



HAL
open science

Lamunkhin Even evaluative morphology in cross-linguistic comparison

Brigitte Pakendorf

► **To cite this version:**

Brigitte Pakendorf. Lamunkhin Even evaluative morphology in cross-linguistic comparison. *Morphology*, 2017, 27 (2), pp.123-158. 10.1007/s11525-016-9296-1 . hal-01960459

HAL Id: hal-01960459

<https://hal.science/hal-01960459>

Submitted on 25 Jan 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Lamunkhin Even evaluative morphology in cross-linguistic comparison

Brigitte Pakendorf

Morphology


ISSN 1871-5621

Volume 27

Number 2

Morphology (2017) 27:123-158

DOI 10.1007/s11525-016-9296-1



Your article is protected by copyright and all rights are held exclusively by Springer Science +Business Media Dordrecht. This e-offprint is for personal use only and shall not be self-archived in electronic repositories. If you wish to self-archive your article, please use the accepted manuscript version for posting on your own website. You may further deposit the accepted manuscript version in any repository, provided it is only made publicly available 12 months after official publication or later and provided acknowledgement is given to the original source of publication and a link is inserted to the published article on Springer's website. The link must be accompanied by the following text: "The final publication is available at link.springer.com".

Lamunkhin Even evaluative morphology in cross-linguistic comparison

Brigitte Pakendorf¹ 

Received: 25 March 2016 / Accepted: 22 July 2016 / Published online: 27 September 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2016

Abstract Cross-linguistic research has shown diminutives to be more widespread than augmentatives: they are found in more languages, attach to a wider variety of bases, and occur more frequently in discourse. Common features of such affixes are their categorial neutrality and the changes they bring about in the semantics of the base. The evaluative morphology of Lamunkhin Even, the westernmost still viable dialect of this Northern Tungusic language, differs strikingly from this cross-linguistic pattern. The evaluative suffixes form a structured set of diminutives and augmentatives with a primary function of size denotation. Typologically rare features of these morphemes are the transference of evaluative meaning from adjectives to their head noun and from verbs to their subject as well as their use to derive adjectives and adverbs from descriptive verbs. These suffixes show different base specifications: some are restricted to nominals, others to verbs, and only one diminutive-augmentative pair occurs with a wide variety of bases; this has also developed disparate semantics.

Keywords Diminutive · Augmentative · Affective · Compassion · Tungusic

The data discussed here were presented during an informal seminar at DDL in January 2014, and I would like to thank my colleagues for their pertinent questions and comments. My sincere thanks go to Maïa Ponsonnet, whose comments on a draft of the paper led to significant improvements, as well as to two anonymous reviewers and Ingo Plag for comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. Furthermore, I would like to express my gratitude to the LABEX ASLAN (ANR-10-LABX-0081) of Université de Lyon for its financial support within the program “Investissements d’Avenir” (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) of the French government operated by the National Research Agency (ANR).

✉ B. Pakendorf
brigitte.pakendorf@cnrs.fr

¹ Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage, UMR5596, CNRS & Université Lyon Lumière 2, ISH-DDL, 14 avenue Berthelot, 69363 Lyon Cedex 07, France

1 Introduction

In recent decades, the morphological and semantic features of evaluative morphology have been the focus of intense research (see, among many others, Stump 1993; Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994; Jurafsky 1996; Bauer 1997; Schneider 2003; Prieto 2005; Watson 2006; Körtvélyessy and Štekauer 2011; Fortin 2011; Spasovski 2012; di Garbo 2014; Grandi and Körtvélyessy 2015; Körtvélyessy 2015a; Ponsonet and Vuillemermet *in preparation*). A clear cross-linguistic tendency that has emerged from this research is that diminutives are more widespread than augmentatives, with the implication that if a language has augmentatives, it will also have diminutives, but not vice versa. For instance, in a cross-linguistic sample of 132 languages 36 % have both diminutives and augmentatives, 22 % can only form diminutives, but only ~5 % (six languages) can form augmentatives but not diminutives (Körtvélyessy 2015a:93). Counter-examples to the implicational hierarchy are Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan, Australia),¹ which has more augmentative than diminutive suffixes (Bowler 2015:439), and Hausa (Chadic, Niger/Nigeria), Ilocano (Western Malayo-Polynesian, Philippines), Nelemwa (Oceanic, New Caledonia), Siar Lak (Oceanic, Papua New Guinea), Thai (Tai-Kadai, Thailand), Wari (Chapacura-Wanhan, Brazil), and Kannada (Southern Dravidian, India) which are described as having augmentatives, but no diminutives (Štekauer et al. 2012:269; Körtvélyessy 2015a:56–88). Furthermore, “[i]f a language has both categories, diminutives are more frequent and can be formed in more ways than augmentatives [...]” (Bakema and Geeraerts 2004:1046). For instance, in a Spanish corpus of spontaneous conversations, 77 % of the tokens with evaluative morphology are diminutives as compared to only 18 % augmentatives, and the diminutive affixes attach to a wider variety of bases (Prieto 2005:17–18). In Slovak, there are more diminutive suffixes than augmentatives, and the diminutives can be used with a wider variety of bases and have denotational as well as expressive meanings, whereas the augmentatives have only expressive semantics (Böhmerová 2011).

There are also hierarchies with respect to the bases to which diminutives and augmentatives can attach, such as the implicational hierarchy proposed by Bauer (1997:540):

- (1) nouns > adjectives/verbs > adverbs/numerals/pronouns/interjections > determiners

However, there are numerous counterexamples to this hierarchy (which in any case was proposed by Bauer “not as a definitive statement, but as a suggestion”, *ibid.* 540), such as Kanuri (Saharan, Chad/Niger/Nigeria/Sudan), Djaru (Pama-Nyungan, Australia), and Alawa (Maran, Australia), which have adjectival evaluatives but lack evaluatives on nouns, or Tat (Iranian, Daghestan/Azerbaijan), which has adverbial, but no adjectival diminutives (Körtvélyessy 2015b:65). In addition, this hierarchy can of course only hold in so far as languages distinguish between the different word classes: it has little relevance for a language such as Jingulu (Mirndi, Australia), which does not distinguish between nouns and adjectives (Pensalfini 2015:416).

¹The genealogical affiliation and geographical location of languages spoken outside of Europe was added by me based on the information in WALS (Haspelmath et al. 2005) or in the primary sources.

The preference for nouns, adjectives and verbs to host evaluative morphology has been explained for diminutives by their semantics, which denote a smaller than normal size with reference to a prototypical standard of dimension. This presupposes that the base needs to have gradable dimensions to be diminutivized: nouns have referents that can differ in size, adjectives refer to gradable qualities, and verbs can denote actions of varying intensity (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994:131–132; Bakema and Geeraerts 2004:1046). With bases that are not gradable, such as interjections, pronouns, or adpositions, the denotative reading becomes highly unlikely and a connotative interpretation of the evaluative item is favored (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994:132). The same explanation clearly holds for augmentatives, which denote a larger than normal size.

The use of diminutive affixes with substance nouns to denote conventional units (2a) or a small amount (2b) of the substance and with nouns denoting aggregates to derive singulatives (2c) is cross-linguistically common. This contradicts Fortin's (2011:124–126) claim that a descriptive reading of diminutives and augmentatives is available only for nouns that are [+bounded], i.e. individuals or groups, while for nouns that are [–bounded], such as substances or aggregates, only the expressive reading is available. In contrast to the widespread attestation of diminutive affixes with singulative functions, the parallel between augmentatives and collective number is only historical: some augmentative affixes have developed out of collective markers, but such polysemy has not been attested synchronically (Grandi 2015a:102–103).

- (2) a. Catalan² (Grandi 2015a:103)
 aigü-*et*-a
 water-DIM-F
 'small bottle of water'
- b. Moroccan Arabic (Caubet 1992 cited from Grandi 2015a:103)
 εsəl εsīl-a
 honey.M honey.DIM-F
 'honey' 'a little bit of honey'
- c. Udihe (Tolskaya 2015:335)
samikta-ziga
 eyelashes-DIM
 'an (individual) eyelash'

²Abbreviations used in glosses: ABL: ablative; ACC: accusative; ADJ: adjectivizer; ADV: adverbial(izer); AFF: affirmative; AI: animate intransitive; ALL: allative; ALN: alienable; ANT: anterior; ASS: assertive; AUG: augmentative; AUX: auxiliary; CAUS: causative; CMPS: compassion; CONAT: conative; COND: conditional; CONN: connective; CVB: converb; DAT: dative; DEF: definite; DETRNS: detransitive; DIM: diminutive; DIR: direct; DIST: distal; DP: discourse particle; DUR: durative; EMPH: emphatic; EQAT: equative; EX: exclusive; EXCL: exclamative; F: feminine; FUT: future; GNR: generic; HAB: habitual; IMP: imperative; IMPF: imperfect; INCH: inchoative; INDEF: indefinite; INS: instrumental; INTENT: intentional; INTS: intensive; LIM: limitative; LOC: locative; M: masculine; MED: mediopassive; MULT: multiplicative; NEG: negative; NFUT: non-future; PF: perfect; PL: plural; POSS: possessive; PRES: presumptive; PRFL: reflexive possessive; PROG: progressive; PROL: prolative; PROP: proprietive; PROX: proximal; PRS: present; PRV: privative; PST: past; PTCP: participle; PTL: particle; PURP: purposive; R: Russian copy; REFL: reflexive; RES: resultative; RESTR: restrictive; Q: question; QUAL: qualitative; SG: singular; SIM: simultaneous; SML: similitative; SOC: sociative; TA: transitive animate; TNDR: tenderness; TRM: terminative; TRNS: transitive; VB: verb; VR: verbalizer; Y: Sakha (Yakut) copy.

The Lamunkhin dialect of Even differs from the cross-linguistically common pattern in having a large number not only of diminutive suffixes, but also augmentatives, which form a structured system (see Table 1 below). These are used very frequently in discourse, as illustrated by the following example (3) taken from a description of a close encounter with a bear (referred to by the euphemism *abaga* ‘grandfather’). Note that for reasons of space epenthetic vowels are not glossed separately in this and all other examples, but are joined to the preceding morpheme.

- (3) *ila-ja:č̣i* *eči-je* *ila-baha-d-ni*
 stand.up-AUG.CV B PROX.QUAL-AUG stand.up-AUG.VB-NFUT-3SG
abaga-ńč̣a
 grandfather-AUG.DEF
 ‘Standing up like this, he stood up, the big bear.’ (MKK_bear_053)

In this example, each of the four words carries a different augmentative suffix, and all, including the two different suffixes on the verbs, indicate that the bear was exceptionally large (or seemed so to the little girl observing it), not that it was standing up in a particularly intense manner. This uncommonly large complement of augmentative suffixes in Lamunkhin Even and its diminutive counterpart are the focus of this paper, which aims at providing an in-depth and typologically informed description of the evaluative morphology of this dialect. Given the structure of the system, the description follows functional lines, taking into account both the diminutive and the augmentative suffix in each category, rather than separating the diminutives from the augmentatives, as is frequently done.

Section 2, which comprises the bulk of the article, is devoted to the description of the different sets of morphemes: Sect. 2.1 discusses the diminutives *-k(A)kAn* and *-č̣An* and the augmentatives *-mAjA* and *-ńč̣A*, which attach to all kinds of nominals, including pronouns and adjectives. In addition to their cross-linguistically unique function as markers of (in)definiteness (Pakendorf and Krivoshapkina 2014), another rare feature of these suffixes will be described, namely the “transference” of the evaluative meaning (Bauer 1997:554 following Gooch 1967) from adjectives and participles to the head noun. Section 2.2 describes verbal suffixes: the finite verb augmentative *-bAhA* (Sect. 2.2.1), the converbal diminutive *-kAnč̣i* [SG]/*-kAnč̣ur* [PL] and augmentative *-jA(:)č̣i* [SG]/*-jA(:)č̣ur* [PL] (Sect. 2.2.2), and the affective suffixes *-A:n* and *-jA:t* [CMPS] that express compassion and endearment (Sect. 2.2.3). All of these suffixes are characterized by the transference of the evaluative meaning to the subject referent, rather than their changing the semantics of the verbal base. In Sect. 2.3 the suffixes that derive adjectives and adverbs from descriptive verbs are discussed: the diminutive *-ŋAkAn*, the augmentative *-ŋAjA*, and the affective suffix *-č̣A:gAgAj*, which expresses strong affection for children. Lastly, in Sect. 2.4 two suffixes are described that attach to a variety of bases: the diminutive *-kAn* and the augmentative *-jA(:)*. These suffixes have extended their functions beyond the description of size to include the expression of approximation and intensification. It will be argued that this is due to the old age of these suffixes, especially the diminutive *-kAn*, which have thus had the time to undergo some of the semantic developments discovered by Jurafsky (1996) in a cross-linguistic sample. In Sect. 3 the possible combinations of evaluative suffixes are explored. It will be shown that the only possible combinations include

Fig. 1 Map of Even dialects mentioned in this paper; *diamonds* = western dialect group, *circles* = eastern dialect group. Created with the WALS Interactive Reference Tool (Bibiko 2005)



the diminutive *-kaŋ* as the final element, which can be preceded both by augmentatives and diminutives, and that the resulting forms do not intensify the denotational meaning of the evaluatives, but convey a higher degree of expressivity and imagery of the utterance and an increased dynamicity of the action. Finally, in Sect. 4 the cross-linguistically rare features of the Lamunkhin Even evaluative morphemes are reiterated and discussed; the most striking are the use of the nominal suffixes to mark the referential status of nouns and the structured system of the descriptive evaluative suffixes consisting of sets of diminutive-augmentative pairs. A further rare, though not unique feature, is the transference of the evaluative meaning from adjectives and participles as well as verbs to the head noun/subject referent, respectively.

