance of the studied aspect. This addresses a methodological concern, as the assignment of numerical values to collected data in Körtvélyessy's study is not founded upon any solid theoretical principle. Moreover, in the final calculation of the proposed EM saturation value, no proper underlying idea justifies the joint computation of the three separate values. In this regard, the revised approach discussed in the present study (a rework of Körtvélyessy's proposal) argues for the individual

consideration of each of the values obtained, as their separate consideration may draw a more detailed picture of the similitudes and differences between any language pair (or group) in subsequent interlinguistic contrastive analyses.

The descriptive framework discussed in this article is developed according to a pre-established set of parameters and aims to structure and facilitate the description of EM resources and to express the obtained data in a numerical form, as calculated according to certain theoretical foundations. The framework has been tested satisfactorily with the Spanish and Latvian languages (Martín Calvo 2022), ensuring its feasibility. The following section contains the discussion of five productivity parameters, previous approaches to their description, as well as a reasoned quantitative approach to the obtention of five independent but complementary EM saturation values.

2. Productivity parameters in the description of EM resources

Seeking to develop a descriptive EM framework in such a manner that it is feasible, not overly complex from a conceptual perspective and applicable cross-linguistically, a limited number of features relevant to EM have been selected to construct the present descriptive framework. Its main aim is to conceptualize and quantify five main descriptive features related to a given language's morphological resources involved in EVAL-formation. Five descriptive aspects have been considered as productivity indicators, given that they have a direct impact in terms of which types of EVALs may be obtained in a language, as well as which semantic features these EVALs may convey. Each productivity indicator, as well as the quantitative approach to its numerical expression (in the form of five individual values), are discussed in the following subsections.

2.1. Types of morphological EVAL-forming processes

Based on a 200+ language sample, Štekauer (2015a, 46–53) has described morphological processes involved in EM and established a thorough typology in which twelve processes for EM formation are described. However, Štekauer (ibid., 43) duly notes that the relevance or validity of these processes "depends heavily on the definition of the scope of evaluative morphology, (an issue, on which there is no agreement between morphologists)". The twelve processes described by Štekauer are divided into inflectional and derivational groups as follows:

a) derivational: affixation, prefixal-suffixal derivation, circumfixation, reduplication, prefixation of a reduplicated base, compounding, root and pattern, sound symbolism, introflection;
b) inflectional: change of inflection class, classifiers, clitics (Štekauer 2015a, 46–53). Such division, however, seems at odds with Štekauer's admission (2015b, 231) in that "it is not possible to draw a clear-cut borderline between inflection and derivation and that the relation between these two areas of

morphology is best treated 'as a cline rather than a dichotomy' [..], with prototypical cases at both ends of the cline".

Furthermore, a division into derivational and inflectional morphological processes does not seem an adequate overall approach if, as argued by some researchers EM is to be considered as a third type of morphology, with its own set of distinct morphological rules (see Grandi 1998, 644 and Fortin 2011, 42–50). Moreover, linguistic evidence offered by Štekauer (2015a) to characterize some of the proposed processes as evaluative has not been considered entirely conclusive, while other processes, such as *sound symbolism*, need not be considered as they are not essentially morphological but phonological in nature. Accordingly, the subsequent examination will be exclusively on EVAL-forming processes, not taking into consideration processes that are fundamentally derivational or not morphological in nature.

Seeking to examine thoroughly the possibility of EVAL-formation in different languages, this study follows (albeit with some minor variations, further discussed) the classification of morphological processes proposed by Mel'čuk (2000) and revised by Beck (2017). The taxonomy of morphological processes is divided by Beck (ibid., 326) into two main types of processes: additive (comprising compounding, affixation and suprafixation) and non-concatenative (comprising reduplication, segmental apophonies, suprasegmental apophonies and conversion) A total of 18 processes will be briefly characterized and discussed concerning their presence or absence as EVAL-forming processes.

2.1.1. Additive processes

A.1 Compounding. The process of compounding as an EVAL-forming process involves the addition upon a base of a stem which has undergone a process of complete or partial loss of its original meaning: TEL ***paččabaddham*** '[raw+lie] gross lie' (Sailaja 2015, 325), NLD ***stervens****duur* '[dying + expensive] prohibitively expensive' (Hoeksema 2012, 114). Such compounds rather commonly contain expletives, given the frequency of the partial desemantization, morphological flexibility and grammatical promiscuity of these lexical units: DAN ***røv****tur* '[ass + trip], trip.PEJ' (Miller 2017, 48), NLD ***dood****simpel* '[dead + simple] very simple' (Hoeksema 2012, 115), DEU ***scheiß****egal* '[shit + irrelevant] totally irrelevant' (Finkbeiner et al. 2016, 3). In all cases described, the stems added to the bases have lost their reference to an original signified and have become resemanticized as evaluative markers, usually conveying appreciation, pejoration, or intensification.

A.2 Affixation. As evidenced by cross-linguistic research (see Grandi, Körtvélyessy 2015b), affixation is decidedly the most common and productive of EVAL-forming processes Affixation processes can be divided into six subtypes:

1. **Canonical affixation**. Both prefixation and suffixation are the most thoroughly researched EVAL-forming processes, attested in a majority of EM productive languages: LAV *kaķis* 'cat' > *kaķ****īt****is* 'cat.DIM/APP', SPA *bueno* 'good' > ***re****bueno* 'good.INT'.

