This document is dedicated to God; my wife, Monica; my son, Victor Emanuel; my mother, Silvia; my father, Juvenal; my siblings: Raxil, Isaac, Daniel, Ruth, David, Javier, Judith, Martin, Nali, Antoine, and Pipo; the linguistics and Spanish departments at the University of Florida; Baptists in all the world; Hispanics in the USA; my home country, Venezuela; and my second home countries: Colombia and the USA.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank God for His help and company during all these years of fights and victories, sadness and happiness, and defeats and triumphs. I feel forever grateful to my wife, Monica; my son, Victor Emanuel; my parents; and my siblings.

I would like to express my special gratitude to my supervisory committee chair and advisor (Dr. Diana Boxer) for all her support, understanding, teachings, and help during these years of graduate school. At the same time, I thank my other supervisory committee members; Dr. D. Gary Miller, Dr. David A. Pharies, and Dr. Shifra Armon. Each one of them immensely contributed to my training, learning, and research during this time of reading, preparation, investigation, and writing. Other professors who are not members of my committee also contributed to this final product at some point: Dr. Caroline Wiltshire, Dr. Joachim Camps, Dr. Theresa Antes, Dr. Eric Potsdam, Dr. M.J. Hardman, Dr. Ratree Wayland, and Dr. Edith Khan. I also express my gratitude to Steve Flocks, my editor; and to my classmates. In general, I feel appreciation for the Program of Linguistics at the University of Florida for its office staff, Joan and Jolee; and for its entire faculty. Finally, I would like to express words of gratitude to the Baptist Hispanic Church of Gainesville, FL. since they constituted one of my main sources of data and information. I will never forget these people, this department, this university, and this church.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic Theoretical Tenets</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic Perspectives</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative Morphology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology in general</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluativeness in morphology</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Participants</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphopragmatics</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 EVALUATIVE MORPHOLOGY: FUNDAMENTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluativeness in General</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Morphology of Evaluatives</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluativeness Cross-Linguistically</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non(morphologically) Evaluative Languages: Evaluative Syntax</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphologically Evaluative Languages: Two Types</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Postulates and Evaluative Morphology</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origins of Spanish EVALs</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE and Latin antecedents</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-DIM Latin suffixes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency of Spanish EVALs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Frequency of use for DIMs</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Frequency of uses for AUGs</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency of Spanish EVALs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tree diagram of EVALs</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New proposal for DIM’s radial categories</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Radial categories for AUGs</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semantic-pragmatic functions of Spanish DIMs</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Frequency of uses for DIMs</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frequency of uses for AUGs</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spanish evaluative morphology (diminutive and augmentative suffixes, prototypically; superlatives and pejoratives, marginally) has been the focus of many studies in linguistics. However, important practical and theoretical aspects have not been formally considered accurately or in entirety. The pragmatics and the sociolinguistics of such Spanish suffixation is one such area in which more research is needed. My study brings all of these morphological processes together under one major category: evaluativeness. First I analyzed important pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects of such Spanish morphological phenomena. Second, I considered relevant semantic and morphological issues. Theoretically, my study shows the need to redefine or clarify pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and morphological concepts. Methodologically, my study was ethnographic in its data collection and analysis. The data corpus consists of around 600 Spanish evaluatives (EVALs) found in spontaneous verbal interactions. My study also
shows the many different uses, meanings, and functions of these suffixes and connects them to their basic functions, according to radial category models and pragmatic and sociolinguistic categories. The multiplicity of functions of the morphemes analyzed here (at times seemingly contradicting traditional Spanish grammar) is better understood using an integrative analytical approach. By considering the potential morphological status of such morphemes, their core semantic senses, their pragmatic functions, and their sociolinguistic effects, I show the usefulness of this integrative approach to language study. The following are the major conclusions observed:

- **Conclusion 1**: Pragmatically, diminutives are essentially attenuation, affection and derogation markers; whereas augmentatives and superlatives are intensifiers, and at times, augmentatives may serve as attenuators.

- **Conclusion 2**: Sociolinguistically, evaluatives may mark contexts (e.g., informality) and groups or segments of the society (e.g., children, women, and low classes), which may reveal much about the power structure in modern societies of the Spanish speaking world.

- **Conclusion 3**: Semantically, all the diverse meanings of these suffixes emerge cognitively or conceptually from single core senses in each case via metaphorical connections, inferences, or reanalysis.

- **Conclusion 4**: Morphologically, these suffixes are all part of one single category: heads of evaluative phrases.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This is an analysis of the pragmatic and sociolinguistic effects of Spanish evaluative suffixes (diminutives, augmentatives, and superlatives) in linguistic interactions of everyday life. The study also indicates some important morphological and semantic issues related to these pragmatic uses of these suffixes.

Spanish suffixation processes are many and have multiple functions. Explanations for these have been the focus of many formal linguistic analyses in the areas of morphology, semantics, phonology and syntax. Morphological analyses have shown how complex words are formed and for which purposes. Semantic analyses have shown the specific meaning and use of these affixes. Phonological studies have accounted for the specific phonetic form of the affixes, their phonotactic constraints, and also the allomorphy found in many of them (Miranda, 1999), among other aspects. In syntax, specific lexical categories are affected by these processes, and also by the equivalency between suffixed (synthetic) and non-suffixed (analytical) forms such as the prepositional phrase and the adjective in Vera-Lujan’s (1986) examples: "Pedro es de Valencia" and "es ValenciANO" (from Valencia vs. ValenciAN). My study also addresses other crucial issues in morphology and semantics.

Traditional accounts of Spanish diminutives, augmentatives, and superlatives leave much unexplained. Phenomena such as navaj+ero (knife+agentive -er) with the meaning of "someone who often uses a knife with criminal purposes" (Vera-Lujan, 1986: 32) cannot be fully explained without further pragmatic analyses. For instance, we cannot
explain (based only on morphosyntactic and/or phonological and semantic accounts) where the idea of criminality comes from, if we do not refer to contextual and social factors.

We also could not explain the fact that some processes occur more frequently in some social groups than in others (e.g., diminutives are used more often with women-related words than with men-related lexical items). Such phenomena require a two-fold analysis in our systematic account of language use. First, we must account for these formal aspects of language (including these suffixation processes) from a morphosyntactic, semantic, or phonological perspective. Second, such phenomena need systematic sociolinguistic and/or pragmatic explanations. This second analysis is the main purpose of my study. In this way, my study applies formal discoveries in linguistic research to our daily life contexts and situations.

My study focuses on a specific linguistic phenomenon called “evaluative morphology” or more specifically “evaluative Spanish suffixation,” observed in its sociolinguistic and pragmatic dimensions. The Spanish evaluatives suffixes (or EVALs) my study considers are diminutives (DIMs), augmentatives (AUGs), and superlatives (SUPERLs).

Suffixation is the most common resource for word formation in Spanish and the other Romance languages (Muñoz, 1994). Given this fact, the data consist of a large and rich corpus of EVALs. Moreover, while many pragmatic and sociolinguistic studies deal with phonological and syntactic issues, very few deal with Spanish morphological phenomena. My study should contribute to filling this linguistic research gap.
Research Questions

Given the lack of analyses of this type of Spanish morphology, the primary aim of my study was to qualitatively describe the use of Spanish evaluative suffixes (EVALs)—namely DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs—from a pragmatic and sociolinguistic perspective. Schneider’s (2003) exhaustive study on diminutives (especially English) indicates that one reason for the problematic and puzzling state of DIMs (from a conceptual, scientific, and academic perspective) is that these suffixes “have not, as a rule, been studied from a pragmatic perspective” (p. 1). The objective is, therefore, to answer the following three research questions:

• Question 1: How do Spanish EVALs affect speech act performance?
• Question 2: What effects do Spanish EVALs have in linguistic interactions in society?
• Question 3: How can we account for the various meanings and uses of such affixes?

Question 1 deals with pragmatics. Question 2 deals with sociolinguistics. Pragmatics and sociolinguistics are the two main areas my study focused on. Question 3 deals with semantics. Although not necessarily a semantic analysis, the semantic denotations of the affixes I studied need to be clearly discussed, to account for the different pragmatic effects of these EVALs.

Literature Review

Three areas were related to my study: pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and evaluative morphology. Theories of morphology and semantics are mentioned as they relate to this discussion. Some morphological issues are addressed in the section on evaluative morphology. Semantics is compared to pragmatics in the first section of this literature
review. The order of presentation simply follows the relevance of such issues for the goals and scope of the present research.

**Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is the study of language use in context; or more accurately, “the cognitive, social, and cultural study of language and communication” (Verschueren et al., 1995: ix). However, it is necessary to further clarify the use of this term in the present study. Since this is a relatively new field of linguistics, the conceptual framework is still relatively vague. There are two major conceptual approaches to defining the field of linguistic pragmatics: the holistic approach and the segmental approach. The segmental approach concerns the different language components studied in linguistics (phonetics/phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics). It is called segmental because it deals with one specific area of language competence. This approach considers pragmatics one more language component. In other words, pragmatics is part of a native speaker’s competence (Hymes, 1972). This issue gave rise to criticism of Chomsky (1965) who (in the view of a number of linguists) overlooked pragmatics as a language component, or part of the linguistic competence of native speakers. In the conceptual segmental approach, pragmatics deals with what semantics (and other grammar components) do not fully account for. It involves the study of speech acts, conversation norms, politeness, discourse structure, and (micro)sociolinguistic aspects.

Many linguists today agree with this view. Pragmatics is then considered part of grammar (Moskowitz, 1998). Moskowitz attempts to define language by first considering what language consists of (for example, rules of language structure or grammar). Moskowitz indicates that grammar includes “rules of phonology … of syntax …of semantics … and rules of pragmatics, which describe how to participate in a
conversation, how to sequence sentences, and how to anticipate the information needed by an interlocutor.” (p. 530). Other proponents of such an approach are Jaworsky and Coupland (1999), who take a discourse analytic view. They made an important distinction between pragmatics and semantics: pragmatics deals more with the meaning of utterances in specific contexts of use. All of these authors see pragmatics as a component of language.

The holistic approach examines language use across all instances of language. In this approach, every linguistic analysis accounts for language use. In other words, any linguistic analysis that entirely and openly ignores language in use is superfluous and disposable. Proponents of the holistic approach see pragmatics more as a perspective on language than a component of language. Some proponents of the holistic approach are Kasper and Rose (2001), and Verschueren et al. (1995). The main tenet is that every language utterance is performed in a context, with a clear goal, and an ultimate (maybe subconscious) intention. Kiefer (1998), in line with Verschueren, indicates that “pragmatics can be defined as the functional perspective on language” (p. 272).

Both approaches are important: my study takes an eclectic approach. It examines language use in specific contexts and across all instances (Ninio and Snow, 1996). A segmental approach lets us answer questions such as:

- How do people process a communicative act in a concrete speech situation?
- What do people attempt to accomplish by communicating?

A holistic approach may help us examine the implications of these questions for all components of language. This perspective view is epistemologically sound, since it reminds us of the integrated nature of language. The segmental approach is
methodologically practical, since we can segment our object of study (language) for academic and research purposes.

For the purpose of my study, then, a pragmatic function has to do with the ultimate cognitive (and sometimes subconscious) intention of the speaker when uttering a linguistic unit (phoneme, morpheme, lexical item, and so on); and more specifically the intention of the speaker when uttering a bound morpheme. Finally, whether seen as a component of language or a perspective on language, pragmatics must be part of any linguistic analysis with integrative purposes because “a language user makes a systematic analysis of the social context. This analysis is based on strategies involving schematic knowledge structures (frames) about social, interactional and communicative behavior of speakers” (van Dijk, 1981: 298).

It is important to note here that in the area of pragmatics, my study does not deal with some formal pragmatic aspects such as presuppositions and implicatures. As a pragmatic study, my study deals with ultimate intentions and effects in linguistic interactions. More specifically, it deals with the (sometimes subtle) reasons for and effects of using a diminutivized, augmentativized, or superlativized word instead of its non-EVAL version.

**Pragmatic Theoretical Tenets**

My notion of a speech act as a primary pragmatic unit comes from Austin (1962) and Searle’s (1969) Speech Act Theory. According to Sbisà (1995), one of the two main ideas in Speech Act Theory is that any kind of utterance can be considered an act. Examples of these speech acts are asking for information, requesting, asserting, and complaining. Speech acts are normally performed via an actual linguistic utterance such as a declarative sentence or an interrogative phrase, which is considered the locution of
the speech act. However, the intention or final goal of the speaker may be different from that of the apparent syntactic form of the locution. For example, a question may be asked without really asking for information but for another reason; greeting, for example (“How are you?”). This intention of the speaker is called the illocutionary force in Speech Act Theory. The effect on the addressee (the actual final result of the speech act) is the perlocutionary force.

Speech Act Theory demands a distinction between the semantic weight and the pragmatic force of these suffixes. This is another fundamental principle of Speech Act Theory. As Sbisà (1995) said, “a distinction has to be drawn between the meaning expressed by an utterance [semantics] and the way in which the utterance is used [pragmatics]” (p. 496). Jaworsky and Coupland (1999) showed the difference between understanding a sentence based on the meanings of its words and the referential meanings, and understanding the same sentence in relation to its intended meaning in a particular context.

Important differences exist between the basic semantics of Spanish EVALS and their pragmatic functions. The basic semantic denotation of DIMs (Chapter 3) is littleness (hence the grammatical name “diminutive”). The basic denotation of AUGs is bigness. The basic denotation of SUPERLs is very (more common in modern Spanish) and most (which can be considered a type of semantic shift). These would be, in technical semantic terms, the intensions of these affixes. Now, many of the uses of such suffixes go beyond these basic semantic effects. Again, in technical semantic terms, other extensions of these Spanish suffixes could be associated with their semantic connotations, and these
ultimately may be linked to pragmatic norms (for a better understanding of the terms intension, extension, denotation, and connotation, see O’Grady et al., 1997).

Although potentially connected (shown below), it is still necessary to keep the semantic denotation and the pragmatic effects of EVALs separate, as two distinct linguistic components. Even from a formal semantic perspective, it is recognized that

the fact that [some expressions] would be considered … very strange … in [a] situation … shows that over and above truth-functional [semantic] properties there are other factors which decide our interpretation of linguistic utterances. One suggestion for an analysis of these factors is to say that there is a set of communicative norms which aim at making the exchange of information between the participants in a speech situation as effective as possible. Basing oneself on these norms one could say: one should not say p v q if one can say p or p & q, both of which by virtue of their truth-conditions give more definite information than p v q. One should utilize linguistic expressions as effectively as possible, making both what one says and what one does not say relevant to how what is said is understood. This is normally one of the implicit assumptions of linguistic communication (Allwood et al., 2001: 37).

The norms (in bold letters above) the writers refer to in the previous quotation are pragmatic in nature. That these are pragmatic norms is clear because Allwood et al. directly referred to the Gricean Maxims (Grice, 1975).