2 Evaluative morphology in Lamunkhin Even

Even is a dialectally fragmented North Tungusic language spoken by numerous small individual speech communities settled in various locations of northeastern Siberia (see Fig. 1 for the approximate location of the dialects mentioned in this paper); the Lamunkhin dialect is the westernmost still viable Even dialect. It is morphologically rich, exclusively suffixing, and agglutinative, although a number of morphological processes result in diverse surface forms of morphemes.

In the Lamunkhin narrative corpus on which this study is based,³ 14 different evaluative suffixes are found, of which five are diminutives, six are augmentatives, and three express only emotional values (Table 1). In contrast to Štekauer (2015) and Körtvélyessy (2015b), I discuss here only those suffixes that include a function of denoting larger or smaller than normal size as well as suffixes with purely affective values; verbal aktionsart suffixes, such as the multiplicative, are excluded. Note that

³This corpus comprises ~52,000 words and was compiled in four field trips which were undertaken with the generous assistance of the Max Planck Society (via the MPRG on Comparative Population Linguistics) and the Volkswagen Foundation (via a DoBeS grant on “Documentation of the dialectal and cultural diversity among Èvens in Siberia”). I thank all the speakers who contributed to the corpus for their time and Ekaterina Shadrina and Ija Krivoschapkina for transcriptions. Russian translations were provided by Ija Krivoschapkina, who is also gratefully acknowledged for the time spent discussing the data. Some of the materials were glossed by Natalia Aralova; I thank her for access to these.

Table 1 Evaluative suffixes occurring in the Lamunkhin narrative corpus

Type of base	DIM	<i>N</i> *	AUG	<i>N</i>	AFFECT	<i>N</i>
nominals (indefinite)	-k(A)kAn [DIM.INDEF]	210/88	-mAjA [AUG.INDEF]	92/48		
nominals (definite)	-čAn [DIM.DEF]	255/73	-ičA [AUG.DEF]	107/52		
finite verbs					-A:n [CMPS]	30/15
finite verbs					-jA:t [CMPS]	9/7
finite verbs			-bAhA [AUG.VB]	2/2		
verbs > converbs	-kAnčji// -kAnčjur [DIM.CVB]	17/9	-jA(:)čji// -jA(:)čjur [AUG.CVB]	21/9		
descriptive verbs > adwords	-ŋAkAn [DIM.ADJ]	14/9	-ŋAjA [AUG.ADJ]	10/8		
descriptive verbs > adwords					-čA:gAgAj [TNDR]	1
various	-kAn [DIM]	145/35	-jA(:) [AUG]	63/15		
<i>Total</i>		<i>641</i>		<i>295</i>		<i>40</i>

* *N* = number of tokens of suffixes/types of base roots in the corpus. The count includes all the tokens of suffixes found in the corpus with the exception of -kAn [DIM] as second element (see Sect. 3 and Table 2 below). For the total, only the number of tokens is given. (The numbers for the nominal suffixes are somewhat higher than those in Pakendorf and Krivoshapkina (2014:Table 2), since the numbers here include all tokens found in the corpus, while in the previous study only the clear examples that could be assigned a function were included in the count.)

In square brackets = glosses used to identify the suffixes throughout the article

due to the vestiges of vowel harmony, the suffix vowel can be either /a/ or /e/; this variation is shown by the capital A used for suffixes in isolation.

The suffixes vary in their co-occurrence with different word classes: the suffixes -kAn (diminutive, DIM) and -jA(:) (augmentative, AUG) are the most prolific, attaching to a variety of bases (Sect. 2.4). The suffixes -čAn (definite diminutive, DIM.DEF) and -k(A)kAn (indefinite diminutive, DIM.INDEF), and -ičA (definite augmentative, AUG.DEF) and -mAjA (indefinite augmentative, AUG.INDEF) occur with various types of nominals (Sect. 2.1), and the other suffixes are restricted to occurring with verbs (Sects. 2.2 and 2.3). Base specificity of evaluative morphemes is cross-linguistically not uncommon; it is indeed rather rare for one and the same affix to attach to bases belonging to different word classes (Štekauer 2015:58). As is cross-linguistically common, the diminutive and augmentative suffixes not only denote a smaller or larger size than usual, but can also carry expressive overtones of endearment, pejoration, or, in the case of the augmentatives, respect.

Evaluative morphology is very common in the Lamunkhin dialect: not only are there many different suffixes, but these are also frequently used in discourse. Overall, the text corpus contains nearly 1,000 tokens of the different evaluative suffixes (i.e. on average about one evaluative suffix for every 50 words), with the nominal suffixes making up nearly 70 % of these. Furthermore, frequently several evaluative suffixes

co-occur in one sentence, as shown in (3) above and in (4a) and (4b). In (4a) the dropped subject of ‘laugh’ is introduced into the discourse two sentences earlier as *Pronja-ńčǵa*, i.e. Pronja-AUG.DEF ‘big Pronja’ (the Russian hypocoristic form of the name Prokopij).

- (4) a. *tarit eči-je* *hamat-ja:čǵi* “ehni!” *gom-e-m* *tarit*
 then PROX.QUAL-AUG laugh-AUG.CVB no say-NFUT-1SG then
 ‘he [a big man] laughs, and then I say “no”’ (beseda_0954_NPZ)
- b. *tarit tarak hat-la-n* *eči-ken* *kotle-kken*
 then DIST base-LOC-POSS.3SG PROX.QUAL-DIM small-DIM.INDEF
ampa:r-kakam *o:ča-l, ...*
 storage.shed[R]-DIM.INDEF.ACC make-PF.PTCP-PL
 ‘Then next to that they made a tiny little storage shed like this...’
 (AXK_Sebjan_history_1_089)

These morphemes are not restricted to communication involving close acquaintances or to spontaneous narratives: in a corpus of utterances elicited⁴ in various ways (with video or picture stimuli as well as with translations of Russian sentences) that targeted diverse grammatical topics, but not evaluative morphology, 47 tokens of evaluative suffixes are found. While these are predominantly nominal, e.g. (5a), they include several examples of suffixes that attach to other bases (5b, 5c). Their occurrence in such a formal and sterile setting of interaction between a speaker and a foreign linguist, which largely precludes pragmatic language use, indicates that in Lamunkhin Even the denotative values of these evaluative suffixes are at the core of their functions,⁵ and not “an invariant, non-semantic, still more *basic pragmatic feature [fictive]* [...]”, which is conceptualized as a departure from conventional, culturally accepted standards of meaning” and which “is further specified as a character [non-serious]” for diminutives (Merlini Barbaresi 2015:36, 37, emphasis mine; see also Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994:144–149, 394–400).

- (5) a. *omolgo kotle-čen* *ahikan-du kotlu-kken*
 boy small-DIM.DEF girl-DAT small[EMPH]-DIM.INDEF
kniga-w *bo:d-ni*
 book[R]-ACC give-NFUT-3SG
 ‘The/a boy gave the small girl a small book.’ (S_AgreementBook06,
 video stimulus)
- b. *kuŋa-l imma-ja: urekčen-duk tig-ri-tnen*
 child-PL fast-AUG hill-ABL fall-PST-3PL
 ‘The children quickly ran down the hill.’ (S_MovementSentences14,
 translation from Russian)

⁴These elicitation sessions were undertaken at the very beginning of my first field trip, when I was still a complete stranger (who was introduced as a foreigner and a scientist), and they were marked as “work” by taking place in the school (all consultants were teachers) and by my having specified from the outset that the speakers would be remunerated for their efforts.

⁵However, as will be seen in the following discussion, while the denotative function of the evaluative suffixes is the basic one, these do have various connotative functions as well.

- c. *o:n nek-e:n-čji-m, bi: at kuŋa-la bi-he-m*
 how do-CMPS-FUT-1SG 1SG NEG child-PRV be-NFUT-1SG
 ‘What will I do [poor me], I don’t have any children.’ (S_DesignativeD1d,
 translation from Russian)⁶

In the following sections I will discuss the different categories of suffixes one by one, starting with the nominal suffixes and ending with the suffixes that attach to diverse bases. This discussion will focus on the morphosyntactic and combinatorial properties of the suffixes, comparing what is found in Lamunkhin Even to what has been described from other languages; nevertheless, where relevant, their expressive uses will be mentioned as well.

2.1 The nominal suffixes -čAn [DIM.DEF], -k(A)kAn [DIM.INDEF], -ńčA [AUG.DEF], -mAjA [AUG.INDEF]

This section will briefly describe the functions of these suffixes before turning to a detailed discussion of their use with mass and aggregate nouns, pronouns, hesitatives, adjectives and participles, and proprietive objects in proprietive constructions. As will be shown, whereas the evaluative meaning refers to the base when used with nouns, pronouns, hesitatives, and proprietive objects, this meaning is generally transferred from adjectives and participles to the head noun of the construction.

The cross-linguistically most unusual feature of the nominal evaluative suffixes is their use as markers of the referential status of noun phrases, with -čAn [DIM.DEF] and -ńčA [AUG.DEF] indicating the identifiability of the referent and -k(A)kAn [DIM.INDEF] and -mAjA [AUG.INDEF] indicating the non-identifiability of the referent, as shown in (6a, b) for the pair of augmentatives. Since this system is discussed elsewhere, I will not go into details here; interested readers are referred to Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina (2014) for more information. In (6a) the big blue bead is introduced into the discourse with the indefinite augmentative -mAjA on the adjective *čulbaña* ‘grue (i.e. green/blue)’, and in (6b) it is referred to again with the adjective carrying the definite augmentative -ńčA.

- (6) a. *ere ti:ke haŋana-ssi-d-da-m čji:, ia-w,*
 PTL now sew-CONAT-PROG-NFUT-1SG AFF what-ACC
suvenir-kakam o:-nikan, ha:m čurita-ŋa-l-bu
 souvenir[R]-DIM.INDEF.ACC make-SIM.CVB other beads-ALN-PL-ACC
ne:ri-w ele, egčso:-meje busa-mdas, ečin
 put-PST-1SG here big[EMPH]-AUG.INDEF bead[R]-SML PROX.QUAL
čulbaña-maja
 grue-AUG.INDEF
 ‘I am now trying to sew, making little souvenirs, I put my beads here,
 one big like a big pearl, a blue one like this.’ (ZAS_jubki_Aniwrin_091)

⁶Note that the Russian sentence contained no explicit expression of pity, although pity is one of the possible readings of the sentence, depending on intonation and context (which of course is missing in an elicitation setting): *Что же мне делать, детей у меня нет* (thanks to Natalia Aralova and Irina Pugach for their native-speaker intuitions).

- b. *čulbaña-ńčǵa nisa-ŋ-u!*
 grue-AUG.DEF beads-ALN-POSS.1SG
 'My big blue bead!' (ZAS_jubki_Aniwrin_104)

The primary function of these suffixes is to denote small or large size, both when referring to animates and to inanimates. As is cross-linguistically common (cf. Ponsonnet, to appear), when referring to humans they can also carry different expressive overtones (Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina 2014:295–296), with the diminutives additionally expressing mainly endearment (7a), but also depreciation (7b). The two separate utterances in (7b) are taken from a conversation between four friends, and the person referred to with the diminutive suffixes ("stingy Pashko") is one of the shopkeepers in the village, a big, solidly built man from the European part of Russia. The utterances are taken from an indignant account of how he and his wife had short-changed one of the speakers, and the diminutive suffixes here clearly express disapproval of his behavior rather than denoting his size.

- (7) a. *domŋe-le biet-ti kuŋa-kka-l*
 taiga-LOC be.GNR-IMPF.PTCP child-DIM.INDEF-PL
gučŋeje-kie-kke-l bi-wre-r
 sweet-INTS-DIM.INDEF-PL be-HAB[NFUT]-3PL
 '... , children who live in the taiga are often very sweet.'
 (NAS_kochevaja_shkola_025)
- b. *Pasko-čan eŋeneŋ ...*
 Pashko-DIM.DEF nearly
 'Pashko nearly...' [interrupted sentence from a conversation]
 (beseda_0657_NPZ)
- čuru-kakan o:-ča, go:-li?*
 stingy-DIM.INDEF become-PF.PTCP say-IMP.2SG
 '(Pashko) has become stingy, hasn't he?' (beseda_0682_LNZ)

In addition to denoting larger than normal size, the augmentatives can express respect (8). However, respect alone is not sufficient for augmentative marking: for instance, a highly respected former headmistress of small stature could by no means be called *Nastja-ńčǵa* with the definite augmentative suffix, as she is simply too short to license the augmentative (Ija Krivoschapkina, pers. comm.).