2. **Infixation**. Although not widely employed in EVAL-formation, it has been attested for various languages: e.g., ARY *sbəʕ* 'lion' > *sbə**yyə**ʕ* 'small lion' (Arbaoui 2015, 467). Recently attested and productive infixes with evaluative semantics are the African American Vernacular English infix *-iz(z)-* (e.g., dark > d**izz**ark, in Miller 2004), as well as the 'Homeric infix' *-ma-*: e.g., saxophone > saxo**ma**phone, secretary > secre**ma**tary (Yu 2004, n.p.).
3. **Transfixation**. Defined by Mel'čuk (2000, 528) as a process in which "affixes interrupt roots and are interrupted by elements of roots themselves", transfixation has been attested as a widespread EVAL-forming process in Semitic languages: HEB *šéver* 'fraction' > *š**a**vri**r*** 'small fraction' (Faust 2015, 238), ARA *jisr* 'bridge' > ***ju**s**ay**r*** 'small bridge' (Arbaoui 2015, 461).
4. **Circumfixation**. Circumfixation has been attested for Berber, among other languages: ZBT *fus* 'hand' > ***t**fus**t*** '≈ small hand' (Abdel-Massih 1971, 128).
5. **Co-prefixation and co-suffixation**. Beck (2017, 337) describes as separate categories of co-fixes the groupings of prefixes and suffixes labelled *co-prefixes* and *co-suffixes* respectively. As far as it has been possible to ascertain, no instances of these two processes have been described associated with EVAL-formation. Instances of EVALs containing more than one evaluative affix are considered as cases in which one same morphological rule is applied recursively: SPA *tonto* 'silly' > *tont-**orr-ón*** 'silly.INT.PEJ'. While there are cases, in which one affix may require the presence of another, they cannot be said to form one 'single, non-decomposable, linguistic sign', but rather than in certain specific instances, their joint presence is required.
6. **Interfixation**. Given that interfixes (or intermorphs) are defined by Beck (2017, 338 and 352) as semantically empty linking morphs found between the two elements of a compound or serving as a nexus between a stem and a derivational or inflectional affix, they cannot be considered as productive evaluative markers, although they may be found in evaluative forms, as required by language-specific morphological and phonological rules: SPA *flor* 'flower' > *flor<ec>**ill**-a* 'flower.DIM/APP'.

B. Suprafixation. Beck (2017, 338) defines suprafixation as "the addition of a predefined suprasegmental element, most commonly a fixed tonal melody, to a base. Suprafixation, as opposed to suprasegmental apophony, always involves the application of a specific suprasegmental element or pattern, a suprafix". Insofar as it has been possible to ascertain, no instances of this process have been found described in relation to EVAL-formation.

C. Cliticization. Although not included in Beck's taxonomy (2017), cliticization has been proposed by Štekauer (2015a, 46) as an EVAL-forming process attested in languages such as Apma (Oceanic family) (Schneider 2015, 346–348), Eton (Bantu family) (Van de Velde 2008, 207) or Dalabon (Gunwinyguan family) (Ponsonnet and Evans 2015, 402).

2.1.2. Metamorphic or non-concatenative processes

A. Reduplication. Reduplication, as defined by Frampton (2009, 3), consist in the repetition of a linguistic segment in such a manner that "the material produced by copying, called the *reduplicant*, is adjacent to the original, often called the *base*". According to Mattes (2014, 35), the classification of reduplications from a formal point of view can be carried out according to different variables, but the basic distinction is established between *full reduplication* of a word, a stem or a root, or *partial reduplication* of a portion of the simplex form. However, reduplications may be simultaneously characterized according to the location of the base in relation to the stem – initial, internal, or final. The present study will consider these two variables to distinguish among five types of reduplications, all of which have been attested to be involved in EVAL-formation:

- full-preposing: IMI *xya* 'white' > ***xya***~*xya* 'whitish' (Ingram 2001, 161)
- full-postposing: EUS *handi* 'big' > *handi*-***handi****a* 'very big' (Artiagoitia 2015, 203)
- partial-preposing: FRA *fille* 'girl' > ***fi****fille* '≈ little girl, sweet girl'
- partial-postposing: HEB *zanav* 'tail' > *znav****nav*** 'small tail' (Faust 2015, 239)
- partial-infixing: SHS *sqéx̌he* 'dog' > *sqé****q****x̌he* 'little dog' (Yu 2003, 43)

B. Segmental apophonies. Under this label, Beck (2017, 344) describes processes involving modifications to a base by "making changes to one or more of its segments, altering its tonal or accentual patterns, or by removing material from it". Beck's study establishes a difference between:

1. **Mutation or replacement**, "a phonological alternation in a particular segment or segments of a base that expresses a regular meaning" (ibid.). While the most common types of mutations are ablaut and umlaut, none of them has been clearly identified as a stand-alone EVAL-forming process, although they may be triggered by other processes: GER *Buch* 'book' > *Büch****lein***.
2. **Subtraction or truncation** "is a morphological process that removes part of the base" (ibid., 347). This process, although rare in EVAL-formation, has been attested in languages in which the evaluative marker takes the form of a disfix: SHI ***t****agrtil****t*** 'mat' > *agrtil* 'large mat' (Lahrouchi and Ridouane 2016, 457).
3. **Metathesis** involves a modification by altering the order of the elements in the base via permutation. The consulted EM literature has not provided any instance in which metathesis appears discusses as a productive EVAL-formation process.

C. Suprasegmental apophonies. These processes "involve making a change to the tonal melody, accentual pattern or some other non-segmental phonological feature of the base" (Beck 2017, 348). However, since suprasegmental apophonies are better analysed from a phonological or prosodic viewpoint, rather than from a strictly morphological one, they are not further examined in this study.