My study adheres to Austin and Searle’s notion of speech act as a major unit of pragmatic analysis. Since context and communicative intentions beyond purely grammatical rules (grammatical from a traditional view) are essential parts of our everyday linguistic interaction, we cannot ignore pragmatics when studying EVALs.

Sociolinguistic Perspectives

Sociolinguistics is the study of language in society. One main objective of sociolinguistics is to study the interplay of language, society, and culture in human communication (Wolfson, 1989). Sociolinguistics, then, may observe linguistic variations with various societal functions. A sociolinguistic analysis is needed to accurately
determine social motivations of Spanish suffixation processes. According to Lippi-Green (1997), people “situate themselves in relationship to others, the way they group themselves, the powers they claim for themselves and the powers they stipulate to others … People use language to indicate social allegiances … to create and maintain role … in such a manner that the linguistic varieties used by a community form a system that corresponds to the structure of the society” (p. 31). My study aims at observing sociolinguistic issues regarding evaluative suffix use.

Despite the apparent importance of such an endeavor, there is a paucity of formal published work on the interface between Spanish morphology and sociolinguistics. The scarcity of studies addressing the sociolinguistic implications of Spanish suffixation is obvious when we examine important and extensive bibliographies on the topic both recent and early (Bosque & Mayoral, 1979 and Pharies, 1994). The gap in dates of these two bibliographies shows that this paucity in research has not improved significantly over the years. At the Spanish morphology level, thus, we have few studies in the sociolinguistic arena, unlike the numerous studies in the area of phonological variation and sociolinguistic impact (Perissinotto, 1975; Caravedo, 1990; Alba, 1990; Calero-Fernandez, 1993; Medina-Rivera, 1997). This is true in Spanish and also in English, observable in studies on the interface between phonology and sociolinguistics, such as Labov’s (1966, 1972) pioneering work and others.

An extensive literature search yielded few formal linguistic accounts showing the sociolinguistic implications of these suffixes. One isolated account requires mentioning here. Muñoz (1994) assumes that some of these forms were *cultas* (learned, educated, with culture/education) whereas others were not. Muñoz implies that some words with
certain EVAL suffixes characterized people with a low level of education. This would give us a linguistic criterion to mark these people socially as belonging or wanting to belong to the class *culta* (i.e., the high social class, the one with education, and normally the one with power). Muñoz is one of the few studies connecting Spanish EVALs and societal impact.

Other than this isolated mention, there is a significant lack of formal references to the connection between some Spanish suffixation processes and its sociolinguistic implications and effects on the interlocutors. Consequently, my study aims to account for those still-unexplained processes and to fill this gap in the literature on sociolinguistic research in the Spanish language. It is important to note that my study does not touch upon major macro-sociolinguistic aspects such as language planning, language policies, and the like. The focus here is primarily microsociolinguistic.

**Evaluative Morphology**

Before further defining the type of morphology my study focuses on, let us consider some general issues in the realm of morphology.

**Morphology in general**

Theoretical approaches in the field of morphology do not deal clearly or directly with the type of morphology discussed in my study. My study focuses on the pragmatics and sociolinguistics of the morphological phenomena. As a conceptual tool, I treat these linguistic units (Spanish EVALs) as separate morphemes, which is in line with both traditional linguistic theories and more recent theories such as Halle and Marantz’s (1993) Distributed Morphology (or DM). This morphological approach considers both stems and affixes as lexical entries or vocabulary items. Thus, my present study considers DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs as separate morphemes, with relatively independent
semantic and phonological information. As a starting point, my study addresses semantic affixes (Miller 2003, personal communication) and not other types of affixes (such as phi-feature affixes observed by Chomsky, 1993). Henceforth, my study avoids the fuzzy and unclear derivation-inflection dichotomy as a theoretical foundation because of the arguments outlined below.

**Evaluativeness in morphology**

Evaluative morphology (more prototypically, diminutive and augmentative morphology) has given rise to much research and interest. Many studies address this type of morphology (Corbin, et al., 1999), probably because of its unusual characteristics in relation to other types of morphology. Evaluative morphology has also been called affective morphology (Beard and Szymanek, 1988; Volek, 1987). Mackenzie (2001) called the DIMs, AUGs, PEJs (his list did not include SUPERLs) “affective” suffixes. Bruyne (1989) called this type of morphology appreciative. Howard (1998) called it expressive. Hualde et al. (2001) classified the Spanish diminutive and augmentative suffixes as emotive or appreciative morphemes.

Chapter 2, which covers important fundamentals of EVAL morphology, elaborates further on the definition of this type of morphology. A brief introduction is given here as an overview. In simple terms, evaluative morphology refers to the synthetic marking of features such as size and positive/negative emotional affect, which is the reason “affective” is another term used to describe this type of morphological processes (Bauer, 1997.) Of course, Bauer recognizes that this would define mostly the core or prototypical evaluative morphemes, but not the marginal ones, which also exist. Considering Sapir’s (1921) typology regarding morphological processes, evaluative morphology would be classified within the affixation processes (Sapir, 1911, cited by Anderson, 1992:326).
In line with this simple definition, many authors such as Bauer suggest that the core areas of evaluative morphology are diminutivization and augmentativization. However, other areas (such as pejoration and endearment) are also described in this type of morphology. Furthermore, languages exist (such as Spanish and Italian) in which these two types of processes (DIM/AUG vs. pejoration/ endearment) are hardly kept apart. Although Bauer includes concepts such as intensification, politeness, and modesty in the realm of evaluative morphology, we can conclude that the prototypical elements of this type of morphology are the diminutive (DIM) and the augmentative (AUG).

The specific types of affixes I studied have the following characteristics:

- They often attach to bases such as nouns (N), adjectives (A), adverb-verbs (Adv-V), pronouns (Pro), and interjections; in order of importance/hierarchy as suggested by Ettinger (1974), according to Bauer’s (1997) citations.
- They are quantitative (augmentatives, diminutives, superlatives) according to Alvar and Pottier (1987) since they express some type of degree or gradable quality; without necessarily having any affective purposes.
- They may have emotive, appreciative, and expressive connotations, according to Lang (1990). In fact, Volek (1987) describes emotive attitudes expressed by DIMs.
- They have similar functions and behavior as degree words (e.g., much, very) accounted for as functional heads as in Abney (1987), Corver (1997) and Cinque (1999). Cinque (1999), particularly, includes Mood evaluative markers in his list of functional heads (pp. 71, 76). This is precisely the motivation for EVALS to be considered functional heads.

Pragmatically, this type of morphology can be labeled as “expressive” and not always “plain” morphology. Expressive morphology has to do with playful expressions, and poetic, and/or ostentatious effects. Plain morphology, on the other hand, tends to be purely semantic, and therefore does not express these characteristics (Bauer, 1997). More accurately and importantly, however, is that the main difference is that expressive
morphology is conscious explicit knowledge, vs. the implicit knowledge of grammatical markers (Miller 2005, personal communication).

Scalise’s (1988) study on Italian, as cited by Stump (1992), presents distinctive features of this type of morphology. Among these features are the following:

- Base semantic change (which should be taken cautiously, based on the arguments discussed below).
- Possibility of consecutive application of more than one rule of the same type.
- Syntax-preserving features.

Stump describes evaluative morphology in the broader label of category-preserving rules. However, Spanish EVALs do not really involve rules (discussed later). These suffixes are probably more accurately analyzed here as syntactic heads.

Finally, EVAL morphology has been often considered to be morphology with iconic tendencies. Since DIMs refer to lilleness, and AUGs refer to bigness, many authors think that the linguistic forms may express these gradable features iconically. In line with tenets of Natural Morphology (Wurzel, 1994), some authors cited by Bauer (1996) (such as Sapir, 1956 and Fischer-Jorgensen, 1978) stress this idea of the universal tendency of EVAL morphology for iconicity. They argue that a preference exists for the [i] vowel in DIMs and for [o] in AUGs, based simply on the commonality of some phones in the EVALs that they observed. The front vowel, for example, may be interpreted as expressing smallness, whereas the back vowel expresses bigness. However, the iconic value of such phones is still unclear. Bauer (1996) shows that this is not the case in his 50-language sample. He explicitly concluded that “there does not appear to be any universal principle of sound symbolism operating in markers of the [DIM] and [AUG]” (p. 201). The slight tendency among some languages may be caused by
coincidence; frequency of some sounds over others in a language; and most probably, this tendency may be caused by an over-emphasis on some major language families, such as Indo-European. Thus, he concluded that the tendency for iconicity might very well be culture specific, not universal. Bubenik (1999) argued the same when he stated that “we have to assume that various languages would rank differently on the scale of iconicity” (p. 7).

**Spanish EVALs.** Spanish morphology requires us to discuss Penny’s (1993) view of Spanish evaluative morphology. His diachronic account of Spanish grammar calls this type of morphology “derivation”. He molds his definition to include Spanish EVALs in the category of derivational processes. Spanish derivation, in Penny’s view, involves adding suffixes to preexisting roots with two different purposes: forming new lexemes (e.g., *Limón+ada = Lemon+ade*) and marking the speaker’s attitude toward a certain entity or reality (e.g., pejoratives). He called the first process “lexical derivation”, and the second “affective derivation”. However, these suffixes should not be described as derivational.

Halle and Marantz’s (1993) Distributed Morphology may account for fundamental morpho-syntactic characteristics of Spanish EVALs. The Distributed Morphology approach conceptually categorizes Spanish EVALs as distinct morphemes. Because of the relative conceptual adherence to this morphological theory, my study does not make the traditional distinction between derivational and inflectional affixes, even though traditional Spanish accounts of these suffixes categorize them as derivational.

The derivation vs. inflection distinction is completely artificial and *ad hoc*: no consistent examples in real languages sustain such a distinction. Miller (1993) argues that
this dichotomy is not even a continuum, as Kiparsky (1982) and Bybee (1985) seem to suggest. The language-particular realization of grammatical vs. semantic affixes is categorical: one or the other. Miller (1993) clearly states that “many affixes cannot be classified as either derivational or inflectional” (p. 13). Spanish EVALs give empirical evidence for this statement.

Spanish DIMs, for example, do not change lexical category. If they attach to a noun, the resulting word is also a noun. There may not be a semantic change at all. A “car” may be exactly the same as a “car+DIM”, just with smaller proportions. What should we say about this DIM? Is it still a derivational suffix, even though it does not affect lexical category or semantics? The solution adopted in my study and many others is to simply dispose of this dichotomy in the treatment of such affixes; or, at least, to not consider this dichotomy as fundamental for general morphological conclusions.

Ambadiang (1997) observed similar issues in the morphology of DIM formation: some important features of the morphology of DIM formation are not properties of common derivational processes (e.g., the relationship among the different allomorphs). Well-known scholars in the field of morphology (Anderson, 1982; and Spencer, 1991) have also recognized this problem. Spencer literally indicated that this type of morphology “falls midway between inflection and derivation” (p. 197); one of many ad hoc stipulations by which authors force the use of such dichotomy.

Penny’s (1993) approach, like many other studies that use the derivation-inflection dichotomy, faces categorization problems. He recognizes that in derivational affective processes, there is no formation of new lexemes with different meanings from the base or new semantic-syntactic categories, for which he uses the “cat+DIM” example. He argues
(accurately) that “cat” and “cat+DIM” could have essentially the same referent. Most explanations of derivation (vs. inflection) characterize derivation as producing new words, lexemes, or a large meaning change with regard to the base (Kuryłowicz, 1964; Bybee, 1985; Bauer, 1988; Bubenik, 1999). This presents a conceptual problem with Penny’s account. Some of his examples are also problematic. Such is the case with “car+DIM”, which can actually mean the same thing, contrary to what he stated. He does recognize that there are cases that are difficult to account for, and this is precisely the reason for not adhering to such a dichotomy as a major conceptual tool in my study. Another conceptual problem is that Penny does not explain why affective processes should be labeled derivational (considering that they may not produce or derive new words).

Penny classifies Spanish evaluative morphology within the affective derivational processes, where he includes diminutivization, pejoration, and augmentivization. Superlatives are not classified in this type of processes in Penny’s account, but within adjectival comparative processes. In classifying such morphological processes as affective, we face another problem. One of the most common and important pragmatic functions of DIMs and AUGs is speech act attenuation. In some cases, an assertion is marked with a DIM to mitigate the degree of commitment of the speaker, which is hard to connect to an affective purpose. Important pragmatic functions exist that are clearly affective, such as marking proper nouns with the [dear] feature via diminutivization. However, affection is just one of the several components or features of this evaluativeness. The term evaluative covers all these different functions of such suffixes, unlike the term affective.
Since they are a type of semantic suffixes, they are distinct from other affixes with more grammatical functions; such as those “phi-feature” affixes discussed in Chomsky (1993) and others in relation to Agreement (Agr). In syntactic theory, Agr is a collection of φ-features (e.g., gender, number, person) common to the systems of subject and object Agr.

One of Lowie’s (1998) conclusions most relevant to my study (after reviewing important morphological theory and psycholinguistic models) is that “lexical representations should contain or refer to properties defining syntactic, semantic/pragmatic information. The syntactic properties can be seen as … argument structures of the lexical representation.” (Lowie, 1998: 63). Since Chapter 3 focuses on EVALs’ semantics, and Chapter 4 deals with pragmatic issues, I briefly considered the important morpho-syntactic aspects above as a preliminary base (for this pragmatic rather than morpho-syntactic study).

To finish this summary of morphological properties of Spanish EVALs, let us briefly consider some frequency and productivity issues. Regarding frequency of Spanish EVALs, approximately 75% (447 of the 573 words) of all the EVAL words in the data analyzed are DIMs; around 20% of all the EVALs (around 100 words) have AUGs; and only 5% (30 words) have SUPERLs. Thus, the data include four times as many words with DIMs as words with AUGs, and AUGs are used around four times more than SUPERLs (see table 1 and figure 1). Even though the table and figure below reflect only the data analyzed, DIMs seem to be the most common EVAL elsewhere.

Table 1. Frequency of Spanish EVALs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DIMs</th>
<th>AUGs</th>
<th>SUPERLs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of tokens</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Frequency of Spanish EVALs

Regarding productivity, we normally find in the data that SUPERLs attach to adjectives only; AUGs attach to nouns and adjectives; and DIMs attach to nouns, including abstract nouns that traditionally do not subcategorize for EVALs (“attitude+DIM” or “lack+DIM”); adjectives, adverbs (“now+DIM”, “near+DIM”), verbs (“eating+DIM”), numerals (“one+DIM”), exclamatory expressions (“cheers+DIM!”, “certainly+DIM!”), other quantifiers (“many+DIM”), one prepositional use (“in-front-of+DIM”). Even though it is not in the data, other uncommon uses of DIMs, such as one with a pronominal (suyita or “yours+DIM”) have been attested in modern Spanish.

Some may argue that a type of AUG attaches to verbs (llorón = cry+AUG) and makes up a noun or adjective. Some others may argue that the SUPERLs also attach to adverbs (much+SUPERL). This is debatable in grammatical terms, but regardless, DIMs are still much more productive than AUGs in the data and elsewhere, and AUGs are at the same time more productive than SUPERLs.