- (8) *tarak etike-ŋe-n, etiken Kejmetinov Afanasij Nikolaevis*
 DIST old.man-ALN-POSS.3SG old.man Kejmetinov Afanasij Nikolaevich
gerbe abaga-ńčǵa-wu bi-hi-n tala
 name grandfather-AUG.DEF-POSS.1SG be-PST-3SG there
 'Her husband, an old man called Afanasij Nikolaevič Kejmetinov, my grandfather, was there.' (AXK_Sebjan_history_1_040)

These suffixes attach to all kinds of nominals: common nouns, proper nouns, adjectives, participles, hesitatives, and pronouns. When attached to names,⁷ nouns, and

⁷Since there is no difference in the function of the nominal evaluatives whether they attach to common nouns or names, I here treat names together with the other nominals.

pronouns, the evaluative meaning applies to the referent, as seen in ((7b), (8), (10), respectively), among others. When used with mass nouns, the diminutive can express a small amount⁸ (Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina 2014:ex. 2c). Addition of an evaluative suffix, either diminutive or augmentative, can also change the mass noun into a count noun and denote conventional units of the substance; this is commonly found for diminutives (cf. Jurafsky 1996:555; Fortin 2011:128; Grandi 2015a:103). This is shown by (9a–c), where the plural marking on evaluative-marked ‘bread’, ‘meat’ and ‘flour’ indicates that these are individual loaves, pieces of meat and portions of flour.

- (9) a. *kiliép-u em-u-če, noka-di ečín*
bread[R]-ACC come-TRNS-PF.PTCP Sakha-ADJ PROX.QUAL
egče-meje kiliép-meje-l bi-wre-če-l
big-AUG.INDEF bread[R]-AUG.INDEF-PL be-HAB-PF.PTCP-PL
‘... , he brought bread, it was Yakut bread, such big [loaves].’
(AXK_1930s_103)
- b. *upe:-nčje [. . .] ulde-kke-l-bu ne:-keč-če,*
grandmother-AUG.DEF meat-DIM.INDEF-PL-ACC put-MULT-PF.PTCP
‘My grandmother gave them [some pieces of] meat.’ (AXK_1930s_058)
- c. *tar burduk-kaka-l-bu bekeč-čen-du-tne*
DIST flour[R]-DIM.INDEF-PL-ACC all-DIM.DEF-DAT-POSS.3PL
bari-č-ča-l
share-RES-PF.PTCP-PL
‘They gave the small [portions of] flour to everyone.’
(AXK_Sebjan_history_1_067)

When used with first or second person pronouns, the evaluatives carry negative overtones and are thus rarely used; no examples occur in the narrative corpus (Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina 2014:301). The proximal and distal demonstrative pronouns *erek* and *tarak*, however, are frequently used as third person pronouns with anaphoric reference; the evaluatives then denote the size of the referent (10). The referent of *tarčam* in (10) was introduced into the discourse as *ahikkan kuŋa-kkam* ‘girl child-DIM.INDEF.ACC’, and her small size is denoted by the diminutive on the anaphoric pronoun; since this carries accusative case, the final *-n* of the diminutive suffix changes to *-m*.

- (10) *tar-čam it-tičji iŋa-duk hōr-ričji,*
DIST-DIM.DEF.ACC see-ANT.CVB stone-ABL get.caught-ANT.CVB
tik-te-n
fall-NFUT-3SG
‘Having seen her [the little girl], he got caught on a stone and fell.’
(JPZ_pearstory_014)

Similarly, the evaluative meaning applies to the referent of the noun when the suffixes are attached to hesitatives, for which in Lamunkhin Even the interrogative pronouns *iak* ‘what’ and *ŋi:* ‘who’ are used. Since *ŋi:* stands in for humans who are identifiable, it only occurs with the definite evaluative suffixes *-čAn* [DIM.DEF] and *-nčjA*

⁸No augmentatives with a meaning of ‘a big amount’ occur in the corpus.

[AUG.DEF]. In (11), *ŋi:* replaces the name of the boy encountered by the speaker. The young age and small size of this boy, Dima, is indicated by the diminutive suffix *-čAn* on both the hesitative and the proper noun.

- (11) *nənan ŋi:čem bak-alda-ra-p, Dima-čam*
 at.first who-DIM.DEF.ACC find-SOC-NFUT-1PL Dima-DIM.DEF.ACC
 ‘... at first we met whatsisname, little Dima’ (beseda_1461_NPZ)

Iak in contrast stands in for common nouns, and as such often has a referent that is new to the discourse; it therefore frequently occurs with the indefinite evaluative suffixes *-k(A)kAn* [DIM.INDEF] and *-mAjA* [AUG.INDEF] (12a). Only when *iak* stands in for a possessed noun does it take the definite evaluative suffixes *-čAn* (12b) and *-ńčĀ*, since in Lamunxhin Even possessed NPs obligatorily occur with the definite suffixes (Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina 2014:299–300).

- (12) a. *tala ol_ihin me:ne ečín ia-maja ŋənam*
 there therefore[Y] simply[Y] PROX.QUAL what-AUG.INDEF long
gəl-maja nək-u-k-kara-n
 firewood-AUG.INDEF hang.up-DETRNS-RES-HAB[NFUT]-3SG
 ‘Therefore there a whatchamacallit, a long piece of wood simply hangs,
 ...’ (IVK_memories_126)
- b. *ia-čan-ti, ətur:čan-ti ele:r*
 what-DIM.DEF-POSS.1PL fire[Y]-DIM.DEF-POSS.1PL here
bi-d-de-n,
 be-PROG-NFUT-3SG
 ‘And our whatchamacallit, our fire is here.’ (MKK_bear_055)

When attached to adjectives or participles, the evaluative meaning generally (but not always, see below) applies to the head noun, denoting its size, rather than augmenting or diminishing the quality of the modifier (13a, b); see also (6a, b). Cross-linguistically, such transference of the evaluative meaning is known for verbal diminutives (see Sect. 2.2.2 for a discussion), but is rarely found with adjectives.

- (13) a. *hulaña-maja palak-u nək-ča-l*
 red-AUG.INDEF flag[R]-ACC hang.up-PF.PTCP-PL
 ‘they hung a big red flag’ [NOT: a very red flag]
 (AXK_Sebjan_history_1_047)
- b. *naha: dahli-kkan ia-kakan er go:n-i-n*
 very[Y] tasty-DIM.INDEF what-DIM.INDEF PROX say-PST-3SG
 ‘“very tasty, what is this”, he said’ [talking about kiwi fruit]⁹ [NOT:
 somewhat tasty] (beseda_1391_LNZ)

That it is generally indeed the size of the head noun that is being denoted by the evaluative suffix on the adjective is illustrated particularly clearly by the following example (14). Rather than the diminutive suffixes on the adjectives expressing that a

⁹It might appear incongruous that kiwis should be considered small. However, apples are the imported fruit most commonly found in the village shops, and it might thus be that apples are the default standard of reference for fruit.

house of normal size was slightly old and slightly black, the emphatic rounding and lengthening of the second vowel in the adjective *irbe:t* ‘old’ indicates that the house was actually VERY old, but that it was a house of small size.¹⁰

- (14) *irbo:k-keken* *ialdaña-kkan* *ç̣u:*
 old[EMPH]-DIM.INDEF coal.black-DIM.INDEF house
 ‘A very old, black little house.’ (AXK_Sebjan_history_1_085)

This contrasts with the cross-linguistic tendency for evaluative morphology to modify the semantics of the base word (Stump 1993:3, citing Scalise 1986). Thus, commonly evaluative affixes attaching to adjectives attenuate or intensify the meaning expressed by the lexeme, for instance in Basque (Artiagoitia 2015:196), Israeli Hebrew (Faust 2015:241), or Latvian (Kalnača 2015:257–259). In Macedonian, “all diminutivized adjectives” have a meaning of approximation, resulting in ‘rather X’ or ‘X-ish’, e.g. *topli-čok* ‘warmish’ or *glupi-čok* ‘rather stupid’ (Spasovski 2012:110). Similarly, adding a diminutive suffix to adjectives in Italian changes the semantics of the adjective and says nothing about the head noun; thus, “. . . *alt-ino* means ‘less high’ than expressed by *alto* ‘high’ [. . .]; *lungh-etto* ‘less long than *lungo*’, *grand-ino* (*gross-ino*) ‘less big than *grande* (*grosso*)’, . . .”, etc. (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994:117). Apart from Lamunxhin Even, other counterexamples to this generalization are known: in Udihe, a Southern Tungusic language related to Even, the diminutive meaning carried by the diminutivized adjective is assigned to the head noun (Tol'skaya 2015:336). In Yurakaré (isolate, Bolivia) the diminutive “. . . can refer either to the size of the referent about which the property or action is predicated [. . .] or to the degree to which the predicate applies” when attaching to property words or action words describing processes (van Gijn 2015:644). A very specific case of transference of evaluative meaning is found in some southern Bantu languages, for example Tswana, where the diminutive attached to color terms in general expresses ‘a nice color’. However, when these color terms modify animate beings, the basic form denotes a male, while the diminutive denotes a female, e.g. *pitse e tshweu* [horse the.one white] ‘the white stallion’ vs. *pitse e tshwaana* [horse the.one white.DIM] ‘the white mare’ (Creissels 1999:34–35).

It should be noted, however, that the semantics of adjective-evaluative combinations in Lamunxhin Even depend on the context, as in some cases the evaluative can be interpreted as changing the semantics of the base rather than denoting the size of the head noun. Thus, while *hepeku-meje ŋin* [shaggy-AUG.INDEF dog] would normally be understood as ‘a big shaggy dog’, it can be used to refer to a very shaggy dog if the referent is an animal of normal size Ija Krivoschapkina, pers. comm.). Similarly, in (15) the diminutive on the participle *hebe:hri* ‘being rough’ attenuates the quality of roughness rather than denoting the small size of the stones that are needed to sharpen axes.

¹⁰Of course, the intensifying adverb *naha:* in (13b) similarly shows that the kiwi is very tasty, not just a little bit, so that the diminutive on *dahli* clearly refers to the head noun.

- (15) *tobar-ur awna-dar nek-mi, hu: okat-tuk*
 axe[R]-PRFL.PL sharpen-PURP.CVB.PRFL.PL do-COND.CVB 2PL river-ABL
tarbačan hebehri-kken iŋa-w ga-ričur,
 DIST.QUAL be.rough.IMPF.PTCP-DIM.INDEF stone-ACC take-ANT.CVB.PL
tala awna-lda gom-e-m
 there sharpen-IMP.2PL say-NFUT-1SG
 ‘“If you want to sharpen your axes, take such roughish stones from the river,
 sharpen them there”, I said.’ (AAK_headmistress_056)

Furthermore, when the adjectives themselves express a size-related notion, the evaluative always intensifies that notion. Thus, the augmentatives added to *ŋonam* ‘long’ and *egčžen* ‘big’ in (16a) and (16b) result in a meaning of ‘very long’ and ‘very big, huge’, respectively, while the diminutive added to *kotlen* ‘small’ in (16c) results in ‘very small’. A similar result is found with Italian diminutives: “... stem-based diminutive formation may increase smallness only with words denoting nothing else than smallness. *The combination of two identical denotative meanings has the effect of semantic intensification, ...*” (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994:118, emphasis mine).

- (16) a. *tar noŋan: digen kira-lkan ŋonam-maja gəl bi-čši-n*
 PTL 3SG four edge-PROP long-AUG.INDEF firewood be-FUT-3SG
 ‘Thereupon he (said): “It will be a very long piece of wood with four edges”.’ (AAK_headmistress_065)
- b. *omen egčže-meje etiken tegeče-d-če, gurgata-lkan*
 one big-AUG.INDEF old.man sit-PROG-PF.PTCP beard-PROP
 ‘One huge old man was sitting, he had a beard.’ (KKK_Emcheni_105)
- c. *kolle-kken tünnük-keken bi-h-ni, tara-w*
 small-DIM.INDEF window[Y]-DIM.INDEF be-NFUT-3SG DIST-ACC
patuk-ča
 hit-PF.PTCP
 ‘There is a tiny window, (the bear) hit that.’ (RDA_shatun_012)

When attached to the proprietive object in proprietive constructions (17a, b), the evaluative meaning generally applies to this and not the head noun.

- (17) a. *omen koza-lka-kkan bej ielten-i-n*
 one goat-PROP-DIM.INDEF man pass-PST-3SG
 ‘... a man with a little goat walked past.’ [NOT: a little man with a goat] (Mitja_pearstory_02)
- b. *tik alta kolohe-lken učaka-lkan-maja*
 now six[Y] wheel[R]-PROP riding.reindeer-PROP-AUG.INDEF
o:ča bi-he-nni
 become-PF.PTCP be-NFUT-2SG
 ‘...now you have got a big riding reindeer with six wheels [i.e. a truck].’ [NOT: you have become big] (VNZ_poselok_037)

However, if the size of the proprietor is of similarly notable proportions as that of the proprietive object, then the evaluative meaning can extend to the proprietor as well,

so that *koza-lka-kkan bej* can carry a meaning of ‘a (small) man with a small goat’, depending on the context (Ija Krivoschapkina, pers. comm.).

When both modifiers and head nouns carry evaluative suffixes, the characteristics of the items have to match;¹¹ it is not possible to combine a modifier carrying a diminutive with a head noun carrying an augmentative and vice versa (18a–d).