D. Conversion alludes to alterations of the grammatical properties of the base. Although Štekauer (2015a, 47) states that "conversion appears to be totally absent" in EVAL-formation, several attested instances contradict this affirmation. Beck (2017, 351) describes three subtypes of conversion:

1. **Categorial conversion** involves a change in word class or part of speech: e.g., *pepper*$_{N}$ > *to pepper*$_{V}$. By its very nature, categorial conversion is incompatible with EVAL-formation, a process in which the base's referent and word class must remain unchanged.
2. **Rectional conversion** "involves a change in the government or agreement pattern of a word" (ibid.). This type of conversion is observed in the case of changes in the grammatical gender of the base, as observed in EVAL-formation in Iatmul (Jendraschek 2015, 409), Berber (Grandi 2015, 456), and Latvian (Kalnača 2014, 85–86): e.g., LAV *skuķe*$_{FEM}$ 'girl, young woman' > *skuķis*$_{MASC}$ 'girl', but also 'inexperienced or unserious young woman' (Tezaurs.lv, 2022). These genuine cases must be differentiated from those in which a gender shift occurs as a by-product of other EVAL-formation processes: e.g., SPA *problema*$_{FEM}$ 'problem' > *problem*ón$_{MASC}$ 'problem.AUG'.
3. **Paradigmatic conversion** modifies the paradigmatic properties of the word, such as changes in noun class. This process has been attested as EVAL-forming in Shona and Venda: SHO *mu*$_{CL1}$*-cheri* 'drinker' > ***zi***$_{CL21}$***-mu***$_{CL1}$*-cheri* / ***zi****mucheri* 'heavy drinker' (Mudzingwa and Kadenge 2014, 130); VEN *khali*$_{CL9}$ 'clay pot' > *thi*$_{CL17}$*-kali* 'small clay pot' > *thi*$_{CL17}$*-kal-**ana**, thikal**ana*** 'very small clay pot' (Poulos 1990, 87, as cited in Agbetsoamedo and Di Garbo 2015, 493).

Following the above discussion, it is considered that 15 morphological processes can be said to have been sufficiently attested as productive in EVAL-formation: compounding, five types of affixation, five types of reduplication, subtraction, two types of conversion and cliticization. The detailed discussion carried out in this section serves to establish a blueprint for processes that will require to be addressed in the description of a language's EVAL-forming possibilities. The number of attested EVAL-forming processes will be employed in the calculation of the EVAL-formation processes value (E_{FP}), obtained from the quotient resulting from dividing all attested EVAL-formation processes in a language by a divisor. Said divisor could be either a) the number of all strictly morphological processes previously described for a language, or b) the number of morphological processes attested as productive in EVAL-formation cross-linguistically (set at 15).

Given the mentioned lack of thoroughness concerning EM descriptions, as well as the difficulty of being sufficiently familiar with all existing EM descriptions, it is possible that some of the morphological processes not yet attested as EVAL-forming may in fact be productive in some languages. Therefore, to err on the side of caution, it seems safer to assume as the divisor the total number of morphological processes, established in an adapted version of Beck's classification at 22 (since tonal and accentual suprasegmental apophonies are arguably not fundamentally morphological processes). This approach is, admittedly, not entirely unproblematic: using the number of morphological processes existing in a language as a divisor would result in an evaluative formation processes value (E_{FP}) that would reflect more accurately the EVAL-forming resources of a language in relation to its own morphological processes. However, adopting the total number of morphological processes as the divisor seems to be a more neutral approach, as it allows for easier

cross-linguistic contrast and does not require a previous discussion of all available morphological processes in each language. While the choice of either divisor may be argued for and against from a variety of perspectives, an essential aspect is to remain consequent with the choice when computing the value for different languages prior to their contrast.

2.2. Morphological recursivity in EVAL-formation

One of the most characteristic features of evaluative markers is their recursivity, defined by Ralli (2012, 91) as the "cyclic reapplication of the same process". Additionally, evaluative markers do not necessarily block other markers carrying out an identical function (that of evaluation), even when conveying similar or near-identical semantic features or pragmatic functions. Recursivity must therefore be considered a key productivity element in EM given that it is one of the features clearly differentiating evaluative morphs from a majority of derivative and inflectional ones. Although recursivity has been amply remarked upon in EM research, no study has addressed a typology of this feature. In this regard, and according to available EM descriptions, three different types of recursion can be considered separately (Van den Berg 2015, 368):

a) *repetition*, involving the consecutive application (twice or more) of one same evaluative marker: SPA *poco* 'few, little' > *poqu-**it-it-**o* (*poqu**itit**o*) 'few.INT.INT, very, very few';
b) *recurrence*, involving the consecutive or simultaneous application of two or more evaluative markers employing the same EVAL-forming process (affixation or other): LAV *mamma* 'mom' > *mamm-**uc-īt-**e* (*mamm**ucīt**e*) 'mom.APP.APP';
c) *concurrence*, involving the consecutive or simultaneous application of two or more evaluative markers employing two or more different EVAL-formation processes: e.g., prefixation plus reduplication: MNB *golu* 'ball' > ***ka**-golu-**golu*** 'DIM-ball-RED, small ball'.

The consecutive or simultaneous application of an EVAL-forming morphological rule (be it in the form of the same or different morphological processes) allows EVALs to encode and convey highly nuanced semantic features and pragmatic functions. Calculation of the *recursivity resources value* (E_{RR}) also takes the form of a quotient in which the divisor is a number expressing all seven available combinations of the three types of recursions described above, while the dividend is the number of instances or combinations of instances attested in a language. Thus, as illustrated in Martín Calvo (2022, 256–257), the E_{RR} value for Spanish would be 0,86, as six out of the seven possible recursion types have been attested: repetition (*pura* 'pure, sheer' > *pur**itit**a* [*pur-**it-it-**a*]), recurrence (*feo* 'ugly' > *fe**uchill**o* [*fe-**uch-ill-**o*]), concurrence (*impuesto* 'tax' > ***recontra**impuest**azo*** [***recontra-**impuest-**az-**o*]), repetition and recurrence (*corto* 'short' > *cort**iquitic**o* [*cort-**iqu-it-ic-**o*]), repetition and concurrence (*chico* 'small' > ***re**chiqu**itit**o* [***re**-chiqu-**it-it-**o*]), as well as recurrence and concurrence (*gorda* 'fat, plump' > ***re**gord**etill**a* [***re-**gord-**et-ill-**a*]).