**EVALs illustrated: diminutives.** Let us now exemplify or illustrate this concept of evaluation with one of the most prototypical and studied EVALs; namely, the diminutive. DIMs have received much attention in linguistic research, especially from a semantic perspective (Hasselrot, 1957; Alexopoulos, 1994; Jurafsky, 1996; Scalise &
Grandi, 2001). In the Spanish language this has not been different (Alonso, 1937; González-Ollé, 1962; Náñez, 1973; Zuluaga, 1991; Howard, 1998). For Alonso (1937), one of the first Spanish grammarians to formally account for DIM meaning and uses, DIMs are more related to affection than to littleness. This shows the evaluative nature of DIMs, since these suffixes are part of those affixes with which “nuestro pensamiento no se detiene en las palabras … sino que las atraviesa como la luz al aire y va a dar de un modo peculiar en las cosas mismas o derechamente en el ánimo del prójimo…indudable valor sistemático-estilístico” (Alonso, 1937: 43) (our thoughts do not stop in the words … but they go through them as light through air and end up, in a peculiar way, in the things themselves or directly in the mood of the others…without a doubt, a systematic-stylistic value). He perceives DIMs as having a fictive and/or ludic character, since they express a somehow either imaginary or playful mood, which is in line with Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi’s (1994) [-serious] feature. For Alonso the basic sense, or “sentido nuclear” as he called it, of the DIMs is that of mood expression, which is consistent with Cinque (1999). In general then, DIMs are semantic/pragmatic markers of a subjective evaluation/appreciation of (often) littleness/affection towards the entities to which they refer.

Náñez (1973) explains (based on his studies of traditional Spanish grammars) that the diminutive indicates a conceptual quantitative distinction regarding the magnitude of the entity referred to by the base. In this quantitative tendency, it often refers to the general concept of smallness. However, Náñez criticizes these traditional grammars for their overemphasis on only this one function of DIMs. He recognizes other important connotations in the DIMs not recognized by traditional grammarians such as Nebrija (1492) and the anonymous grammar known as Lovaina (1955), among others. My present
study makes constant reference to these other meanings or functions. Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi (1994) present a more complete account regarding diminutives. They describe diminutive formation as “evaluative (cf. the traditional term valutativi for Italian diminutives, augmentatives, and pejoratives), that is, diminutives express an evaluation or judgment ‘as to value’ (not ‘as to fact’), according to the evaluator's intentions, perspective and standards of evaluation” (p. 153). This is precisely one of the major arguments for the evaluative label for the type of morphology analyzed in my study. In the case of diminutives, the evaluation of the entity would be that of a (subjectively) small, appreciated (or its opposite), and/or endeared one. According to Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi, the basic pragmatic connotation would be that of the [-serious] feature, which is questionable according to the data and analysis presented here, as we will see in the following chapters.

The following are uses of the DIM already documented. Jurafsky (1996) assigns the [child] feature as the basic notion of these suffixes. My data and analysis seem to favor the [littleness] feature as the basic semantics of DIMs instead. Jurafsky also presents other semantic senses that emerge from that basic notion mentioned above: small/little, female, imitation, intensity/ exactness, approximation, and individuation or partitive. We will discuss more about Jurafsky’s arguments later. In relation to pragmatic functions, the following have been cited: affection, contempt, playfulness, and child/animal context marking. Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi (1994), on the other hand, agree with Jurafsky regarding the semantic base of the DIMs (i.e., [child]). In relation to what he calls the “pragmatic base”, he suggests the [-serious] feature at its core.
Before referring to other authors, let us consider some arguments against Jurafsky and Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi’s proposal of [child] as the core sense of DIMs. It seems more plausible to consider [+little], not [child], as the core semantics of DIM and [dear], not [-serious], as its nuclear or core pragmatics. On the one hand, the label diminutive approaches more logically the idea of littleness than the idea of childhood. More importantly, however, the [little] feature, with its primarily adjectival (and consequently modifying) function seems to be more easily morphologically embedded (as a bound morpheme in a word) than the feature of [child]. The latter is more a referential item (more a nominal function, primarily), whereas the former is more of a modifier. Thus, due to this important difference between the morpho-syntactic and semantic behaviors of these two features, the [little] feature seems to represent the nucleus of this bound morpheme. We will see, however, that morpho-syntactically speaking, DIMs (and the other EVALs) present an important core: Mood/modality function, in line with Cinque (1999).

On the other hand, the pragmatic core of [-serious] proposed by Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi misses many important pragmatic functions of such affixes, for example, that of affection. Not only are there many uses of DIMs that are not [-serious] in essence, but furthermore, many uses present challenging difficulties if we try to present some type of semantic or pragmatic association with DIMs. Thus, neither directly (in essence) nor indirectly (by semantic/pragmatic association) may many DIM uses be bound by this [-serious] feature. Chapter 3 deals with this in more detail.

In the Greek language there have been important studies on DIMs, and particularly on their pragmatics. Triantafyllidis (1941), for example, calls the DIMs also “caressives”
and assigns to this suffix the pragmatic function of request mitigation. Holton et al. (1997) explains that one of the major functions of this type of affix is that of depreciation, which is in line with the pejorative uses found. Other authors have related these suffixes to speech acts (Sifianou, 1992). For Sifianou, they may serve as markers of informal positive politeness and friendliness. Alexopoulos (1994) agrees with Sifianou in this politeness marking function. Crocco-Galeas (2002) suggests the following pragmatic functions: attenuation, understatement, meiosis of the speaker’s commitment to the illocutionary force of the speech act, and the mitigation of the interlocutors’ obligations. Giakoumaki (2000) also discussed what my study refers to as the “euphemistic” DIM.

In the realm of sociolinguistics, authors such as Giakoumaki (2000) and Daltas (1987) refer to the gender-marking functions of DIMs. They observed that, in general, females use more DIMs than males (they suggest that this is caused by more involvement of women with children). Giakoumaki particularly observed that women use more euphemistic DIMs than men in Greek.

**Methodology**

**Ethnography**

My study takes primarily an Ethnography of Speaking approach (Hymes, 1962). Hymes’ SPEAKING model provides a structure for my study to perceive components of the interactions analyzed: setting, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentality, norms, and genre. As can be observed, the model is very appropriate for my study since it implies sociolinguistic and pragmatic perspectives. In many of the descriptions herein, there is reference to one or more of these speech components to expand such descriptions. My study is primarily a micro-sociolinguistic approach (focus on face-to-face interactions and reference to speech communities), supplemented when appropriate
by macro-sociolinguistic issues (for example, Chapter 5 addresses gender-related issues, which have been studied from a macro perspective). Since my study combines both function elements (the pragmatic functions of EVALs) and form elements (the forms of these suffixes), it resembles Schneider’s (2003) formal-functional paradigm in his analysis of English DIMs.

Data and Participants

The data corpus (Appendix D) that is the basis for the analysis in my study consists of 580 (7 were not analyzed because after further analyses, they did not really constitute examples of EVALs) tokens found in about 300 situations where evaluative suffixes were used in spontaneous interactions in Spanish. The motivation for categorization of data into situations or events is that ethnography (more details below), pays special attention to speech events. Examples from this corpus were selected and discussed in detail for the data analysis chapters. All the examples are given first in Spanish (as originally uttered) in quotation marks with a literal translation into English in italics underneath. If the literal translation seems unclear, another translation is given in parentheses, next to the literal one, for clarification purposes. The use of the suffixes in the examples is marked by DIM, AUG or SUPERL (in capitals) for easier reading.

Using the ethnographic approach (Hymes, 1962) for data collection, a large portion of the data were taped conversations among native speakers of Spanish. These conversations took place without any prescribed task in encounters such as church fellowship meetings, services, phone conversations, television programs, and other less structured interactions. A long subset of the data examples comes from one particular speech community, a Spanish-speaking religious group in Gainesville, FL. where the researcher is a member. By being a member of such a speech community under study, the
researcher could approach this not only as an outsider linguist and researcher but also with an emic perspective, as defined by Pike (1958). In Pike’s discussion of such a methodological approach, it is clear that the *emic* perspective helps the researcher to concentrate on the intrinsic socio-cultural distinctions that are relevant and essential according to the members of the community, group or society under study. It helps the researcher to discover which phenomena, properties, or features constitute the worldview of a given society.

From this investigative perspective, it is critical that the researcher observe the community as is. Therefore, in such a linguistic study, naturalistic data are the most suitable. Boxer (2002) believes that “most good analyses of spoken discourse employ data that captures spontaneous speech among interlocutors, since elicitation instruments necessarily interfere with the naturalness of spontaneous discourse” (p. 10).

Radio and TV talk, one of the data sources for my study, is one of the many techniques for data collection that Boxer (2002) surveys. Admittedly, she recommends being cautious of this type of data, since it may not be representative of naturally occurring conversations. However, most of the TV programs that contributed to the data here were live spontaneous entertainment programs or talk shows in interaction with a live audience. In this way, these are still samples of naturalistic data (admittedly, with perhaps a slight difference in speech event). There are also several movies and soap operas, which may be less naturalistic; but they still provide adequate samples of the use of the suffixes under study.

The data collection in my study resembles that of Milroy’s (1980). Milroy audio taped spontaneous linguistic interactions by interviewing people. There were
interruptions (e.g., telephone calls) during such interviews, but the audio taping was not interrupted at any time. People then were recorded in both types of interaction: being interviewed and also interacting with people off-record (on-interview data and off-interview data). These off-record pieces of interactions were crucial for her analysis. In this way she captured spontaneous talk and avoided what Labov (1972) called the Observer’s Paradox. Milroy’s argument was that these off-record pieces captured true spontaneity in language use because of the interviewees being unaware of being recorded. That was precisely the reasoning behind the taping that took place for the collection of the data for my study. People were first unaware of being recorded for the type of linguistic analysis I carried out; thus, their language use was truly spontaneous. Unlike Milroy’s method, the data in my study do not come from interview contexts but purely spontaneous interactions.

The main speech community analyzed is a Spanish-speaking church of about 70 people where many nationalities converge in different types of social activities. Even though a religious environment, the amount of social encounters is significant. Also, it represents an encounter point for people of different nationalities. Most of the participants were either Cubans or Puerto Ricans, with others from Honduras, Nicaragua, Mexico, Argentina, Venezuela, Colombia, Bolivia, and other Latin-American countries. As indicated above, some data also came from TV programs (soap operas, movies, talk shows, entertainment programs, and so on) in a well-known Spanish-speaking TV station based in Miami, Florida, USA: Univision. Some data also came from Internet sites or chat groups, phone conversations, and everyday talk where the researcher was one of the interactants. Direct participation of the researcher in such interactions was very useful,
especially when trying to understand the nature, purpose, and context of these linguistic interactions.

**Data Analysis**

After collecting the data, I transcribed the suffixed words, paying special attention to the contexts of those words to determine the meaning and intention of the suffixation. Then, it was necessary to categorize the suffixed words into major sociolinguistic and pragmatic categories. To perform such taxonomy, this categorization process considered the different SPEAKING speech components described above and also common sociolinguistic and pragmatic labels in the corresponding literature described below.

Subsequent to transcription and classification, triangulation of the data took place. This is a common approach in studies of this type to tap into the participants’ own perspectives on interactions under analysis (Gumperz, 1982). Two triangulation techniques were used: quasi-ethnographic interviews (as defined in Boxer, 2002) and questionnaires (see appendixes). The questionnaires were given to Spanish L1 speakers. Twenty-five L1 speakers’ questionnaires were analyzed, and the discussion is presented in the data analysis chapters (primarily Chapter 4 and Chapter 5). In the ethnographic interviews that took place after the recording, the interviewees answered questions that helped to either confirm or reject hypotheses in relation to particular instances. These answers enriched and supplemented the analysis at the time.

These interviews (around 20 in total) with native speakers of Spanish also took place. These informants’ (in both the interviews and questionnaires) ages spanned some forty years (from late teens to early sixties). Both female and male speakers participated in the data triangulation process. Also, speakers from different countries (mostly Latin American countries) participated. Some of the interviewees contributed to the data corpus
and others did not. These interviewees that did not contribute to the data corpus commented on the grammaticality, potential meaning, and effects of the expressions they were given. During these quasi-ethnographic interviews, the interviewees answered “triangulating” questions with simple non-technical terms which were useful to determine the participants’ opinion of the semantics, pragmatics, grammaticality, and sociolinguistics of the suffixes used. These questions served to delve more deeply into the interviewees’ perception of such linguistic forms, since much of this is not at the conscious level of the speakers. The following are examples of the types of questions in the interviews:

• Can you tell me the difference between *carro* (car) and *carrITO* (car+DIM)?
• Why didn’t you say *carro* instead of *carrITO* at this moment?
• What can you tell me about the person or activity you hear in this recording?
• Can you paraphrase what you just heard?
• What is this person trying to do or achieve here? What’s her/his ultimate intention?
• Can you imitate a person with the following characteristics (e.g., a rich lady at a party)?
• What do you think is going to happen after this point in the recording (the tape paused)?
• Is this acceptable or good Spanish for you?
• What degree/size do the following features/items have? (car vs. car+Dim; blue vs. blue+Dim)
• Why do you think this word can have an –ito/-ote/-ísimo but this other word cannot?

Many of the questions used in the questionnaire and the interviews had a psycholinguistic motivation based on Reeder’s (1996) speech act comprehension strategy. This technique was used to test children’s pragmatic awareness (of speech acts)
in Reeder’s study. The children undertook 12 task items in a randomized fashion. Before receiving a stimulus sentence, they were given an explanation of the context of the sentence they were about to hear (“Would you like to look at the books?”). This sentence took place in a classroom format, and a teacher had uttered this sentence to indicate to the students to start the reading section of the class. In the testing section, after this clarification, the children were asked which alternative (of two) or meaning they thought the teacher had in mind when she said “Would you like to look at the books?” The two response alternatives were: 1) “I want you to look at the books”, and 2) “Do you want to look at the books?” According to the general procedure of the experiment, #1 was the expected answer and #2 was just a distractor. It would show whether the children participating in the test were in fact aware of the actual speech act (command) given by the utterance. In my study, these questions were intended to determine what this (already internalized) pragmatic awareness of L1 speakers informed us about the different functions of Spanish evaluative suffixes.

The results of this data analysis process are presented in Chapter 4 (Pragmatic Functions) and Chapter 5 (Sociolinguistic Effects). The first one focuses on pragmatic categories such as speech acts attenuation or intensification, politeness marking, and related issues. The second addresses sociolinguistic categories such as in-group identity, social distance, and social context marking.

**Morphopragmatics**

In relation to the type of linguistic phenomena analyzed in my study and its goals, this is a morphopragmatic study, since it shows the interface between morphology and pragmatics. Morphopragmatics has been defined simply as *morphologized pragmatics* (Dressler & Merlino-Barbaresi, 1994: 55), or in other words, pragmatic functions
performed via morphological processes. This is a relatively new sub-field of linguistic research. The first studies that were formally categorized as morphopragmatic appeared in the mid eighties (for detailed explanations, definitions and history of this field, see Dressler & Merlini-Barbaresi, 1994).