- (18) a. **hepeku-maja* *ɲin-kakan*
 shaggy-AUG.INDEF dog-DIM.INDEF
 intended: ‘a very shaggy small dog’
- b. **hepeku-kken* *ɲin-maja*
 shaggy-DIM.INDEF dog-AUG.INDEF
 intended: ‘a slightly shaggy big dog’
- c. **koza-lka-kkan* *bej-meje*
 goat-prop-DIM.INDEF man-AUG.INDEF
 intended: ‘a big man with a small goat’
- d. **koza-lka-maja* *bej-keken*
 goat-PROP-AUG.INDEF man-DIM.INDEF
 intended: ‘a small man with a big goat’

To summarize, the nominal evaluative suffixes in Lamunkhin Even are cross-linguistically unusual in their use as markers of (in)definiteness as well as in the transference of their evaluative meaning from the modifier to the head noun. This transference of meaning is known for verbal diminutives (see Sect. 2.2.2); in Lamunkhin Even it also applies to adjectives and participles, but not to the proprietive object in proprietive constructions.

2.2 The verbal suffixes

2.2.1 The finite verb augmentative -bAħA [AUG.VB]

The only two examples of this suffix occur in the narrative about the encounter with the big bear (see (3), repeated here for convenience as (19a), and (19b)). No diminutive suffixes occur with finite verbs in the corpus; however, the diminutive counterpart of *noke-behe-d-ni* from (19b) would be *noke-hehn-e-n* ‘a small creature does something’ (Ija Krivoschapkina, pers. comm.).

- (19) a. *ila-ja:ɕi* *eči-je* *ila-baha-d-ni*
 stand.up-AUG.CVB PROX.QUAL-AUG stand.up-AUG.VB-NFUT-3SG
 abaga-ńɕa
 grandfather-AUG.DEF
 ‘Standing up like this, he stood up, the big bear.’ (MKK_bear_053)
- b. *tar emiske* *abaga-ńɕa* ... *ɕiŋ*
 PTL suddenly[Y] grandfather-AUG.DEF very[Y]
 i-hn-e-n *ele, gde-to, ...* *tarak ɔn*
 be.audible-LIM-NFUT-3SG here somewhere[R] DIST how
 ia-ja:ɕi, *přt přt go:-je:ɕi,* *noke-behe-d-ni*
 do.what-AUG.CVB přt přt say-AUG.CVB do-AUG.VB-NFUT-3SG

¹¹ As pointed out by a reviewer, one could call this “evaluative agreement”.

'Then suddenly the big bear—it was audible here—did how, made a sound "prt prt".' (MKK_bear_070)

In these two examples it is clear that the verbal augmentative suffix denotes the large size of the bear—which is furthermore expressed by the multitude of augmentative suffixes on other parts of speech in these sentences—and does not intensify the action performed by the bear. Similarly, the form *noke-hehn-e-n* provided as a diminutive counterpart for the verbal augmentative in (19b) indicates the small size of the subject of the verb, and does not attenuate the action expressed by the verb. Such transference of evaluative meaning from the verb stem to its subject also characterizes the converbal evaluatives and will therefore be discussed in the following section.

2.2.2 The converbal suffixes *-kAnč̣i/-kAnč̣ur* [DIM.CVB] and *-jA(:)č̣i/-jA(:)č̣ur* [AUG.CVB]

These suffixes are arguably of bipartite origin, consisting of the evaluative suffixes *-kAn* [DIM] and *-jA(:)* [AUG], respectively, and the instrumental case-marked reflexive possessive suffixes¹² *-č̣i* (SG) and *-č̣ur* (PL). In this, they are formally parallel to the anterior converbs¹³ *-rič̣i* (SG) and *-rič̣ur* (PL), which consist of the imperfective participle *-ri* and the instrumental reflexive possessive suffixes. The converbal evaluative suffixes generally denote the size of the subject referent ((3, 4a, 19b) above, (20a, b) below), but can also express emotional overtones, such as endearment (20c) or depreciation (20d), again with respect to the subject referents, i.e. here, too, we find transference of the evaluative meaning from the verb to the subject referent.

- (20) a. *tar-č̣a-l* *buolla gruša-w* *č̣eb-ken č̣ur*
 DIST-DIM.DEF-PL DP[Y] pear[R]-ACC eat-DIM.CVB.PL
ielten-i-dnen
 pass-PST-3PL
 'And they [the small boys] walked by eating pears.'
 (JPZ_pearstory_025)
- b. *es, Vladimira-ńč̣a* *ia-ri-n*
 no Vladimir-AUG.DEF do.what-PST-3SG
 "Oo, bi: *o:n* ... *halč̣u-ha* ... *ta-li* *ńo:č̣i-m*"
 oh 1SG how be.embarrassed-EXCL DIST-PROL exit-FUT-1SG
go:je:č̣i
 say-AUG.CVB.SG
 'no, big Vladimir did what [refused]. "Oh, how will I go out there, how embarrassing", he said' (beseda_1905–1906_LNZ)

¹²These mark an instrument whose possessor is coreferential with the subject of the verb, e.g.

č̣ukača-čan *kuŋa-č̣am* *de:tle-č̣i* *o:hi-ča*
 bird-DIM.DEF child-DIM.DEF.ACC wing-INS.PRFL.SG scratch-PF.PTCP
 '... the little bird scratched the little child with its wing...' (KKK_Emcheni_087)

¹³Non-finite verb forms that mark an action that takes place prior to the action expressed by the main verb, see ex. (10) or (43b).

- c. *tala kahna-čam-ur* *hobgi-k-ko:nčur*,
 there pipe-DIM.DEF-PRFL.PL smoke-RES-DIM.CVB.PL
 ‘Smoking their little pipes there, [those dear old women] ...?’
 (EAK_reindeer_herd_336)
- d. *ieke-wur* *huj-u-t-je:čji-l* *ulde-we-n*
 pot-PRFL.PL boil-TRNS-RES-AUG.CVB-PL meat-ACC-POSS.3SG
anaŋ ia-wa-n *ulde-we-n* *čheb-čji-p=tu*
 ram what-ACC-POSS.3SG meat-ACC-POSS.3SG eat-FUT-1PL=PRES
go:je:čji-l
 say-AUG.CVB-PL
 ‘boiling our pot (i.e. setting water to boil), saying we’ll probably (hope-
 fully) be eating the meat of a mountain sheep...’ [from a description of
 how taboos are broken] (beseda_1073_NPZ)

The example in (20c) was said about old women for whom the speaker clearly has positive feelings, since she introduced them into the discourse as being “old women with good thoughts (feelings), who were always laughing”, and went on to say that they were “kind”. The example in (20d), in contrast, is from a description of numerous ways in which young women nowadays break taboos, one of which prohibits women to talk about what animals the men might bag during hunting. Throughout the description of the taboos that are broken, augmentative converbs are used to express censure of women who behave in this way. Some irony is clearly included in the expressive meaning, since the speaker includes herself in this group. Note that she idiosyncratically uses the nominal plural suffix *-l* with the augmentative converb instead of the correct forms *hujut-je:čur* and *go:ječur*.

That the evaluative converbal suffixes indeed transfer the evaluative meaning to the subject referent and do not change the semantics of the base verb is shown clearly by the following example (21). Here, the subject of the converb ‘laughing’ is a small and thin boy (also the subject of example (11) above), as additionally indicated by the diminutive suffix on the name *Dima-čan*. Dima was laughing not a little bit, as one might expect with a verbal diminutive, but rather very much, as indicated by the emphatic rounding and lengthening of the vowel in the diminutive converb *ha:mak-ku:nčji*, which would normally be *ha:mak-kančji*. It is thus clear that the diminutive converb refers to the size of the little boy and does not attenuate the action of laughing.

- (21) *Dima-čan* *kolle-kken* *bi-hi-n* *giawanu ča:w-du*
 Dima-DIM.DEF small-DIM.INDEF be-PST-3SG last.year far-DAT
ha:mak-ku:nčji *nok-kere-n*
 laugh-DIM.CVB[EMPH] do-HAB[NFUT]-3SG
 ‘Dima was small the year before last, he did (something) laughing very
 much.’ (beseda_1509_NPZ)

This transference of evaluative meaning from the verb stem to its subject contrasts with verbal evaluatives in other languages: diminutives added to verb stems tend to express a lower intensity, shorter duration or iterativity of the action (Dressler

where speakers were expressing strong feelings of pity and empathy for their parents they emphasized the emotion by using the particle *baraxsan* copied from the neighboring language Sakha (Yakut), where it has a pronounced meaning of compassion (23d, e).

- (23) a. *noŋan tarit bokke do:la-n* *ülčü*
 3SG then ice inside-LOC-POSS.3SG immediately[Y]
hor-e:n-če, *mo: do:la-n?*
 go-CMPS-PF.PTCP water inside-LOC-POSS.3SG
 ‘then he [the poor man] immediately went under the ice, into the water?’ [talking about a man who is assumed to have drowned] (beseda_1256_NPZ)
- b. *beje-t* *me:n-čur* *ihu-je:t-ti-t*
 self[Y]-POSS.1PL REFL-INS.PRFL.PL grow-CMPS-PST-1PL
 ‘So we grew up by ourselves [poor us].’ (MKK_nastavlenie_052)
- c. *irka-ča-la-n* *amar-da-duku-n*
 scream-PF.PTCP-LOC-POSS.3SG behind-SIDE-ABL-POSS.3SG
amm-u *no:je:t-te-n*
 father-POSS.1SG exit-CMPS-NFUT-3SG
 ‘... when (the child) shouted, from behind him my [dear] father came out.’ (ZAS_naled_080)
- d. *oŋ ejm-u,* *ejm-u* *baraxsan*
 oh mother-POSS.1SG mother-POSS.1SG dear[Y]
i:č-e:n-ne-n,
 prepare.leather-PROG-CMPS-NFUT-3SG
 ‘Oh, my poor mother is softening leather, ...’ [looking at a photo showing her deceased mother preparing leather in a reindeer herding camp] (TPK_photos_030)
- e. *amm-u* *buolla baraxsan oŋok* *buluhi-kie*
 father-POSS.1SG DP[Y] dear[Y] completely[Y] pitiful-INTS
oŋok, *tara-ŋaka:n*
 completely[Y] become.drenched.with.sweat-DIM.ADJ
hokolo-n *bütünnü: ečin*
 sweat-POSS.3SG entirely[Y] PROX.QUAL
eje:hen-če-kken *em-e:n-ne-n,*
 float.downriver-LIM-PF.PTCP-DIM.INDEF come-CMPS-NFUT-3SG
amm-u *baraxsan*
 father-POSS.1SG dear.Y
 ‘And my poor father came, very pitiful, completely wet from sweat, covered in sweat that is running (off him), my poor father.’ [describing her father after he had tried to keep the huge bear mentioned in (19a, b) away from his daughters] (MKK_bear_073)

While most of the examples in the corpus with a reading of compassion refer to people who are by now deceased (especially parents), this is not the sole context for this emotional value. For instance, the following example (24) is taken from an account of how two children—who at the time of the recording were still alive, albeit

grown up—had mistaken bear faeces for blueberries and were happily eating them until caught by an adult who slapped them both. The narrator laughed heartily while telling this anecdote, and the compassion expressed by *-A:n* must be due to the fact that eating faeces of any kind is not a pleasant experience when one thinks about it, even if they taste like berries.

- (24) *tačín tewte go:-niken ɕebe-č-če-l, tačín*
 DIST.QUAL berries say-SIM.CVB eat-PROG-PF.PTCP-PL DIST.QUAL
neke-ɕ-e-n-neke-tnen ɲi:-gol eńen-ni
 do-PROG-CMPS-COND.CVB-3PL who-INDEF mother-POSS.3SG
bak-ča noɲmutnan
 find-PF.PTCP 3PL.ACC
 ‘They were eating like that, thinking those were berries, while they were doing that [the poor things], somebody’s mother found them.’
 (IVK_memories_214)

The suffix *-A:n* appears to be the result of a reanalysis of the so-called ‘durative aspect’, ‘repetitive aspect’, or ‘repetitive-retarded aspect’ suffix *-ɕA:n* also found in other Even dialects (Novikova 1980:46; Malchukov 1995:15; Rišes and Cincius 1952:742; Robbek 2007:516). This is described as expressing a repeated action, e.g. *ɲene-ɕe:m-dej* ‘walk and walk’¹⁵ (Rišes and Cincius 1952:742), a durative action, e.g. *hore-ɕe:n-* ‘go for a long time’ (Malchukov 1995:15), or an action that is slowly and continuously repeated:

- (25) Berëzovka dialect (Robbek 2007:516; glosses and English translation mine)
orar-bu tini-ɕe:m-ri-n
 reindeer.PL-ACC send-DUR-PST-3SG
 ‘(he) set loose and set loose the reindeer without haste’

For the Ola dialect, which is spoken close to Magadan, the functions of this suffix are described as purely aspectual, expressing durativity and repetition (26a; Novikova 1980:46), whereas the suffix is described as frequently having only an (unspecified) emotional function in the Berëzovka dialect of northeastern Yakutia (Robbek 2007:516). In the Bystraja dialect spoken in central Kamchatka it generally expresses pity (26b), but can also have a purely durative meaning (26c). Note that for consistency I gloss this suffix as DUR(ative) even where it has a reading of compassion, as in (26b).