2.3. Number of available standalone evaluative markers

This section addresses the number of available evaluative markers in a language. Different morphs may come to perform the role of an evaluative marker, some of them already pre-existing (as in the case of affixes), and some of them generated in relation to the base they appear attached to (as in the case of reduplicative processes). Given that it is not possible to account for context-dependent evaluative markers, only pre-existing markers will be taken into consideration.

EM studies and descriptions are rarely exhaustive in this respect. A majority of studies limit their discussion to a restricted number of them, their selection being usually carried out either in terms of common usage or in terms of traditional semantic labels. While it is understandable that not all descriptions can afford or achieve the level of thoroughness and detail seen in, for example, Rūķe-Draviņa (1959), González Ollé (1962) or Ettinger (1974), studies should strive to represent a wide sample of the language's resources, instead of limiting the discussion to the most typical instances. While a truly exhaustive account of all available evaluative markers in a language would require a dedicated study, it can be argued that even a reasonably thorough collection of recognized markers may already provide a rather accurate image of a language's wealth in this respect. Such thoroughness would be useful to reveal the morphological and semantic extent and diversity of a language's evaluative markers, as well as to allow for their joint consideration as an interrelated set of individual units.

In contrast to the calculation of the previous productivity values, the calculation of the number of stand-alone evaluative markers (E_{EM}) takes the form of a simple addition, one in which neither allomorphs nor combinations of evaluative markers should be considered separately. The value E_{EM} may not, in and of itself, give a full idea of a language's EM productivity, but it can attest to its diversity of forms and, foreseeably, of semanto-pragmatic features. Moreover, the E_{EM} value, when considered in combination with the rest of the above-described EM values, may be of assistance in conveying a more comprehensive picture of an EM system's overall resourcefulness.

A challenging aspect in the assemblage of a language's catalogue of evaluative markers appears both in terms of their formal evolution and relevance across time, as well as their presence or absence in the various nationlects, dialects and subdialects of the language in question. Regarding the former, it is considered that EM descriptions should generally adopt a synchronic perspective, accounting for evaluative markers which are relevant and productive at one moment in time. In that which concerns the various levels of dialectal variation, studies should adopt the perspective better suited to the specifics of the study. While this aspect may not be a concern in the case of languages with a rather limited number of speakers or geographical distribution, its clear definition is crucial for widely spoken languages with a high degree of variation across geographical areas.

2.4. Distribution of EVALs among word classes

Most EM descriptive studies examining the availability of different word classes as bases in EVAL-forming processes follow a distinction between major and minor word classes. However, as discussed by authors like Hengeveld (1992) or Haspelmath (2012), word class division is by no means cross-linguistically uniform. So-called major word classes can either be lacking in a language (then termed *rigid*) or a language may not differentiate between two of said word classes (termed *flexible*), i.e., "a single part of speech may be used in different functions" (Hengeveld 1992, 65). Such formal imbalance, present even among closely related languages, may be more pronounced between languages genealogically unrelated, for which the Anglo- and Eurocentric notions and definitions of individual word classes may not apply neatly.

EM research literature has traditionally been focused on denominal, deadjectival and deadverbial EVALs, while only more contemporary studies have addressed deverbal ones. Lexical units from minor word classes have received comparatively little attention, and hardly ever from a cross-linguistic perspective. A singular feature of evaluative markers (in opposition to common derivational and inflectional morphs) is that they are not, in principle, bound to a single word class. This extended availability has been the object of some research and authors like Ettinger (1974) and Nieuwenhuis (1985) have suggested hierarchies among word classes susceptible to EVAL-formation processes. Said hierarchies reflect the ample prevalence of denominal and deadjectival EVALs. However, ascertaining the productivity of evaluative markers within a language imposes the task of establishing some sort of organizational structure or principle that accounts for all possible instances. In the present proposal, the distribution of EVALs among word classes is carried out on a case-per-case basis, i.e., according to the recognized word classes in the description of each language.

Concerning word classes, two main aspects can be objected to the calculation of the *word class value* (V_{WC}) found in Körtvélyessy (2015a), whose study examines the presence of diminutive and augmentative formations in nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs. Additionally, her survey also collects information on class-changing derivatives, conflating once again EVALs and other evaluative constructions, when arguably they are best characterized as two different lexical groups (see Martín Calvo 2020). Unfortunately, Körtvélyessy's study does not examine so-called minor word classes (pronouns, numerals, determiners, interjections, etc.), although it can be conjectured that it is precisely in relation to these groups that significant and nuanced cross-linguistic discrepancies might be found. Additionally, the restriction to the notions *diminutive* and *augmentative* entails leaving unaccounted for a significant amount of EVALs. To address these shortcomings, the present approach proposes taking into consideration all word classes recognized in a language's grammatical description and establishing which of these are susceptible to EVAL-forming processes. Consequently, as discussed with regard to the word-formation value, also the word class value (E_{wc}) would be a numerical quotient in which the divisor would be the total number of word classes described for a given language and the dividend would be the total number of word classes available as bases to EVAL-formation processes. The result of the E_{wc} quotient will be found in an interval ranging from 0 (indicating a complete absence

of EVAL-forming processes in any word class) to 1 (indicating productive EVAL-forming processes in all word classes).

