Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi and Wolfgang U. Dressler

Pragmatic explanations in morphology

Abstract: This chapter focuses on new perspectives and the recent history of pragmatic explanations in morphology, both on morphopragmatic issues where pragmatics is of primary importance, such as in diminutives, and where pragmatic interpretations are clearly secondary to semantic meanings as in most pragmatic aspects of inflectional morphology. The main categories dealt with are evaluatives, extragrammatical and grammatical reduplication, honorifics, but there is a survey of many others as well. The discussion also includes emotional, sociopragmatic and psycholinguistic argumentations (especially from language development). The outlook urges for more consideration of morphopragmatic issues in areas of cognitive science.

Keywords: Morphopragmatics, pragmatics, diminutives, reduplication, evaluatives

1 Introduction

This focus of this chapter is on the importance of the interaction between pragmatics and morphology against a background of competing approaches and neighboring disciplines whose main difference lies in the nature of the interaction between semantic and pragmatic meanings. We are opposed to those who assume only a secondary interaction between morphosemantics and morphopragmatics, i.e. who take morphosemantics as always primary, and only secondarily exploited pragmatically. This view is compatible with a Fodorian view of modularity (Fodor 1983), where only after the encapsulated course of derivation of the morphotactics and morphosemantics of a pertinent morphological category, interaction with pragmatics is possible. In contrast, our view (since Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a) assumes the possibility of a basic pragmatic meaning of a morphological category or a pertinent language-specific morphological rule, although it does not exclude a secondary interaction with pragmatics for a corresponding rule in other languages, or for different morphological categories. This will give us the opportunity to provide a detailed, updated map of a largely uncharted territory, and to revive our complaint

Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi, University of Pisa, Italy

Wolfgang U. Dressler, University of Vienna, Department of Linguistics, Vienna, Austria

Open Access. © 2020 Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi et al., published by De Gruyter. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110440577-011>

against the persisting neglect of pragmatic motivations in morphology and against the presentation of pragmatic meanings as semantic ones.

We argue that the explanatory power of pragmatics is not sufficiently exploited to account for the complex meanings and effects conveyed by certain morphological operations, mainly exemplified in the domain of evaluative word formations, such as diminutives. Morphopragmatics precisely covers the area of the general pragmatic meanings generated by morphological rules.

To give an example, in the expressive Italian speech act

- (1) *Come vorrei essere nel mio lett+ino!*

‘How I’d love to be in my bed-DIM’,

the diminutive can be easily substituted with the augmentative *lett+one*, and used in the same context to refer to the same bed. Thus, the semantic meanings of small size (diminutive) and big size (augmentative) cannot be the primary reason for using them. It is rather the emotional coloring of the speech act, which drives the imagination of the desired bed.

A discussion on the state of the art in this and similar areas of research gives us the scope for a fresh outlook on morphopragmatics, and new evidence for re-proposing and elaborating on some crucial points of our theory of morphopragmatics (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a) and for widening the topic area of morphopragmatic investigations.

In a pragmatic perspective, language is viewed as action, or, more precisely, as social interaction arising among participants when jointly producing speech act sequences in a speech situation (after Austin 1962, Eco 1987:704, Kempson et al. 2016, Vernant 2003). A large part of this chapter is intended to show how patterns of word-formation (be it derivational morphology or compounding) and of inflection may either have a basic pragmatic meaning (e.g. hypocoristics and diminutives), or at least obtain regular pragmatic effects triggered secondarily on the basis of a semantic meaning and reference, whose interpretation is strictly conditioned by contextual factors, as is the case, for instance, with pronouns, plurals and the categories of aspect and mood (Binnick 2009). The approach is mainly synchronic, but some diachronic argumentations will be included. Other disciplines, as, for example, psycholinguistics and corpus linguistics, will become relevant whenever they can give helpful hints.

After a brief introduction into the history or research on the morphology-pragmatics interface (§ 2) and on the impact of emotion (§ 3) we present our extended and interdisciplinary view on morphopragmatics (§ 4), deal with related studies (§ 5), competing approaches (§ 6), especially Daniel Juravsky on evaluatives (§ 7), the objects of our analysis (§ 8), especially diminutives and

related evaluatives (§ 9), then with honorifics (§ 10), morphopragmatics in inflectional morphology (§ 11), and reduplication (§ 12) plus extragrammatical English reduplication (§ 13). The brief conclusion (§ 14), after the references, by an appendix of utterances illustrating the various pragmatic uses of diminutives.

2 Early studies in morphology interfacing with pragmatics

Important precursors to the theory of morphopragmatics are found in early studies on diminutives: De Amicis (1905) gave an ample pre-theoretical description of their pragmatic effects in Italian, more complete than Staverman's (1953) for Dutch.

Spitzer (1921) pioneered the important notion whereby the pragmatic scope of the diminutive is the whole utterance and not just the diminutivized word (cf. Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi's 1994a: 218 elaboration of the concept). For example, diminutivization of the speech act of the Italian invocations

- (2) a. *Madonna santa!*
 'Oh holy virgin!'
- b. *Dio buono!*
 'Good Lord!'

results in *Madonn+ina santa!*, which could be conceivably interpreted as being a simple diminutivization of the head noun. However, since *Dio* 'God' cannot be diminutivized in Italian (in contrast to Spanish *Dios+ito* and German *Ach Gott+chen* in exclamations), the attributive adjective is diminutivized in *Dio buon+ino!*, clearly not meaning that the goodness of God is diminutivized. Rather the expression of inner states may be downgraded in the speech situation of restrained complaints and mild commiserations or, conversely, upgraded when pleading. Note also the substitution of Italian *lett+ino* by *lett+one* in (1).

In this connection, also Alonso (1933/1961) must be mentioned because he was the first scholar who systematically related the emotional values of diminutives to context, participants' attitudes and, ante litteram, to types of speech acts, as is the case of the examples just mentioned.

3 Emotion

Within linguistics, the subsequent stream of studies on diminutives (for example, Dardano 1978, Klimaszewska 1983, Volek 1987, Wierzbicka 1984, 1991) all contributed to downgrading the denotative meaning of smallness in favor of emotional values, whose meanings and effects depend on the motivating context, interacting participants, speech acts and discourse register.

A natural connection between emotions and the pragmatics of social actions is also a major tenet in recent psychological and philosophical theories. For example, Wüschner (2015) explores the idea that emotions in social contexts and their intentionality may be conceived of as pragmatic or epistemic actions, i.e. not only as inner states. This applies directly to the down- and upgrading in the invocations mentioned in (2). Moreover, Slaby and Wüschner (2014) conceptualize emotions as unfolding in relational and dialogical acts. As such, they are to be seen less as mental states and more as one's behavior in and towards the world. They observe (see Slaby and Wüschner 2014: § 3) that in recent studies emotions are variously described, for example as 'felt evaluations' (Helm 2001), 'feelings towards' (Goldie 2000), 'affective perceptions' (Döring 2007), or 'felt evaluative attitudes' (Deonna and Teroni 2012). What is especially interesting for us here is the recognition of an evaluative attitude inherent in the interactants' dialogical acts.

A more indirect contribution to the emotionalist line of research is found in studies on politeness (Brown and Levinson 1983, Leech 1983 and 2014, Haverkate 1990, Sifianou 1992, Watts 2003), where various interfaces between morphology/grammar and pragmatics are assumed. In Leech (2014), the interface of pragmatics and linguistic form ('pragmalinguistics') and that between pragmatics and society ('sociopragmatics') are the basis of his renovated approach to politeness. Leech (2014: ix and Ch.9) asks two important questions that can be generalized and become pertinent to all investigations concerning pragmatics: (1) how do we know about the pragmatics of politeness? (2) what kind of observational or experimental evidence can be brought to bear?

Morphopragmatics tries to answer such questions empirically by isolating, through the analysis of various discourse types and tokens, those linguistic (morphological) elements that are capable of systematically contributing stable pragmatic effects. Evidence of a correct pragmatic interpretation rests not only on the complex inferential work of the interpreter (cf. the notion of 'contextually drawn plausible inferences' in Ariel 2007:1) aimed at recognizing such effects, but especially on objectifying contextual and co-textual motivations and perlocutionary reactions, by recognizing relevant linguistic cues and indices (cf. Bazzanella 2004), i.e. in linking the interpretation of morphopragmatic

elements to the co-text and/or context. Only in this way can we interpret the function of diminutivization in the invocations of (2) as either downgrading or upgrading. When used in pleading, the speaker wants to increase, i.e. to upgrade, the addressee's readiness to fulfil the speaker's direct or indirect request (i.e. the intended perlocutionary sequel). In contrast, when complaining, the speaker wants to downgrade, the addressee's possible negative reactions. Such interpretations by an analyst must be confirmed by other coherent cues in the situational context or in the preceding or following co-text.

The scope of influence of the morphological elements is the utterance, as said above, but the pragmatic effects obtained may actually extend to the entire text (cf. Watts' 2003:142 discourse-oriented perspective in relation to politeness). The speech act and speech act sequence have proved to be too narrow a target for a safe pragmatic evaluation (Leech 2014). Conversational discourse can give a better account of the dynamically changing behaviors of the individuals involved. An example is the ludic character of diminutives in pastoral poetry of the 18th century and in Mozart's opera *Così fan tutte*.

Of relevance is the concept of pragmatic act (Mey 2001), whereby the focus of the analysis has shifted from the speech act to the situation of utterance for its understanding. The issue of analysis beyond utterances has also been on the agenda of dialogue studies (e.g. Weigand 2000, 2010a, 2010b; Carbaugh 2013; Cooren 2010). A broader scope is actually implied in the computational notion of dialogue act (DA) (Bunt 1979, 2000, 2011, Bunt et al. 2017 and the connected area of research). DAs can be thought of as a tag set that classifies utterances according to a combination of pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic criteria. Kecskes (2016) speculates on the interfacing of DAs with pragmatics. See the interesting elaboration of various concepts and modalities of computational pragmatics in Jurafsky (2006), which, for him, is also a starting point for revisiting the problem of speech act interpretation.

4 Morphology and pragmatics

In Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi's *Morphopragmatics* (1986, 1987, 1989, 1994a and continued by both authors together or separately), the mutual relation between the two areas of morphology and pragmatics is amply and systematically described, i.e. morphological rules and elements are analyzed in their interaction with pragmatic conditions. More precisely, morphopragmatics deals with grammatical morphological operations that autonomously (cf. Potts's 2007 notion of 'independence') assign pragmatic meanings to the utterance, i.e. obtain

regular pragmatic changes when moving from the input to the output of a morphological operation, both within word formation and inflection. The authors' theoretical position actually rests on a major premise: they view semantics as a specialized subpart of pragmatics in general (Morris 1938). But elsewhere in this chapter we use pragmatics, as in general usage, only as pragmatics from which the specialized subpart of semantics has been subtracted.

Morphopragmatics can be paralleled with, but distinguished from, other well-established sub-areas of research, like morphosemantics, lexical semantics of morphology (Lieber 2004), lexical pragmatics of morphology, sociopragmatics and pragmatics of syntactic patterns and textual strategies (for a more detailed account, cf. Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a:55 and Merlini Barbaresi 2015b). But some extra observations on these disciplines are in order here, because of their close relevance to our general discussion.

Lexical pragmatics of morphology is the area where most often uncertainty can arise concerning the boundaries of a morphological operation. It deals with the pragmatic meanings idiosyncratically acquired by single complex words, like, for example, lexicalized *stark-et*, somewhat derogatory due to connotations acquired by use over time, or *bunn-y* 'rabbit', a diminutive of Scottish dialectal *bun*, pet name for *rabbit*, selecting a child environment and obtaining a pragmatic meaning of endearment, or, more recently, a sexist environment in connection with its use in the Playboy magazine. The pragmatic meanings/effects belong to the word itself and its circumstances of use, and not to the word-formation operation. The majority of the early studies aiming at a pragmatic account of word-formation belong here. The pragmatic meaning of a morphological rule is unfortunately often conflated with that of the individual lexical item.

What is neglected in this latter approach is a focus on the capacity of the morphological operation involved in the construction of the complex word to obtain similar effects regularly, given certain sets of contextual conditions (for diminutive formation, for example, typically, child-centered speech situations and the emotionality involved, ludic character of playfulness among intimates, familiarity and informality in general), and given certain regulating factors (typically, sympathy and empathy, but also understatement, euphemism, false modesty, irony and sarcasm).

The area must be restricted and specified with respect to current general theories of Lexical Pragmatics (LP) within cognitive linguistics, which investigates the processes by which literal meanings of words are modified in use, basically through the pragmatic operations of narrowing (meaning restricted to the specific case) or broadening (approximation or category extension), which correspond to the two types of lexical pragmatic processes that take place during comprehension. The linguistic meaning of a word in an utterance only provides a

point of departure for an inferential process of meaning construction (Rebollar 2013); see also Blutner (1998) and Wilson and Carston (2007). Of course, within this type of studies, the focus is again on the word in use (whether simplex or complex) and not on word-formation mechanisms and their effects.

Experimental Pragmatics is another area of research that tangentially touches upon morphopragmatics. Experimental approaches draw on formal semantics and pragmatics with perspectives from psychology and cognitive science, and concentrate on the actual mental processes involved in language comprehension (Schwarz 2014: 2). More specifically, they investigate to what extent the overall message conveyed by a certain utterance is actually covered by the literal meaning of the sentence uttered. In doing that, they foreshadow various possible enrichments of the literal meaning that are clearly pragmatically-based as crucially related to the context of the utterance. Within this area, some aspects of non-literal meaning are investigated that are also key-points in a morphopragmatic investigation: namely irony, sarcasm, metonymy, and metaphor (see also Potts 2006 and Potts et al. 2015). An example amply discussed in Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi (1994a: 370–372) is the episode of an Italian professor misunderstanding as sarcastic the literal semantic meaning of diminution in the phrase *quel libr+etto* ‘that rather small book’, uttered by a student in referring to an objectively small book written by the same professor. In considering the larger context less superficially, the professor could have acknowledged the student’s attempts to understate modestly his amount of preparation for the ongoing exam.