- (26) Ola dialect (Novikova 1980:46; glosses and English translation mine)
 a. *omneken hoɲa-ɕa:n-raka-n hatassi-la urke-ten*
 once cry-DUR-COND.CVB-3SG darkness-LOC door-POSS.3PL
kiɲgun-uken-ni
 jingle-CAUS-NFUT.3SG
 ‘Once, when she was crying for a long time, in the darkness (someone) opened the door with a jingle.’

¹⁵This is the only example given. The accompanying description of this ‘aspect’ is “...the action is continuously renewed repeated” (...действие непрерывно возобновляется повторяется).

Bystraja dialect (RME_Anin_1_085)

- b. *nána=si tarak, uŋen, Sveta nó:ma-č̣e:n-ni-n desjatyj*
and=PTL DIST this.one Sveta die-DUR-PST-3SG tenth[R]
klas-tu tarj-ni-wun
grade[R]-DAT read-PST-1PL.EX
'And then this Sveta died [the poor thing], we were in tenth grade, ...'

Bystraja dialect (JET_igodnyj_078; Natalia Aralova's field data)

- c. *nan bu kuŋa-l čele-č̣ur tibere-č̣e:n-ni-wun*
and 1PL.EX child-PL all-INS.PRFL.PL drool-DUR-PST-1PL.EX
'So we children all salivated for a long time.'

In the Lamunkhin dialect, this seems to have been reanalysed as consisting of the progressive aspect marker *-č̣* and an evaluative suffix *-A:n*,¹⁶ as indicated by the progressive reading obtained from the combination *-č̣-A:n* (27a), which is clearly missing from the evaluative suffix used on its own (23a). In the Bystraja dialect, in contrast, *-č̣A:n* can co-occur with the progressive suffix (27b), indicating that it constitutes a single unitary suffix by itself.

(27) Lamunkhin dialect (ZAS_naled_029)

- a. *tara-w ielten-e-p, ielten-ič̣ur č̣e ha:tahri-du*
DIST-ACC pass-NFUT-1PL pass-ANT.CVB.PL PTL[Y] dark-DAT
hore-č̣-e:n-ne-p
go-PROG-CMPS-NFUT-1PL
'We passed that and then went on in the dark for a long time [poor us].'

Bystraja dialect (KAM_EIA_EPA_historical27)

- b. *nán tadu bi-si-ten geologe-r e-dle-ten*
again there be-PST-3PL geologist[R]-PL NEG-TRM.CVB-POSS.3PL
a:ŋa-na-r tala mestoroždenija, nán ta-duk nán
open-INTENT-NEG.CVB there ore.deposit[R] again DIST-ABL again
ča-ski nó:n-č̣i-č̣a:n-ni-tan tawur Šanut-kida-tki,
far-ADV.ALL run.away-PROG-DUR-PST-3PL those Sanuč-SIDE-ALL
uŋ-teki=de, Managis-kida-tki nó:n-ni-tan nán
something-ALL=PTL Managis-SIDE-ALL run.away-PST-3PL again
maxnjo-l-duk
Russian-PL-ABL

¹⁶It is of course also possible that the combination of the affective suffix *-A:n* and progressive *-č̣* was reanalyzed as a durative aspect suffix *-č̣A:n* in the other dialects, and that only the Lamunkhin dialect maintained the bare affective suffix. Fusion of suffixes during grammaticalization occurs more frequently than splitting, so that one might favor this explanation. However, in agglutinative languages it is not unlikely that speakers are able to identify individual segments with morphemes occurring elsewhere (i.e. identifying the initial segment *-č̣* with the progressive suffix) and thus are able to reanalyze one morpheme as consisting of two. At the moment, *-A:n* is only attested in Lamunkhin Even, so that the fusion would have occurred in several dialects, while the hypothesized split would have occurred only in Lamunkhin Even. To be able to elucidate the actual diachronic process, more data on the presence or absence of the affective suffix *-A:n* vs. the "durative" suffix *-č̣A:n* in different dialects is needed to verify whether such a hypothetical merger would have taken place once in a recent common ancestor of the eastern dialects (a plausible scenario) or several times (which would make this scenario rather less plausible).

'And there they lived until the geologists came to discover ore deposits, and from there they ran away further, to the Shanuch, where else, to the Managish, running away from the Russians.'

To summarize, Lamunxhin Even has several verbal evaluative suffixes, of which the finite verb augmentative suffix *-bAhA* and the converbal diminutive *-kA:nčI/-kA:nčur* and augmentative *-jA:čji/-jA:čur* have primarily denotative functions, while *-Am* and *-jA:t* are purely expressive. As also found in some North American languages, the evaluative meaning of these suffixes generally transfers to an argument of the verb rather than modifying the action expressed by the verb, as is more generally the case with verbal evaluatives.

2.3 The evaluative suffixes that derive adjectives and adverbs from descriptive verbs: *-ŋAkAn* [DIM.ADJ], *-ŋAjA* [AUG.ADJ], and *-čA:gAgAj* [TNDR]

The two suffixes *-ŋAkAn* [DIM.ADJ] and *-ŋAjA* [AUG.ADJ] derive adjectives and adverbs from descriptive verbs. Judging from the examples in the corpus, these mostly have an attenuative (DIM.ADJ) or intensive (AUG.ADJ) meaning (28a, b). However, *-ŋAkAn* is also frequently used in contexts of endearment (28c) and occasionally compassion (see 23e), and these forms can also denote the dimensions of the head noun (28d, e).

- (28) a. *ialda-ŋakan, eč̄in karič̄nevaj ɔ:-kan*
 be.black-DIM.ADJ PROX.QUAL brown[R] become-TRM.CVB
zagaraj-da-rič̄sur, tar n̄olten-du
 tan[R]-VR-ANT.CVB.PL DIST sun-DAT
 'Blackish, until we became brown (we) tanned, in that sun.'
 (ZAS_jubki_Aniwrin_037)
- b. *noŋan ialda-ŋaja, ia-w zagaratj noŋandun*
 3SG be.black-AUG.ADJ what-ACC tan[R] 3SG.DAT
 'He's completely black, why should he tan.' (ZAS_jubki_Aniwrin_018)
- c. *č̄sep-teke-t kollen kuŋa-l no:-ŋil-ti*
 eat-COND.CVB-POSS.1PL small child-PL younger.sib-PL-POSS.1PL
eči-ken hiba-ŋak̄o:n
 PROX.QUAL-DIM become.dirty-DIM.ADJ[EMPH]
ɔ:-jak-kara-r, huŋel eči-ken
 become-CMPS-HAB.NFUT-3PL blood PROX.QUAL-DIM
o:ru-niken
 flow-SIM.CVB
 'When we eat (roasted velvet antlers) my younger cousins become so dirty, the poor dears, the blood flows like this.'
 (EAK_reindeer_herd_383)
- d. *omen buwdi-maja ŋina-tnan Bahargas gerbe bi-č̄e,*
 one piebald-AUG.INDEF dog-POSS.3PL Bahargas name be-PF.PTCP
kongo-ŋeje gogo-d-di
 become.bass.like-AUG.ADJ bark-PROG-IMPF.PTCP

'There was one big piebald dog of theirs, its name was Bahargas, which barked with a deep voice.' (AXK_1930s_036)

- e. *tara-w noŋan omolgo-čan aŋta-ŋakan tara-w*
 DIST-ACC 3SG boy-DIM.DEF be.absentminded-DIM.ADJ DIST-ACC
e-niken it-te, ahikkan-taki ečin
 NEG-SIM.CVB see-NEG.CVB girl-ALL PROX.QUAL
ehen-ičji hore-d-niken,
 look.around-ANT.CVB go-PROG-SIM.CVB
 'He, the absent-minded little boy, without seeing this, riding, having
 looked around at the girl, ...' (TVK_pear_story_046)

These suffixes appear at first sight to be bipartite, consisting of a possible adjectivizer *-ŋA* and the evaluative suffixes *-kAn* [DIM] and *-jA(:)* [AUG]. However, neutral adjectives are derived from descriptive verbs with the suffix *-ku* (compare the minimal pairs in 29a and 29b–c), and *-ŋA* by itself does not exist. The origin of these suffixes is thus opaque, although *-kAn* and *-jA(:)* have clearly played a role in their formation. Note that in (29a) the speaker accompanied the word *huta-ŋaja* with a gesture showing a big nose or beak, and then went on to show eyes while saying that the eyes were red.

- (29) a. *huta-ŋaja, iahala-n ečin huta-ku*
 become.red-AUG.ADJ eyes-POSS.3SG PROX.QUAL become.red-ADJ
 'Such a big red [beak/nose], and its eyes were red!'
 (AVZ_indjuk_internat_029)
- b. *tarit tar dura-ku futbolka-n*
 then DIST get.dirty-ADJ Tshirt[R]-POSS.3SG
noŋa-j-ar boł-lag-a
 hang.up-CONN-PRS.PTCP[Y] AUX[Y]-ASS[Y]-3SG[Y]
 'And he hangs his dirty T-shirt there.' (IVK_memories_128)
- c. *tarak kuruk ia-la bi-wek-kere-n*
 DIST always[Y] what-LOC be-GNR-HAB[NFUT]-3SG
dura-ŋakan Hergej-čen
 get.dirty-DIM.ADJ Sergej-DIM.DEF
 'but he's always going out there, dirty little Sergej' (beseda_1925_RDA)

In addition to the synthetic augmentative adjectivizer *-ŋAjA*, there are three examples in the corpus (involving three different descriptive verbs) of the neutral adjectivizer *-ku* followed by the indefinite nominal augmentative *-mAjA*, e.g. (30). There is apparently no difference in meaning, and according to Ija Krivoshapkina, who is both a native speaker and an Even philologist, one could just as well say *kapta-ŋaja* as *kapta-ku-maja*.

- (30) *ej-mu gon-i-čji-n, koččin-ni*
 mother-POSS.1SG say-IMPF.PTCP-INS-POSS.3SG hoof-POSS.3SG
kapta-ku-maja, egčje-meje bi-če
 become.flat-ADJ-AUG.INDEF big-AUG.INDEF be-PF.PTCP
 'As my mother says, it had such big flat hooves, ...' (IVK_memories_009)

Only one example exists in the corpus of the combination of the adjectivizer *-ku* (pronounced *-gi* by this speaker) with the indefinite nominal diminutive *-k(A)kAn* (31). Furthermore, during elicitation I was told that from the descriptive verb *gilden-* ‘be shining’ one could derive both the diminutive adjective *gilde-ŋeken* and the adjective with nominal diminutive *gilde-ku-kken*, just as one could say *gilde-ŋeje* or *gilde-ku-meje*, with the augmentative adjectivizer or neutral adjectivizer plus nominal augmentative, with no difference in meaning.

- (31) *tar debe-gi-kken* *hiekite bi-h-ni*
 PTL become.shaggy-ADJ-DIM tree be-NFUT-3SG
 ‘... there’s a shaggy tree ...’ (AEK_childhood_073)

The affective suffix *-č̣A:gAgAj* [TNR] derives adverbs from descriptive verbs and expresses endearment and love with respect to children (32a). Compare this example, where *bombo-č̣e:gegej* ‘chubbily’ refers to the young son of the speaker, with (32b), where *bombo-ŋeken* ‘chubby’, derived with the diminutive adjectivizer *-ŋAkAn*, refers to the son’s little fur boots.

- (32) a. *tar unta-čam-i* *tet-tič̣i,*
 PTL fur.boots-DIM.DEF-PRFL.SG put.on-ANT.CVB
bombo-č̣e:gegej *girka-wra-n,* *hut-u*
 be.small.and.chubby-TNDR walk-HAB.NFUT-3SG child-POSS.1SG
 ‘Having put on his little fur boots, he walked chubbily, my darling child.’ (EAK_reindeer_herd_198)
- b. *tala bombo-ŋoken* *eč̣in*
 there be.small.and.chubby-DIM.ADJ PROX.QUAL
unta-kakan... *ia-kakam*
 fur.boots-DIM.INDEF what-DIM.INDEF.ACC
ketinče-kekem *ej-mu*
 fur.stocking-DIM.INDEF.ACC mother-POSS.1SG
tet-u-wre-n
 put.on-TRNS-HAB.NFUT-3SG
 ‘Little chubby boots like this, little fur stockings my mother put on him.’
 (EAK_reindeer_herd_195)

In spite of its highly expressive meaning, *-č̣A:gAgAj* is not restricted to occurring with verbs with a positive meaning, as shown by the elicited example (33). The verb *pelpelde-* from which *pelpe-č̣e:gegej* in (33) is derived has a very complex meaning: speakers cannot translate it, but try to explain its meaning by referring to hyperactive people. However, this hyperactivity does not refer to movement, rather, *pelpelde-* has a sense of not conforming to the Even code of behavior, which stipulates being calm and controlling one’s emotions and actions; overall, the meaning is very negative. The form *pelpe-č̣e:gegej* expresses love in spite of seeing the shortcomings of one’s child, a meaning which would not be carried by the less affective form *pelpe-ŋeken* (Ekaterina Krivoschapkina, pers. comm.).