A challenging aspect of this computation is apparent when considering the word class value from a contrastive perspective. Given the variation found in the description of word classes across languages (as well as academic disagreements over the very definition of the term *word class*) the possibility of establishing a satisfactory classification that does not contain some type of conceptual bias or disputable assumption seems rather unlikely.

2.5. Interpretative semantic features for EVALs

Although language users seem to have a relatively keen grasp of the semantic functions of evaluative forms, clear semantic demarcations have proven to be difficult to establish in EM research. EM studies evidence that traditional categorial evaluative labels do not accurately portray the wide range of semantic features displayed by EVALs in a manner that would facilitate their analysis or comprehension. Ponsonnet (2018, 18), observes that "since diminutives and augmentatives can often express pejoration and melioration, their semantics largely overlap". An additional issue of contention is the way semantic features, pragmatic functions and emotional connotations are routinely discussed interchangeably, often without drawing well-defined boundaries among them. In the present study, the focus is solely on semantic features, that is, meanings that can be glossed via elemental semantic notions.

A noticeable feature in EM-related studies is the proliferation of different terms for similar, and often identical concepts. Under the terms *semantic features*, *semantic denotations*, *semantic connotations*, *emotional connotations*, *evaluative meanings* and others, a wide array of descriptors has been proposed by different authors. While some of the individual semantic features are based on qualitative and quantitative aspects (size, appreciation, repetition, etc.), others appeal to situational elements (such as *flirt* or *child-oriented speech*), to vaguely poetic labels (e.g., *caressing* or *graceful*), or to rather whimsical designations such as "comfort of familiar routines" (Ponsonnet 2018, 24), "condescending superiority" (Alonso 1961, 167), or "strategic humbleness" (Gaarder 1966, 586).

In line with a non-discrete approach to the categorization of evaluative markers, this study proposes a limited set of fundamental *interpretative features*, based on semantic and expressive meanings attested in available EM descriptions. The proposed fundamental interpretative features support a functional and dynamic (i.e., context-based) approach. Accordingly, evaluative markers are analysed individually, as encountered in specific linguistic contexts, while prototypical readings, as well as etymological aspects, are deemed secondary in terms of relevance. The set of interpretative features intends to cover as many denotational and connotational aspects of EVALs as possible. The said features are catalogued through labels that are distinctive enough without being overly specific, to avoid excessive segmentation. As a matter of theoretical principle, most of the features are available to all and any morphological markers, while it is in function of diatopic and diachronic aspects

(as well as contextual ones) that certain readings can be said to acquire prevalence. Likewise, semantic features often appear bundled, and only a contextual interpretation can provide a sense of which feature may prevail in an individual utterance.

1. **Appreciation (APP)**: It conveys a notion of positive evaluation of and disposition towards the marked object or the speech act situation at large. It encompasses senses such as familiarity, sympathy, tenderness, endearment, intimacy, affection, goodness, amelioration, respect, esteem, recognition of worth or status (honorific), commiseration, empathy, and pleasantness or correctness in actions. This feature is often found associated with both diminution and augmentation: e.g., SPA *película* 'film' > *peliculón* 'film.APP, great film'.
2. **Pejoration (PEJ)**: It conveys a notion of negative evaluation of and disposition towards the marked object or the speech act situation at large. It encompasses senses such as badness, contempt, enmity, wrongdoing, unpleasantness, antipathy, disrespect, disregard, irrelevance, and aimlessness (for actions): e.g., SPA *animal* 'animal' > *animalejo* 'animal.PEJ'.
3. **Diminution (DIM)**: It conveys mainly the evaluative notion of a decrease in quantity, particularly concerning physical objects. It encompasses senses such as smallness and littleness. In general terms, it is the semantic interaction between the base and the evaluative morph which indicates whether the main feature DIM is accompanied by other features, usually appreciation or pejoration: e.g., LAV *kaste* 'box' > *kastīte* 'box.DIM'.
4. **Augmentation (AUG)**: It conveys mainly the evaluative notion of an increase in quantity, and it encompasses senses such as largeness, amplitude, greatness, addition, and heftiness: e.g., SPA *zapato* 'shoe' > *zapatón* 'large shoe'.
5. **Intensification (INT)**: It conveys mainly the evaluative notion of an increase in intensity, encompassing senses such as richness, fullness, thoroughness, and completeness. This feature could be glossed analytically via adverbs such as 'absolutely', 'extremely', 'completely', 'entirely', 'totally', 'very', etc: SPA *tormenta* 'storm' > *tormentazo* 'intense storm'.
6. **Attenuation (ATT) / Approximation (APPR)**: Both features convey mainly the evaluative notion of an intrinsic lack or decrease in intensity, encompassing senses such as mitigation, partiality, paucity, deficiency, reduction, incompleteness, lack, indetermination, and uncertainty. While both features are relatively easy to distinguish in certain instances, there are others in which it is difficult to establish a strict difference. Therefore, to keep the present proposal from being excessively fragmentary, both interpretative features are discussed jointly. Attenuation and appreciation can be glossed analytically via adverbial constructions such as 'approximately', 'around', 'almost', as well as the locutions 'more or less', 'not quite', 'not very' and 'or so': e.g., nine > nine**ish** 'around nine'. Both features are often expressed in relation to immaterial or nonfigurative properties for which there is not an established or obvious standard. Such properties often concern notional objects related to the senses (particularly colour and taste), as well as to psychological and physical states: e.g., LAV *sarkans* 'red' > *iesarkans* 'reddish'.