A recent theoretical approach by Bara (2011) based in ‘cognitive pragmatics’, provides extra validation to the approach above. On an interactive perspective, cognitive pragmatics focuses on the mental states (emotional and cognitive) of the participants in a conversation, in their developing along the conversation time. The analysis of the mental processes of human communication is based on three fundamental concepts: cooperation, sharedness, and communicative intention (not dissimilar from the principles proposed by Grice 1975). Shared beliefs and knowledge (‘common ground’ in Clark 1996) are of special significance for us, as it accounts for the possibility of comprehending non-standard communication such as humorous talk, irony, jokes, deceit and figurative language, which are often the target of a morphopragmatic investigation. Bara (2011: 457) also observes that studies in intercultural communication (Piller 2010, Spencer-Oatey and Franklin 2009) have shown that the culture dimension may be responsible for differences in the pragmatic possibilities of realizing interactional communication, also due to the impact of cross-cultural psychology (Berry and Poortinga 2011). An example is the above-mentioned episode of the misunderstanding of the Italian student’s diminutive *libr+etto*, because according to our experience

students from some other nations would not choose such a strategy of modesty when taking an exam.

This approach has weakened the thesis of universality in favor of a greater attention to be paid to an ethnocentric dimension, which also points to the need to carry out pragmatic interpretations with great attention to specific interpreters and contextual sets. But this is a bias, of course, against the universal validity of many current models of linguistic analysis (see problems of universalism vs. relativism in Ronga et al. 2014). Expectedly, cognitive pragmatics and cognitive sociolinguistics (see Kristiansen and Dirven 2008) have much to contribute to overcome such limitations. A similar earlier but much simpler approach to diminutives, which still lacks this interdisciplinary perspective, can be found in Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi (1994a: 410–414).

It is also relevant to mention Schmid (2012), dealing with the construal of non-explicit and non-literal meaning-in-context and Kempson and al.'s (2016) concept of a psycholinguistically motivated model of analysis that includes in its definition of 'context' the various processing paths that unfold for each participant in the course of the interaction (see also Duranti and Goodwin 1992).

The area of sociopragmatics (relative to morphological rules) also deserves attention, because it actually may overlap with that of the pragmatics of morphology in various ways. In agreement with one main point in our general discussion, Körtvélyessy and Štekauer (2014) complain about the neglect reserved to the social aspects of derivational morphology by social studies (in comparison to the massive contributions of psychological studies), in particular to the factors that affect the formation and interpretation of complex words. Prieto (2015, see also Prieto 2005), in reference to Spanish, confirms this result. Unlike numerous sociolinguistic studies dealing with phonological and syntactic aspects of language, there are just very few publications addressing the issues of morphology. Prieto underlines the fact that evaluative suffixes have sociolinguistic effects, as they mark the language of social groups as well as the context (especially informal speech situation).

Expectedly, sociopragmatics would seem more than entitled to answer questions concerning word-formation rules and their interpreters, contextual and indexical factors and variables of their use, as well as factors regulating interactant rapport. Examples may be social preferences in the use of specific word-formation mechanisms (e.g. evaluatives), as regulated by genre, sex, age, diastatic and diatopic varieties, channel of communication, formal vs. informal situations. A notion of adaptability (Verschueren 1999), in the social-interactive sense and in terms of language being adaptive to the process of communication, is especially relevant. Various restrictions on the pragmatic use of diminutives, for example, are regulated by such concepts. A pragmatic foundation is also at the

basis of the sociopragmatic norms regulating the use of honorifics (more in § 9). A study centered on the sociopragmatics of diminutives is De Marco (1998).

From a morphopragmatic perspective, a mutual relevance of the two disciplines can be found, for example, in the use of polite or strategic diminutives in discourse, as in Italian *solo un minut+ino* ‘just a sec, lit. ‘only a minute+DIM’; Mexican Spanish *ahor+ita* ‘immediately, lit. ‘now+DIM’, or in mitigated requests, as Italian *Mi fai un piacer+ino?* ‘can you do me a little favor (lit. a favor+DIM)?’, as well as in the use of honorifics and polite pronouns.

5 Morphopragmatic and related studies

The morphopragmatic approach attracted other scholars, who applied the model to different speech situations or other languages or other categories. For example, Kilani-Schoch and Dressler (1999) elaborated and specified the model on the French *-o* suffix, Crocco Galéas (1992) on the pragmatic difference between learned and usual Italian ethnics, Laalo (2001) on the pragmatics of Finnish diminutives, Biscetti (2001) on diminutives in technical terminology, Merlini Barbaresi (2001) on the English *-y/ie* suffix, Merlini-Barberesi (2014) on the English *-let* suffix, Mattiello (2009) on the morphopragmatics of English and Italian negative prefixes, and Appah and Amfo (2012) on the morphopragmatics of the diminutive suffix (*-ba/-wa*) in Akan.

With somewhat different applications, Cantero (2003) studies the Spanish morphopragmatic elements and Badarneh (2010) the pragmatics of diminutives in Jordanian Arabic. Pertinent observations on the pragmatic roles of diminutives and other morphological elements are already present in Bazzanella, Caffi, and Sbisà (1991).

Other related studies show divergent interpretations, such as Kiefer (2004) on Hungarian diminutives (and excessives), who derives the pragmatic effects of diminutives from their semantic meanings, i.e. from semantic diminution, according to his principle (p. 327) “morphopragmatics entails semantics”. In his Hungarian example:

- (3) *a konyak+ocska helyèben*
 ‘in place of the little brandy’,

Kiefer (2004: 338) derives the pragmatic meaning from the thereby eliminated semantic meaning of smallness, from the intimate relationships between the

adult interactants in casual conversation, and from the suggestion that the speaker “is on good terms with alcoholic drinks”.

This conflicts with a basic tenet of the theory pioneered by Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi, who, advocate priority of pragmatics over semantics for diminutives in the languages investigated, except English (see Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 2001: 43 onwards. Another exception is French, see Fradin 2003, Dressler 2010).

Various scholars, who include pragmatic explanations in their analyses of evaluatives’ meanings, do not necessarily theorize about their semantic vs. pragmatic status: see for example Böhmerová’s (2011) extended study on Slovak diminutives and augmentatives, Bardaneh’s (2010) on Jordanian Arabic, Reynoso Noverón (2005) on Mexican Spanish, Pakendorf (2017) on Even (a Tungusic language spoken in Siberia) diminutive suffixes, of which only a part has clear pragmatic meanings. More radically, Meibauer (2014: 117) observes that recent important theorists in morphology do not even feel the need for an interface between morphology and pragmatics (for example Lieber 2004). Not dissimilarly, a pragmaticist like Ariel (2010) amply theorizes on pragmatics but with no allusion to morphology. We find no mention of morphology, either, in *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics* (Horn and Ward 2006), although a specific section is devoted to pragmatics and its interfaces.

A whole line of theoretical studies, dealing with diminutives or more broadly evaluatives, neglect reference to pragmatics. This is the case of Scalise (1984, 1994), whose theoretical proposal for locating evaluatives and only evaluatives in a ‘third morphology’ between inflectional and derivational morphology, has had the merit of attracting greater attention to evaluatives. There are other important studies where the pragmatics of evaluatives is discussed as a matter of semantics, although without necessarily assuming the same boundaries between semantics and pragmatics. First of all we have to refer to the extended studies by Grandi (2002, 2011, 2015, 2017, cf. Carstin 2017 about boundaries between pragmatics and semantics in general), but also note, for example, Bosanac et al. (2009), exploring the semantic background of Croatian diminutives. Even Schneider (2003), in his important study on English diminutives, in spite of his pragmatic program, actually conceives of an attitudinal meaning, identified as affection and emotion, as a feature of the diminutive suffix semantics, which he represents as nice/sweet+small.

Scalises’s (1984, 1994) idea of a “third morphology” in addition to inflection and derivation, is correct only insofar as evaluatives combine formal properties of prototypical inflection and prototypical derivation, as conceptualized by Dressler (Dressler 1989, Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a, b, Dressler et al. 2014). However, if this is the only reason for Scalise to propose a “third

morphology”, it should be observed that such a mixture of prototypical properties of inflection and derivation is not restricted to evaluatives alone. There exist many other morphological categories that share characteristics of both prototypical inflection and prototypical derivation, such as infinitives, participles, and noun plurals, with language-specific variations of how many properties of inflection and derivation they have.

Diminutives in the European languages represent a case of non-prototypical derivation, i.e. they are closer to prototypical derivation than to prototypical inflection, whereas Bantu diminutives represent a case of non-prototypical inflection, being closer to prototypical inflection. For example, in Shona (Déchaine et al. 2015: 504), they do not change word class, have inflectional agreement and systematically peripheral position (i.e. outside derivational suffixes). In what follows, we provide a few examples for the non-prototypical properties of diminutives in European and many other languages.

Prototypical derivational suffixes are heads and thus determine word class and gender of the derived complex word. This property is shared by German diminutives, as in *dumm* ‘stupid, dumb’ → Austrian German neuter noun *das Dumm+erl* ‘the dumb person’, *die Mutter* ‘the mother (fem.)’ → neuter DIM *das Mütter+chen/-lein/-l*, but feminine gender is maintained in the variant *die Mutt+i*. Romance and Slavic diminutive suffixes most of the time do not change word class or gender, whereas this is prototypically the case when a derivational suffix is attached. Modern Greek *-áki* transforms a masculine or feminine word into a neuter, whereas competing Greek diminutive suffixes preserve word class and gender.

Prototypically derivational suffixes precede inflectional ones, which holds in most languages also for diminutive suffixes. Exceptions, though, occur in several languages (Derzhanski 2005), for example in German *Kind+er+chen* ‘child+en+DIM’, or in Johann Sebastian Bach’s sarcastic *Lied+er++chen* ‘song+s+DIM’ about a rival composer, an occasionalism which sounds nearly acceptable to native speakers today. However, as noted, belonging to non-prototypical derivational or inflectional morphology does not as such justify establishing a “third morphology” for evaluatives only. What is specific for diminutives, however, and presumably for other morphopragmatic categories, is the lack of lexical and pattern blocking, when they have a (at least predominantly) pragmatic meaning. For example, from recent English loanwords, the following Italian diminutives have been derived:

- (4) *vipp+ino/+etto/+ar+ello/+uccio*, *manager+ino/+etto/+ello/+uccio*

(and 14 more such diminutive sets derived from other bases in Dressler et al. 2019). Comparable Polish diminutive competitions have been reported by Malicka-Kleparska (1985). Although competing word derivations exist also in prototypical derivational morphology (Plag 1999; Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013), such massive competition between suffixations for one and the same base without a difference in semantic meaning does not seem to have been observed so far in the area of prototypical derivational morphology

There are other recent studies whose theoretical approaches underestimate the explanatory power of pragmatics in finding the right interpretation of evaluatives in their context. For instance, Fortin (2011) intends to cover what he considers as underdeterminacy with his notion of ‘multidimensional semantics’ of evaluatives. On a comparative line, in the majority of the contributions contained in the extended work edited by Grandi and Körtvélyessy (2015), specific reference to pragmatics is amply disregarded.

As illustrated in Körtvélyessy (2014), also evaluative morphology is not universal, it is language-specific. Through her analysis of 203 languages of the world, Körtvélyessy also suggests that the most productive morphological process in the field of evaluative morphology is suffixation. However, the process of reduplication (§ 12, but also prefixation) relative to a large number of world languages challenges such primacy, as shown in the constellation of studies concerning the 60, not yet or hardly documented languages described in Grandi and Körtvélyessy (2015). The descriptions of the morphological processes of affixation and reduplication in these extra-European languages greatly enlarge the picture of the phenomenon of evaluatives and of their theoretical issues.

Among the studies on language-specific evaluatives in Europe, we mention Stefanescu (1992), Rainer (1993), Napoli and Reynolds 1995, Dal (1997), De Marco (1998), Mutz (2000), Gracia and Turón (2000), Nekula (2003), Fradin et al. (2003), Merlini Barbaresi (2004, 2014), Prieto (2005), often with no or rare reference to pragmatic uses.

Grandi (2002, 2011, 2015, 2017) deserves special attention in the panorama of studies on evaluatives for his vastness of topics, centered on the formal and semantic aspects of evaluatives in many languages, or dealing with their historical origin and development, also from a typological perspective. His theoretical model is based on viewing the linguistic evaluative strategy as the realization of four semantic primitives, the values BIG, SMALL, GOOD and BAD, of which the first two are descriptive, the second two are said to be qualitative, all four, though, being strictly semantic.

6 Morphopragmatics and its competitors

This bibliographic discussion is concluded here by contrasting Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi's model of Morphopragmatics (1994a) with competitors and afterwards (§ 7) with another important and widely accepted model, that of Jurafsky (1996).

6.1 Evaluatives

According to Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi's theory of morphopragmatics, a large number of meanings obtained by evaluatives (especially diminutives and augmentatives), such as downgrading and upgrading of illocutionary force, sympathy and empathy, understatement, euphemism, false modesty, irony and sarcasm can be explained only via a pragmatic interpretation (referring at least to European languages). This is in line with their conception of a priority of pragmatics over, or at least independence of, semantics. Both categories of evaluatives exhibit great polysemy, often paradoxically contradictory (a diminutive like Italian *cas+ina* 'house-DIM' can be nice and cosy or, in other contexts, poorly small and unattractive, or the augmentative Italian *occhi+oni* 'eyes-AUG' conveys a meaning of beauty, whereas *gamb+one* 'huge legs', conveys the reverse). Moreover, in spite of their semantic polarity, diminutives and augmentatives, in some cases, are felt as indistinguishable, as shown, for example in translation, e.g. of Italian into English, a language lacking the category of augmentatives: Italian AUG *biond+one* is translated into English as DIM *blond+ie*, similarly Italian *grass+one* is translated as *fatt+y*. This choice can only be explained if we conceive of a dominant pragmatic meaning and advocate its autonomy from semantics (more in Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 2001 and Merlini Barbaresi 2014).