Recall that my study analyzes Spanish morphological processes from a sociolinguistic and pragmatic perspective. It also looks at pragmatic effects caused by Spanish bound morphemes. My study has this dual nature: pragmatic and morphological. The reason for this is that “grammar and pragmatics are complementary domains within linguistics” (p. 4) as defined by Leech (1983). Because of this double-fold nature (pragmatic and morphological), my study falls under the category of morphopragmatic research.

Extensive review of literature in Spanish in the topic yielded only one study that openly described itself as morphopragmatic (Cantero, 2001). Cantero presents adequate theoretical accounts of this field in the Spanish language. Yet, we still need many more formal Spanish descriptive studies in this new and important field of linguistic research. My study also aims at contributing to filling this gap in the general field of morphopragmatics, and more specifically in the field of Spanish morphopragmatics. We definitely need morpho-pragmatic analyses because they show how bound morphemes may not only obey basic semantic (semantic affixes) or grammatical (phi-feature markers) requirements of the language (e.g., Spanish) but also may have pragmatic functions.

Mey (1989), who is not a morphologist but a well-known pragmatician, pleads for the investigation of this connection between morphology and pragmatics. Interestingly,
and in line with my study, Mey (as cited by Kiefer, 1998) shows some morphological processes that express power and solidarity, which is the case of Spanish EVALs as shown throughout my study. In conclusion, methodologically, this is a morphopragmatic descriptive account of Spanish naturalistic data using an ethnographic approach. In essence, my study is morphopragmatic, qualitative/descriptive, naturalistic, and ethnographic.

**Conclusion**

My study, in sum, represents an ethnographic attempt to qualitatively describe morphological phenomena with pragmatic and sociolinguistic implications. The specific type of morphological phenomena analyzed is Spanish Evaluative Morphology, which involves prototypically processes such as diminutivization and augmentativization, and marginally processes such as (absolute) superlativization and pejoration. Pejoration will be analyzed only as a subcategory of DIMs and AUGs, not independently. My study leaves suffixes that have already been accounted for as pejoratives (e.g., *ejo, ajo, ucho, uelo*) out of formal consideration. There seems to be not much more to say about these suffixes, pragmatically speaking. In fact, the term “pejorative” is essentially a pragmatic one. Thus, any account of such suffixes is in essence, a pragmatic account. My study is limited to the other EVALs: diminutives (DIMs), augmentatives (AUGs), and superlatives (SUPERLs), which appear to have had up to this point insufficient or incomplete pragmatic and sociolinguistic formalization. These processes represent relatively productive and frequent suffixation in modern informal Spanish.

The literature reviewed has shown two important impetuses that motivated this topic. On the one hand, there is not much formal research on the pragmatic and sociolinguistic implications of such suffixes. On the other hand, most studies that do
analyze these aspects of such phenomena fail to account for important issues in this respect. My study, then, is an attempt to fill this gap in the research.

It is a primary goal that, by the end of my study, the reader will have a fuller understanding of three important related issues (three research questions): 1) The ways in which Spanish evaluative suffixes (EVALs) affect speech act performance; 2) the effects Spanish evaluative suffixes can have in linguistic interactions in society; and 3) the (semantic-pragmatic) connection of the various and many meanings and uses of such affixes. These aspects constitute the main goals in this work.
CHAPTER 2
EVALUATIVE MORPHOLOGY: FUNDAMENTALS

Evaluativeness in General

The linguistic items analyzed here (e.g., DIMs, AUGs) as any other type of evaluation expressed in linguistic form, are evaluative in the sense that they convey (consciously or subconsciously) a type of value of the referents or audience, according to the speaker’s judgment. Hunston and Thompson (2000) give an overview of evaluation, its discourse functions and how to recognize it, and they observe a lack of consensus among linguists in regards to its delimitations, categorization and definition. The authors distinguish two major types of evaluation-driven marking in language: affective (good-bad) opinion, primarily in reference to entities; and epistemic or probability opinion (e.g., “it is fairly certain ...”), in connection normally to propositions. They view these two types of speaker/writer’s opinion as subcategories of evaluation. Hunston and Thompson further elaborate on subcategories and add two more types of evaluation: expectedness (i.e., how much resemblance to the norm) and importance (i.e., subjective value in relation to degree of relevance).

They suggest that parameters such as expectedness and importance can be related to the basic good-bad parameter. Hunston and Thompson argue that identifying evaluation "is a question of identifying signals of comparison, subjectivity and social value ... evaluation consists of anything which is compared to or contrasts with the norm" (p. 13). This definition encompasses linguistic structures; attitudinal, interpersonal and discourse-organizational functions; pragmatic inferences as well as conventional, coded
meanings. Since these authors recognize that (linguistic) evaluation can be achieved via lexical, syntactic or morphological marking, then it follows that we may find evaluative lexicon, evaluative syntax and evaluative morphology in human languages.

**Evaluativeness in Morphology: Evaluative Morphology:** Based on the discussion above and arguments in the previous introductory chapter, evaluative morphology refers basically to the marking of subjective appreciation of the referents via bound affixes. The specific types of subjective evaluation analyzed here are those of diminution, augmentation, and intensification. These correspond respectively to diminutive, augmentative, and superlative affixes. Chapter I already elaborated on the definition of evaluative morphology, but this section presents some important additions to that discussion to place evaluative morphology in a broader context.

The category of diminution, as a general concept, is a universal category since it may be expressed in all languages (Schneider, 2003). The difference from language to language is the particular linguistic devices used (e.g., suffixes, separate lexical items, tones). We then can logically expect its opposite, augmentation, to be found also in many languages, if not all. Superlativization is a concept that some authors do not even consider within the same category of diminutivization or augmentivization. However, as shown in subsequent chapters, in many respects, superlatives (in Spanish at least) behave similarly to diminutives and augmentatives. Furthermore, as mentioned above, SUPERLs present a subjective evaluation of the referent. In conclusion, all these evaluative processes (i.e., diminution, augmentation, superlativization) express the speaker’s attitude/appreciation towards a certain abstract or concrete entity, state or event. They refer to entities when attached to nouns, states when attached to adjectives, and events
when attached to verbs. They may even evaluate modifications of actions/states when attached to adverbs.

**The Morphology of Evaluatives**

Let us start with some simple notions. Traditionally, EVALs have been considered derivational affixes (Fernandez, 1986). In Modern Spanish, DIMs attach to many bases such as Nouns (N), Adjective (A), Adverb-Verb (Adv-V), Pronoun (Pro), and Interjection (in order of importance/hierarchy as suggested by Ettinger (1974), according to Bauer’s, 1997 citations). One restriction we observe in modern Spanish DIMs regarding productivity is the impossibility of attachment to abstract Ns, which is noticed in the unacceptability of *felicidadita* (happiness + DIM), *dependencita* (dependence+ DIM), *inteligencita* (intelligence+DIM), *entendimientito* (understanding+DIM), *pacita* (peace+DIM). We also have a certain allomorphy in some dialects of Spanish regarding the distribution of –*ito* and –*ico*. In some Caribbean varieties of Spanish, -*ico* is an allomorph of –*ito* (or –*cito*) when following root-final [t]. The phonological motivation for –*ico* may be captured in an Optimality Theory approach (Kager, 1999) by making reference to a well studied constraint called the Obligatory Contour Principle or OCP. This principle is commonly understood as a constrain prohibiting the adjacency of two identical elements on a tier (Myers, 1994). For the dialects that use this allomorph, then, the OCP constraint is high-ranked; whereas this is a low-rank constraint for the “non-*ico*” dialects. Speakers of dialects with a high-ranked OCP would have the following forms: [*kar-t-a*] (letter+FEMININE) → [*kar-t-ika*] (letter+DIM) but not *[*kar-t-ita*], for example. It is a type of dissimilation process; dissimilation of two successive [t]s at the phonological consonantal tier ([t V t] → t V c).
AUGs have very similar contexts as DIMs, but they are still less productive. For example, there are no attested examples of AUGs attaching to gerunds (*comiendote= eating+AUG), contrary to attested cases of comiendito (eating+DIM). Even more, some AUGs such as -azo and -ón are further restricted, probably due to the etymons that gave rise to these suffixes, unlike the “pure” AUG -ote. For example, the adjective grande (“big”) normally accepts the –ote AUG. Not any other AUG is normally found with this adjective (grande+ote; *grande+azo, and ?grand+ón).

Superlatives attach to adjectives, not to adverbs (in the case of attachment to Ns, usually these Ns are, at least potentially, adjectives also). It has been suggested that it attaches to adverbs. However, let us consider the following arguments against attachment of –ísimo to adverbs:

- –mente (-ly) adverbs do not accept SUPERL (*lentamentísima; lentísimamente),
- Nor do monomorphemic adverbs: (ex. *bienísimo vs buenísimo).

In a few words, this SUPERL attaches to whatever may be used as an adjective. It does not attach to pure adverbs (bien and -mente adverbs). Let us now look at this morphology more accurately and in detail.

**Morphological Theoretical Tenets:** Even though my study has no real foundation in morphological theory (it is more pragmatic in nature), there are still important morphological conceptual aspects to clarify. There have been two major theoretical approaches to morphology and its relation to the lexicon: The word-based lexicon (words are stored in the lexicon as whole units, not as separate affixes and bases) and the morpheme-based lexicon (only roots are stored and then rules are applied). My study adheres to Lowie’s (1998) and Miller’s (1993) assumption that there is actually a connection between the two. “Most linguists as well as psychologists will now agree that
instead of a choice between listing and active-rule word formation, both strategies are likely to interact in a complete model of producing and processing morphologically complex words” (Lowie 1998: 7). These approaches complement each other. Some morphologically complex words may be stored and accessed in the lexicon as a whole (especially those less frequent, less productive and more opaque), and others may be analyzed (those more frequent, productive, and transparent). For example, Lowie mentions DIMs as a very transparent affixation process (modern –illo, an exemption), which would therefore be formed through rules.

One clear account that connects morphological theory, evaluative morphology and cognitive fields is provided by Pounder (2000). Pounder set up a list of word-formation functions, which she divided into primary and secondary. Even though this distinction is not clearly explained, it seems to be related to the degree of productivity and frequency of such functions. Thus, diminutivization, which she labeled as DIM(‘X’) and defined as “‘X’ is made smaller, diminished” (p. 118), is a primary function. In the data analyzed in my study, DIM is definitely a much more productive and frequent suffix than the other two evaluatives analyzed here (AUG and SUPERL). These other two evaluatives, accordingly, were labeled as secondary in Pounder’s list. Even though Pounder does not overtly cite a “SUPERL” category, she has an “INTENS(X)” function, which resembles our SUPERL. This INTENS(‘X’) function is defined as “‘X’ is associated with a high degree of expressive-emotional intensity or as present in an extraordinary degree” (p. 121). AUG(‘X’) is simply defined as “‘X’ is increased” (p. 121) and opposite to DIM. In all these instances, “X” refers to the base for the affix or function in consideration. PEJ(X), one of the functions of the DIMs and AUGs analyzed in my study, is also part of
the secondary functions and is defined as “‘X’ is evaluated negatively” (p. 120). In fact, Pounder states that most secondary functions belong to evaluative morphology, the main focus of my study. However, this is more a psycholinguistic approach, which leaves important morphological aspects unanswered. Furthermore, it seems to be simply a taxonomic model in that it provides classificatory labels more than theoretical explanations.

**EVALs as morpho-syntactic markers:** As in all Phrase Structure morphological accounts since Baker (1988), my study relies on the notion that word formation and phrase formation involve the same operations. Borer (1998) explains that “the thrust of the argumentation in these works is to show that WF [word formation] phenomena adhere to syntactic constraints and interact with syntactic rules, and hence are best characterized as syntactic” (p. 157). Miller (1993) clearly indicates that “the order of affixes obeys the same principles that govern sentence formation; this can hardly be coincidental” (p. 16). My study proposes a single head-complement relation for EVALs.

In Distributed Morphology, DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs may be said to function as operators which occupy the head of a whole functional phrase, which shares features with what Abney (1987), Corver (1997) and Rijkhoek (1998) called “Degree Phrase”. According to Abney and Corver, degree elements (e.g., “so”, “more”, SUPERL) are heads that select APs (and other phrases) as their complements. In this syntactic model, it is said that they project a Degree Phrase (DegP) and select an AP. In their analysis, based on the X° X’ X’” structuring (common in syntactic models), the constituency is the following:
Because of the similar syntactic behavior of Spanish EVALs to functional phrases (when compared to degree operators such as “very” and “more”), based on our definition of evaluativeness above, and considering Miller’s (personal communication) suggestions and Cinque’s (1999) treatment of evaluatives, we propose the following general morpho-syntactic structure for Spanish EVALs:

![Tree diagram of EVALs](image)

Figure 2. Tree diagram of EVALs

Since DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs all have an evaluative function, it is reasonable to unify them as incorporations of an evaluative head. The head of the tree above is the suffix itself (DIM, AUG, or SUPERL), and the complement of this head could be phrases such as NPs, APs, AdvP, or VPs (in short, any phrase that can be evaluated via these suffixes). We would then have the following specific configurations:

1. EVAL-P  
   EVAL’  
   EVAL  N(P)  
   cari -ito  

2. EVAL-P  
   EVAL’  
   EVAL  A(P)  
   -ote  grand  

3. EVAL-P  
   EVAL’  
   EVAL  Adv(P)  
   -isimo much  

4. EVAL-P  
   EVAL’  
   EVAL  V(P)  
   -ito trotando  

In this hypothesized representation, there is left adjunction, in line with the syntactic model above. In Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry hypothesis adopted by Rijkhoek
(1998), movement to the right and right-adjunction are illegitimate. Thus, the X(P)
constituents move to adjoin to Eval⁰ or Eval, deriving words such as *carrito (car+DIM)
in configuration 1, *grandote (big+AUG) in 2, *muchísimo (much+SUPERL) in 3, and
*trotandito (jogging+DIM) in 4.

One potential problem with the previous proposal involves its account of the
reduplicative or iterative property of Spanish EVALs. On the one hand, iterative cases
(e.g., *poquitititito = little+DIM+DIM+DIM) can be treated as successive adjuncts,
assuming it is necessary in the logical form (LF) component of the grammatical system,
where derivations get interpretation. On the other hand, if they are not processed at LF,
then they may be simply phonological copies (PF copies) or part of language play. My
study argues that these iterative cases do convey some type of interpretative force;
namely that of intensification. Even though my study suggests that it be further looked
into, especially by studies of a more morphosyntactic nature than this one, it hypothesizes
that these reduplication-like (or more accurately, iteration) cases constitute a type of
successive adjunction to EVAL-heads. Regardless of how they are treated, it is important
to note that this type of right-edge iteration seems to be a unique property of these
functional phrases (FP). FPs do not normally have this property. In fact, it seems to
violate the haplological constraint or OCP as formalized before (Raffelsiefen, 1996).
Usually, this type of iteration is permitted only on the left-edge, and strictly forbidden on
the right edge. In fact, Miller (in personal interviews) mentions the following examples to
show how this constraint works: boyish vs *fishish. Even though these are not examples
of morphological reduplication, these show that repeating similar syllabic groups on the
right edge is not permitted; which seems to be the only reason for the ill-formedness of
“fishish”. To account for the type of iteration found in evaluative items, we would need to propose that iteration may be an inherent property of EVAL-Ps (also seen in English phrases such as “very very very good”). This is one thing that makes these Spanish suffixes special; they seem to violate a strong constraint.