7. **Excess (EXC)**: It conveys an evaluative judgement concerning superabundance or overdose. In general, it could be glossed analytically via the addition of the adverb 'too' or the adverbial locutions 'too much' and 'too many': e.g., EUS *gazi* 'salty' > *gazi**xe*** 'too salty' (Artagoitia 2015, 199).
8. **Exactness (EXA)**: Some evaluative markers have been characterized as conveying the evaluative notion of exactness, precision, thoroughness, limitation and prototypicality. This feature could be glossed analytically via adverbs such as 'precisely', 'completely', 'exactly', 'totally' or 'right', as well as locutions such as 'this very': e.g., EUS *hau* 'this' > *hau**xe*** 'precisely this', *orain* 'now' > *orain**txe*** 'right now' (Artiagoitia 2015, 198), or Jaqaru *sipsa* > *sipsa**cha*** 'just a single woman' (ibid., 598) (Birioukova and Hardman 2015, 597). It must be noted that this sense of evaluative *prototypicality* or *exactness* is at odds with Štekauer's (2015a, 45) definition of evaluative forms as indicating "morphological expressions meeting a condition of deviation from a default value".
9. **Expressivity (EXP)**: This feature, comprising a strong pragmatic component, is discernible in EVALs in which the semantics of the evaluative markers do not, in principle, convey an evaluation of size or quality, but simply supplement the utterance with a sense of familiarity and casualness. This feature encompasses senses such as jocularity, playfulness, vulgarity, and irreverence: e.g., SPA *guapa* 'pretty' > *guap**is***, LAV *frizūra* 'hairdo, hair style' > *fričene,* FRE *prolétaire* 'proletarian' > *prol**o***.
10. **Repetition (REP)**: Particularly frequent in deverbal EVALs, the feature repetition often appears accompanied by the features ATT, INT, and PEJ. It encompasses senses such as iterative, frequentative, distributive, repetitive, diversative or dispersive: SPA *chupar* 'to suck, to lick' > *chup**et**ear* 'to suck.REP/PEJ' > ***re**chup**et**ear* 'REP/INT.to suck.REP/PEJ'.

Körtvélyessy's (2015a, 55) approach to the quantification of the cognitive category value (V_{SC}) specifies that "each cognitive category is assigned one point. If a language, for example, expresses the categories of Quantity of Substance and Quantity of Quality, the presence of 2 cognitive categories is evaluated by 2 points. If 3 categories are expressed, the score is 3, etc.". However, Körtvélyessy's Model of evaluative word formation (ibid., 45) contains two assumptions which arguably do not entirely reflect the common use of EVALs. Firstly, the description of the cognitive categories reveals that the concepts represented roughly correspond to the four major word classes: *substance* for nouns, *action* for verbs, *quality* for adjectives and *circumstance* for adverbs (ibid., 41). Consequently, her framework leaves unaccounted for EVALs taking as bases other types of word classes. Secondly, Körtvélyessy's model (ibid., 4) assumes that the use of EVALs occurs prototypically in relation to an object: "The model is founded on the idea of evaluative morphology as a continuum in which prototypical cases express the meaning of quantity under or above the default value". However, contemporary EM research relying on statistical evidence provided by large linguistic corpora (such as Reynoso Noverón 2003 or Kiefer and Németh 2015), has shown that the use of EVALs ostensibly bears more relation to the utterance or the communicative context at large (the pragmatic aspect) than to the notional

reality expressed by the base. The eminently pragmatic aspect of EVALs has been given a thorough theoretical treatment and substantiation by Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi (1994), as well as by Günthner and Mutz (2004), who consider the use of EVALs akin to that of other pragmatic markers. In any case, while it cannot be ruled out that the pre-eminent function of EVALs (whether semantic or pragmatic) may be dissimilar cross-linguistically, available data does not support Körtvélyessy's proposal in that QUANTIFICATION must necessarily be a part of the EVAL-formation interpretation process.

Moreover, regarding a subsequent QUALIFICATION step, Körtvélyessy (2015a, 44) argues that it occurs in the following manner: "if there is a need for qualitative evaluation, based on the metaphorical shifts SMALL IS CUTE and BIG IS NASTY, the evaluation takes the qualification path". However, such metaphorical shifts are extremely reductive and hinder a context-based interpretation of EVALs. As discussed by Mutz (2015, 149–151), the concepts GOOD and BAD can both be objects of metaphorical shifts from the central concepts SMALL and BIG. Moreover, in a proposed radial category for pejoratives, Mutz (ibid., 152) also indicates that both SMALL and BIG are concepts that may shift diachronically towards the central meaning BAD. Arguably, Mutz's study unwittingly highlights the difficulty in establishing boundaries between these traditional categories by revealing the high degree of semantic overlap and reciprocal connections among many of them. Given the perceived insufficiencies in Körtvélyessy's arguments, the present study proposes resorting to the set of features above described for a dynamic interpretation of EVALs. The calculation of the value associated with interpretative features (E_{IF}) can again be obtained as the quotient resulting from dividing the total number of attested features in a language by the total number of interpretative features, set at 10.

Conclusions

The detailed and systematic accounts proposed by the framework ensure that the examination of EM resources may be carried out in a thorough and organized manner. Quantitative data obtained using the proposed calculations can be contrasted to available EM descriptions to confirm, contradict, or add nuance to the latter. From a cross-linguistic perspective, the framework aims to provide a single analytical tool that subsequent EM descriptions can rely on. In this manner, obtained quantitative data may be easily contrasted, as well as employed in studies of a typological nature.

In line with the tenets of the open systems theory of classifications, the proposed descriptive framework is open to reinterpretation, as well as to the addition of elements (or recategorization of existing ones) in view of additional empirical data or theoretical insights. Additionally, the design and formulation of the proposed framework would benefit from its application to languages from various genealogical adscriptions to test its applicability and reliability, as well as to reveal its limitations.