These authors claim for both diminutives and augmentatives a complex meaning structure which cannot be exhaustively described in terms of morpho-semantic denotation and connotations plus some type of contextual pragmatics. Rather, they envisage a global concept having both semantic and pragmatic invariant features. That is, the complex meaning structure of evaluatives is definable in terms of a morphosemantic denotation (dimensional smallness vs. bigness), morphosemantic connotations (positive and negative) and morphopragmatic meanings characterized by a subjective, fictive evaluation and a context of lowered formality, both implying a state of non-seriousness. In particular, word connotations, intended as stable meanings picked up from contextual uses over time, are often misinterpreted as pragmatic in nature, but

they are instead part of the complex semantics of the word and are not obtained through synchronic morphological operations.

A priority of the present approach is to demonstrate the autonomous capacity of morphological rules of conveying pragmatic meanings and therefore to recognize a clear separation between their semantics and pragmatics.

6.2 Fictiveness

The authors advocate a thesis whereby the denotative meaning is attributed to morphosemantics and the remainder of the meaning components to morpho-pragmatics. In addition to the basic semantic meaning [small], with its allo-*semes* [unimportant] and [young] for diminutives, and [big] plus its allo-*semes* [important] and [exaggerate] for augmentatives, the authors propose for both an invariant, non-semantic, still more basic pragmatic feature [fictive], which implies reference to the speaker's attitude in the speech event and which naturally conforms to the fuzziness of subjective evaluations.

6.3 Non-seriousness

The invariant morphopragmatic feature [fictive] is further specified as a character [non-serious], which frames the majority of the diminutive meanings in discourse, for example, imprecision, attenuation, euphemism, but also irony, meiosis, ludic attitude, and others (cf. Schneider's 2013: 144 interesting notion of sub-normality, and some principles current in politeness, such as modesty, opinion reticence and low assertiveness, as in Leech 1983).

This is confirmed by the corpus-linguistic analysis of the competition between the Standard German suffix *-chen* and the Austrian German *-erl* in different genres (Schwaiger et al. 2019): in the electronic Austrian Media Corpus, the ratio between the two types of diminutives is 2.5 *X+chen* to 1 *X+erl*, but in our corpus of early Viennese child speech, the corresponding ratio is 1 to 2.8, because the Austrian variant is for small children more intimate and ludic. However, in the tweet corpus of the *Academiae Corpora* of the Austrian Academy of Sciences the ratio is 1 *X+chen* to 270 *X+erl*, because twittering is considered as a rather ludic and non-serious form of communication. Similar confirmation comes from the contrast carried out in Dressler and Merlini (1994a) between the two different iconic renderings of love in the Mozart libretti of diminutive-rich *Così fan tutte*, where love is treated as non-serious (like in earlier pastoral poetry), and diminutive-poor *Don Giovanni*, where love is presented as dramatic and demoniac.

In general, the great prominence of diminutives also in (especially early) child speech and child-directed speech can be explained, within our framework, by characterizing the speech situation as often ludic and including a participant who is considered, also legally, as a non-serious participant when compared to adults. This fits to the general finding that the earliest meanings of diminutives in child speech, that analysts can identify, are pragmatic and that children first express smallness analytically by adjectives meaning “small”. As to pragmatic effects, directly recoverable pragmatic meanings are acquired much earlier than inferential meanings (Savickiene and Dressler 2007, Dressler and Korecky-Kröll. 2015, Kilani-Schoch et al. 2011).

The speaker evaluates the speech act and the speech situation as non-serious, in the sense of non-formal, non-demanding, non-binding. An evaluative diminutive suffix appears to conform to the speaker’s evaluation of non-socially dangerous contextual premises, naturally exemplified by speech situations centered on children and intimates, or, conversely, to the speaker’s evaluation of a socially-dangerous situation that needs some hedging, illustrated, for example, by threatening speech acts, like requests, critical assertions, etc. In general, the diminutive suffix indexes the speaker’s lowered responsibility and entails lower distance between speaker and addressee.

Also augmentatives, albeit more rarely, can induce contextual non-seriousness (e.g. a comical effect due to exaggeration), and can serve, via different routes, the same mitigation strategy. For example, an augmentative can downgrade the weight of requests, as in Italian:

- (5) *Raga[zzi], qualcuno me lo fa un piacer+one?*
 “Hey, buddies, can somebody do me a (big) favor-AUG ?”
- (6) *Sono una sfacciat+ona, ma vorrei chiederti un piacer+one*
 ‘I am an impertinent-AUG, but I’d like to ask you a favor-AUG’
 ‘I know this might sound really cheeky but I must ask you a big favor, can I?’

Or, in critical assertions, the exaggeration expressed by the augmentative confers a ludic character to the offence, actually mitigating it, as in Italian:

- (7) *Sai cosa ti dico, spiritos+one?*
 ‘You know what I tell you, witty-AUG’
 ‘You know what, funny guy?’

6.4 Evaluation act

- (8) *Well, speak to your little wife+let, your little bunn+y, for God's sake*
(from Albee's "Who's afraid of Virginia Woolf?" mentioned in Schneider 2013)

The evaluation in the example above is implicit and indirect, it is pragmatically obtained in the course of the interaction but rests on a sort of prior personal prejudice which remains unexpressed. What is made explicit is some type of contextual conditions which semiotically stand for something else. Through the speaker's sarcasm, we can easily reconstruct the state of his disapproval of the addressee's wife or of wives in general and of their silly influence on their husbands. The specific contextual factor is pragmatically determined by the type of interaction (and interactants) and favors the use of linguistic elements capable of a shift from a semantic to a pragmatic dimension. Even a single textual element such as a diminutive, in fact, may obtain such a shift and, as seen above, may allow the speaker to express an evaluation, i.e. a judgement 'as to value' (not 'as to fact') (Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi 1994a), although implicitly and indirectly.

A 'judgement as to value' is a mental operation assessing the value of an object or event, as more or less desirable and important in the interpreter's views and involves an explicit or implicit act of approval or disapproval. The act of evaluation stems from an audience-directed intention (in the sense of Strawson 1964: 459), both communicative and persuasive, and comes in successive steps. First, it is self-directed and refers to the speaker's affective and attitudinal dispositions. These consist of continua of implied personal feelings, like interest / disinterest, pleasure / displeasure, attachment / detachment, approval / disapproval, whose different degrees and combinations regulate the evaluative orientation, both axiologically and in terms of affective intensity of the utterance. A second step of the speaker's evaluation is directed at the social context of use and its relevant properties. These will regulate the terms and the forms of the evaluation in accordance with contextual variables, such as, for example, degree of formality, participant closeness, purpose or other specific circumstances. It is at this point that the speaker will judge contextual conditions as more or less favorable for the use of evaluative affixes or other morphological mechanisms.

At this phase, the evaluative process is still a private act, based on the speaker's perception of the object (cf. Fradin's 2003 notion of referent's pole) and on his/her personal intentions, perspectives and standards of evaluation (Fradin's locutor's pole). It acquires social relevance when it is translated into a

speech act involving an addressee (Fradin's interlocutor's pole). The evaluation, then, becomes a social act that may trigger perlocutionary reactions. The addressee may or may not recognize the favorable conditions and share or reject (various degrees of intensity of) the speaker's evaluative attitude.

A consequence of the wide scope of the evaluative process is also the pragmatic relevance of diminutives for the whole speech act rather than just for the diminutivized word (as already mentioned in § 1 and 2), although a diminutive suffix needs a specific landing-site on a specific word (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi, 1994a: 218–228). The choice of the landing-site may depend on specific grammatical and lexical conditions of a language.

An example is the sarcastic speech act of the rhetorical question at the beginning of Figaro's aria in Mozart's "Le nozze di Figaro" I, 3:

- (9) *Se vuol ballare signor cont+ino?*
 'if he wants dance Sir count-DIM'
 'Would his lordship, that dumb count, care to dance with me?'

In German, the prefixed title 'Sir/Lordship' and 'count' is not a legal landing-site for a diminutive suffix, because such prefixed titles cannot be diminutivized. In the most popular German translation

- (9a) *Will der Herr Graf ein Tänz+chen nun wagen?*
 'wants the Sir count a dance-DIM now dare?'

neither of the two nouns 'Lordship' and 'count' is a possible landing-site, therefore the noun 'dance' is diminutivized. And this pragmatic attitude sets the tone for the whole aria to follow.

7 Jurafsky

Jurafsky (1996: 563) challenges Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi's core argument relative to the feature [non-serious] (see Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 2001 for a general critical rebuttal), which he (following Wierzbicka 1984) proposes to replace with 'child' and its meaning [small], as a semantic prototype that he postulates to be at the center of a universal radial category (Lakoff 1987) of diminutive meanings (Vanhove and Hamid Ahmed 2016: 4 oppose this conception). He considers these multiple meanings as the result of recurrent semantic processes in both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. As a synchronic

object, the radial category motivates the sense relations of a polysemous category, but as a diachronic object, it gives account of the meaning changes from the more physical, central sense of ‘child’ to the more general, abstract and qualitative meanings (e.g. pragmatic) of the edge. Jurafsky’s major asset is his universalistic cognitive approach, i.e. he explores 60 languages, and identifies a synchronic complex network of meanings, all diachronically postulated as emanating from the central meaning [small], of which each language instantiates at least a portion coherently connected with the center.

Prieto (2015) fills a big lacuna in Jurafsky’s work by extending his radial system to augmentatives, but providing no opposite analogue to the core concept [child] of diminutives. Matisoff (1992), in his study of diminutives and augmentatives in some languages of Southeast Asia, maintains that the origin of augmentative markers is the word for ‘mother’, but, according to Vanhove and Hamid Ahmed (2016), this is not proved and in any case far from being universal.

Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi (2001: 45) and Mutz (2015:144) challenge the possibility to use a unique model to represent both synchronic and diachronic variation. Both studies oppose Jurafsky’s assumption of a universal unidirectionality of the meaning ‘child’ to cover all the meaning variations synchronically represented, for example in the Indo-European languages, where many diminutive suffixes have developed from derivational suffixes (e.g. creating denominational relational adjectives), unconnected with the meaning ‘small’.

To the universalistic quality of Jurafsky’s semantic model, so vastly applicable and actually applied in evaluative analyses, morphopragmatics opposes a more dynamic capacity to generate pragmatic meanings, thanks to the invariant feature [fictive], inherent in evaluatives, which is immediately capable of both building a favorable set of situational circumstances, including co-text (non-serious, personalized and subjective), and creating pragmatic meanings (attenuation, euphemism, ludic attitude, contempt, etc.) suited to the speech act sequences involved (cf. Biscetti and Dressler 2002). Compare the following utterances A and B: the simple adding of a diminutive in B invites a complex pragmatic interpretation (mitigated non-offensive criticism or hedged request), which would be inadequate for A utterances:

- (10) a. Il tuo ragazzo è grasso!
 ‘your boyfriend is fat!’
 b. Il tuo ragazzo è grass+ott+ello! ‘fat-DIM₁.DIM₂’
 ‘your boyfriend is a bit plump’

- (11) a. Non potresti darmi un aiuto?
 ‘couldn’t you give me a help?’
 b. Non potresti darmi un aiut+ino? ‘help-DIM’
 ‘what would you say to a bit of help?’

The advantage of a morphopragmatic approach compared to others also rests on its capability to accommodate major problems connected with a synchronic analysis of diminutives (and augmentatives), namely their seemingly irregular and unpredictable polysemy, and on its capability to systematize and explain their variety of forms and functions.

In this regard, and to resume our general criticism concerning the vast neglect of pragmatics, we like to mention Simon and Wiese (2011: 21–22), as reported in Grandi (2017), who confirm our point and criteria and view “the possibility of directly involving pragmatic aspects in morphology” in order to explain some of the seemingly contradictory properties of diminutives and augmentatives, whose “erratic behaviour” – they say – “turns out to be more systematic when viewed from a morphopragmatic perspective”. Consider also Fortin’s (2011: 1) reply to Stump (1993): “Stump’s definition of evaluation semantics as “diminution, augmentation, endearment and contempt” is too limited. As is well known, evaluative affixes have many other uses, e.g., non-seriousness/informality, intensification, exactness, attenuation, approximation, and illocutionary mitigation, among others (see, e.g. Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi 1994a; Jurafsky 1996)”.

8 Objects of analysis

On a world-wide perspective, the expression of evaluative meanings can be approached onomasiologically through different linguistic means, singularly or in various combinations: for example, at the level of phonology, with consonant, vowel or tone alternations and expressive palatalization; at the level of morphology, with suffixes, prefixes, semi-prefixes, interfixes and more rarely infixes, often accompanied by gender and number changes (cf. Grandi and Körtvélyessy 2015, where more than 50 world languages have been analyzed). Also what Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi (1994a, Doleschal and Thornton 2000, Mattiello 2013) call extra-grammatical mechanisms, may be involved, like clipping, blending and echo-word formation (cf. Bauer, Lieber and Plag 2013 for different interpretations). More rarely, compounding, particles and clitics may have an evaluative function. Lexical constructions with evaluative adjectives,

nouns or adverbs may add to or interfere with evaluations obtained by single constituents of the text. Let us summarize the most important morphological mechanisms employed in the European languages discussed here.