**Evaluativeness Cross-Linguistically**

**Non(morphologically) Evaluative Languages: Evaluative Syntax**

“Evaluative syntax” is symmetrical to “evaluative morphology”. The latter involves the marking of EVAL features at the morphological level. Thus, we can extend the definition to the area of syntax. We can think of “EVAL syntax”, then, as the marking of EVAL features at the syntactic level; or in other words, not synthetically but analytically. Essentially, the difference between analytical and synthetic is that the latter involves affixal instantiations of the former. One fundamental similarity is that both markers occupy head positions on EVAL-P trees. We discuss specific examples below.

In relation to languages without EVAL morphology, it should be first noted that “it is difficult to be sure from grammars that a given language does NOT have a particular phenomenon”, as Bauer (1997) clearly states, in relation to universal tendencies in evaluative morphology precisely. However, based on traditional typologies and some discoveries in the review of the relevant literature, this chapter presents some potential examples. We could logically assume that languages traditionally classified as analytical will have no EVAL morphology. Such category involves English, marginally, and more clearly Chinese. The latter has been reported as marking all categories at the syntactic level, with isolated (and often monosyllabic) words (Crystal, 1997). Even purely grammatical functions such as tense would be marked lexically (with different lexical
items). Thus, it is easy to predict that the same is true for marking [+EVAL] features when applicable.

English, on the other hand, has synthetic (work+ED) and analytical (WILL work) features; which makes it mixed. However, there is a consensus among linguists that English tends to be more analytical than synthetic. Actually, in historical perspective, English has been changing from synthetic to analytic structures. In relation to EVAL marking, we also see the two tendencies: Synthetic (John-Y, dogg-IE) and analytical (LITTLE/DEAR John, LITTLE/DEAR dog) (Schneider, 2003). However, there are more cases of analytical EVAL marking than synthetic EVALs. For example, there is no real morphological equivalent of Spanish –ísimo (one marginal EVAL suffix), which means something like “very”. English more often uses the separate lexical item “very” for this intensive function, even though in modern English a few synthetic instantiations of this function can be observed in cases like “the bestest” vs. “the very best”. Also, English DIMs such as “-let” (piglet), “-ling” (duckling), and “y-ie” (Johnny, doggie) are not very productive (Schneider, 2003).

The bases for these few English diminutives are very restricted (often infantile terms), unlike the analytical equivalents (little/small), which combine with many lexical categories. That is why we have “lousy little…” in English instead of pejorative DIM affixes such as the Spanish and Fula ones. This may be also observed in the fact that analytical expressions such as “itsy bitsy, teeny weeny” (analytic diminutivization, even if we consider final –y as a remote DIM) are common DIMs for certain English-speaking groups (Schneider, 2003). Some other languages without EVAL morphology are
Samoan, and Quiche Mayan, of which Crystal (1997) says: “many of the features of Anglo-American motherese …-such as diminutives- were found to be absent.” (p.237)

Thus, it is obvious that some languages have evaluative morphology while others express related semantic nuances lexically; henceforth analytically. On the analytic side, we have languages such as Chinese, English, Samoan, and Quiche Mayan. On the synthetic/morphological side we have many Indo-European languages (e.g., German, Latin, Dutch, Greek, Scottish), including more distinctively Romance languages (e.g., Spanish, Italian), and other non-IE languages such as Fula, Swahili, and Japanese.¹

The marking of evaluativeness at one level or the other may have to do with historical processes or with (typological) representational preferences. These two types of motivations are in line with Jurafsky (1996), who believes that by “considering the dependence of synchronic meaning on both historical and human cognitive context it is possible to tease apart the seemingly paradoxical and unmotivated components of a particular semantic category: [for example] the diminutive.” (p. 562). Anderson (1992) states that it is not uncommon across languages for the “internal structure of words [to] derive from earlier syntactic constructions” (p. 348). He cites Givón’s (1971) famous aphorism “today’s morphology is yesterday’s syntax” (p. 348). Anderson (1990) also supports this idea, since he thinks that “words have the form they do … especially … because of the history of the language with respect to both grammar and to sound.” (p. 278). However, it is important to keep in mind that this may not be the end of the whole story. Recall that it is also possible for morphological anomalies to be altered in language change to conform to the syntax of the language. Even though there may still be
unexplained phenomena across languages from a historical perspective, it definitely is an explanation for the difference between evaluative morphology and evaluative syntax.

Diachronically, it is possible that those languages that do not have evaluative morphology but syntactic or analytic EVALs, have simply not gone through linguistic changes of the analytical-to-synthetic type. Those that do have EVALs at the morphological level did go through (or are going through) the changes already. However, even within the morphological EVAL languages, it is totally possible that those affixes emerged not from lexical items but from previous bound morphemes. This is very probably the case with Spanish EVALs. In this sense, reanalysis may have taken place and previous non-EVAL affixes were re-interpreted or understood as EVALs. Below, we discuss a language with evaluative morphology (or EVAL morphology language), Fula. Anderson (1992) explains how noun class suffixes in Modern Fula can be traced back to earlier pronominal elements. In the section below on Fula, we see that EVALs are also class suffixes; thus, this could be a reason to hypothesize that EVAL class suffixes also may have had a non-affixal or non-grammatical status. This can be a good example of a historical motivation for EVAL morphology.

In conclusion, the reason for marking some categories at different levels across languages may have an explanation in the history of the language, in basic human cognition and cultural or pragmatic forces (last two elaborated later since they may be connected).

**Morphologically Evaluative Languages: Two Types**

Let us start this section with a reference to Fula EVAL morphology, which should help us observe the relationship of evaluative morphology to the Agr evaluatives such as the Fula pejorative DIM. According to McIntosh (1984), Fula (West Atlantic branch of
the Niger-Congo language family) has a rich nominal declension system with 25 N
classes, 19 singular and 6 plural. That is why Anderson (1976) calls it a “class language”
and explains that the complete declension often contains 7 forms: citation form (class 1)
and its Pl. (cl. 2), DIM (3) and its Pl. (6), DIM Pej. (5), AUG. (7), and its Pl. (8). Stem
initial consonants (Cs) vary (often within 3 possibilities or grades such as stops, [-stop],
and prenasal stops) or agree/inflect with noun classes, which is known in Fula grammar
as “C gradation” or “alternation”. Each noun class has a corresponding form or grade for
the initial C of the stem. For example, when “man” (dim-/rim-/ndim-) attaches to PL. -be,
the initial C grade is continuant ([r]), producing the form rimbe (men); when attached to
DIM –el, the grade is stop ([d]), producing the form dimel (little man); and when attached
to the DIM Pl. –on, the grade is prenasal stop ([nd]), deriving ndimon (little men).

All this morpho-phonological explanation in the previous paragraph should make it
clear that nominal stems are constituents of the same XP as nominal-class markers (i.e.,
noun roots must be accompanied by a nominal-class suffix). In our morphological model,
we could say that these nominal-class suffixes are functional heads whose complement is
an NP (whose head is the noun root). The class suffix limits the reference of the stem. We
need to keep in mind here that Fula EVAL suffixes such as DIMs and AUGs are just part
of these class-suffixes with clear and heavy class-marking features and functions. The
Fula language has 6 evaluative suffixes: ngel (DIM. Sing.), koyŋ (DIM. Pl.), kal (DIM.
Qu.), nga (AUG. Sg.), ko (AUG. Pl.), and the pejorative DIM ngum (McIntosh, 1984).

Mukoshy (1991) makes a distinction in the 25 N classes referred above: Basic
classes and subsidiary/secondary classes. Among the latter, Mukoshy included the
evaluative suffixes we are dealing with in this paper. In another paper, Mukoshy (1991)
clarified this distinction. The primary class refers to Ns that are fixed within a particular class and will not change to another (for example, “horse” will always belong to the nonhuman class). On the other hand, secondary classes (like DIMs) may take any N.

All these suffixes mark features or functions very essential to Fula speakers; as important as gender reference in Spanish, or number reference in English. In Spanish, we always find reference to the gender (often Masculine-Feminine) of entities in discussion. In English, we cannot speak without referring to the number (Sing-Pl) of the entity we talk about (more on this below in reference to Hardman’s, 1978 linguistic postulates). In the same fashion, Fula people cannot speak without reference to aspects such as class, quantity, and animateness. According to Mukoshy (1991), in Fula, “a thing is either ordinary/normal, large, small, or tiny.” (p. 25). That is why he states that, unlike other cultures, Fula people do not see things in terms of masculinity or femininity (like Spanish-speaking people), but rather in terms of distinctions such as countable/uncountable, animate/inanimate, and human-nonhuman.

On the other hand, these nominal suffixes, including the evaluative ones, mark class membership. This is precisely the reason for classifying the Fula evaluative suffixes as grammar-compliant (vs. pure semantic affixes such as Spanish EVALs), since they are basically class/number and concord/agreement morphemes, unlike the same type of morphemes in other languages. They are basically grammatical markers (i.e., they code redundant information or information already present in the derivation). Anderson (1992) pointed out that this type of affixes include some sort of [+Agr] features within the phrase (feature absent in Spanish EVALs). These features can be imposed on class-markers (such as Fula’s evaluative suffixes in our case) due to the position they have in the larger
phrase and in relation to other phrase constituents. Anderson argues that in this Fula class paradigm, DIM/AUGs act, morpho-syntactically, exactly as the PL(ural) suffixes. Thus, both PL and DIM, for example, should get the same label.

The other type of morphological marking of evaluativeness corresponds to most cases of morphological EVALs: semantic suffixes. These, again, are optional in nature and not required by grammar-compliant rules. Spanish EVALs fall within this category as do the rest of the Romance languages EVALs and those of many other languages. This, at first sight, may seem to correspond to the inflectional-derivational distinction. However, as argued before, this dichotomy is not principled and finds many counter-examples. We simply refer to these two types of morphological marking as grammar vs. semantic suffixes (i.e., as a terminological tool).

However, in our morpho-syntactic model, this distinction does not seem relevant, since both markings may be accounted for by similar principles. We just need to keep in mind that the difference between the two relies on LF processing. The “grammatical” type (e.g., Fula) involves redundant features adjoined at spellout or assignment of phonetic form-PF (not at LF) whereas the “semantic” type (e.g., Spanish) involves non-redundant features required for LF interpretation. This distinction is only important when further analyzing the specific grammars of languages with EVALs.

In conclusion, languages mark the category of evaluativeness (or use EVALs) in one of two ways, synthetically (affixal instantiation) or analytically (non affixal instantiation), which may be in direct connection with the marking of language-specific postulates. This takes us to the assumption that evaluativeness may be in fact a linguistic postulate.
Linguistic Postulates and Evaluative Morphology

Hardman (1978) defines linguistic postulates as “those recurrent categorizations in the language… most directly and most tightly tied to the perceptions of the speakers” (p. 122). These are so imposed that the interactants view them as natural parts of their universe or reality. The importance of this in linguistic research is simply that the more powerful a postulate is, the more involved it is in a language’s grammatical system. Very succinctly, Hardman explains that these postulates are language specific, and that they may be realized at different levels; morphologically or syntactically, for example, which was shown in the previous section. Hardman mentions some examples of these postulates in two different language families. On the one hand, we have postulates such as sex and number in Indo-European languages. On the other hand, we have data source (something similar to what O’Grady et al (1997) called “assertion” in Hidatsa) and humanity as linguistic postulates in Jaqi languages.

We can assume, then, that these postulates originate as human conceptual categories which may develop special significance in a particular culture and consequently get coded in the language of that culture. We can also assume that this may be the case for EVAL marking and for the evaluativeness postulate. If we extrapolate, then, it would not be strange at all that so many languages exhibit this EVAL feature, even though it seemingly ought to be culture specific. The important point is that cognitive/conceptual categories (e.g., littleness) may have culturally very different realizations. It would be similar to other linguistic postulates, such as number. Hardman mentioned number in Indo-European (IE) languages, in which this category is a postulate. Other non-IE languages may also mark number (e.g., Hebrew, Fula). Miller (1993) points
out that all languages have numerals, supporting the idea that number is conceptual (i.e., enumerating entities is a cognitive process).

Postulates can pervade languages/cultures and even language families, as the arguments above suggest. If this is true with number and sex, there are no reasons to believe that it may not happen with other postulates such as the type of evaluation discussed in my study. Because of the observations mentioned so far and my findings in the literature, no doubt DIMs (or EVALs) are “among the grammatical primitives which seem to occur universally or near-universally.” (Jurafsky 1996: 534).

On the other hand, we may need to resort to historical and anthropological linguistics to give another possible answer to the question of the pervasiveness of evaluativeness. As Hardman suggests, postulates such as sex and number are inherent in IE languages. What this implies is that these features are almost unavoidable when speaking an IE language. However, for non-IE speakers, those features are not of general importance; they are features with which they do not need to be concerned. One possible hypothesis for the existence of different linguistic features in a language is that these may come from language ancestors or Proto-languages. In the case of IE languages, historical linguists propose a Proto Indo-European or PIE stage (Jeffers and Lehiste, 1979). Thus, we might hypothesize that one reason sex and number marking occurs in so many IE languages is that these were also PIE’s linguistic postulates (Miller, in personal communication, clarifies that sex only became a postulate after the Anatolian branch split off); they just spread to many of its daughters. Even though it might need more historical reconstructions (which Jurafsky claims to have done for DIMs, as explained in the next chapter), this is a very plausible explanation for understanding the existence of similar
postulates across languages. We have here another possible reason why the evaluation postulate is found in many languages. Due to the importance of historical developments in language, the next section presents a relatively brief overview of EVALs’ history.

**Origins of Spanish EVALs**

It is important to look at EVALs from a diachronic perspective, even if the main focus of analysis is pragmatic-sociolinguistic. A well-known sociologist of language, Joshua Fishman (1972b), argued that sociolinguistics might well benefit from historical perspectives. Fishman believes that “time [or historical] perspective deepens our understanding of and appreciation for any particular sociolinguistic topic.” (p. 146). Jurafsky (1996): “In recent years, however, many scholars have begun to treat the synchronic state of the semantics of a language as profoundly bound up with its diachronic nature” (p. 533). Let us consider each one of Spanish EVALs, in order of frequency. Even though the following is not a historical linguistic treaty, it should help the reader to know somewhat more about the suffixes under scrutiny here.