Abbreviations

1. Linguistic terms

APPR	Approximation
ATT	Attenuation
AUG	Augmentation
DIM	Diminutive
EM	Evaluative morphology
EVAL	Evaluative form
EXA	Exactness
EXC	Excess
EXP	Expressivity
HON	Honorific
INT	Intensification
PEJ	Pejoration
RED	Reduplication
REP	Repetition

2. ISO 693-3 language codes

ARA	Classical Arabic
ARY	Moroccan Arabic
BFG	Figuig Berber
DAN	Danish
EUS	Basque
FRA	French
GCD	Yukulta (Ganggalida)
HEB	Israeli Hebrew
IAN	Iatmul
IMI	Anamgura / Anamuxra
LAV	Latvian
NLD	Dutch
SHI	Tashelhiyt (Berber)
SHS	Shuswap
SNA	Shona
SNW	Sɛlɛɛ
SPA	Spanish
TEL	Telugu
VEN	Venda
ZBT	Tamazight

Sources

1. Abdel-Massih, Ernest T. 1971. *A Reference Grammar of Tamazight (Middle Atlas Berber)*. Ann Arbor: Center for Near Eastern and North African Studies, University of Michigan.
2. Agbetsoamedo, Yvonne, Di Garbo, Francesca. 2015. Sɛlɛɛ. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 487–495. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
3. Arbaoui, Nora. 2015. Classical and Moroccan Arabic. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 461–471. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
4. Artiagoitia, Xabier. 2015. Basque. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Lívia, Körtvélyessy (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 195–204. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
5. Birioukova, Olga, Hardman, Martha J. 2015. Jaqaru. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 595–605. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
6. Faust, Noam. 2015. Israeli Hebrew. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 238–245. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
7. Grandi, Nicola. 2015. Berber. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 453–460. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
8. Ingram, Andrew. 2001. *Anamuxra*. Sydney: University of Sydney.
9. Jendraschek, Gerd. 2015. Iatmul. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 408–415. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
10. Lahrouchi, Mohamed, Ridouane, Rachid. 2016. On diminutives and plurals in Moroccan Arabic. *Morphology.* 26 (3/4), 453–475. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-016-9290-7
11. Miller, Wilson Joseph. 2017. *Grammaticalization in English: A Diachronic and Synchronic Analyses of the 'ass' Intensifier*. Master's Thesis. San Francisco, California: San Francisco State University. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28009.60001
12. Mudzingwa, Calisto, Kadenge, Maxwell. 2014. Class 1 deverbal and non-deverbal nouns in Shona: A comparative analysis. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*. 44, 129–148. https://doi.org/10.5842/44-0-643
13. Sailaja, Pingali. 2015. Telugu. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 321–332. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
14. *Tezaurs.lv*. 2022. Rīga: LU Matemātikas un informātikas institūts. Available at: http://www.tezaurs.lv
15. Yu, Alan. 2003. *The Morphology and Phonology of Infixation*. PhD dissertation. Berkeley, California: University of California, Berkeley. https://doi.org/10.7282/T35T3J9Q

References

1. Alonso, Amado. 1961. Noción, emoción, acción y fantasía en los diminutivos. *Estudios Lingüísticos.* Madrid: Gredos, 161–189. [1st ed. 1935.]

2. Beck, David. 2017. The typology of morphological processes: Form and function. *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., Dixon, Robert M. V. (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 325–360. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316135716
3. Dressler, Wolfgang, Lavinia, Merlini Barbaresi. 1994. *Morphopragmatics. Diminutives and Intensifiers in Italian, German, and Other Languages*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
4. Ettinger, Stefan. 1974. *Form und Funktion in der Wortbildung: Die Diminutiv- und Augmentative modifikation im Lateinnischen, Deutschen und Romanischen. Ein kritischer Forschungsbericht 1900–1970*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
5. Finkbeiner, Rita, Meibauer, Jörg, Wiese, Heike. 2016. What is pejoration, and how can it be expressed in language? *Pejoration*. Finkbeiner, Rita, Meibauer, Jörg, Wiese, Heike (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.228.01fin
6. Fortin, Antonio. 2011. *The Morphology and Semantics of Expressive Affixes*. PhD thesis. Oxford: Oxford University.
7. Frampton, John. 2009. *Distributed Reduplication*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262013260.001.0001
8. Gaarder, Bruce. 1966. Los llamados diminutivos y aumentativos en el español de México. *Publications of the Modern Language Association,* 81, 585–595. https://doi.org/10.2307/461214
9. González Ollé, Fernando. 1962. *Los sufijos diminutivos en castellano medieval*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
10. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). 2015a. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
11. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia. 2015b. Introduction: why evaluative morphology? *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
12. Grandi, Nicola. 1998. Sui suffissi diminutivi. *Lingua e stile*. 4, 627–654.
13. Grandi, Nicola. 2011. Renewal and innovation in the emergence of Indo-European evaluative morphology. *Lexis. Journal in English Lexicology*. 6, 4–25. https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.403
14. Günthner, Susanne, Mutz, Karin. 2004. Grammaticalization vs. pragmaticalization? The development of pragmatic markers in German and Italian. *What makes grammaticalization? A Look from Its Fringes and Its Components*. Bisang, Walter, Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., Wiemer, Björn (eds.). Berlin / New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 77–107. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197440.2.77
15. Haspelmath, Martin. 2012. How to compare major word-classes across the world's languages. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics. Theories of Everything*. 17, 109–130.
16. Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-Verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110883282
17. Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2017. Word classes. *Oxford Bibliographies in Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199772810-0159
18. Hoeksema, Jack. 2012. Elative compounds in Dutch: Types and historical development. *Intensivierungskonzepte bei Adjektiven und Adverben im Sprachenvergleich /*

Crosslinguistic Comparison of Intensified Adjectives and Adverbs. Vol. 2. Oebel, Guido (ed.). Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač, 97–142.