- (33) *pelpe-č̣e:gegej* *neke-l-le-n*
 be.noisy/hyperactive-TNDR do-INCH-NFUT-3SG
 ‘he started to behave badly’ [but said with love]

In summary, Lamunkhin Even has (at least)¹⁷ three evaluative suffixes that derive adjectives and adverbs from descriptive verbs. This is yet another cross-linguistically rare feature, since one of the most salient characteristics of evaluative morphology mentioned throughout the literature is its categorial neutrality, i.e. the fact that it does not change the syntactic category of the base, in contrast to typical derivational morphology (Grandi 2015b:75–76). Nevertheless, word-class changing evaluative affixes have been described in other languages, most notably in Italian, where the nominal augmentative *-one* can derive nouns from verbs, e.g. *mangi-one* ‘big eater, glutton’ (Grandi 2015b:76), and in Dutch, where addition of the diminutive suffix turns every word into a noun, e.g. *zitten* ‘sit’ > *zit-je* ‘seat’ or *tien* ‘ten’ > *tien-tje* ‘tenner, tenguilder note’ (Bauer 1997:549–550). Similarly, in English and German addition of a diminutive suffix to some adjectives can change the word class to a noun (Schneider 2003:6).

2.4 The evaluative suffixes -kAn [DIM] and -jA(:) [AUG]

These suffixes occur with a wide variety of bases and also have a range of meanings beyond the denotation of smaller or larger size, covering attenuation (DIM), intensification, and exactitude (both DIM and AUG). In the corpus, the augmentative *-jA(:)* occurs mainly with adverbs, quantifiers, and the qualitative demonstrative *eči(n)* ‘like this’, but there are also a few examples of *-jA(:)* occurring with nominals (a participle and an adjective, to be precise) and the interrogative pronoun *o:n* ‘how’. With adverbs and quantifiers it adds an intensive meaning (34a, b), but it can also have a meaning of exactitude (34c). With the nominals and especially with the qualitative demonstrative *eči(n)* it frequently denotes the large size of a referent, as shown by accompanying gestures (34d).

- (34) a. *ɕe tala gora-ja: bi-ɕi-r, nelke nelke*
 PTL[Y] there long-AUG be-FUT-3PL spring spring
o:d-di-la-n
 become-PROG-IMP.F.PTCP-LOC-POSS.3SG
 ‘Well, there they live a very long time, until it becomes spring.’
 (TPK_family_174)
- b. *ho:ja-ja turki-du... tar ia-n e-ti*
 many-AUG sled-DAT PTL what-POSS.3SG NEG-IMP.F.PTCP
ič-u-r ho:ja turki-lkan irek tarak epej-u
 see-DETRNS-NEG.CV.B many sled-PROP which DIST rich-ACC
bo:-če-l,
 give-PF.PTCP-PL
 ‘On a lot of sleds... they gave various riches with so many sleds that their [end] wasn’t visible, ...’ (KKK_Emcheni_122)

¹⁷Since I am basing my analysis on a relatively small narrative corpus, I can of course not exclude the existence of more such suffixes that have simply not been used by the speakers contributing to the corpus.

- c. *hergi-le hiarga iha-p-ti-la-n*
 bottom-LOC sled[Y] reach-MED-IMP.F.PTCP-LOC-POSS.3SG
istala [...] hergi-je:-le, ogi-je:-nuk tar
 until bottom-AUG-LOC top-AUG-ADV.ABL PTL
ir-bak-kara-m
 drag-GNR-HAB.NFUT-1SG
 ‘To the place down below where sleds can come [...], to the very bottom I drag (the logs) from the very top.’ (AEK_childhood_077)
- d. *egč̣e-kie-mdeh-je eči-je, e-ti*
 big-INTS-SML-AUG PROX.QUAL-AUG NEG-IMP.F.PTCP
howna-r o:-kan, hi: muka-w
 move-NEG.CVB become-TRM.CVB 2SG fur.jacket-ACC
tet-ti-s e-h-ni, tač̣in
 put.on-PST-2SG NEG-NFUT-3SG DIST.QUAL
 ‘Like such very big ones, until they couldn’t move—like you, when you put on that fur jacket, right.’ (IVK_memories_089)

In (34d) the speaker accompanies the words *egč̣e-kie-mdeh-je eči-je* ‘like such very big ones’ with a gesture to show how big the people were after having put on many layers of clothes, and she compares the scene she is describing to an occasion on which I had worn several pairs of pants, three jerseys and an Even fur jacket and thus felt I couldn’t move at all.

The diminutive suffix *-kan* occurs with adjectives, adverbs, converbs, interrogative and reflexive pronouns, numerals and quantifiers, and postpositions. It has rather diverse functions: attenuative (35a, b), intensive (35c), and exactitude (35d, e). Some speakers geminate the *-k-* after stems ending in vowels (e.g. 35b), and the vowel of the suffix can be lengthened (and even rounded) for emphasis (e.g. (38, 39b)).

- (35) a. *noč̣artan hore-hn-e, mut amari-kan eme-hn-e-p*
 3PL go-LIM-NFUT.3PL 1PL behind-DIM come-LIM-NFUT-1PL
 ‘They left, and we arrived a bit later.’ (RDA_stuck_in_stado_025)
- b. *aduku-kkam g̣ol-u hi: no:da-mč̣a-s*
 a.bit-DIM.ACC firewood-ACC 2SG throw-SBJV-2SG
 ‘... you might throw her [give her] a little bit of firewood’
 (beseda_1491_NPZ)
- c. *beket-ken-ni ijem-če eč̣in, tarit*
 all-DIM-POSS.3SG freeze-PF.PTCP PROX.QUAL then
ama-hki muču-ra-p
 behind-ADV.ALL return-NFUT-1PL
 ‘EVERYthing of his froze like this, then we went back.’
 (ZAS_naled_051)
- d. *tala, tala em-č̣i-p, kulin e-dle-ken-ni*
 there there come-FUT-1PL mosquito NEG-TRM.CVB-DIM-POSS.3SG
na:-ra, č̣e em-de:r, go:-ɲne-če-l
 hit-NEG.CVB PTL[Y] come-PURP.CVB.PRFL.PL say-HAB-PF.PTCP-PL
 ‘We will come there, right before the mosquitoes hit, let’s come there, they said.’ (AXK_svatovstvo_019)

- e. *ačʒas* *Tirextex gerbe tor-re* *istala-kan*
 completely[Y] Tirextex name earth-LOC until-DIM
 ‘Until the very place called Tirextex.’ (DVK_Segen_018)

When attached to the qualitative demonstrative pronoun *eči(n)* ‘like this’ *-kAn* often denotes the small size of the referent, as illustrated in (4b) and (37) below, with accompanying gestures showing a small size or space. However, the evaluative meaning of this item has also been bleached, so that *ečiken* is frequently used simply as a synonym of *eči(n)* (36). In this example, the speaker is discussing the use of tethering poles for work reindeer in the treeless tundra. Since these have to be solid enough to confine the reindeer to one place, there is nothing diminutive about them, and there is no accompanying gesture or change in intonation that would indicate that *ečiken* here has any meaning other than ‘like this’.

- (36) *er ol_ihin* *er ija-w* *igin* *er eči-ken* *er*
 PTL therefore[Y] PTL stone-ACC etc[Y] PTL PROX.QUAL-DIM PTL
ija-w *uj-gere-r,* *mahji bi-de-n*
 stone-ACC tie.up-HAB[NFUT]-3PL hard be-PURP.CVB-POSS.3SG
 ‘That is why they tie a stone like this [to the pole], so that it is solid.’
 (KNK_eksponat_033)

Although the functions of *-kAn* [DIM] and *-jA:* [AUG] have widened beyond the denotation of size or the expression of emotional values, there are three facts that allow me to include them among the Lamunkhin Even evaluative suffixes. First of all, even though the denotative use of these suffixes is relatively rare, there are some examples in the corpus in which *-kAn* and *-jA(:)* clearly denote an opposition of small vs. big size, namely when used with the qualitative demonstrative *eči(n)* (37); see also (4a, b) and (34d) above. In (37) the speaker accompanies the description with a gesture to show how big the rocks are and how small and narrow the ravine in between is.

- (37) *apkit er-teki* *eči-je:* *kada:r, er-teki* *kada:r,*
 ravine PROX-ALL PROX.QUAL-AUG rock PROX-ALL rock
eči-ken=ńun *ere bi-h-ni*
 PROX.QUAL-DIM=RESTR PROX be-NFUT-3SG
 ‘A ravine. Here a big rock, there a rock, only here it is like this [small/narrow].’ (ZAS_naled_089-090)

Secondly, *-kAn* is the only evaluative suffix that can be reconstructed to the Tungusic family, being found with a diminutive meaning in three languages of the Northern branch (Even, Evenki and Oroqen) as well as in Nanai and Oroč from the Southern branch (Pakendorf and Krivoshapkina 2014:325–327). And lastly, as discussed above (Sects. 2.2.2 and 2.3), these morphemes arguably participate in the formation of suffixes with clear diminutive and augmentative functions.

Given that *-kAn* is arguably the oldest evaluative morpheme in the Lamunkhin dialect—as shown by its presence in other languages of the Tungusic family—it has had time to develop some of the peripheral meanings of the diminutive identified by Jurafsky (1996:542; cf. Prieto 2015:27), such as exactness and approximation. In this process, it appears to have largely lost its primary diminutive functions, which have

been taken over for nominals by the (presumably related) suffixes *-čAn* and *-k(A)kAn* (cf. Rose, to appear, for a similar renewal of denotational diminutives as a result of semantic change of older forms). Thus, *-kAn* practically does not occur with nouns in the Lamunkhin corpus. There are only few exceptions, in none of which the suffix retains a productive primary diminutive meaning: it is found in the lexicalization¹⁸ *ahi-kkan* ‘girl’ (< *ahi* ‘woman’) and in the form *ńari-kan* ‘boy’, which is not yet fully lexicalized (*ńari* occurs more frequently by itself), but where the diminutive meaning is completely bleached. This is shown by the diminutive *ńari-ka-ča-l* [boy-DIM-DIM.DEF-PL] ‘the small boys’, where *-kAn* is followed by the definite diminutive suffix *-čAn*. As will be discussed in Sect. 3, the only productive combinations of evaluative suffixes in the Lamunkhin dialect are those in which *-kAn* is the final element. Since *-kAn* in *ńari-ka-ča-l* precedes the definite diminutive suffix, it cannot have a diminutive meaning anymore. It also occurs with three different nouns carrying the simulative suffix *-g(A)čĭn*, e.g. (38); however, in this case *-kAn* does not denote the small size of the referent or express endearment or pejoration, but adds a meaning of exactness/intensity.


- (38) *iami go:mi* *eben o:tel* *bekeč-čur* *omen ečĭn*,
 why say-COND.CVB Even previously all-INS.PRFL.PL one PROX.QUAL
omen ńime:r-gečĭ-ke:n *bi-če-l*
 one neighbor-SML-DIM be-PF.PTCP-PL
 ‘Because previously Evens were exactly like one family.’
 (IDB_traditions_044)

This highly restricted occurrence of *-kAn* with nominals in Lamunkhin Even differs from its cognate in the closely related language Oroqen, which not only expresses intensity or—depending on the context—attenuation or even endearment with adjectives as well as a restrictive meaning with numerals, but also has prototypical diminutive functions and denotes small size, a small quantity, or endearment with nouns, e.g. *bakfa-kan* ‘little coffin’, *mu:kən* ‘small amount of water’, *ona:čĭ-kan* ‘little girl, dear girl’ (Whaley and Li 1998:458–460). Similarly, *-kAn* in Evenki, a close sister of both Even and Oroqen, attaches to nominals and derives prototypical diminutives with a meaning of small size or affection, e.g. *bira-ka:n* ‘little river’, *koŋnori:ka:n* ‘black (one) [affectionate]’ (Bulatova and Grenoble 1999:50).

The seemingly contradictory meanings of intensity and attenuation achieved when adding *-kAn* to adverbs can be explained by the semantics of the base lexeme. Based on a corpus study of Russian adjectives, Zalivanskaja (Babičeva) (2005, 2006) has convincingly demonstrated that the diminutive added to gradable adjectives with open-ended scalarity always results in a lowering of the characteristic on the scale of intensity (cf. Jurafsky’s 1996:555 proposal of lambda abstraction). With adjectives whose meaning places them at the top end of the scale (e.g. long, tall, big), this lowering results in a lesser degree of this characteristic and thus an attenuative meaning of the diminutive. With adjectives whose meanings places them at the bottom end

¹⁸Further probable lexicalizations including *-kAn* are *kačĭkan* ‘puppy’, *e:ŋken* ‘reindeer fawn’, *munrukan* ‘hare’, *ujamkan* ‘mountain sheep’, *atikan* ‘old woman’, *etiken* ‘old man’, and *aŋatkan* ‘orphan’ (cf. Bulatova 2015:61 for similar fossilized diminutives in Evenki). However, the base in these items is already opaque.