As anticipated above, among the best candidates for a morphopragmatic description are evaluative suffixes, such as diminutives and augmentatives (more rarely pejoratives), on which Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi based their main demonstration (mostly with reference to Italian, German, English and other European languages), but also elatives, (e.g. Italian *-issimo*), patterns of reduplication, excessives, and, within inflection, personal pronouns of address and honorifics, whose basic characters equally allow for a morphopragmatic analysis, to be discussed later (see § 10, 11). Extra-grammatical phenomena were not included in the 1994 model, but they are mentioned here, especially because they configure a context of intimate, informal discourse, where pragmatic meanings are expectable.

Examples are mainly drawn from languages of the European area (from corpora, web, personal collections), contextualized examples from various languages (see Appendix).

Below we group a sample of the morphological devices whose meanings seem to be primarily located in pragmatics and thus most likely to be involved in exemplary morphopragmatic operations. The list includes evaluatives, already partly illustrated above but worth of a more specialized treatment:

- a) evaluative/alterative affixes (diminutives, augmentatives, pejoratives) (examples from Italian, German, English, Spanish, French), including ante-suffixal interfixes, as in various Romance languages (e.g. Italian ludicrous *top+ol+one* vs. serious *top+one* ‘sewer rat-AUG’), more in § 8 and in the Appendix. On hypocoristics see § 9.1.
- b) clipped forms, blends or portmanteaus (e.g. French *intell+o* ← *intellectuel* ‘intellectual’, Australian contemptuous *win-o*, “an alcoholic”, *comm-o* for communist, Spanish *telebobela* ‘silly soap opera’ ← *telenovela* ‘soap opera’ and *boba* ‘silly’. These formations are implicitly evaluative and often restricted in speech situations and relations between interactants (Kilani-Schoch and Dressler 1999, Scullen 1997, Antoine 2000).
- c) Italian elative *-issimo* as a pragmatic intensifier in rebuttals to assertions or questions (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a, Merlini Barbaresi 2004: 449)
- d) The use of some formatives, prefixoids and suffixoids derived from negatively connoted words (e.g. Italian *-poli* ← *Tangent+o+poli* ‘bribing system’ in *vallett+o+poli* ‘irregular recruitment of TV starlets’; English *-gate* ← *Watergate* in *Enron-gate*, English *-holic* in *work+a+holic*, *shop+a+holic*), which have pragmatic meanings at least in the early stages of their

productivity, whereas later some of them may have become normal suffixes or combining forms.

- e) The English disdainful analytic form *little* reduced and unstressed (cf. Schneider 2013), as in

(12) *I can't stand your little tricks;*
compare

(13) *Estoy harto de tus brom+ita-s*
'I'm fed up with your nasty little jokes';

Fr. *petit* reduced to the prefix *ti-*, diminutive in French Creoles (Avram 1998), hypocoristic in Québec, expressing tenderness, as in *ti-Jean* 'Johnny'.

- f) Feminine motional suffixes. Through the procedure of motion between genders, feminine nouns can be obtained from the masculine ones, as well as masculine nouns from the feminine ones, by adding motional suffixes or substituting the appropriate gender marker (e.g. in Italian, the feminine marker *-a* replaces the masculine *-o* in such new words as *sindac-a* 'mayor-FEM', *magistrat-a* 'magistrate/judge-FEM', *ministr-a* 'minister-FEM'). The advent of feminist movements has led to a highly increased profitability of feminine motional suffixes in many languages (Doleschal 2005). The situation is pragmatically complex. For example, when referring to a plurality of female and male teachers, traditionalists and antifeminists use the (traditionally also generic) zero plural of the masculine deverbal agent noun *Lehrer*. One official egalitarian written correspondent is *Leh-rer-Inn-en* 'teacher-FEM. Motion-PL' with an internal capital letter I. Its normative pronunciation requires the insertion of a glottal stop before this internal /i/. But most often the glottal stop is not pronounced, which renders this generic plural identical with that of the feminine agent noun *Lehrerinnen*. Therefore, many speakers replace such plurals with paraphrases such as *Lehrerinnen und Lehrer*. Thus, this motion suffix has become an object of morphopragmatics.
- g) Metaphorical compounds, often exploited pragmatically, to express exaggeration, tenderness, irony, e.g. English *giant-killer*, *baby-dolphin*, *baby-trees*, *pico-brain*, *uber-brain*, Italian literary *pietre-bambine*, i.e. *pietr-uzze* 'stone-DIM-PL' (in D'Arrigo's novel *Horcynus Orca*), *pargoletta mano* 'child-DIM hand', metaphor for "little hand" (in Carducci's poem "Pianto Antico") are often pragmatically exploited, e.g. tenderness in *baby-dolphin*, *pargoletta mano*, exaggeration and irony in *pico-brain*, *uber-brain*. (Merlini Barbaresi 2015a). Phrasal compounds have also been described as being created for expressive reasons (Meibauer 2007, 2015, Trips 2012, 2014).

- h) German intensifying compounds. This is another type of pragmatically exploited compounds. While *blút+arm* ‘lit. blood-poor’ means ‘anaemic’, the prosodically different *blút+ârm* means “poor as a church-mouse”. Compounds with such double stress express an intensifying evaluation and cannot be used in formal speech situations (Schmitt 1998; Klara 2009).
- i) Honorifics, for example the Japanese suffix *-masu*. These are devices grammaticalizing politeness (more in § 10).
- j) Some inflectional categories having a pragmatic foundation: (1) personal pronouns (cf. Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a: 60–72); (2) English present perfect, whose meanings Žic Fuchs (2009) considers to be the result of conventionalized pragmatic inferences about the currently relevant state; pragmatic uses of plural forms (more in § 11.1); (3) excessives (more in § 11.2); (4) evidentials as morphologizing source of information and surprise, as in Turkish, Bulgarian, Albanian, Korean, etc. (cf. Cornillie and Marín Arrese 2015); (5) affective demonstratives, such as English *this* (Potts and Schwarz 2010, Halm 2018); (6) Pragmatics has also a role in the well-known specific and context-sensitive uses of other inflectional categories such as historical presents and infinitives, and infinitives used for giving orders as well as past participles for giving warnings.
- k) reduplication and echo forms in extra-European languages (Austronesian Muna contemptuous affixed *ka-guru-guru* ‘poorly performing teacher’, affectionate affixed *ka-lima-lima* ‘little hands’), vs. reduplicatives in the European area (e.g. English *Lizzy-wizzy*, *easy peasy*, *teensy-weensy*, French *joujou* “toy”, *Zizou* for Zidane, *sousoupe* “soup” (Merlini Barbaresi 2008). See also Yiddish *shm*-reduplicatives (echo words) indicating irony, derision or scepticism, as in “He’s just a baby! Baby-*shmaby*. He’s already 5 years old!”

Only some of the devices mentioned above will have a more detailed account.

9 Evaluatives

Evaluative diminutive and augmentative suffixes are capable of modifying the denotative semantic meaning of their bases in terms of dimension or in terms of quality (pejoratives) and in addition, they may confer to their bases and to the entire utterance, a vast array of pragmatic meanings, which co-vary with contextual and discursive variables. It would be impossible to derive such variations from morphosemantic meanings. Diminutives may be totally responsible for the added utterance meanings, with the word-base being either neutral

(*book-let*) or contributory (*dear+ie*, Italian *piccol+ino* “small-DIM”) or even contrary (Spanish fem. *gord+ita* or Italian *gross+ina* “big-DIM”) to the effect pursued. With Italian augmentatives, the word-base meaning can hardly be contradictory because augmentatives always retain some of their denotation of bigness even when especially engaged in conveying pragmatic, non-denotational meanings (cf. Italian *piccol+ona* “small-AUG”) (Merlini Barbaresi 2004).

Due to non-seriousness, pragmatic meanings are especially consonant with informal interactional discourse (in-group or intimate), in which participants’ attitudes, emotions, and beliefs are foregrounded. Their type and intensity is regulated by the participants’ epistemic commitment and evaluative judgements.

9.1 Diminutives

Among evaluatives, diminutives (e.g. English *kitchen+ette*, Spanish *hasta+lueg+ito* ‘bye-bye-DIM’, Austrian German *Papp+erl* ‘meal-DIM’, Italian *dormit+ina* ‘a nap-DIM’, cf. § 5–7) are the morphological mechanism that best exemplifies the variety of morphopragmatic meanings/effects. They are the unmarked evaluative category, i.e. the presence in a language of a productive category of augmentatives, by implication, also means the presence of diminutives (cf. Grandi 2011). Apparently, though, in Australian Warlpiri (Bowler 2015: 439), augmentatives are more common than diminutives. In Berber, Grandi (2015: 453) discusses the systematic and intricate relationship between feminine gender and diminutives and between masculine and augmentatives, which may greatly confound the picture.

Moreover, diminutives are almost universally represented cross-linguistically. At least all languages possess the pragmatically-connected category of hypocoristics, which may share with diminutives specialized contexts of use, namely, child-directed, pet-directed, and lover-directed discourse types. And, in their being strongly conditioned by an interpersonal dimension, hypocoristics appear essentially pragmatic in nature and function.

9.1.1 Hypocoristics

Although in many languages there is a large overlap between markers of hypocoristics (and appellatives) and of diminutives, each category may have access to its own variety of means or even combine means of the two categories. For example, in Italian, together with a large use of diminutive markers (appellatives *picc+ol+ino*, *om+etto* and *Cicc+ina*, *Pepp+ino*), we find reduplicatives as

appellatives/hypocoristics for babies, like *puffo puffo*, *iccio-ciccio*, echo word, like *Gino-pino*, *kiki*, (see mothers' web blogs), or in English, abbreviations and reduplicatives, as *hun* for *honey*, *babe* for *baby*, or *luv* for *love*, *Lizz+y-wizz+y*, etc., but also combinations of different markers, like Italian *puff+etto-puff+etto*, *kik+ina* (reduplicative plus DIM) or English *lov+ie-dov+ie*, *sweet+ie* (< *sweetheart*).

In some languages, we can still formally distinguish hypocoristics and proper (non-hypocoristic) diminutives. For example, in German, the adjective *lieb* 'dear' can give rise, to both the gendered hypocoristic nominalization *der/die Lieb+i* 'the dear one' (referring only to the speaker's boy/girl-friend), and to the neuter diminutive *das Lieb+chen* 'the beloved girl/woman'. In general, it seems to be the case that the existence of pragmatic diminutives in a language implies the co-existence of hypocoristics. Moreover, in hypocoristics, the dominance of the pragmatic character over the semantic one is even greater and clearer than in diminutives.

9.2 Augmentatives and pejoratives

These evaluative types are much less widespread cross-linguistically (Dahl 2006, Grandi 2011) and in terms of pragmatic effects less efficient than diminutives. Their markedness does not only show in their cross-linguistic implicational relation to diminutives, but also in the fact that, if they occur in the same language, then the paradigm of diminutives is richer than the paradigms of augmentatives and pejoratives (type frequency) and that diminutives are used more often than augmentatives and pejoratives (token frequency). Moreover, there seem to exist always more competing rules of diminutives (e.g. Italian productive suffixations in *-ino*, *-etto*, *-uccio*, *-uzzo*, *-olo*, *-onzolo*, plus several unproductives) than of productive augmentatives (It. *-one*) and pejoratives (It. *-accio*, *-astro*), see Merlini Barbaresi (2004). Their pertinence to pragmatics is less direct and exclusive, because, as said above, at most, they confer to their bases a combination of semantic and pragmatic meaning. When pragmatics is predominant, both augmentatives and pejoratives may be very close to diminutives in their effects, i.e. they may actually be alternative marks for signaling morphopragmatic meanings. In Italian, for example, augmentatives or pejoratives can convey, in addition to their semantic meanings [big] and [bad], respectively, tenderness and jocular closeness, as in: *Il mio fratell+one/ino!* 'My brother-AUG/DIM!' or in a famous epithet pronounced by the comedian Roberto Benigni *Ah, Wojtył+accio* 'Oh, (pope) Wojtyła-PEJ', or, current in

Tuscany, *Gin+ett+accio*, ‘Gino-DIM-PEJ’ referred to Gino Bartali, which combines Tuscan ludic irreverence with affection.

Arguments for the primacy of the pragmatic meaning of evaluatives (especially of diminutives) have been given before, including evidence from acquisition and corpus-linguistic analysis of genres (§ 6.3). Here we want to add the diachronic comparative argument of the development of corresponding Romance diminutives and augmentatives from Latin sources (cf. Hasselrot 1957; Mutz 2000, 2015): one finds the etymologically identical suffix in Italian *cavall+one* = Spanish *cabal+ón* ‘horse-AUG’ and French *aigl+on* ‘eagle-DIM’ (also hypocoristic of Napoleon’s son). Similarly, Spanish *libr+ote* ‘book-AUG’ corresponds to French *îl+ot* ‘island-DIM’, *vieill+ot* ‘old-DIM’, hypocoristic *Pierr+ot*. In Italian, the semantic meaning of the correspondent suffix is rather imprecise: for example, the size of a *tazz+otta* ‘cup-DIM’ lies in between the sizes of a *tazz+ina* ‘cup-DIM’ and a *tazz+ona* ‘cup-AUG’. Diachronic jumps from “small” to “big” or the reverse would be surprising, whereas the primacy of a common pragmatic meaning renders secondary semantic meaning changes easier to understand.

10 Honorifics

Honorifics represent a main means of grammaticalizing politeness (Haase 2000). The most frequently described cases are various Japanese honorifics, starting with personal pronouns. There is a scale even for the first person singular, starting with *tin*, which can be used only by the Japanese emperor, but came into disuse after the death of emperor Hirohito. His successor Akihito preferred, instead, the most formal normal variant *watakusi* over the less formal variant *watasi*.

Much more pragmatically relevant is the verbal humbling suffix *-masu*, which, among the various means of honorification, is the only grammatical suffix, whose use is restricted to pragmatic meanings (Harada 1976, Ide 2003, Fukada and Asato 2004).