**Diminutives**

The 24 Spanish suffixes below have been associated more or less with DIM functions in the literature review (mainly based on lists by Gonzalez Olle, 1962; Gooch, 1967; Fernandez Ramirez, 1986; Penny, 1993; and Pharies, 2002) across dialects and across time. In Appendix C, the reader can observed a table with these suffixes and some information about their origins and meanings. Let us list them all here as a starting point, even though some of them will be hardly discussed since they have either lost DIM functions or are hardly productive: -acho, -ajo, -ancho, -allo, -asco, -culo, -eco, -ejo, -elo, -ico, -illo, -in, -ingo, -ino, -iño, -ito, -oco, -orro, -ulo, -acho, -uco, -uelo, -ujo, and –uncho.
When looking into the history of Spanish, we need to look first into the (mainly Vulgar) Latin language, its main ancestor (the IE language that appeared in Italy probably around centuries VI or VII, given that Wallace (1989) lists Latin inscriptions form 620-600 BC). Admittedly, there are influences on Spanish from other languages such as Basque, Greek, Arabic, Proto-Germanic, and others, as Entwistle (1948) clearly shows. We can also look for more remote origins if we look at the ancestors of Latin, namely the Proto-Indo European (IE) language, whose daughters include Italic/Latin (Crystal, 1997).

**PIE and Latin antecedents**

There were Indo-European suffixes with función minorativa (Gonzalez-Olle 1962: 177). Of these, according to Gonzalez-Olle, -lo- evolved the most in Latin (> -olo- > -ulo-). But *–ko- is also a reported IE suffix (even though some argue that it had DIM functions, it was mostly an emphatic affix), which probably gave rise to the Latin DIM –culus when combined with –lo-. Thus, we may summarize saying that there were two main DIMs in Latin, –ulus, DIM for nouns of 1st and 2nd declension, and culus, DIM for the rest of the declensions, reflections of the IE equivalents -lo- and –ko-, respectively. The other Latin DIM –ellus (or its allomorphs –illus/-ollus/-ullus according to root final vowels) is believed to come from a morphonological variation of –ulus. In relation to the use of this suffix, Gonzalez-Olle explains (which has been known already) that in root-final liquids and nasals, assimilation takes place (of –root- Cs to the suffix [l]), after the loss of its initial V, producing the variant –ellus, according to root final vowels (p. 178). This would give us cases like *librelo > *librlo > *liberlo >libellus (Steriade, 1988).

However, whatever the specific origins of the LAT DIMs were, we may assert, as Pharies (2002) did, that there were really only two LAT DIMs: -(c)ulus and -(c)ellus (p. 366) (four if –culus is separated from –ulus and –cellus from –ellus), at least in the form they
were really used in LAT. Let us see the development of these and other related suffixes that gave rise to Spanish DIMs. References to specific phonological changes from Latin to Spanish are based on historical accounts by Resnick (1981) and Penny (1993).

-ellipsis (Acc. –ellum > -ellos; the first is a short vowel, and ll is a geminate or long [l]). It has produced Spanish forms with an initial [e], its diphthong [ié], or the reduced diphthong [i], whence the Spanish DIM –illo and its variants. In relation to the new final vowel, there was a process of vocalic changes often implying a certain degree of vowel (V) lowering or opening (u → o), according to description of common Latin-to-Spanish phonological changes. Until the XIV century, the most frequent form was –iello, and for approximately the next two centuries, –illo was the most common variant.

-(i)(c)ŭlŭs (sometimes it had a short or long –i): Common Latin (LAT) stress pattern rules causes the first –u of the suffix to be in unstressed position. When short vowels (e.g., –ū) were in this position, they were normally lost from LAT to Spanish (SPN). It (plus rules mentioned above) would produce –iclo. Another common phonological rule (i.e., –cl- → -j-) gives us a new form –ijo with no clear relation to vowel length. Vocalic changes such as -i → e gave rise to –ejo, and in rare cases, when the –i- was long, it might have produced –ijo. However, this last relationship described is not totally clear. Pharies (2002) proposes more a semantic tie, rather than a phonological one. The allomorph –ulus gave rise also to –ulo, which seems more a learned suffix, unlike those discussed above.

-ŏlus. (Late LAT) For this suffix, similar processes of vowel opening (u → o) and vowel diphthongization (stressed short o → ue) take place. This gives us modern Spanish DIMs such as –uelo or –uela. The former comes from the accusative masculine singular
form (-*olum), which also implies a final-m deletion process, and the latter comes from its
dominant counterpart (-*ola).

**Other non-DIM Latin suffixes**

- **-inus**: It would clearly produce our modern –in(a/o) suffixes, according to the rules
  mentioned above. However, we should keep in mind that this is not a LAT DIM suffix.

- **-ittus**: (hypocoristic anthroponomy, which will be discussed under “Meaning
  Changes”). This LAT suffix produces the widespread and productive modern –ito, even
  though it should have produced –eto, which has also been observed as another DIM. This
  may be related to the DIM series in –*et (ete- eta- eto). Admittedly, this was not really a
  LAT DIM since “Le latin ne possédait pas de suffixe diminutive en –tt-” (Hasselrot 1957: 9)
  (Latin did not have DIMs in –tt-). There is more on its original use and meaning
  below.

- **-*iccus**: (o.u.o.) (Vulgar LAT but not LAT, Pharies, p. 306) This gave rise to –ico.

These are the most common historical accounts of the etymological origins of the
Spanish DIMs discussed in this paper. Let us now discuss some modern and historical
morpho-semantic restrictions on these suffixes.

**DIM’s formal grammar**

Regarding Latin, there were clear grammar restrictions for the suffixes discussed
thus far. Some LAT suffixes are –ulus and –culus, which gave rise to several Spanish
suffixes such as –culo/-ejo. They attached to nouns and adjectives to form their DIMs.
The suffixes –ulus and -culus were in an allomorphic relation, probably morphologically
motivated. The morphological motivation was in relation to noun classes. –ulus was used
with nouns of the 1st and 2nd declension. Some examples mentioned by Pharies are:

*porta–ae > portula* (1st declension) and *servus –i > servulus* (2nd declension). On the
other hand, -culus was used for the rest of the declensions. For example, *flos* –*oris* > *flosculus* (3rd declension), *manus* –*us* > *manuscula* (4th declension), and *dies* –*diei* > *diecula* (5th declension). In Latin, according to Varro, a well-known Latin grammarian, suffixes such as –*ulum* (DIM in modern grammar) were used to mark one of the differences among nouns (Kent, 1938). Varro, according to Kent’s (1938) translation, asserted that Latin nouns “are varied in form to show differences in those things of which they are the names or to denote those things outside, of which they are not the names” (p. 381). Diminutives are used to mark differences with reference to the whole thing, not a part of it. Plurality and smallness were the two main categories mentioned by Varro in reference to this aspect of nouns. The examples of smallness are: *homunculus*, which meant “manikin” (from *homo*, which meant “human being” plus the diminutive); and *capitulum*, which meant “little head” (from *caput*, which meant “head” plus the diminutive). Varro also comments on the possibility for recursiveness of DIMs in cases where double and even triple DIMs can be found (Ex. *Cista* “box” → *cistula* “little box” → *cistella* “a smaller box” → *cistellula* “very little box”). Such cases were used on a sliding scale of greater diminution (i.e., 3 l’s is smaller than 2 l’s and 2 smaller than 1).

The other Latin DIM –*ellus* (etymon of Spanish DIM –*illo*), used to be an allomorph (phonologically motivated) of –*ulus* for roots ending in a liquid or nasal consonant. This happened especially when the first –u was lost (caused by the common unstressed vowels deletion mentioned above) and then the final consonant of the root (especially nasals and liquids) assimilated to the –l- of –*ulus*. Pharies mentions the example of *liberulus* → *liberus* → *libellus* (diminutivization of “book”). However, –*ellus* started replacing –*ulus* regardless of phonetic environment (probably around the first two
centuries AD). The non allomorphic and productive –ellus used to have different connotations depending on the lexical category of the base; with adjective bases it had an attenuative function, and with nominal bases it was a diminutivizer and/or differentiator.

Pharies cites Gonzalez-Olle and Casado Velarde (1992) in relation to the distribution of the three main Old Spanish DIMs: -uelo (pedazuelo “little piece”), -ejo (portalejo “small portal”), and -i(e)llo (cosilla “little thing”). The first was used mostly with root-final non-liquid sonorants; -ejo was used for root-final liquids, and –iello, elsewhere. However, for the XV century, -i(e)llo started being used in phonetic contexts of its allomorphs (which gave rise to the significant productivity of -illo during those times.) Pharies cites Gonzalez-Olle’s about two variants of –iello in Old Spanish: -iello and –ciello. The variant with –c- (derived itself from –culus, and this from the IE suffixes *ko+lo) is used for two-syllable bases ending in –e, iambic bases ending in –n/-r, and monosyllables ending in consonants, which is similar to the distribution of –ito/-cito and –illo/-cillo in Modern Spanish (with few alterations and much dialectal variation; Mackenzie, 2001).

**DIM’s original senses**

Varro (1938), Hanssen (1952), Ettinger (1974) and Fruyt (1989) all show that Latin made extensive use of DIMs, and these suffixes were normally associated with the idea of littleness. The pure meaning of DIMs was, according to Malkiel (1989) “genuine miniaturizing… [it] underlies the relationship of casa ‘house’ to casita ‘small house’, or señora ‘(married) lady’ to señorita ‘(unmarried) young lady’” (p. 95). Menendez-Pidal (1977), in reference to the Hispanic Romance times (probably around the 9th century), explained that the people then used to use DIMs (such as artículus) in a concrete sense of littleness of the base (p. 10). In the very first grammar written for any Romance
language, around Renaissance and Middle Spanish times, Nebrija (1492) considered the DIM as one of the nine forms or differences for derived nouns, together with patronymics, possessives, augmentatives, comparatives, denominatives, verbals, participials, and adverbiales. He defined derived DIMs as diminution of the original base: *ombre* (man) → *ombrezillo* (man+DIM) = *pequeño ombre* (little man); thus the basic sense for early grammarians (Varro and Nebrija) is “little/small” (p. 93-94). Pattison (1975) separated diminutive and augmentative suffixes from the rest of early Spanish suffixes as “affective” or “appreciative”. The rest he called “categorials” (p. 5), which have basically a function of structural and logic order.

**Changes in meaning and productivity**

In general, there is a tendency of the type DIM > PEJ, not only in Spanish, but it seems to be a universal tendency, at all times and in all languages, as suggested by Pharies (in personal communication). Pharies further clarifies that not only DIM>PEJ but also AUG>PEJ is possible. Anything that is supposed to be big but is actually small causes the DIM>PEJ process. On the other hand, anything that is supposed to be small but is actually big causes the AUG>PEJ process. This section emphasizes the former process (DIM>PEJ). In the case of Spanish, much of the basic Latin sense of littleness in the diminutive is lost in many of the Spanish suffixes; and in many of those cases, it is the pejorative idea that prevails. Pharies (2002) thinks that this is the normal trajectory or course of Latin DIMs that end up becoming Spanish pejorative suffixes (p. 423), even though this is one of the attested functions in Latin, as shown in the following example mentioned by Miller (2003) in personal interviews: *Graeculus* = “lousy little Greek!” This is the most essential change in the semantics and pragmatics of the diminutives. This can be observed in the following DIMs that now have
both diminutive and pejorative functions in Spanish: -ancho, -ejo, -ete, -ucho, and – uncho. All these had a smallness sense in their Latin origins (e.g., -culus), but now this littleness sense seems to be competing with pejorative connotations. Other suffixes exist whose diminutive sense has been completely lost: -elo, and –ulo (from Latin –ellus and –ulus, respectively).

There are yet other less frequent phenomena in relation to the semantic development of these Spanish DIMs: One is reanalysis, and the other is semantic association. Some reanalysis is observed in –usculum, which becomes a suffix via a wrong morphological analysis, which reanalyzes corpus-culum as corp-usculum (Pharies 2002: 507). Semantic extension or association is a plausible explanation for the origin of the very productive DIM –ito, according to Pharies (2002), Gonzalez-Olle (1962), and others. Originally, it is believed that –ittus was used with anthroponyms (especially as nicknames for people). It is logical, semantically speaking, to see the connection between these types of names and the diminutives since both share hypocoristic connotations. It is not uncommon to see these types of names given to children, and this could have been the explanation of its association with the sense of smallness, which probably was extended later to inanimate entities. Also, Alonso (1937) considers more important for the DIM the idea of hypocoristic and expressiveness than smallness. This, again, could have been an even stronger reason to extend –ittus to its DIM behavior.

In relation to productivity, it is noticeable that many suffixes treated in this paper are not productive. They are either productive only dialectally (like –oco in Chile), or with very limited productivity (such as –ujo or –ucho), or with no productivity at all (–uco, –ulo, –ueco, among others). There seem to be around four that are productive in
modern Spanish, namely -ejo, -ico, -illo, and –ito. Of these, -ejo is not really a diminutive; it serves more pejorative and attenuating functions, as Pharies’ example with azulejo (bluish) shows. Thus, my study focuses on the productivity of the other three.

-ico. -ico was productive between the XV and the XVII centuries. Today it is mostly in allomorph variation with –ito in Caribbean Spanish (which has already been discussed under “Formal Grammar”). Very few –ico diminutives are found in Spanish literature of the 2nd half of the XVII century. In one example Pharies cites, there were only five –ico DIMs found in Don Ramon de la Cruz’s comedies. In the same literary works, 206 times –illo was found, and 1008 times for –ito. Thus, obviously in this time, -ito was the most productive DIM, followed by –illo, and finally –ico.

-illo. This suffix becomes generalized between the XIV and XV centuries. Before, it was –iello, which was the Spanish DIM par excellence. The suffix -illo is related to –ĕllus, which is not frequent in Latin until the Post-Classical period (centuries I, II AD). At that moment, -ĕllus started replacing –ulus, which was the most productive Latin DIM until that time. Around the XV century, -illo competed hand-in-hand with –ito. However, after this period, -ito wins the productivity race. Alvar and Pottier (1987) present –ito even attaching to verbs (dormitar= “sleep+DIM”).

-ito. The suffix -ito becomes more common during the XV century, and its frequency and productivity continues to grow until today, when it represents the Spanish DIM par excellence. Until the XV century, –illo was apparently the most productive Spanish DIM. However, Gonzalez Olle suggests a very interesting explanation regarding this apparently long period of time between –ittus and the appearance of –ito during the 12th and 13th centuries and then the long time before the great productivity of such affix
in the 15th century. Gonzalez Olle suggests that it may be the case that –ito was used
during these apparent times of absence but in uneducated or very informal environments,
which made it inappropriate for formal writings of the time. This is the reason this suffix
is not found in the documents that researchers normally have access to.