Fig. 2 Effect of diminutivization on gradable adverbs and adjectives (Fig. 1 from Zalivanskaja (Babičeva) 2005 adapted to the Lamunxhin Even data)



of the scale (e.g. short, small), this lowering results in an even lower position on the scale and thus an intensification of this characteristic (i.e. an object that is smaller than small is very small). This analysis is also applicable to the different effect of the diminutive *-kAn* with adjectives and adverbs in Lamunxhin Even (Fig. 2): with items that express a characteristic belonging to the top end of a gradable scale, such as *gɔr* 'far', the suffix diminishes this characteristic, resulting in an attenuative reading (39a): *gɔr-kan* 'a bit far' is less far than *gɔr*. When the item expresses a meaning from the bottom end of the scale, such as *ɲajukun* 'quietly', which is situated at the bottom end of a scale of noisiness or movement, the diminished degree of this characteristic results in an even lower degree of noisiness or movement, i.e. in an intensification of the meaning of quietness: *ɲajuku-kan* 'very quietly' (39b). This intensification is further expressed by the frequent rounding and lengthening of the vowel of the diminutive suffix.

- (39) a. *tar hin gɔr-kan tegeč-če-l, nɔ tarak ɕu: e-duk*
 PTL a.bit[Y] far-DIM sit-PF.PTCP-PL but[R] DIST house PROX-ABL
tar oškɔla-di:n kolle-kken-et ɕugas
 DIST school[R]-EQUAT small-DIM-INS near[Y]
 'They lived somewhat far, but that house was at a distance like the school from here, a bit closer [i.e. about 40–50 m].' (RDA_shatun_007)
- b. *tar bebe: dɔ:l-a-n ɲajuku-ku:n*
 DIST cradle inside-LOC-POSS.3SG quietly-DIM[EMPH]
dessi-wre-n
 lie-HAB.NFUT-3SG
 'He lay quietly in that cradle.' (EAK_reindeer_herd_164)

In summary, Lamunxhin Even has two evaluative suffixes that attach to a variety of bases and have considerably broadened functions. This gradual widening of the semantics of diminutives has been described in detail by Jurafsky (1996) on a cross-linguistic scale, and it can be explained for the diminutive *-kAn* by its old age.

3 Combinations of evaluative suffixes

In contrast to what is found in languages like Italian (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994:99–100) or Shona (Fortin 2011:62), where evaluative affixes can be reiterated, in Lamunxhin Even combinations of the nominal evaluative suffixes are not possible: in order to express extremely small or large size evaluative-marked adjective-noun

Table 2 Evaluative suffixes preceding *-kAn**

	DIM	AUG
	-čAn (6/5)	-ńčA (3/3)
		-mAjA (2/2)
*In brackets = number of tokens of combined suffixes/types of base roots in corpus	-kAnč̣i (2/1)	-jA(:)č̣i (1)
	-kAn (3/1)	-jA(:) (3/3)

combinations are used (40a–d, all examples elicited).¹⁹ Note that in (40b) the emphatic reading is obtained through the rounding and lengthening of the second vowel of the root *egč̣en* ‘big’. The only possible combinations of evaluative suffixes include the diminutive suffix *-kAn* as the final element (Table 2).

- (40) a. **abaga-maja-maja*
grandfather-AUG.INDEF-AUG.INDEF
intended: ‘a very large bear’
- b. *egč̣o:-meje abaga-maja*
big[EMPH]-AUG.INDEF grandfather-AUG.INDEF
‘a VERY big bear’
- c. **kuŋa-ča-čan*
child-DIM.DEF-DIM.DEF
intended: ‘the very small child’
- d. *kotle-čen kuŋa-čan*
small-DIM.DEF child-DIM.DEF
‘the very small child’

When *-kAn* combines with the nominal evaluative suffixes the result is one of increased dynamicity of the event, and a more intense imagery and increased expressivity of the utterance, while the denotational semantics of the nominal evaluatives are maintained. Thus, the boy in (41a) is small, while the elk and the dog in (41b) and (41c), respectively, are big.²⁰

- (41) a. *omolga-ča-ka:n, ńurma-rič̣i, hiat*
boy-DIM.DEF-DIM sneak.up-ANT.CVB willow
amar-gida-duku-n tuhan-ča, kotle-čen
behind-SIDE-ABL-POSS.3SG hop-PF.PTCP small-DIM.DEF
asatka-čam ńurit-tuku-n naŋti-hin-ča
girl-DIM.DEF.ACC hair-ABL-POSS.3SG grab-LIM-PF.PTCP
‘The little boy snuck up and jumped out from behind the bushes and grabbed the small girl by her hair.’ (KKK_Emcheni_045)

¹⁹I had offered the forms with repeated evaluatives (40a, c) for judgment, and the speaker had corrected them to the adjective-noun constructions (40b, d).

²⁰The dog in (41c) is Bahargas with the deep voice from (28d).

- b. *tačin muču-d-daka-n ajukaja tar*
 DIST.QUAL return-PROG-COND.CVB-POSS.3SG suddenly[Y] DIST
aman-duku-n=gu, ia-duku-n=gu ia-ričji
 father-ABL-POSS.3SG=Q what-ABL-POSS.3SG=Q do.what-ANT.CVB
ňo:ničji tar hiat-tuk ia-maja-kkan
 run.away-ANT.CVB DIST willow-ABL what-AUG.INDEF-DIM
tõ:ki-maja-kkan ia-ča tõhajči-ča
 elk-AUG.INDEF-DIM do.what-PF.PTCP jump-PF.PTCP
 ‘While she was returning like that, suddenly out of those willow
 bushes a huge elk jumped out, frightened by her father or something.’
 (IVK_memories_236)
- c. *tara-ńčja-kan gogo-l-ča čje*
 DIST-AUG.DEF-DIM bark-INCH-PF.PTCP PTL[Y]
 ‘That one [suddenly] started to bark.’ (AXK_1930s_037)

One example exists in the corpus of the augmentative converb *-jA(:)čji* combined with the diminutive *-kAn* (42). Here, *-kAn* inserts between the augmentative *-jA(:)* and the instrumental reflexive possessive suffix *-čji*, thus confirming the hypothesis that the evaluative converb suffixes have a bipartite origin (cf. Sect. 2.2.2). Like the combinations of the nominal suffixes with *-kAn*, the result of the combination of *-kAn* with *-jA(:)čji* is one of heightened imagery and dynamicity, while the augmentative converb denotes the extraordinarily large size of the folklore hero’s riding reindeer.

- (42) *učaka-ńčja-n harga-ja<ka:n>čji,*
 riding.reindeer-AUG.DEF-POSS.3SG wheeze-AUG.CVB<DIM>
i:t-i kika-ntakan kōkčín-ni
 tooth-PRFL.SG bite-MULT.CVB hoof-POSS.3SG
i:hn-i-n hagara-kie bi-wre-če
 be.audible-IPF.PTCP-POSS.3SG noisy-INTS be-HAB-PF.PTCP
ńamni-d-daka-n
 gallop-PROG-COND.CVB-POSS.3SG
 ‘His big riding reindeer, wheezing, gnashing its teeth, the sound of its hooves
 was very loud when he rode.’ (KKK_Emcheni_017)

With respect to the combination of *-kAn* with the diminutive converb *-kAnčji*, it is a moot point whether the additional *-kAn* infixes into the converbal marker or precedes it, since in both cases the result is the sequence *-kAkAnčji*. However, as found for the combination of *-kAn* with the augmentative converb *-jA(:)čji*, *-kAn* inserts between the original imperfect participle *-ri* and the instrumental reflexive possessive suffix *-čji* when intensifying the anterior converb *-ričji* (compare (43a) with the neutral converb in (43b)). It is therefore a plausible assumption that additional diminutives infix into the diminutive converb suffix as well.

- (43) a. *i:ri<kke:n>čji, aman-taki-w tore-hen-če*
 enter-ANT.CVB<DIM> father-ALL-POSS.1SG speak-LIM-PF.PTCP
 ‘As soon as he entered [= right after entering], he spoke to my father.’
 (AXK_1930s_060)

- b. *Liljetta i:-ričji, tar urke-le ilgam-na-n*
 Lilja enter-ANT.CVB PTL door-LOC stand-NFUT-3SG
 ‘Liljetta entered and stood in the door [= after entering, L. stood in the door]’ (beseda_1465_NPZ)

Like the combination of *-kAn* with the augmentative converb, the combination with the diminutive converb appears to heighten the imagery and dynamicity of the utterance while referring to a referent of small size. Here, the speaker is talking about her grandson, who was about three years old at the time, and she is clearly expressing both his small size and the speed of his movements:

- (44) *distantionnaj go:-ke<ken>čji, kampjuter go:-nteken,*
 remote.control[R] say-DIM.CVB<DIM> computer[R] say-MULT.CVB
ečín nek-čí-m ečín nek-čí-m
 PROX.QUAL do-FUT-1SG PROX.QUAL do-FUT-1SG
go:-ke<ke-ken>čji ečín
 say-DIM.CVB<DIM-DIM> PROX.QUAL
 ‘Saying the remote control, saying the computer, I will do like this, I will do like this, saying like this.’ (ZAS_jubki_Aniwrin_125)

Combinations of the general augmentative *-jA(:)* and the diminutive *-kAn* result in a higher degree of intensity (45a). Three examples exist in the corpus of combinations of *-kAn* with *-kAn*, all with the qualitative demonstrative *ečín* ‘like this’ as a base. In two examples produced by the same speaker (45b, c), the double diminutive appears to underline the repetitiveness of the movement: the speaker shows with her hands how the sled was rocking back and forth in the icy water in (45b), and in (45c) she shows how her brother had to take small and frequent steps. The use of the double diminutive in the last example (45d) is not fully clear, although it probably expresses some positive emotional nuance: it was uttered after the recitation of a poem about a reindeer herder finally coming back home to see his family.

- (45) a. *ti:k-je-ke.n hore-lde go:-j-deg-im*
 now-AUG-DIM go-IMP.2PL say-CONN-ASS[Y]-1SG[Y]
 ‘You go right away, I said,’ (beseda_0658_RDA)
- b. *oŋ, bi ŋe:le-l-le-m, ho:č*
 oh 1SG be.afraid-INCH-NFUT-1SG very-INS
ŋe:le-l-le-m, ere noŋan turki-n
 be.afraid-INCH-NFUT-1SG PTL 3SG sled-POSS.3SG
eči-kke-ko:n lođka-mdas melumeči-d-ni čji;
 PROX.QUAL-DIM-DIM boat[R]-SML rock-NFUT-3SG AFF
no:wu mo:le girka-či-d-da-n
 younger.sib-POSS.1SG water-LOC walk-RES-PROG-NFUT-3SG
 ‘Oh, I got a fright, a big fright, here his sled is rocking in the water like this [back and forth], like a boat, my brother is walking in water.’ (ZAS_naled_038)

- c. *tala omkan-dula ojši-raka-t, Apořia*
 there mountain-LOC go.up-COND.CVB-POSS.1PL Afanasij
kata, eřin, bekeč-čen-ni
 thank.god[Y] PROX.QUAL all-DIM.DEF-POSS.3SG
ere-ŋe-n ijem-deŋe-n, aji-kie,
 PROX-ALN-POSS.3SG freeze-PST.PTCP-POSS.3SG good-INTS
eči-kke-ken ojši-raka-n e-h-ni
 PROX.QUAL-DIM-DIM go.up-COND.CVB-POSS.3SG NEG-NFUT-3SG
bakarki-t-ta
 slip-RES-NEG.CVB
 ‘When we were climbing up that mountain, luckily everything that had
 frozen on Afanasij, very good, when he climbed up like this [with small
 steps] he didn’t slip.’ (ZAS_naled_053)
- d. *tarit turan ontŋn ereger mut eči-ke-ken*
 then stand.CVB[Y] then[Y] always 1PL PROX.QUAL-DIM-DIM
ebe-sel ereger irildu, boŋo emči-niken
 Even-PL always summer late.autumn migrate.as.one.family-SIM.CVB
ňulge-wek-kere-p
 migrate-GNR-HAB[NFUT]-1PL
 ‘Then we Evens always migrate like this in summer, in our families.’
 (stado#10_SEN_poems_079)

In summary, the only combinations of evaluative suffixes in Lamunkhin Even involve the diminutive suffix *-kAn*, which has largely lost its primary diminutive meaning and has considerably extended its semantics. In this respect Lamunkhin Even differs from other languages with considerable amounts of evaluative suffixes, where evaluative morphemes can be stacked to express a higher degree of diminution or augmentation (Dressler and Merlini Barbaresi 1994:99–100; LeSourd 1995:120–122; Gregová 2015:301–302). Interestingly, in Lamunkhin Even not only diminutives can combine with *-kAn*, but so can augmentatives. Combinations with *-kAn* result in heightened expressivity and imagery while maintaining the denotational semantics of the base evaluative.