We exemplify the pragmatic features of the speech situation with the following pair of statements (both meaning “here is a book”):

- (14) Koko ni hon ga ari- *masu*
 Koko ni hon ga aru
 ‘Here PARTICLE book PARTICLE there’

where the more polite or humble form with *-masu* is used instead of the simple form by:

(a) female rather than male speakers, (b) higher educated speakers with more prestigious professions than lower educated ones, (c) towards addressees that belong to a ratified out-group (vs. in-group) rather than towards bystanders, (d) towards strangers. Also authority relations play a role: if addressees have authority over the speakers, these must use *-masu* when speaking to them. There is also the conventional impact of the occasion and topic of interaction. In contrast to evaluatives, speech act intensification or mitigation is expressed by other devices than *-masu*.

What is much more common in many languages are honorifics attached to names or human subjects in general (Haase 2000, Shibatani 2006). This is also not foreign to Japanese: for example, the suffix *-chan* is limited to addressing very familiar interactants and children in an affectionate way. A very special honorific system exists in Lhasa Tibetan (Simon and Hill 2015: 387–388), where compounds used for honorific evaluation consist of a honorific first and a non-honorific second constituent; if the second constituent is already a lexical honorific, the first constituent “is replaced by an honorific categoriser morpheme” (Simon and Hill 2015: 387).

11 Morphopragmatic inflection

Although morphopragmatics plays a smaller role in inflection than in word formation (as already noticed in the greater proximity of diminutives to derivation than to inflection) we have already mentioned pragmatic foundations of inflectional categories in § 8. and inflectional properties of honorifics in § 9. Here we are going to briefly discuss pragmatic uses of plurals (§11.1) and excessives (§ 11.2).

11.1 Pragmatic uses of plurals

Well-known instances of secondary metaphoric or indexical uses of the plural are the pluralis maiestatis employed by emperors, kings or other secular or ecclesiastic authorities or the defocusing devices (cf. Shibatani 1990: 364) of the pluralis modestiae of the authorial plural.

Much less studied (but see Dressler and Mörtz 2012) are pragmatic differences which exist, at least optionally, between German plural doublets such as *Rikscha+s* vs. *Riksch+en* from singular *die Rikscha* ‘rikshaw’ (< Japanese *jīnriki-sha*), *Datscha+s* vs. *Datsch+en* from singular *die Datscha* ‘dacha’ (< Russ. *dača*), *Schmock+s* vs. *Schmök+e* from Singular *der Schmock* ‘shmock, hack writer’.

The respective -s plural variants can have a connotation of strangeness, either of foreignness or of connoting pejoratively an out-group, as in the use of *Schmock+s* used by antisemites and particularly Nazis against Jews. In contrast, *Riksch+en* is used in Germany predominantly for rikshaws in Germany, *Rikschas* for those in Asia. As to *Datsch+en*, due to Russian influence, it was used predominantly in East Germany, whereas *Datschas* was used in West Germany.

11.2 Excessives

The excessive is the highest degree of adjective (and adverb) gradation in Dutch, German, North Germanic languages, Hungarian and Finnish. It represents an absolute intensification of the superlative (Dressler and Kiefer 1990, Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a: 558–573), on which it is also formally built. In the above-mentioned Germanic languages it is formed with the prefix *aller-* ‘of all’, in Hungarian by a repetition of the superlative suffix (coordinated by ‘and’), and in Finnish in two analytic ways (Raun 1960). The pragmatic conditions for its use can be of two kinds:

(a) when there is a pragmatic insistence on the absolute poles of a hierarchy, as in reference to an absolute monarch or to God, as in: Danish *den aller+hellig+ste Fader* = German *der aller+heilig+ste Vater* ‘the Holy Father’, (b) when addressing a monarch in German up to the 19th century (in Danish up to the 18th century), as in *Aller+gnädig+ster Herr!* = Danish *aller+naadig+ste Herre!* ‘most gracious Lord!’, paralleled by a sign of humbleness, as in a letter signed with German *aller+untertänig+st* = Danish *aller+underdanig+st* ‘most devout/submissive’.

(b) when, in accordance with the Jakobsonian principle of equivalence, the very last threshold on a paradigmatic scale of intensification is projected syntagmatically into the very last instance of a succession of instances, within a coherent chunk of text or discourse. This is exemplified in the exaggerated sequence in Heinrich Böll’s novel *Der Lorbeer ist immer noch bitter*:

- (15) *diese immer wieder verzögerten Abschiede, von denen jeder der letzte zu sein schien, bis dann doch noch der aller+letzte und der aller+aller+letzte kam*
 ‘these again and again delayed farewells, of which each seemed to be the last one, until still the very last and the very, very last came’

12 Reduplication

According to Haspelmath's (2003: 274) definition, reduplication is a morphological process which repeats the morphological base entirely or only partially. Restricting the phenomenon to morphology, though, is perhaps an unduly limitation. In fact, reduplication can be better described as a borderline case between morphology, phonology and the lexicon, which lends itself to being treated from diverse perspectives and theoretical approaches. For our purposes, though, the notions of morphological process and lexical reduplicate form are the most relevant ones and sufficient.

On reduplication, there is an abundance of studies and of research projects (Hurch 2007), Kouwenberg and La Charité (2003) both enlarging its phenomenology and promoting novel research paradigms. As observed by Hurch (2007), reduplication lends itself perfectly as a test field for theories that opt for a non-segmental organization of phonology and morphology. It is relevant here because it may be alternative or complementary to suffixation in obtaining evaluative meanings in many languages of the world.

Reduplicative morphological constructions are indeed the second-best candidates for a morphopragmatic analysis. Like evaluative affixes, they seem to be an ideal test area for theories capable of accounting for a plurality of forms, of semantic meanings, often underdetermined and even contradictory, for a large variety of functional properties and, importantly, for motivations and explanations which often appear basically rooted in pragmatics.

In a recent publication (Grandi and Körtvélyessy 2015), a large number of extra-European languages, not yet investigated in terms of evaluative morphology, are described to give a fairly representative picture of the phenomenon worldwide. In these languages, reduplicative strategies appear to be an important alternative option for expressing meaning modifications comparable to those achieved by evaluative affixation.

12.1 Grammatical vs. extragrammatical reduplications

Reduplication is amply productive in many areas of the world, but not in the contemporary languages of Western Europe, except for the area of English, which greatly deviates from the rest of Europe both in terms of productivity and of type and token frequency.

A preliminary observation is in order: reduplication (often combined with affixes or particles) across the majority of the extra-European languages, although difficult to describe systematically, is mostly a grammatical (regular)

phenomenon, engaged in fairly transparent (the reduplicative formation is always recognizable in spite of various base modifications), non-arbitrary operations, capable of regular strategies of grammar (plurality, feminine gender, imperfective aspect, distributive, iterative) and of encoding well-defined meanings (diminutive, augmentative, among others, mostly tinged with emotionality). Their formation rules and output data are, in other words, generally predictable and stable, even when they seem contradictory in meaning.

Many patterns of reduplication are in fact recognized and described by scholars as evaluative in nature, for example, in Austronesian Muna (van den Berg 2015: 367), reduplication can express diminution and tenderness (e.g. *lima* ‘hands’ > affixed *ka-lima-lima* ‘little hands’), contempt (*guru* ‘teacher’ > affixed *ka-guru-guru* ‘poorly performing teacher’), approximation (*lolu* ‘stupid’ > affixed *no-ka-lolu-lolu* ‘rather stupid’), attenuation (*linda* ‘to dance’ > affixed *no-poka-linda-linda* ‘dance a little, just for fun’) and intensification (*ai* ‘younger sibling’ > *ai-ai* ‘youngest sibling’). In Bikol (Mattes 2014), full reduplication may be used to express diminutives and augmentatives as well as plurals and intensives. In Taiwanese Hakka, they convey attenuation/approximation, as in *giang* ‘somewhat afraid’ vs. *giang* ‘afraid’ (Lai 2006:491, reported in Arcodia 2015).

In contrast, in the so-called Western area, reduplication is mostly an extra-grammatical morphological formation (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a, Dressler 2000, Doleschal and Thornton 2000, Mattiello 2013) mostly not rule-bound, morphotactically unstable and fuzzy in the meanings obtained. At variance with the type described above, it more clearly partakes of the nature of word-formation, in that it is capable of enriching the lexicon of a language, if not with synonyms at least with connoted variants, e.g. English noun and verb *hush-hush* ‘secret’, noun and adjective *goody-goody* ‘ostentatiously virtuous person’, adjective *gaga* ‘senile’, adjective *go-go* ‘aggressive’, noun (echo word) *knick-knack* ‘a small worthless object.’

All types are pertinent to this discussion because they may be alternative or complementary to affixation in obtaining evaluative meanings and hypocorism.

Moreover, reduplicative constructions can raise comparative or contrastive theoretical issues that can help clarify the picture of evaluatives in general and of their pragmatic motivations.

12.2 Iconicity

A great practical and theoretical gap between evaluative affixation and reduplication, though, lies in the semantic disequilibrium which arises from the fact

that evaluative affixes have a meaning of their own, interfering and combining with that of the base, whereas a reduplication mechanism obtains meaning effects which seem regulated by very basic semiotic principles, like, for example, the time-honored iconic maxim “more of the same form equals more of the same meaning” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:128, see Kouwenberg and LaCharite 2003, on Caribbean creole languages), which is pertinent to plurality (e.g. Indonesian *orang* “person” *orang orang* “many people”), intensification (Thai-Cadai *dii* ‘good’, *dii-dii* ‘very good’, Chinese *hóng* ‘red’, *hóng hóng* ‘dark red’. See Moravcsik (1978: 316) for a much less optimistic view on such predictability of meanings (in connection with reduplication or any other expression).

12.3 Evaluation meanings

A more sophisticated iconic principle may also be at work and is needed to explain opposite meanings also obtained, namely diminution, attenuation, imitation, etcetera, which some scholars consider instead as non- or anti-iconic (Regier 1998). This principle refers to a more general motivation which, in order to be explanatory, requires a complex cognitive elaboration: a change of quantity, whatever direction is intended, may diagram either intensification or diminution, but the path to reach the actual meaning pole may be much more tortuous and indirect. For example, more spots of color on a surface may result in lower intensity as in Jamaican Creole *yelo-yelo* ‘yellow-spotted, yellowish’, or a repetitive, intermittent action appears attenuated, less effective than a continuous action (see the above-mentioned Muna *linda* ‘to’ dance’ vs. affixed (*no-poka*)-*linda-linda* ‘dance a little, just for fun’), which is not dissimilar from Italian *salt+ell+are* ‘jump-DIM-ending’ < *saltare* ‘jump’ and *dorm+icchi+-are* ‘sleep-DIM-ending, sleep intermittently’ or *bago* ‘new’ > *bagu-bato* ‘rather new, newish’.

An object may acquire lower importance (cf. the notion of “non-seriousness” in morphopragmatics), for example in Tagalog *bahay* ‘house’ > *bahay bahayan* ‘toy house’, *tao* ‘person’ > *tau-tauhan* ‘puppet’. Also in Bikol, full reduplication may be used to express diminutives as well as plural and intensive, as in *mahal* ‘expensive’, *mahal-mahal* is both “rather expensive” and “very expensive”. See Mattes on Bikol (2014) for an extensive treatment of this iconic evaluative principle and of the ambiguity involved and its possible solutions (also in Yami, a Philippine language, reduplicative *ara-rako* means both ‘all big’ and ‘biggish’). Unfortunately the data reported in Grandi and Körtvélyessy (2015) as well as in other specialized studies are hardly or not at all contextualized, which renders interpretation difficult, but can we perhaps envisage some type of meiosis similar to that encountered in Italian or English (see APPENDIX). *Mahal-mahal* in its

attenuated meaning, for example, seems to compare with euphemistic and understated assertions, like Italian *E' costos+etto* 'it's quite costly' with the intended meaning 'very costly'. An interesting case of diminutivum modestum is found in Selee, a Niger-Congo language (Agbetsoamedo and Di Garbo 2015: 493), in an offer context, but it is a case of analytical diminutive with *pitiipiti* 'little'. In Selee, the pragmatic meaning of the diminutive marker, *bi* can be intensified by lengthening the vowel or reduplicating it, as in *biibii*.

In Somali (Lampitelli 2015: 507), reduplication is very productive and is largely employed to express approximation, attenuation, reduction (with adjectives), pluractionality (Bertinetto and Lenci 2012) with verbs, *bood* 'to jump' > *bood-bood* 'to jump repeatedly, in small jumps'.

In Zulu (van der Spuy and Mjiyako 2015:519), partial and full reduplication is a complex system and an important way of marking evaluative meanings with nouns, adjectives and verbs. With verbs, it normally means 'do X a little' (Doke 1973), but also 'do X repeatedly' or 'do X without much skill'. This last meaning is primarily pragmatic, precisely self-deprecating, as in *ngi-ya-cul-a-cula* 'I'm just singing a bit' (cf. Italian *cant+icchi+-are* with a diminutive suffix). In Zulu, reduplicatives often codify negative evaluations (e.g. *a-rang* 's/he does', but *a-rang a-rang* 's/he boasts, shows off'). The analysts here try an interesting explanation, which implies a complex cognitive path. They suggest that in Zulu culture, the insistent repetition of the same action can be interpretable as a 'performance' and therefore as a way for somebody to show off, even with a suspicion of evil intentions.

The data examined above provide just a sketchy picture of the great number of languages where evaluation is expressed by morphological means, be it affixes or reduplicatives: what is amazing is the pervasiveness and persistence of the same meaning effects (sometimes with further specifications) obtained cross-linguistically. Is this indicative of a universal semantics or of a shared pragmatics?