19. Kalnača, Andra. 2014. *A Typological Perspective on Latvian Grammar.* Berlin/ Warsaw: De Gruyter Open. https://doi.org/10.2478/9783110411317
20. Kalnača, Andra. 2015. Latvian. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 253–261. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
21. Kiefer, Ferenc, Boglárka, Németh. 2015. Hungarian. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
22. Körtvélyessy, Lívia. 2015a. *Evaluative Morphology from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
23. Körtvélyessy, Lívia. 2015b. Evaluative morphology and language universals. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 61–73.
24. Körtvélyessy, Lívia. 2015c. Evaluative morphology from a cross-linguistic perspective: Introduction to the descriptive chapters. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 187–193. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
25. Martín Calvo, Rafael. 2020. Evaluative derivatives and evaluative forms: Two distinct groups of affixed lexical units in evaluative morphology. *Bridging Languages and Cultures* II. *Linguistics, Translation Studies and Intercultural Communication*. Dreijers, Guntars, Sīlis, Jānis, Sviķe, Silga, Veckrācis, Jānis (eds.). Berlin: Frank & Timme, 83–112.
26. Martín Calvo, Rafael. 2022. *An Analytical Framework for the Description of Evaluative Morphology Resources. Contrastive Analysis of Evaluative Forms in Spanish and Latvian*. PhD thesis. Ventspils: Ventspils University of Applied Sciences. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35400.60161
27. Mattes, Veronika. 2014. *Types of Reduplication. A Case Study of Bikol*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110363128
28. Mel'čuk, Igor. 2008. Morphological processes. *Aspects of the Theory of Morphology*. Beck, David (ed.). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 288–320. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110199864
29. Mutz, Karin. 2015. Evaluative morphology in a diachronic perspective. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 142–154. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
30. Nieuwenhuis, Paul. 1985. *Diminutives*. PhD dissertation. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
31. Ponsonnet, Maïa, Evans, Nicholas. 2015. Dalabon. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 401–407. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
32. Ponsonnet, Maïa. 2018. A preliminary typology of emotional connotations in morphological diminutives and augmentatives. *Morphology and Emotions Across Languages. Studies in Language.* 42 (1). Ponsonnet, Maïa Vuillermet, Marine (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17–50. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.00002.pon
33. Potts, Christopher, Kawahara, Shigeto. 2004. Japanese honorifics as emotive definite descriptions. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory.* 14, 253–270. https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v14i0.2917

34. Ralli, Angela. 2012. *Compounding in Modern Greek.* Vol. 2. Berlin / Heidelberg: Springer Science & Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4960-3
35. Noverón Reynoso, Jeanette. 2005. Procesos de gramaticalización por subjetivización: el uso del diminutivo en español. *Selected proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Eddington, David (ed.). Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 79–86.
36. Rūķe-Draviņa, Velta. 1959. *Diminutive im Lettischen.* Lund: Acta Universitates Stockholmiensis.
37. Schneider, Cindy. 2015. Apma. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 341–351. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
38. *Štekauer, Pavol. 2015a. Word* formation processes in evaluative morphology. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
39. Štekauer, Pavol, 2015b. The delimitation of derivation and inflection. *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*. Vol. 1. Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg (eds.). Berlin/ New York: De Gryter Mouton, 218–235. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110246254-016
40. Van De Velde, Mark L. O. 2008. *A Grammar of Eton*. Berlin/New York. Mouton De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110207859
41. Van Den Berg, René. 2015. Muna. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Grandi, Nicola, Körtvélyessy, Lívia (eds.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 367–374. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748681754
42. Yu, Alan C. L. 2004. Reduplication in English Homeric infixation. *Proceedings of the 34th North East Linguistics Society.* 34. Moulton, Keir, Wolf, Matthew (eds.). Amherst: Graduate Linguistics Students Association, 619–633.

Kopsavilkums

Mūsdienu vērtējummorfoloģijas pētījumu pārskats liecina, ka valodām pieejamo vērtējummorfoloģijas resursu apraksti parasti nav sistemātiski un pietiekami izsmeļoši, ņemot vērā noteiktas aprakstošās sistēmas trūkumu. Šī pētījuma mērķis ir izveidot ietvaru, kas ļautu sistemātiski aprakstīt valodas vērtējummorfoloģijas resursus. Diskusija ir strukturēta, balstoties uz vairākiem produktivitātes rādītājiem, kas jau eksistē vērtējumformu konstrukcijā. Pētījumā tiek apskatīts Kertvēješi (*Körtvélyessy* 2015a) priekšlikums, novēršot dažus trūkumus un paplašinot tā darbības jomu. Proti, ierosinātajā ietvarstruktūrā iekļauts a) visu vērtējumformu konstrukcijā iesaistīto morfoloģisko procesu apraksts; b) dažādu vārdšķiru pieejamība kā bāze vērtējumformu konstrukcijā; c) semantisko pazīmju kopums vērtējumformu dinamiskai interpretācijai un d) subjektīvā vērtējumiezīmētāja rekursīvās iespējas. Papildus vērtējummorfoloģijas resursu aprakstam ierosinātajā sistēmā ir ieteiktas arī to skaitliskās kvantifikācijas procedūras, lai iegūtu izmērāmus rādītājus, kurus turpmāk var izmantot kontrastīvajos, tipoloģiskajos un areālajos vērtējummorfoloģijas pētījumos.

Atslēgvārdi: vērtējummorfoloģija; vērtējumformas; vērtējumiezīmētāji; aprakstošais ietvars; deminutīvi.