4 Discussion and conclusions

Some of the cross-linguistically widespread features of evaluative morphology are the fact that diminutives (1) occur more frequently and (2) can be formed in more ways than augmentatives, (3) that evaluative affixes most commonly attach to nouns followed by adjectives and verbs, with other word classes being rare as bases, (4) that they are categorially neutral, i.e. they do not change the word class of the base, and (5) that they change the semantics of the base. As shown in the detailed discussion of the evaluative morphology found in Lamunkhin Even, this lect presents some cross-linguistically rare features. While in the corpus of spontaneous speech on which this investigation is based diminutives indeed occur more frequently than augmentatives

(68 % DIM vs 32 % AUG),²¹ there are not more diminutive than augmentative suffixes. Rather, the descriptive evaluative suffixes form a structured system of pairs of diminutives and augmentatives. The gap in this system (the finite verb diminutive) is most probably merely due to the relatively small size of the corpus. The higher frequency of diminutives than augmentatives in discourse is due to the higher frequency of nominal diminutives (*-k(A)kAn* and *-čAn*) and the general diminutive *-kAn* (cf. Table 1); this can be accounted for by the wider range of meanings carried by the nominal diminutives. In addition to denoting small size they can also express positive or negative affect, whereas the nominal augmentatives have a more restricted range of expressive meanings, being used only to convey respect. As for the suffix *-kAn*, it occurs very frequently (66 tokens) with the qualitative demonstrative *ečín* 'like this', where it is often semantically empty. In contrast, there is no substantial difference in frequency of occurrence of the converbal and adjectivizing diminutive vs. augmentative suffixes: 17 diminutive and 21 augmentative converbs occur in the corpus, and 14 diminutive adjectivizers as compared to 10 augmentative adjectivizers (cf. Table 1). The Lamunxhin Even system of evaluative morphemes shows hardly any restrictions concerning the word class of the base, with all word classes except for interjections being attested as bases. However, the suffixes show a functional division, with the suffixes *-čAn*, *-k(A)kAn*, *-ńčǂA*, and *-mAjA* occurring with nominals, the suffixes *-bAħA*, *-kAnčǂil-kAnčǂur*, *-jA(:)čǂil-jA(:)čǂur*, *-ŋAkAn*, *-ŋAjA*, *-An*, *-jA:t* and *-čǂA:gAgAj* occurring with verbal bases, and the suffixes *-kAn* and *-jA(:)* with all the rest. While the base specificity of the nominal and verbal suffixes is cross-linguistically common, the 'promiscuity' of *-kAn* and *-jA(:)* is less usual; this can most probably be explained by the fact that the primary denotative meanings of these suffixes are by now quite bleached. Whereas most of the evaluative suffixes indeed do not change the verb class of their base, the suffixes *-ŋAkAn*, *-ŋAjA* and *-čǂA:gAgAj* derive adjectives and adverbs from verbs and thus contradict the cross-linguistic generalization of categorial neutrality. If one analyses converbs as verbal adverbs, then the suffixes *-kAnčǂil-kAnčǂur* and *-jA(:)čǂil-jA(:)čǂur* fall into this category as well. Finally, the Lamunxhin Even suffixes do not always modify the semantics of the base word: the evaluative meaning generally transfers from adjectival and verbal bases to the head noun and subject referent, respectively.

None of these characteristics of Lamunxhin Even is entirely unique to this lect, as discussed throughout the paper, with the possible exception of the structured nature of the evaluative system. One feature, however, that to the best of my knowledge has not yet been attested outside of Even—where it is found in many, if not all, dialects—is the use of the evaluative suffixes to mark the referential status of nouns (Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina 2014). This marking is not obligatory, but depends on the speaker's wish to emphasize the larger or smaller than usual size of the referent or to express some affective evaluation; nevertheless, it is syntactically relevant, since use of a definite evaluative suffix for an unidentifiable referent and vice versa is incorrect. Languages differ with respect to the syntactic relevance of their evaluative morphology, with the most clear-cut cases being Bantu languages in which

²¹Counting only the tokens of suffixes with descriptive uses, i.e. excluding the purely affective suffixes *-An*, *-jA:t*, and *-čǂA:gAgAj*.

evaluatives are part of the noun class system and thus trigger agreement on verbs and adjectives. Nevertheless, outside of Africa evaluative morphemes that have some syntactic relevance are rare (Grandi 2015b:87–88).

A further interesting and quite rare feature of the Lamunkhin Even evaluatives is the fact that combinations of suffixes cannot be used to increase their denotative values, as is found in a variety of languages, especially Italian and other Romance languages and Shona, Xhosa, and other Bantu languages (Bauer 1997:548–549; Grandi 2015b:82–83). Rather, combinations are restricted to including the diminutive suffix *-kAn* as a final element—which can, however, be preceded not only by diminutives, but also by augmentatives. These combinations result in a heightened degree of imagery and expressivity of the form, conveying a sense of dynamics of the action.

Finally, comparison of the Lamunkhin Even evaluatives with those found in other Even dialects and related Tungusic languages shows a notable diversity, both of forms and of meanings that are expressed. For example, the indefinite augmentative suffix *-mAjA* found in Lamunkhin Even is practically not found elsewhere in the family with this meaning. This suffix is most probably cognate to the pejorative suffix *-mljA* found in eastern dialects (which in Bystraja Even has simply a meaning of ‘former/old’, Pakendorf and Krivoschapkina 2014:294). This is demonstrated by data from the Tompo dialect, where the suffix *-mAjA* has mostly a pejorative meaning, with very few examples of the suffix having an augmentative reading (Dejan Matic, pers. comm.). This demonstrates the high degree of turnover in this domain of morphology, with suffixes undergoing semantic shifts, becoming obsolete, and being renewed. This instability of evaluative morphology has been noted in the literature (e.g. Grandi 2011; Mutz 2015:146–148; Rose, to appear), as has its proximity to lexicalize (Bauer 1997:551) which is also apparent in Lamunkhin Even.

Acknowledgements The fieldwork during which the corpora analysed here were collected was undertaken with the assistance of the Volkswagen Foundation (DoBeS programme) and the Max Planck Society. Furthermore, I would like to express my gratitude to the LABEX ASLAN (ANR-10-LABX-0081) of Université de Lyon for its financial support within the program “Investissements d’Avenir” (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) of the French government operated by the National Research Agency (ANR).

References

- Artiagoitia, X. (2015). Basque. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 195–204). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bakema, P., & Geeraerts, D. (2004). Diminution and augmentation. In G. Booij, C. Lehmann, J. Mugdan, & S. Skopeteas (Eds.), *Morphology. An international handbook on inflection and word-formation* (Vol. 2, pp. 1045–1052). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bauer, L. (1997). Evaluative morphology: in search of universals. *Studies in Languages*, 21(3), 533–575.
- Bernal, E. (2015). Catalan. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 205–215). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bibiko, H.-J. (2005). WALS—the interactive reference tool. Available on CD-ROM accompanying Haspelmath et al. 2005, and on <http://wals.info>.
- Böhmerová, A. (2011). A systemic view with some cross-linguistic considerations. *Lexis*, 6, 59–84.
- Bowler, M. (2015). Warlpiri. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 438–447). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bulatova, N. J. (2015). Emocional’no-ocenočnye suffiksy imennyx I glagol’nyx form v evenkijskom jazyke [Emotional-evaluative suffixes of nominal and verbal forms in Evenki]. In N. N. Kazanskij (Ed.), *Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Transactions of the institute for linguistic studies* (Vol. XI, part 2, pp. 60–77). Saint Petersburg: Nauka.

- Bulatova, N., & Grenoble, L. (1999). *Evenki*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Compton, R. (2015). Inuktitut. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 559–567). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Creissels, D. (1999). Origine et évolution des diminutifs et augmentatifs dans quelques langues africaines. *Sillexicales*, 2, 29–35.
- di Garbo, F. (2014). *Gender and its interaction with number and evaluative morphology. An intra- and intergenealogical typological survey of Africa*. Ph.D. thesis, Stockholm University, Stockholm.
- Dressler, W. U., & Merlini Barbaresi, L. (1994). *Morphopragmatics: diminutives and intensifiers in Italian, German, and other languages* (vol. 76). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Faust, N. (2015). Israeli Hebrew. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 238–245). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fortin, A. (2011). *The morphology and semantics of expressive affixes*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford, Oxford.
- Grandi, N. (2011). Renewal and innovation in the emergence of Indo-European evaluative morphology. *Lexis*, 6, 5–25.
- Grandi, N. (2015a). Evaluative morphology and number/gender. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 91–107). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Grandi, N. (2015b). The place of evaluation within morphology. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 74–90). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Grandi, N., & Körtvélyessy, L. (Eds.) (2015). *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gregová, R. (2015). Slovak. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 298–305). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gruzdeva, E. (2015). Nivkh. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 278–286). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Haspelmath, M., Dryer, M., Gil, D., & Comrie, B. (2005). *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jurafsky, D. (1996). Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. *Language*, 72, 533–578.
- Kalnača, A. (2015). Latvian. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 251–261). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Körtvélyessy, L. (2015a). *Evaluative morphology from a cross-linguistic perspective*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Körtvélyessy, L. (2015b). Evaluative morphology and language universals. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 61–73). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Körtvélyessy, L., & Štekauer, P. (Eds.) (2011). *Diminutives and augmentatives in the languages of the world. Special issue of Lexis. E-Journal in English Lexicology*, 6. Lyon: Centre d'Études linguistiques (CEL), Université Jean Moulin, Lyon 3.
- LeSourd, P. S. (1995). Diminutive verb forms in Passamaquoddy. *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 61(1), 103–134.
- Malchukov, A. L. (1995). *Even*. München: LINCOM Europa.
- Merlini Barbaresi, L. (2015). Evaluative morphology and pragmatics. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 32–42). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mutz, K. (2015). Evaluative morphology in a diachronic perspective. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 142–154). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nikitina, T. (n.d.). *Diminutives derived from terms for children: Comparative evidence from Southeastern Mande*. Manuscript, Paris. www.academia.edu/download/30962992/diminutives_network.pdf. Accessed 29 December 2015.
- Novikova, K. A. (1980). *Očerki dialektov evenskogo jazyka. Glagol, služebnye slova, teksty, glossarij*. [Sketches of even dialects. Verb, auxiliary words, texts, glossary]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Pakendorf, B., & Krivoschapkina, I. V. (2014). Even nominal evaluatives and the marking of definiteness. *Linguistic Typology*, 18(2), 289–331. doi:10.1515/lingty-2014-0012.
- Pensalfini, R. (2015). Jingulu. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 416–422). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ponsonnet, M. (to appear). A preliminary typology of emotional connotations in morphological diminutives and augmentatives. *Studies in Language*.

- Ponsonnet, M., & Vuillermet, M. (Eds.) (in preparation). Morphology and emotions across the world's languages. *Special issue of Studies in Language*.
- Prieto, V. M. (2005). *Spanish evaluative morphology: pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and semantic issues*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Prieto, V. M. (2015). The semantics of evaluative morphology. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 21–31). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rišes, L. D., & Cincius, V. I. (1952). Kratkij očerk grammatiki èvenskogo (lamutskogo) jazyka. [A short grammar sketch of the even (Lamut) language.]. In *Russko-Èvenskij slovar' [Russian-English dictionary]* (pp. 693–777). Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarnej.
- Robbek, V. A. (2007). *Grammatičeskie kategorii èvenskogo glagola v funkcional'no-semantičeskom aspekte [Grammatical categories of the even verb in functional-semantic perspective]*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Rose, F. (to appear). Rise and fall of Mojeño diminutives through the centuries. *Studies in Language*.
- Schneider, K. P. (2003). *Diminutives in English*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Spasovski, L. (2012). *Morphology and pragmatics of the diminutive: evidence from Macedonian*. Ph.D. thesis, Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Stump, G. T. (1993). How peculiar is evaluative morphology? *Journal of Linguistics*, 29(01), 1–36. doi:[10.1017/S0022226700000037](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700000037).
- Štekauer, P. (2015). Word-formation processes in evaluative morphology. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 43–60). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Štekauer, P., Valera, S., & Körtvélyessy, L. (2012). *Word-formation in the World's languages: a typological survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tolskaya, M. (2015). Udihe. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 333–340). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- van der Spuy, A., & Mjiyako, L. (2015). Zulu. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 515–521). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- van Gijn, R. (2015). Yurakaré. In N. Grandi & L. Körtvélyessy (Eds.), *Edinburgh handbook of evaluative morphology* (pp. 643–650). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Watson, J. C. E. (2006). Arabic morphology: diminutive verbs and diminutive nouns in San'ani Arabic. *Morphology*, 16(2), 189–204. doi:[10.1007/s11525-006-9103-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-006-9103-5).
- Weidhaas, T., & Schmid, H.-J. (2015). Diminutive verbs in German: semantic analysis and theoretical implications. *Morphology*, 25(2), 183–227. doi:[10.1007/s11525-015-9258-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-015-9258-z).
- Whaley, L. J., & Li, F. (1998). The suffix -kan in Oroqen. *Studies in Languages*, 22(2), 447–471. doi:[10.1075/sl.22.2.06wha](https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.22.2.06wha).
- Zalivanskaja (Babičeva), M. E. (2005). Diminutivizacija prilagatel'nyx v russkom jazyke: korpusnoe issledovanie. Diplomnaja rabota, Xendaut (Diminutivization of adjectives in Russian: a corpus study. Diploma thesis, Handout). Filologičeskij fakul'tet MGU im. Lomonosova (Philological faculty of Lomonosov MSU).
- Zalivanskaja (Babičeva), M. E. (2006). Diminutivizacija prilagatel'nyx i gradal'nost' [diminutivization and gradability]. In *Materialy III konferencii po tipologii i grammatike dlja molodyx issledovatelej [Materials from the III conference on typology and grammar for young scholars]* (pp. 17–21). Saint Petersburg: ILI RAN.