13 Extragrammatical English reduplication

As compared to the types discussed above, the Western-European reduplicatives are much less predictable, and this is mainly due to the large numbers of patterns available, their rule-unboundedness, low internal regularity, fuzzy meanings and even the mystery that often characterizes the modalities of their formation, i.e. the hardly or non-discernible path from input to output data. Still, these morphological formations (also called echo words), unlike the reduplicatives examined in § 12, have in their weaknesses – irregular grammar, non-componential semantics,

often unrecognizable bases, un-headedness – a key to becoming established items in the lexicon. Some of the English reduplicatives, in fact, have been there for centuries (e.g. see the so-called copy reduplicatives, i.e. based on identical member repetition – as in *ha-ha* – which are recorded in some Old English documents dating back to the year 1000, or Shakespearian *skimble-skamble* ‘senseless’ and *hurly-burly* ‘confusion’). This is expectable, because their mechanism of formation is not always identifiable or easily repeatable. They are created often analogically (cf. the notion of ‘analogy via schema’ Mattiello 2017), mainly in harmony with a well-established sound pattern. If they come to cover some useful areas of meaning, over time, they become lexicalized and enter mainstream usage, as for example late 16th century *helter-skelter* ‘disorder’, while others may fall into relative disuse. Their spelling or even their meaning is unstable, though, and may vary a lot in the course of use. In the extra-European languages seen above, by contrast, very rare lexicalizations are reported in connection with reduplication (for example, Rubino 2005: 12, mentions Llocano *bánga* ‘pot’ > *banga bánga* ‘skull’).

For a detailed account of reduplicatives, centered on or including European ones, after Jespersen (1942), Marchand (1960) and Thun (1963), see Marantz (1982), Minkova (2002), Inkelas and Zoll (2005), Nadarajan (2006), Merlini Barbaresi (2008), Mattiello (2013), Kallergi (2015) and the publications connected with the above mentioned Graz project and web-site (Hurch 2007).

13.1 Evaluation meanings

The meaning of reduplication seems to be close to the meaning of diminutives (or augmentative and pejoratives) in several European languages (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994a, Merlini Barbaresi 2008) but especially in English. Like evaluatives, it can express empathy, endearment in child/lover/pet-centered situations but also be derogatory in other situations. For example,

- (16) *Don't be silly-billy!*
has the same type of *jocularity* and mild criticism as Italian

- (17) *Non fare la sciocch-ina!*
'Don't make the silly-DIM' .

- (18) E. *Who's my boobsy-woobsy?*

said by a tender *mother* to her child parallels

(19) It: *Chi è il mio bimb-ol-ino piccol-ino?*

'Who is my baby-INTERFIX-DIM little-DIM'.(see APPENDIX).

Unlike other Western European languages, English, widely and productively exploits extragrammatical reduplication also as a word formation mechanism for enriching the lexicon. But, as seen above, reduplicatives can also cover areas of morphopragmatic use that in other languages are normally covered by evaluative suffixes. Moreover, they suit similar contexts of use, namely informal, familiar, even slangy speech.

13.2 Extragrammatical character

Although difficult to describe in terms of rules, and for that reason marginalized by grammarians, English reduplicatives are by no means neglectable: they are lively, expressive and widespread (Merlini Barbaresi 2008). We distinguish various patterns: (1) apophonic reduplicatives (also called echo words), exhibiting a systematic alternation of the stressed vowel, such as *chit-chat*, *dilly-dally*, *flip-flop*, *knick-knack*, *see-saw*, *zigzag*, *ping pong*; (2) rhyming reduplicatives, exhibiting rhyming constituents and apophony of the initial consonant, as in *boogie-woogie*, *bow-wow*, *fuzzy-wuzzy*; (3) rhyming compounds, in which both bases are meaningful, for example, *artsy-craftsy*, *fag-hag*, *willy-nilly*, *walkie-talkie*, *nit-wit*; 4) copy reduplicatives, in which the second member is the exact copy of the first, as in *bye-bye*, *gale-gale*, *go-go*, *ga-ga*. All types have morphopragmatic applications. For example, rhyming reduplicatives are especially used for hypocoristics and appellatives, as in *Georgie-Porgie*, *Humpty-Dumpty*, *Lizzy-Wizzy* and Ruskin's (letters to his mother) *grammie-wammie-mammie*, *Poos-Moos*, *Poosky-Woosky*, *Puss-Moss*, where he also affectionately refers to an allegorical figure of 'Logic' in a painting as *Lodgie-Podgie*. In a large majority of cases, the mechanism of reduplication also involves the adding of the evaluative/familiarizing/nursery suffix *-y/ie*, which contributes to the same pragmatic meaning.

Reduplicatives are confined to extra-grammatical morphology, together with other phenomena (called "oddities" by Aronoff, in Bauer 1984: 232), like abbreviations, blends, hypocoristics, backformation, acronyms and initialisms (Mattiello 2013), because they exhibit various violations of basic properties of morphological grammar. For example, (a) whereas rules of canonical derivation and compounding are predictable in meaning and form change (*read-able*, *book-cover*), reduplicatives at most show some very general similarity of form; (b) whereas word formation rules form new words (as in *grave* > *gravity*),

reduplication more often obtains connoted variants (*dinner* > *din-din*, *marry* > *marry-schm-arry*), only capable of morphopragmatic effects; (c) whereas canonical formations rely on existing stem or word bases, reduplicatives often have no meaningful bases, hardly recognizable as pre-existent morphemes (*riff-raff*, *zig-zag*), or they are modified before reduplication and made less recognizable (*teeny-weeny* < *tiny*). In the onomatopoeic type (*tip-top*), the two constituents form a phonetic unit and no independent word bases are identifiable, since there is no semantic connection to the homophonous words *tip*, *top*; (d) morphosemantic headedness is only very rarely assignable.

Extragrammatical reduplications do not appear to form a homogeneous set. This is in line with their great interspeaker variation and their preferential use in areas where audacious formations are currently created, e.g. poetry, advertising, slang, fancy denominations (as trade names). Even among native speakers, their collocation in the language proves difficult. For example, the long lists continuously created in the web, mainly by the contribution of ordinary users, do not distinguish among canonical compounds and rhyming reduplicatives (*cook-books*, *flower-power*, *snail-mail* vs. *nitty-gritty*, *super-duper*, *teenie-weenie*).

Their rhyming sound pattern is the most apparent characteristic and its expressive force is so motivating that, sometimes, word-bases undergo major modifications to allow rhyme, e.g. in *cell-yell* (referred to noisy cellular phones), *Anglo-banglo* (a person of mixed English and Bengali descent).

13.3 Gamut of meanings

In general, the semantics exhibited by extragrammatical reduplicatives is restricted to a very limited range of meanings, more often pejorative: each area of meaning is shared by more reduplicatives, which is evidence of their indeterminacy and vagueness. Some of the represented meaning areas are:

(a) pretentiousness, as in *artsy-fartsy*, *culture-vulture*; (b) smallness, as in *itty-bitty*, *bitsy-witsy*; (c) indecision, as in *dilly-dally*, *shilly-shally*; (d) confusion, carelessness and disorder, as in *higgledy-piggledy*, *hitty-missy*; (e) trickery and secrecy, as in *hokey-pokey*, *hugger-mugger*, *jiggery-pokery*; (f) foolishness or inferior quality, as in *nitwit*, *silly-billy*; (g) fussiness, as in *fuddy-duddy*, *worry-wart*.

Not all English reduplicatives, of course, but the majority of them can be accommodated in these areas. In each of the sets, meaning is very fluid, often crossing areas and in fact many of the items could be listed elsewhere. Their indeterminacy is one of the reasons why reduplicatives are marginalized as 'non-serious', non-legitimate lexemes, more expressive than cognitive, indexical of

the speaker's feelings rather than thoughts. Pragmatic meanings, of course, are rooted in this quality.

14 Conclusions

In this chapter we revised our morphopragmatic model (Dressler and Merlini 1994a) by connecting it with further areas of pragmatics, by contrasting it with competing views and by adding external evidence from acquisition and diachrony. We have confirmed that morphopragmatics is more directly present in word formation than in inflection. The reason seems to be that pragmatics is most pertinent for the level of the lexicon (to which word formation is subordinate due to its lexical function) on the one hand and for the discourse level on the other hand. Inflectional morphology is subordinated to syntax due to its syntactic function and thus only indirectly connected with the pragmatic use of syntactic constructions. The importance of pragmatics at the discourse level appears in the broad scope of the evaluative act and the pragmatic relevance of morphopragmatic elements beyond the meaning of the complex word where it is morphologically manifest. The avoidance of semantic (including connotational) synonymy leads to frequent lexical blocking, which is not the case for competition among pragmatic diminutives (Dressler et al. 2019). There is also no lexical blocking in the competition among German intensifying adjectival compounds, such as *stock+dumm* 'utterly stupid, lit. stupid like a stick' = *sau+/blitz+/kreuz+/boden+/vieh+dumm* 'lit. stupid like a sow/lightning/cross/ground/lifestock'. An impact of lack of blocking on processing may be the reason for the lack of priming effects of the Italian diminutive suffix *-etto*, in contrast to non-evaluative suffixes (Giraud and Dal Maso 2016).

Morphopragmatics is absent in vast areas of cognitive science. One reason is the difficulty of testing morphopragmatic elements in formal psycholinguistic tests. Thus, we failed in testing pragmatic aspects of diminutives with aphasics, in contrast to semantic ones (Dressler et al. 1996, Franceschet et al. 2013). A second reason is that corpus-linguistic investigation of morphopragmatic elements requires very time-consuming manual control of contexts. Thus, we were unable to find any relevant publication written within the new approach of corpus pragmatics.

In cognitive science there exists the long-standing, but controversial and overly simplistic claim (see Stemmer 1999b; Perkins 2007) that right-handers process grammar in the left hemisphere of the brain and pragmatics in the right hemisphere. Since our model assumes a direct connection between

morphological grammar and pragmatics, it clearly does not support the assumed dichotomy between the two hemispheres.

References

- Agbetsoamedo, Yvonne. & Francesca Di Garbo. 2015. Σελεε. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtevélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 487–495. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Alonso, Amado. 1961. Nociòn, emociòn, acciòn y fantasia en los diminutivos. *Estudios lingüísticos: Temas españoles*, 161–189. Madrid: Gredos.
- Antoine, Fabrice. 2000. Dictionnaire français-anglais des mots tronqués. Louvain: Peeters.
- Appah, Clement K.I. & Nana A. Amfo. 2012. The morphopragmatics of the diminutive morpheme (-ba/-wa) in Akan. In Livia Körtevélyessy & Pavol Stekauer (eds.), *Lexis 6: Diminutives and Augmentatives in the Languages of the World*, 85–103. http://lexis.univ-lyon3.fr/IMG/pdf/Lexis_6.pdf.
- Arcodia, Giorgio F. 2015. Chinese. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtevélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 352–360. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ariel, Mira. 2007. *Relational and independent strategies in interpreting and conjunction*. Unpublished ms. Tel Aviv University.
- Ariel, Mira. 2010. *Defining Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to do things with words: The William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Avram, Andrei A. 1998. The diminutive noun prefix *ti-* in the French Creoles: Substrate influence or grammaticalization. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 43. 135–154.
- Bardaneh, Muhammad A. 2010. The pragmatics of diminutives in colloquial Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (1). 153–167.
- Bara, Bruno G. 2011. Cognitive pragmatics: The mental processes of communication. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 8. 443–485.
- Bauer, Laurie. 1984. Perspectives on words. In *Views of English* 3, Wellington: VUW English Department.
- Bauer, Laurie, Rochelle Lieber, & Ingo Plag. 2013. *The Oxford Reference Guide to English Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bazzanella, Carla. 2004. Emotions, Language, and Context. In Edda Weigand (ed.), *Emotion in Dialogic Interaction*, 55–72. Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Bazzanella, Carla, Claudia Caffi & Marina Sbisà. 1991. Scalar dimensions of illocutionary force. In Igor Žagar (ed.), *Speech acts: Fiction or reality?*, paper 7. Ljubljana: Institute for Social Sciences.
- Berry, John W. & Ype H. Poortinga. 2011. *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Alessandro Lenci. 2012. Pluractionality, habituality and gnomic imperfectivity. In Robert I. Binnick (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*, 852–880. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Binnick, Robert I. 2009. Tense and aspect. In Frank Brisard, Jan-Ola Östman & Jef Verschuren (eds.), *Grammar, meaning, and pragmatics*, 268–288. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Biscetti, Stefania. 2001. A contrastive morphopragmatic study of Italian and English diminutives in technical terminology. In Enikő Németh (ed.), *Pragmatics in 2000: Selected papers from the 7th International Pragmatics Conference*, vol.2. 81–91 Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.
- Biscetti, Stefania & Wolfgang U. Dressler 2002. Funzioni testuali degli alterativi. In Roland Bauer & Hans Goebel (eds.), *Parallela 9*, 53–68. Wilhelmsfeld: Egert.
- Blutner, Reynhard. 1998. Lexical Pragmatics. *Journal of Semantics* 15: 115–162.
- Böhmerová, Ada. 2011. Suffixal diminutives and augmentatives in Slovak: a systemic view with some cross-linguistic considerations. In Livia Körtvélyessy & Pavol Stekauer (eds.), *Diminutives and Augmentatives in the Languages of the World*, 59–84. http://lexis.univ-lyon3.fr/MG/psf/Lexis_6.pdf.
- Bosanac, Siniša, Dora Lukin & Petra Mikolić. 2009. *A Cognitive Approach to the Study of Diminutives: The Semantic Background of Croatian Diminutives*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Bowler, Margit. 2015. Walrlpiri. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 438–447. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1983. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bunt, Harry. 1979. Conversational principles in question-answer dialogues. In D. Kallmann & G. Stickel (eds.), *Zur Theorie der Frage*, 119–141. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- Bunt, Harry. 2000. Dynamic interpretation and dialogue theory. In Martin Taylor, Françoise Néel, and Don Bouwhuis (eds.), *The structure of multimodal dialogue II*, 139–166. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bunt, Harry. 2011. The Semantics of Dialogue Acts. *Proceedings 9th International Conference on Computational Semantics (IWCS 2011)*, Oxford, 1–14.
- Bunt, Harry, Volha Petukhova & Alex Fang. 2017. Revisiting the ISO standard for dialogue act annotation. *Proceedings 13th Joint ISO – ACL Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation (isa-13)* September 19, 2017 Montpellier, France.
- Cantero, Monica. 2003. *La morfopragmatica del español*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Carbaugh, Donal. 2013. On Dialogue Studies. *Journal of Dialogue Studies* 1. 9–28.
- Carstin, Robyn. 2017. Pragmatics and semantics. In Yan Huang (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook in Pragmatics*, 453–472. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1996. Communities, commonalities, and communication. In John Gumperz & Stephen Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 324–355. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooren, François. 2010. *Action and Agency in Dialogue: Passion, incarnation and ventriloquism*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Cornillie, B. & J.I. Marín Arrese (eds.). 2015. Evidentiality and the Semantics-Pragmatics Interface. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 29.
- Crocco Galéas, Grazia. 1992. Morfopragmatica e pragmatica lessicale degli etnici italiani. In Giovanni Gobber (ed.), *La linguistica pragmatica*, 61–71. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Dal, Georgette. 1997. *Grammaire du suffixe -et(te)*. Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Dahl, Östen. 2006. Diminutives and Augmentatives. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 3, 594–595. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Dardano, Maurizio. 1978. *La formazione delle parole nell'italiano di oggi*. Roma: Bulzoni.
- De Amicis, Edmondo. 1905. *L'idioma gentile*. Milano: Treves.