The productivity of -ito in the 15th century may be caused by two factors. One is the
linguistic pressure to use new expressive resources in the literature of the time, which
was in need of such a revival. The other factor, more at a societal dimension, was that
popular issues gained some prestige during this time caused by the social mobility (to
higher social status and positions) of members of the low social classes. Thus, the
language of such low social classes (among whose features were the uses of –ito),
similarly to other cultural manifestations, started acquiring more importance and respect,
to the point of including it in the literary works of the time. As can be seen, this is
obviously a sociolinguistic phenomenon, reflected here by the use of DIMs. This loss of
productivity of –illo is clear in the lexicalization of words ending in –illo, as Pharies
suggests. In Spanish, we now assume that words such as comilla (comma+ DIM =
quotation marks) bolsillo (bag+DIM = pocket) and others are monomorphemic, because
–ito attaches to them with a clear diminutive function. Admittedly, -illo still keeps some
productivity but at the dialectal level, as other DIMs.

**Augmentatives**

-azo

This is often an adjectivizer and nominalizer that attaches to nouns. Pharies (2002)
recognizes two semantic senses in modern Spanish: a) Augmentative (it makes the base
N bigger than what is normal or convenient, or it intensifies the adjective base); and b)
Names the objects that can be used for hitting or the hit that can be given with such
objects. The suffix -azo comes from Latin -āceus, where it had the original function of deriving adjectives of belonging from nouns. On the one hand, Pharies explains that the augmentative sense appears first in the spoken Latin of the Western region, and the “hitting” sense in the Spanish of the XV century, which represents a secondary evolution of the augmentative sense. On the other hand, he recognizes that it is very difficult to connect or to show the evolution from the original sense in Latin to the modern senses (of augmentative nature, mostly). He agrees with Malkiel (1959) in the sense that this evolution may represent a post-classical-Latin innovation. Malkiel, as cited by Pharies (2002), believes that this evolution may be caused by a series of nouns which had this suffix and referred to bulks or piles of something or big things. Another possibility for this connection or semantic binding, using Jurafsky’s (1996) terms, is that markers of belonging or pertaining (such as Latin –āceus, English -ist, or Spanish –al or –ista) normally imply not only a sense of belonging to the base but also having the qualities expressed by the base in a characteristic way. We need to remember here that this is probably the same type of evolution observed in Spanish –al. The sense of belonging is such that the entity is characterized primarily by such a quality (A Latin Americanist, for example, is a professional that focuses only or primarily in Latin American issues); in this way, we can say that this quality is augmented.

My study does not elaborate further on the modern sense of –azo of nomen actionis (the naming of an action –in this case of “hitting”) since it is not AUG. Some argue that these two senses are so different that it may be necessary to see this as another homophony in the language, which synchronically may be the case, but diachronically is
debatable. This second sense is not essentially or transparently an augmentative; therefore, a discussion on the evolution of such sense is irrelevant in my study.

-al

According to Pharies (2002), this suffix comes from Latin –ālis. Both in Latin and in most uses in Modern Spanish, this suffix is an adjectivizer attached to nouns. In Spanish, this has three main connotations:

- Expression of belonging or a similar relationship.
- Place naming, especially where items like plants are abundant.
- Collectivity.

In the second sense, it normally has the form of a nominalized adjective. Pharies cites examples in both senses. Sense ‘a’ can be found in words such as: anual (annual) (belonging to año or “year”), invernal (winter+the suffix al) meaning “relative to winter”.

For the second sense, Pharies cites naranjal (orange+the suffix al) meaning a place with many orange trees, and maizal (corn+the suffix al) meaning a piece of land where they grow corn.

Even though Pharies does not mention the augmentative function of –al, in some dialects of Modern American Spanish, this suffix is used with such functions, meaning “much” or “a big amount of”. This is in line with the second sense of the affix but also with the third sense. We can clearly see how these senses mentioned above gave origin to the idea of “much” or “big”. Both give the idea of a significant number of something. Now we can see examples such as pantanal (mud+al) and dineral (money+al). The latter example was cited by Pharies as a collectiveness marker. In this sense, there may be a clear contrast with the DIM; dinerito (a little money) vs. dineral (a lot of money). From
here, we can see how in some dialects of modern Spanish, this suffix may be used as an AUG.

-ón

Pharies (2002) observes two distinct origins and functions of this suffix: The augmentative and the *nomina actionis* (naming of an action). The AUG -ón comes from Latin –ō, -ōnis, which in Latin attaches to nouns and verbs to designate people that are particularly characterized by some action, feature or habit, undesired generally. In Spanish, we still see this type of use in words such as llorón, chillón (cry+ón = person that cries too much) and frentón (forehead+ón = person with a big forehead). Thus, this type of function is still an AUG function. The *nomina actionis* –ón comes from its Latin counterpart –(i)ō, -ōnis. Even though different, these two origins and functions end up influencing each other, as explained by Pharies. Finally, Pharies and Gonzalez Olle (1962) recognize the diminutive function of this AUG, shown in the present analysis. Pharies (2002) also recognizes the pejorative function of this AUG. Pharies suggests that certain actions are considered negative if they are intensified. For example, it is bad to sleep too much, whereas it is not necessarily bad to read or study too much. If the suffix is added to verbs like to sleep, then that creates a pejorative connotation, which is not the case with verbs such as to breathe or to study. This is in line with the findings in my study.

Regarding the second sense of –ón (*nomina actionis*), Pharies explains that different authors believe that this second sense in many cases (e.g., rascazón “scratch+ón”, hartazón “swallow/eat + ón”) is also interpreted as an augmentative, and that in some cases it is almost impossible to separate these two uses (bajón “pull down+ón”, visitón “to visit+ ón”). In light of this discussion, many such uses of –ón in
the data under scrutiny here have been labeled as augmentatives, even though we have to recognize the different origins and uses.

**-ote:**

According to Gooch (1967), -ote became very productive in the 19th and 20th centuries. Pharies (2002) argues for the hypothesis of the Catalan origin of such suffix instead of the French origin, as other authors have suggested. It seems that all the authors agree that there is no Latin etymon for Spanisn –ote. The ultimate origin may be –őttus, a non-Latin hypocoristic and probably analogically related to –ittu (etymon of Spanish –ito), originally. Many authors agree in the direct genetic relationship of this –őttus, Vulgar Latin suffix of foreign origin, and the Catalan –ot. Pharies rejects the French hypothesis because the bases of the few –ote words that were borrowed from French into Spanish were not transparent to the Spanish speakers of the time, unlike the Catalan loans. The Catalan bases for the suffix –ot were indeed understood by Spanish speakers (e.g., animalot), and the suffix in Catalan has the same evaluative function as the Spanish –ote today. Apart from this, there is a parallel borrowing from Catalan to Spanish of the DIM –ete. All these arguments, according to Pharies, are enough to sustain the Catalan hypothesis. The final vowel (e) in –ote is paragogic to satisfy phonotactic constraints in Spanish. It is not uncommon in Spanish since there are common schwa insertion processes (e.g., speak → espeak) that satisfy Spanish phonotactics in foreign words; probably a simple case of phonological adaptation.

Because of this origin and the modern uses of –ote, Pharies labels this suffix as an augmentative-pejorative, which was essentially the use in the Catalan etymon; except in North East Catalan, where it was a diminutive-pejorative suffix. There seems to be primarily a pejorative and an augmentative use, and secondly a diminutive function.
Pharies indicates that this uncertainty between DIM and AUG, always with the pejorative, is also observed in Spanish, even though 95% of the cases it is the AUG the one that is realized (p. 456). Some have argued that pejorative connotations may be inherent in augmentative functions. Pharies cites Latorre (1956) who thinks that the AUG has the particular property of communicating a mocking, joke, and cartoon-like tone. Latorre thinks that what is great is never expressed via AUGs, but only what is extraordinarily out of shape or proportions (modern –azo, an exception).

This should be taken with caution. What is undesired, funny or joke in one culture may be the opposite in another. Admittedly, as Pharies (in personal communication) suggests, anything that is smaller or bigger than the norm can inspire negative or pejorative connotations because it is too small or too big. Thus, if bigness is fine or positively viewed, then the AUG would not create pejorative connotations (and if smallness is positive, then DIMs would not produce pejoration). For some, what is extraordinarily big may be what is desired and smallness may be undesired or funny; in which case, DIMs would very likely become pejoratives. AUG –azo in modern Spanish, for example, may mean “great” (car+azo).

Superlative

Regarding this suffix, Nebrija asserted that the Castilian (Spanish) language of his time did not really have superlatives (as explained by Alvar and Pottier, 1987: 378). Then, we may ask, technically, does modern Spanish have SUPERLs? If superlative is considered the grammatical function of “most” as observed in comparative adjectives such as positive (good), comparative (better), and superlative (best), then as in Nebrija’s times, –ísimo is not really a superlative (at least not one with the meaning of “the most”) in Modern Spanish. Unlike Latin, whose SUPERL meant “most” and “very”, Modern
Spanish SUPERL means mostly “very”. There are still a few cases with relative superlative functions but mostly for honorific reasons and mostly in learned words (Excelentísimo Señor Presidente or “Excellent+SUPERL Mr. President”, for example). However, this suffix does exist in modern Spanish, which is apparently a difference between contemporary Spanish and Nebrija’s Spanish, in which this suffix was not part of Spanish morphology. SUPERSL does exist in contemporary Spanish but with a somewhat different connotation from its ancestor or etymon in Latin. If SUPERL simply means “very”, as my study and many others suggest, then this function is performed in Spanish both analytically/periphrastically and synthetically. Synthetically is performed via prefixes such as re-, requete, and others, as Alvar and Pottier (1987) suggest and via the SUPERL suffix –ísimo, which these authors do not account for.

Jörnvig (1962) indicated that this synthetic elative, in its origin, represented a learned suffix of late introduction to Spanish (from Latin). This Latinism in Spanish was caused by the Latin Renaissance, very influential during the John II of Castile reign (1406-1454). Because of this, many Latinisms invaded the Spanish language; and this SUPERL was one of them. Jörnvig cites the XV century as the first time in which this suffix appeared in Spanish. However, the spread of this suffix did not occur significantly until the second half of the XVI century, when it was also commonly observed in informal settings; thus, not more a learned suffix necessarily. He criticized the theory that the origin of this suffix in Spanish was due to the Italian language. He concluded that the appearance in Spanish emerges from its Latin etymon, as mentioned before, but its fast spread later on was definitely influenced by Italian but also by the influence of Catholic preachers in Spain, who used this suffix extensively. Recall that one of the most powerful
tools of conquest and colonization of the Roman Empire was the Catholic Church.
Catholic preaching and teaching was a constant in Roman Empire times, thus, listening to
Catholic preachers was a very common activity in the cities where this Empire ruled.
Therefore, Catholic preachers’ language may have easily influenced the language of their
audience. These preachers were not only Romans (the ruling class) but also those who
spoke in the name of God, so they may have enjoyed an important reputation for a long
time. It is not strange, then, that this elite class of “good, ruling, holy and powerful’
preachers had linguistically influenced the masses.

Conclusion

Evaluativeness, as a primitive linguistic category, involves both semantic features
(such as "littleness"/"bigness", "approximation", "insignificance", “intensification” and
the like) and pragmatic features (such as "attenuation", "admiration", "endearment",
“modesty”, and others related.) This is a very common feature cross-linguistically, which
is manifested in child-related language and language acquisition observations. Thus,
categories such as littleness, childness, and endearment may have been elevated to a
postulate. Languages often mark this linguistic category via diminutives, augmentatives,
pejoratives, and other related morphemes. Evaluatives may have different morpho-
syntactic behaviors from language to language, even though they tend to preserve similar
semantic and pragmatic connotations crosslinguistically. Marking this feature analytically
(as in English, for example), or synthetically (as in Spanish or Fula) depends on either the
history of the language or the degree of significance of such a feature in a particular
culture and cognitive aspects. Evaluative morphology, the main focus of this paper, is
precisely the marking of this feature at the synthetic level in some languages. However,
evaluativeness may imply cross-linguistic semantic and pragmatic connotations at
different grammar levels. This category crosses boundaries of grammar levels and cultures.

Notes

CHAPTER 3
SEMANTIC ISSUES

A complete analysis of Spanish EVALs’ functions and uses must start with fundamental semantic considerations. This chapter answers two interrelated questions: 1) What are the propositional meanings of Spanish EVALs?, and 2) How can we account for the diversity of meanings and uses? This discussion takes us to the core semantics of Spanish EVALs and to an explanation of their polysemy, which is an important characteristic of this type of Spanish morphology (unlike other Spanish morphological processes). This chapter first addresses some general and fundamental semantic issues regarding the model adopted here and then focuses on each of the three Spanish EVALs, in the following order, according to their degree of polysemy: DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs.

Semantic vs. Pragmatic Polysemy

We can look at the case of polysemy observed in Spanish EVALs, especially DIMs and AUGs, from the perspective of cognitive semantics, since it has to do with the way speakers of Spanish organize this type of concept or category: evaluativeness. Here polysemy is defined, according to Taylor (2003) and from a cognitive semantic perspective, as the association of two or more related meanings with a single phonological form. The term polysemy normally refers to semantic senses, but it can obviously extend to pragmatic forces. In the case of Spanish EVALs, we observe a type of polysemy more at the pragmatic level, which can be labeled as “polypragmy”. When we say that Spanish DIMs are “polypragmous”, then, we mean that DIMs have many
(connected but different) pragmatic functions, which may be distinct from pure semantic polysemy. Ambadiang (1997) suggests that the very complex morphology of DIM formation (e.g., various allomorphs, various options for the same base) may be due precisely to the fact that diminutivized words may receive multiple interpretations. Reynoso (2002) referred to this polysemy as “uno de los aspectos más caraterizadores del uso del diminutivo” (one of the most distinctive features of the use of DIMs) (2002: 937). For example, she referred to at least seven different connotations of this suffix (all of which were observed in the data analyzed as shown in the pragmatic analysis presented in the next chapter): affection ([dear]), pejoration, littleness, intensification (“very”), euphemism, emphasis (a type of intensification in the present analysis), and subjective expressive diminution of base identity.

This type of polysemy of EVALs (especially DIMs and AUGs) is complementary in Nerlich and Clarke’s (2003) terms, since all the various senses analyzed here are connected. This constitutes a fundamental principle for this chapter. This principle goes back to Wittgenstein’s (1974) “family resemblances” used in prototype theory.

Wittgenstein indicated that

What a concept-word indicates is certainly a kinship between objects, but that kinship need not be the sharing of a common property or a constituent. It may connect the objects like the links of a chain, so that one is linked to another by intermediary links. Two neighboring members may have common features and be similar to each other, while distant ones belong to the same family without any longer having anything in common. The relations between the members of a concept may be set up by the sharing of features which show up in the family of the concept, crossing and overlapping in very complicated ways. (1974: 35)

This may explain why Jaeggli (1980) refers to diminutivization (and EVALs in general) as one of the most productive morphological processes of Spanish.
Two distinct types of functions or connotations of Spanish EVALs clearly exist: semantic and pragmatic ones. These should be kept separate even though they are related. Reynoso (2002), in one of the most recent semantic-pragmatic accounts of DIMs in the Spanish language, makes a difference between semantics (referential) and pragmatics (non-referential) also, but she includes both under the general cover term of semantics. Pure semantic aspects in her analysis are under the semantic-referential category; the pragmatic aspects are under the semantic-pragmatic category.