- Déchainé, Rose Marie, Raphaël Girard, Calisto Mudzingwa & Martina Wiltshko. 2015. Shona. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtevélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 496–506.
- De Marco, Anna. 1998. *Sociopragmatica dei diminutivi in italiano*. Rende: Centro Editoriale e Librario, Università degli Studi di Calabria.
- Deonna, Julien A. & Fabrice Teroni. 2012. *The Emotions. A Philosophical Introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Derzhanski, Ivan A. 2005. On Diminutive Plurals and Plural Diminutives. In Geet Booij, Emiliano Guevara, Angela Ralli, Salvatore Sgroi & Sergio Scalise (eds.), *Morphology and Linguistic Typology: On-line Proceedings of the Fourth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, 73–90, Università degli Studi di Bologna.
- Doke, Clement M. 1973. *Textbook of Zulu grammar*. Cape Town: Longman.
- Doleschal, Ursula. 2005. Genus und Geschlecht. Die Repräsentation der Geschlechter in der Grammatik. In Tina Bahovec (ed.), *Frauen Männer*, 314–324. Klagenfurt: Drava.
- Doleschal, Ursula & Anna M. Thornton (eds.). 2000. *Extragrammatical and marginal morphology*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Döring, Sabine A. 2007. Seeing What to Do: Affective Perception and Rational Motivation. *Dialectica* 61. 363–394.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1989. Prototypical Differences between Inflection and Derivation. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 42. 3–10.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 2000. Extragrammatical vs. marginal morphology. In Ursula Doleschal & Anna M. Thornton (eds.), *Extragrammatical and marginal morphology*, 1–10.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 2010. Morphologie dynamique et statique des diminutifs. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 17. 141–154. Leuven: Peeters.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Ferenc Kiefer 1990. Austro-Hungarian morphopragmatics. In Wolfgang U. Dressler, Hans Luschützky, Oskar Pfeiffer & John Rennison (eds.), *Contemporary Morphology*, 69–77. Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Katharina Korecky-Kröll. 2015. Evaluative morphology and language acquisition. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtevélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 134–141. Edinburgh University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang, Gary Libben & Katharina Korecky-Kröll. 2014. Conflicting vs. convergent vs. interdependent motivations in morphology. In Brian MacWhinney, Andrei Malchukov & Edith Moravcsik (eds.), *Competing Motivations in Grammar and Usage*, 181–196. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. 1986. How to fix interfixes? *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 36: 53–68.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. 1987. *Elements of morphopragmatics*. Duisburg: LAUD A 194 [now also in Jef Verschueren (ed.), *Levels of linguistic adaptation. Selected papers of the International Pragmatic Conference. Antwerp. II*, 33–51. Amsterdam: Benjamins].
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. 1989. Interfissi e non-interfissi autosuffissali nell'italiano, spagnolo e inglese. In Fabio Foresti, Elena Rizzi, & Paola Benedini (eds.), *L'italiano tra le lingue romanze*. Atti del XX Congresso della Società di Linguistica Italiana, 243–252. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. 1994a. *Morphopragmatics: Diminutives and Intensifiers in Italian, German and other Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dressler, Wolfgang & Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. 1994b. Italian diminutives as non-prototypical word formation. In Livia Tonelli & Wolfgang U. Dressler (eds.), *Natural Morphology: Perspectives for the Nineties*, 21–29. Padova: Unipress.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi. 2001. Morphopragmatics of diminutives and augmentatives: on the priority of pragmatics over semantics. In István Kenesei & Robert M. Harnish (eds.) *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics and Discourse*, 43–58. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U., Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi, Sonja Schwaiger, Jutta Ransmayr & Katharina Korecky-Kröll. 2019. Rivalry and coexistence among Italian and German diminutives. In Franz Rainer, Francesco Gardani, Hans C. Luschützky & Wolfgang U. Dressler (eds.) *Competition in Morphology. Selected Papers from the 17th International Morphology Meeting*, 123–144. Berlin: Springer.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Karlheinz Mörtz. 2012. Produktive und weniger produktive Komposition in ihrer Rolle im Text an Hand der Beziehungen zwischen Titel und Text. In Livio Gaeta & Barbara Schlücker (eds.), *Das Deutsche als kompositionsfreudige Sprache*, 219–233. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Dressler, Wolfgang, Jacqueline Stark, Christiane Pons, Ferenc Kiefer, Katalin Kiss & Eva Mészáros. 1996. *Cross Language Analysis of German- and Hungarian-Speaking Broca's Aphasics' Processing of Selected Morphonological and Morphological Features: a pilot study*. Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Working Papers in the Theory of Grammar, Vol.3, No.1.
- Duranti, Alessandro & Charles Goodwin. 1992. *Rethinking Context: an Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1987. Semantics, pragmatics, and text semiotics. In Jef Verschueren & Marcella Bertuccelli-Papi (eds.), *The pragmatic perspective. Selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference*, 695–714. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fodor, Jerry. 1983. *The modularity of Mind*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Fortin, Antonio. 2011. *The Morphology and Semantics of Expressive Affixes*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford. URL: ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001365/v1.pdf.
- Fradin, Bernard. 2003. Le traitement de la suffixation en –ET. *Langages* 152. 51–77.
- Fradin, Bernard, Nabil Hathout & Fanny Meunier. 2003. La suffixation en -ET et la question de la productivité. *Langue Française* 140. 56–78.
- Franceschet, Roberta, Davide Bertocci, Serena De Pellegrin, Wolfgang U. Dressler, Carlo Semenza. (2013). Diminutivization in patients with aphasia and children. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 94. 103–104.
- Fukada, Atsushi & Noriko Asato. 2004. Universal politeness theory: application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36. 1991–2002.
- Giraud, Hélène & Serena dal Maso. 2016. Suffix perceptual salience in morphological masked priming. *Lingue e Linguaggio* 15. 85–106.
- Goldie, Peter. 2000. *The Emotions: A Philosophical Exploration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graciá, Luisa & Lidia Turón. 2000. On Appreciative Suffixes. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 47. 231–234.
- Grandi, Nicola. 2002. *Morfologie in contatto. Le costruzioni valutative nelle lingue del Mediterraneo*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

- Grandi, Nicola. 2011. Renewal and innovation in the emergence of Indo-European evaluative morphology. *Lexis 6: Diminutives and Augmentatives in the Languages of the World* (6). 5–26.
- Grandi, Nicola. 2015. The Place of Evaluation within Morphology. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 74–90. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Grandi, Nicola. 2017. Evaluatives in Morphology. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*.
- Grandi, Nicola & Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.). 2015. *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Grice, Herbert P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3, *Speech Acts*, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Haase, Martin 2000. *Die Grammatikalisierung von Höflichkeit*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Halm, Tamás. 2018. From possessive suffix to affective demonstrative suffix in Hungarian: a grammaticalization analysis. International Morphology Meeting 18, Budapest, 10.5.2018.
- Harada, Shin'ichi. 1976. Honorifics. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Japanese Generative Grammar*, 499–561. New York: Academic Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2003. The geometry of grammatical meaning : Semantic maps and crosslinguistic comparison. In Michael Tomasello (ed.), *The new psychology of language*. Vol.2, 211–242. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Hasselrot, Bengt. 1957. *Etudes sur la formation diminutive dans les langues romanes*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Haverkate, Henk. 1990. A speech act analysis of irony. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14. 77–109.
- Helm, Bennet W. 2001. Emotions and Practical Reason: Rethinking Evaluation and Motivation. *Noûs* 35. 190–213.
- Horn, Laurence R. & Gregory Ward (eds.). 2006. *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hurch, Bernhard (ed.). 2007. *Studies on Reduplication*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ide, Sachiko. 2003. The speaker's viewpoint and indexicality in a high context culture. In K. Kataoka & Sachiko Ide (eds.), *Culture, Interaction, and Language*, 3–20. Tokyo: Hituzisyobo.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Cheryl Zoll. 2005. *Reduplication: Doubling in Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A modern English grammar*, Part VI, Morphology, Copenhagen: JES.
- Jurafsky, Daniel. 1996. Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. *Language* 72. 533–578.
- Jurafsky, Daniel. 2006. Pragmatics and Computational Linguistics. In Laurence R. Horn & Gregory Ward (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, 578–604. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kallergi, Haritini. 2015. *Reduplication at the Word Level. The Greek Facts in Typological Perspective*. *Studia Typologica* 17. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kecskes, Istvan. 2016. A Dialogic Approach to Pragmatics. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 20. 26–42.
- Kempson, Ruth, Ronnie Cann, Eleni Gregoromichelaki & Stergios Chatzikyriakidis. 2016. *Language as Mechanisms for Interaction*. (draft 2016).
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 2004. Morphopragmatic phenomena in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 51. 325–349.
- Kilani-Schoch, Marianne & Wolfgang U. Dressler. 1999. Perspective morphopragmatique sur les formations en –o du français branché. In Igor Mel'čuk (ed), *Dictionnaire explicatif et*

- combinatoire du français contemporain. Recherches lexico-sémantiques IV*, 55–66. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Kilani-Schoch, Marianne, Fernando Sánchez Miret & Wolfgang U. Dressler. 2011. Towards naturalness scales of pragmatic complexity. *Papers and Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 47. 237–263.
- Klara, Ludmila. 2009. Ist steinreich auch steinreich? Adjektivische Steigerungskomposita des Gegenwartsdeutschen und ihre Akzentuierung. PhD thesis, München: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität.
- Klimaszewska, Zofia. 1983. *Diminutive and augmentative Ausdrucksmöglichkeiten des Niederländischen, Deutschen und Polnischen: Eine konfrontative Darstellung*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Körtvélyessy, Livia. 2014. Evaluative Derivation. In Rochelle Lieber & Pavol Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*, 296–316. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Körtvélyessy, Livia. 2015. *Evaluative Morphology from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Körtvélyessy Livia & Pavol Štekauer. 2014. *Derivation in a Social Context*. In Rochelle Lieber & Pavol Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Derivational Morphology*, 407–423. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kouwenberg, Silvia & Darlene La Charité. 2003. More of the same: Iconicity in reduplication and the evidence for substrate transfer in the genesis of Caribbean Creole languages. In Silvia Kouwenberg (ed.), *Twice as Meaningful. Reduplication in Pidgins, Creoles and Other Contact Languages*. London: Battlebridge.
- Kristiansen, Gitte & René Dirven (eds.). 2008. *Cognitive sociolinguistics: Language variation, cultural models, social systems*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Laalo, Klaus. 2001. Diminutives in Finnish child-directed and child speech: Morphopragmatic and morphophonemic aspects. *Psychology of Language and Communication* 5. 72–80.
- Lai, Hwei-Ling. 2006. Iconic coding of conceptualization: Hakka reduplicative construction. *Language and Linguistics* 7. 483–499.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories reveal About The Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lampitelli, Nicola. 2015. La flexion nominale en Somali de Djibouti: Constatations empiriques et implications théoriques. Paper presented at Xuska 40 guurada farsoomaliida [Celebration for the 40th anniversary of Somali writing], Université de Djibouti, Sijibouti, 17–22 december.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lieber, Rochelle. 2004. *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malicka-Kleparska, Anna. 1985. Parallel derivation and lexicalist morphology: the case of Polish diminutivization. In Edmund Gussmann (ed.), *Phono-Morphology. Studies in the Interaction of Phonology and Morphology*, 95–112. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.
- Marchand, Hans. 1960. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Marantz, Alec. 1982. Re-duplication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13. 483–545.

- Matisoff, James A. 1992. The mother of all morphemes. Augmentatives and diminutives in areal and universal perspective. In Martha Ratliff (ed.), *Papers from the first annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Society 1991*, 293–349. Tempe: Arizona State University.
- Mattes, Veronika. 2014. *Types of reduplication. A case study of Bikol*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mattiello, Elisa. A morphopragmatic analysis of English and Italian negative prefixes. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 47. 125–156.
- Mattiello, Elisa. 2013. *Extra-grammatical morphology in English. Abbreviations, blends, reduplicatives and related phenomena*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Mattiello, Elisa. 2017. *Analogy in Word-formation. A Study of English Neologisms and Occasionalisms*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Meibauer, Jörg. 2007. How marginal are phrasal compounds. Generalized insertion, expressivity, and I/Q-interaction. *Morphology* 17. 233–259.
- Meibauer, Jörg. 2014. Word-Formation and Contextualism. *International Review of Pragmatics* 6. 103–126.
- Meibauer, Jörg. 2015. On “R” in phrasal compounds – a contextualist approach. In Trips, C. and Kornfilt, J. (eds.) *Phrasal compounds from a theoretical and typological perspective, Language Typology and Universals* 68, 241–261.
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2001. The pragmatics of the “diminutive” y/e suffix in English. In Chris Schaner-Wolles, John Rennison & Friedrich Neubarth (eds.), *Naturally!* 315–326. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2004. Alterazione (pp. 264–292) and Aggettivi deaggettivali (pp. 442–449). In Maria Grossmann & Franz Rainer (eds.), *La formazione delle parole in italiano*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2008. Extra-grammatical morphology. English Reduplicatives. In John Douthwaite & Domenico Pezzini (eds.), *Words in Action: Diachronic and Synchronic Approaches to English Discourse*, 228–241. Genova: ECIg
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2014. English Evaluative Suffixes: A Preference for Pragmatics over Semantics. In Alison Duguid, Anna Marchi, Alan Partington & Charlotte Taylor (eds.), *Gentle Obsession. Literature, Linguistics, and Learning in honour of John Morley*, 33–44. Roma: Editoriale Artemide.
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2015a. The Pragmatics of word-formation. In Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen & Franz Rainer (eds.), *Word Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, 1128–1142 (Vol. 2). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Merlini Barbaresi, Lavinia. 2015b. Evaluative morphology and pragmatics. In Nicola Grandi & Livia. Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 32–42. Edinburgh University Press.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Minkova, Donka. 2002. Ablaut reduplication in English: The criss-crossing of prosody and verbal art. *English Language and Linguistics* 6. 133–169.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Reduplicative constructions. In J. H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language: Word structure* 3, 297–334. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Morris, Charles W. 1938. *Foundations of the theory of signs*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Mutz, Katrin. 2000. *Die italienischen Modifikationssuffixe*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.
- Mutz, Katrin. 2015. Evaluative Morphology in a diachronic perspective. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 142–154. Edinburgh University Press.

- Nadarajan, Shanthi. 2006. A crosslinguistic study of reduplication. *Arizona Working Papers. SLAT* 13. 39–53.
- Napoli, Donna Jo & Bill Reynolds. 1995. Evaluative Affixes in Italian, *Morphology Yearbook* 1994. 151–178.
- Nekula, Marek. 2003. System und Funktionen der Diminutive: Kontrastiver Vergleich des Deutschen und Tschechischen. *Brücken* 11. 145–188.
- Nieuwenhuis, Paul. 1985 *Diminutives*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte. 2017. Lamunkhin Even evaluative morphology in cross-linguistic comparison. *Morphology* 27. 123–158.
- Perkins, Michael R. 2007. *Pragmatic Impairment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Piller, Ingrid. 2010. *Intercultural communication: A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Plag, Ingo. 1999. *Morphological Productivity. Structural Constraints in English Derivation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Potts, Christopher. 2006. How far can pragmatic mechanisms take us? *Theoretical Linguistics* 32. 307–320.
- Potts, Christopher. 2007. The Expressive Dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33. 165–198.
- Potts, Christopher, Daniel Lassiter, Roger Levy & Michael C. Frank. 2015. Embedded implicatures as pragmatic inferences under compositional lexical uncertainty. *Journal of Semantics* 33. 755–802.
- Potts, Christopher & Florian Schwarz. 2010. Affective ‘this’. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 3 (5). 1–30.
- Prieto, Victor. M. 2005. *Spanish evaluative morphology: Pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and semantic issues*. Doctoral dissert. University of Florida.
- Prieto, Victor M. 2015. The semantics of evaluative morphology. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtevélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology* 21–31. Edinburgh University Press.
- Rainer, Franz. 1993. *Spanische Wortbildungslehre*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Raun, Alo. 1960. The equivalents of English “than” in Finno-Ugric. *American Studies in Uralic Linguistics* 1: 149–247.
- Rebollar, Bárbara E. 2013. *Lexical pragmatics and the nature of word meaning*. RODIN, Universidad de Cádiz. <http://hdl.handle.net/10498/17171>.
- Regier, Terry. 1998. Reduplication and the arbitrariness of the sign. In Morton A. Gernsbacher & Sharon J. Derry (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 887–892. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Reynoso Noverón, Jeanett. 2005. Procesos de gramaticalización por subjetivación: el uso del diminutivo en español. In David Ellington (ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 79–86. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Ronga Irene, Carla Bazzanella, Erling Strudsholm & Luisa Salvati. 2014. Black as night or as a chimney sweep? *Intercultural pragmatics* 11. 485–520.
- Rubino, Carl. 2005. Reduplication: Form, function and distribution. In Bernhard Hurch (ed.) *Studies on Reduplication*, 11–29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Savickiene, Ineta & Wolfgang U. Dressler (eds.). 2007. *The Acquisition of Diminutives: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1984. *Generative morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1994. *Morfologia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 2012. *Cognitive Pragmatics*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

- Schmitt, Christian. 1998. Zur Gradation mittels Präfixoiden. In Udo Figge, Franz-Josef Klein & Annette Moreno (eds.), *Grammatische Strukturen und grammatischer Wandel im Französischen*, 425–449. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag.
- Schneider, Klaus P. 2003. *Diminutives in English*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Schneider, Klaus P. 2013. The truth about diminutives, and how we can find it: some theoretical and methodological considerations. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 10 (1). http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL22/pdf_doc/08.pdf.
- Schwaiger, Sonja, Adrien Barbaresi, Katharina Korecky-Kröll, Jutta Ransmayr & Wolfgang U. Dressler. 2019. Variation between diminutives in Austrian electronic corpora. In Lars Bülow, Ann Kathrin. Fischer, Kristina Herbert (eds.), *Dimensions of Linguistic Space: Variation, Multilingualism, Conceptualisations [Dimensionen des sprachlichen Raums: Variation, Mehrsprachigkeit, Konzeptualisierung]*, <https://doi.org/10.3726/b15250> (accessed 5 August 2019). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2014. *Experimental Perspectives on Presuppositions*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scullen, M. E. 1997. French Prosodic Morphology, A Unified Account. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1990. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2006. Honorifics. *Encyclopedia of Languages and Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Sifianou, Maria. 1992. The use of diminutives in expressing politeness. Modern Greek versus English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 17. 155–173.
- Simon, Camille & Nathan W. Hill. 2015. Tibetan. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtevélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 381–388. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Simon, Horst. J., & Heike Wiese. 2011. What are exceptions? And what can be done about them? In Horst J. Simon & Heike Wiese (eds.) *Expecting the unexpected: Exceptions in grammar*, 3–31. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Slaby, Jan, & Philipp Wüschner. 2014. Emotion and agency. In Sabine Roeser & Cain Todd (eds.), *Emotion and Value*, 212–228. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen & Peter Franklin. 2009. *Intercultural Interaction. A Multidisciplinary Approach to Intercultural Communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spitzer, Leo. 1921. Das Suffix *-one* im Romanischen. In Ernst Gamillscheg & Leo Spitzer (eds.), *Beiträge zur Romanischen Wortbildungslehre*, 183–205. Genève: Olschki.
- Staverman, W.H. 1953. Diminutivitis Neerlandica [Dutch diminutive sickness]. *De Gids* 116. 407–419.
- Stefanescu, Ioana. 1992. On diminutive suffixes. *Folia Linguistica* 26. 339–356.
- Stemmer, Brigitte (ed.). 1999. Pragmatics: Theoretical and Clinical Issues. *Brain and Language* 68 (3). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Strawson, Peter F. 1964. Intention and convention in speech acts. *Philosophical Review* 73 (4). 439–460.
- Stump, Gregory. T. 1993. How peculiar is evaluative morphology? *Journal of Linguistics* 29. 1–36.
- Thun, Nils. 1963. *Reduplicative Words in English: A Study of Formation of the Types Tick-tick, Hurly-burly and Shilly-shally*. Uppsala: Bloms.
- Trips, Carola. 2012. Empirical and theoretical aspects of phrasal compounds: Against the 'syntax explains it all' attitude. In Angela Ralli, Geert Booij, Sergio Scalise & Athanasios

- Karasimos (eds.), *Online Proceedings of the eighth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, 322–346. University of Patras.
- Trips, Carola. 2014. How to account for the expressive nature of phrasal compounds in a conceptual-semantic framework. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 11:33–61.
- Vanhove, Martine & Mohamed-Tahir Hamid Ahmed. 2016. Diminutives and augmentatives in Beja (North-Cushitic). <halshs-01485949>
- van den Berg, René. 2015. *Muna*. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 367–374. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Van der Spuy, Andrew & Lwazi Mjiyako. 2015. Evaluative morphology in Zulu. In Nicola Grandi & Livia Körtvélyessy (eds.), *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*, 515–522. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Vernant, Denis. 2003. The classification of speech acts revisited: a dialogical and actional perspective. In Jean Caelen, Daniel Vanderveken & Denis Vernant (eds.), *Logic and dialogue*, 45–68. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Volek, Bronislava. 1987. *Emotive signs in language and semantic functioning of derived nouns in Russian*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Watts, Richard. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weigand, Edda. 2000. The Dialogic Action Game. In Malcolm Coulthard, Janet Cotterill & Frances Rock (eds.), *Dialogue Analysis VII: Working with Dialogue: Selected Papers from the 7th IADA conference, Birmingham 1999–2000*, 1–18. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Weigand, Edda. 2010a. Linguists and their speakers. *Language Sciences* 32. 536–544.
- Weigand, Edda. 2010b. Language as Dialogue. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 7. 505–515.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1984. Diminutives and depreciatives: semantic representation for derivational categories. *Quaderni di Semantica* 5. 123–130.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wilson, Deirdre & Robyn Carston. 2007. A unitary approach to lexical pragmatics: relevance, inference and *ad hoc* concepts. In Noël Burton-Roberts (ed.), *Pragmatics*, 230–260. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wüschner, Philipp. 2015. Emotion and Agency. In Sabine Roeser & Cain Todd (eds.), *Emotion and Value*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Žic Fuchs, Milena. 2009. *Kognitivna lingvistika i jezične strukture: engleski present perfect* [Cognitive Linguistics and Language Structures: the English Present Perfect]. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.

Appendix

1. *Emotion, tenderness* (a mother to a child):
 E. Who's my lovely little girlie? b) Who's my *boobsy-woobsy*? (personally heard)
 Ge. Wer komm-erl-t denn da? "who come-DIM-s PART here?" "what cute boy is coming here?" (personally reported)

Lithuanian: *mama*, statyk, statyk, mamyte “mother, build it, build it, mother-Dim” (from Ineta Dabašinskienė 2009 *Intimacy. Familiarity and formality*)

2. *Playful irony*

It. Il confronto è tra le *Sarkozettes* e le *Berlusconette* “the comparison is between (the fem.Pl.) Sarkoz(y)-DIMs and Berluscon(i)-DIMs” (Corriere della Sera Magazine 24-4-08)

3. *Derogatory irony*

E. He’s got a wife and a couple of wifies (girl-friends) (from Nieuwenhuis 1985).

4. *Euphemism*

Ge. Er hat ein Gläschen über den Durst getrunken “He has just drunk one little glass too many” (he is totally drunk). (often cited)

5. *False modesty*

It. Avrei anch’io una mia teori^{et}ta “I’d have me too a theory-DIM” (a little theory of my own) (heard at a Conference in Italy).

6. *Ironical understatement*

E. There is just a *teeny-weeny* drawback^{et}. (from Nieuwenhuis 1985)

7. *Emotion, pleasure*

Fr. Gentil papa veut bien ramener bonne *sou-soupe*? “Do you think that big daddy can bring ome more *soupy-woupy*?” (Reverso Context).

8. *Pleading*

Sp. Deme un pedacito de pan! ‘Give me a piece-DIM of bread!’ (personally reported)

Lithuanian: Ar galėčiau gauti kavytės? “Could I have (some) coffee-DIM?” (from Ineta Dabašinskienė 2009 *Intimacy. Familiarity and Formality*)

9. *Hedged request, jocularly*

It. Ci sarebbe anche da tenere il San Bernarduccio, il cagnetto ‘there should also have to take care of the Saint Bernard-DIM, the doggie’(you should also take care of . . .) (TV Spot 2014)

E. Could I leave here my *doggy-woggy* [a big dog, in fact] for just half an hour? (heard from English friends)

10. *Contempt*

E. Larry Sabato, a well-respected political analyst, sent out an email last week trying to debunk the Hillary *boom-let* (Times, Sunday Times 2005).

11. *Sarcasm* (political TV talk)

It. Cosa fate voi nei vostri salott-*ar-elli* ? “what do you do in your drawing room-Interfix-DIMs?” (silly little parties?).

12. *Sarcasm* (a police inspector to a thief)

It. Il suo è un mestierino che rende! “yours is a job-DIM which rewards” (a quite rewarding job)

13. *Ironic understatement*

E. There’ s also *the bijou snag(g)-ette* that administrators and the finance sector actually need to work together a lot of the time (<http://old.qi.com/talk>)

14. *Anger or sarcasm*

E. Not looking too good for you, *fat-s-o* (Merriam Webster online Dictionary).

15. *Mitigation*

E. We must enable nonverbal *aut-ie-s* (clipped *autistic* + *-ie-s*) to communicate by independent typing or devices that talk for them (Jerry Newport, *Your Life is Not a Label*)