This is precisely where Reynoso’s study and my study converge but diverge at the same time. Like Reynoso’s, my study shows both types of effects. However, theoretically, the non-referential aspects are not semantic here precisely because of their non-referential nature. This difference may be more a conceptual that a practical one, however. My study discusses the neutral sense ([little]) mostly in this chapter, where the semantic connections of DIMs are shown to grow out of this basic littleness notion. In the pragmatic chapter, this neutral or non-referential use is briefly discussed, with examples from the data. The majority of the next chapter focuses, however, on non-referential or pragmatic functions, which synchronically and functionally have little or nothing to do with the core sense of littleness. That is one of the main reasons these two areas are conceptually and organizationally kept separate in my study.

One more important difference of my study to Reynoso's analysis is that my study places the DIM within a broader study of Spanish evaluatives. In this way, we can observe some important aspects that are true not only to DIMs but also to Spanish EVALs in general. DIMs are just part of a broader phenomenon: Spanish evaluativeness.
Admittedly, it is at times very difficult to separate semantic from pragmatic functions. However, there are many instances where it is very clear that a non-referential (pragmatic) use is at play. We will see later that context is a crucial aspect in this respect. For example, DIMs are normally associated with the meaning of littleness but also with endearment (Jaeggli, 1980; Hualde et al., 2001). The latter is a more pragmatic function whereas the former a more semantic one. Based on different contexts, there are many other pragmatic functions of such affixes: irony, euphemism, intensification, and augmentativization, among others. Now, the main question is: What is the connection, if any, between the pure basic semantic denotation and these other pragmatic functions of the DIM; and the other EVALs? The next section discusses these issues.

**Cognitive Semantic Model: Radial Categories**

One possible explanation for the multiplicity of pragmatic functions is extension or association (some may also argue that we see semantic shift as well, at least in the case of the endearment notion). This present analysis shows, based on the theoretical framework used here (Jurafsky, 1996), that all the pragmatic functions observed grow out of or emerge from the basic “littleness” notion. This chapter is, in essence, a cognitive semantic one with the purpose of answering the first research question of my study: How can we link the diverse meanings and uses of Spanish EVALs? Even though we need to refer to many pragmatic features, they all are connected to a basic semantic-referential meaning.

Jurafsky’s model builds on Lakoff’s (1987) radial categories, the first to formally and overtly apply Rosch’s (1983) psychological model of prototypes to linguistics, and cognitive linguistics in particular. We also discussed above how this model emerges from the field of philosophy in the works of Wittgenstein (1974). As mentioned, one of
Wittgenstein’s major findings is that some categories do not express a single concept or meaning. Categories may be instead characterized by family resemblances (or related features). These resemblances are widely shared among the different nodes or members of this semantic mapping or network (or “category members”) in an overlapping fashion, such that no one feature is common to all.

This framework suggests that these members have an internal structure. There are members that are typical, there are others that are exemplary, and yet there may be others that are anomalous. In many cases, Spanish EVALs for example, we see what Rosch (1983) and Lakoff (1987) call a “radial structure”, since there are core meanings. In Rosch’s prototypical model, a prototype (an element in a category used to represent the category as a whole) is used as a cognitive construction to perform some kind of reasoning. It basically functions as a cognitive reference point. The central subcategory (e.g., littleness for DIMs, as suggested below) of this network provided the basis for extending the category in new ways and for defining variations. Lakoff suggests that at the cognitive root or core of the formation of categories, we find image schemata and their metaphorical tokens. That is the reason one of the most useful cognitive tools in this type of semantic mapping are general extension mechanisms such as the metaphor or metonymic chaining.

In summary, the cognitive semantic approach applied in my study builds upon Wittgenstein's notion of family resemblance categories based on a complicated network of similarities or associations that may overlap and criss-cross. This criss-crossing allows in category members with hardly any element in common, but it is crucial that each overlap with certain other members of the category. Such is the case of seemingly
opposing connotations as endearment vs. pejoration and “littleness” vs. “very” (in the case of DIMs), attenuation vs. intensification (in the case of AUGs), and formality vs. informality (in the case of SUPERLs). Wittgenstein (1974) proposed then a certain level of tolerance for fuzzy boundaries or *blurred edges*. Rosch (1983) and Lakoff (1987), on the other hand, observed a certain automatic and unconscious tendency in humans to perceive categorically and to base those categories on prototypical examples. Radial categories are composed of chained elements that *radiate* out from the central (prototypical) examples, and this chaining is frequently a matter of metonymic links as well as shared features.

Cruse (1986) observes similar principles, more from a lexical semantic perspective. In Cruse’s model, related meanings of a word blend fluidly into one another, and different aspects of a word’s meaning may be emphasized or de-emphasized depending on the context in which it occurs. This framework has even been applied to computer models for Natural Language Processing (NLP) in cases of polysemy. Dolan et al. (2000) for example, show how their computer model’s (MindNEt) “processing of the discrete senses in machine-readable dictionaries yields a representation of lexical semantics with the continuous properties of Cruse’s model” (2000: 182). This all emerged from many instances of polysemy and the practical task of word sense disambiguation in natural language processing. Thus, the principles my study adheres to have been useful in philosophy, cognitive sciences, computer sciences, and linguistics. The following is an example of its linguistic application, our main concern.

**Jurafsky’s Model: DIM’s Radial Category:** Let us now consider more specifically the issues concerning evaluative morphology and the Radial Category Model
described above. The only EVAL that has received more formal consideration in this approach is the DIM. Jurafsky’s (1996) Radial Category Model argues that despite the crucial dependence of synchronic meaning on both historical and cognitive context, researchers have traditionally used different tools for capturing synchronic and diachronic generalizations in modeling a complex semantic category like the diminutive. In the case of the diminutive, this is partly caused by the extraordinary, often contradictory range of senses synchronically (small size, affection, approximation, intensification, female gender), and the difficulty of proposing a coherent historical reconstruction for these senses.

Jurafsky (1996) synchronically tries to explain the varied and contradictory senses of the diminutive. Diachronically, the radial category acts as a kind of *archaeology of meaning*, capturing the generalizations of the classic mechanisms of semantic change (metaphor, abstraction and inference). He claims to have compared DIMs and their origins in more than 60 languages, particularly in Indo-European where the theory suggests a new reconstruction of the proto-semantics of the PIE suffix *-ko-*. Jurafsky shares with Lakoff the fundamental intuition that the body is a central site in grounding interpretations of the world, including those that involve power and dominance issues. Thus, much of his reasoning in the linking chains for DIMs lies on this body-world connection.

In summary, Jurafsky’s (1996) Radial Category Model accounts for both the synchronically and diachronically diverse semantics of the diminutive. This is a type of structured polysemy, which clearly binds the various DIM senses. From a synchronic approach (the main focus of my study), the model accounts for the various and apparently
contradictory senses of the diminutive, for example in cases when a DIM has AUG
functions (see the “Intensifying DIM” below). Historically, Jurafsky also presents a
binding of these diverse senses with a common original source. He concludes that “the
origins of the diminutive cross-linguistically lie in words semantically or pragmatically
linked to children” (1996: 533). The following is a summary of the diagram Jurafsky
proposed. In his diagram, numbers indicate the sequential order or semantic associations.
For example, he assigns 1 to the [child] sense, and 2 to [affection]. This simply means
that first is the sense of childness (the core), and then it expands to have the notion of
affection (2) and then the idea of smallness (3). From the sense of smallness, several
other connotations emerge, again in order of sequence: contempt, female, resemblance,
and approximation. These other nodes also may originate other ideas or connotations. For
example, the resemblance node gives rise to the idea of imitation, and the approximation
node gives rise to the function of hedging. Other functions of DIMs also appear in
Jurafsky’s diagram, but the ones summarized here are the ones found in the data.

The various uses or functions in the data are explained based on this model.
Following Jurafsky, all the functions of DIMs may be bound to some more general and
common sources. The innovations of my study, in the application of this model, are the
following:

- Application to a synchronic naturalistic data study in monolingual Spanish
  contexts.
- Accounting for other uses of the DIM not accounted for by Jurafsky; namely, the
euphemistic, ironic, and commiserating functions.
- Extension to other Spanish EVALs (not only to DIMs, as Jurafsky did).
- Emphasis on the pragmatic aspect of such semantic binding or association.
One important consideration that distinguishes my study from Jurafsky (1996) has to do with the universality of such a model. Even though the categories analyzed here (e.g., DIMs) may be universal, it is very hard to use this type of model (Radial Categories) to explain the connections of diverse uses of DIMs made in all cultures (where DIMs constitute a linguistic category) and languages. Instead of universalizing such proposal, my study uses this model to describe potential links between the core sense of littleness and the other uses or meanings of DIMs (and other EVALs) within a particular context: Spanish-speaking groups observed in the data. Thus, in my study, it is not necessarily a theoretical explanatory model but a potential descriptive tool of some specific linguistic behavior in a particular speech community.

**Diminutives**

**Core Sense of DIMs**

The goal in this section is to explore and propose a plausible definition of the basic semantics of DIMs. In other words, following the Radial Category Model, it is an attempt to answer the following question: Which sense is the one that connects, somehow, all the other senses of this suffix (at least in the data analyzed here)? Voeykova (1998) indicates that there are basically two formal hypotheses about the basic semantics of DIMs that may have served as a base for the many other variations in meaning at present: “smallness” (Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi, 1994; Ravid, 1998) or “childness” (Wierzbicka, 1984; Jurafsky, 1996). Because of the arguments below, my study rejects the “childness” hypothesis and favors the more traditional perspective; “smallness”, but with some modification. My study proposes that the notion or concept of “littleness”, and not necessarily “smallness”, is what constitutes the core sense of DIMs in general, and Spanish DIMs in particular (assuming “littleness” is a broader term than “smallness”;
“small” seems to refer only to size, but “little” also refers to amount, for example).

Below, let us see first the inconsistencies in which Jurafsky fails when trying to assign the “childness” sense to the nucleus of this semantic category of DIM.

Jurafsky suggests that an acceptable semantic analysis of DIMs cannot rely on just a single abstract concept based on “small”. The reason for this, he argues, is that we would need many metaphorical, inferential, or abstractive extensions in order for “small” to be able to model senses such as individuating, imitation or exactness functions.

According to Jurafsky, the notion of “small” does not connect whatsoever with words such as Spanish boquete (“hole”) derived from boca (“mouth”), since a boquete indeed can be larger than a boca. He furthermore cites Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi (1994) to indicate that the diminutive cannot simply be listed in the lexicon/grammar with the “smallness” abstract meaning only, and that other senses are derived by contextually-based inferences when the diminutive is used. Dressler, Merlini-Barbaresi and Jurafsky point out that if it were the case (“small” as the core), then we would expect these same inferences for words for “small” in each language (i.e., Italian piccolo should behave like the diminutive -ino); this does not occur. They concluded that there must be some additional, complex, lexicalized meanings specific to this type of suffix.

However, there are some inconsistencies in the previous arguments. First, metaphorical and inferential extensions are an essential part of the cognitive model Jurafsky is applying. How can they then be left out? Why not link the sense “little” to other senses via metaphors or inferences? Furthermore, any link of the “child” sense with other connotations will also need metaphoric and inferential abstractions. If we do not apply this type of semantic extension, we will not be able to assign any concept to a core
sense of any category, and the model of Radial Category turns useless. Second, the only concrete example he showed to argue against “littleness” as the basic sense is the *boquete* example. However, this word can indeed be interpreted with the approximation or imitation function Jurafsky mentioned before. A *boquete* is “sort of a mouth”, but not really a mouth. A *boquete* is missing many features to make it a real mouth, and that is why it is just “a little bit like a mouth”. It, in fact, can be easily connected with the “littleness” concept. Finally, it would be even more difficult and much more abstract to connect this DIM with the concept of “childness”. Third, if we were to adhere to Dressler and Merlini-Barbaresi’s (1994) argument above, then again we could not assign to DIMs any core sense, since the equivalent lexical items for this type of morphological marker can always behave differently. For example, the word for “child” (Jurafsky’s suggestion) does not behave the same as the morpheme –*ito* in Spanish.

The following is the only section in Jurafsky’s paper where some argumentation is given for the choice of childness: “My tentative conclusion is that the origin of the morphological diminutive is the sense Child. We show that in almost every case in which a historical origin can be determined for a diminutive morpheme, the source was either semantically related to Child (e.g., a word meaning “child” or “son”), or pragmatically related to Child (e.g., a hypocoristic suffix on names)” (p. 562). However, without looking at the specific examples, these words or morphemes that probably meant “child”, “son” or hypocoristics (probably in ancestors and proto-languages), could also be interpreted as “little”. For example: *Victorcito* can mean “little Victor”, “Victor’s son”, “child Victor” or “Victor Jr.”. What tools were used to determine that the meaning was “child” and not “little” is not clear in Jurafsky’s study. He also mentioned hypocoristics
and toponyms as sources of DIMs in many languages, especially Indo-European languages. However, that does not show the original sense of “child”. On the contrary, how can we explain that names for places (e.g., cities, towns, regions) gave origin to the notion of “childness”? It is more plausible to associate place names with the notion of “littleness” because one of the inherent properties in places is size; which may be related to “littleness” more than to “childness”.

At times, there is much ambiguity regarding his proposal for a core sense. For example: “our examination of the IE data suggests a completely different reconstruction, in which ‘child’ and not ‘related-to’ is the proto-semantics of *-ko-, and the various approximation and related-to senses are extensions of this core small/child? sense” (bold and question mark added; Jurafsky, 1996: 565). One possible reason for this ambiguity is precisely the apparent contradiction that his own data showed. For example, he shows the different PIE’s daughter languages he analyzed to reconstruct the semantics of *-ko- (p. 566). In the section that he categorizes as the “SMALL/CHILD” senses, of the eleven examples he gave, nine have clearly the “small” or “little” sense and only two have apparently the “child/son” sense. Even more, in the only case where this type of DIM does not have a modified base or noun, it simply meant “small” (not “child”). It is important to note here, however, that in Spanish (and other Romance languages), it is not the PIE suffix *–ko- but –lo- the one that constitutes the etymon for many Spanish DIMs today (Pharies, 2002). This ambivalence of Jurafsky’s examples probably constitutes the main reason for him to recognize, at times, not one but two central senses for DIMs: “…the central senses Child and Small. Every diminutive in our database has either the Child or Small sense” (p. 561).
One more inconsistency shown in Jurafsky (1996) was in relation to the analytical or periphrastic DIMs (adjectives such as “little” or “small”). Jurafsky observed that *petit* in French is grammaticalizing as a diminutive, and the former diminutive suffix *-ette* is disappearing. In Spanish and Italian (with very productive morphological DIMs), these analytical adjectives (*pequeño* and *piccolo* respectively) are not common. The French adjective for “little/small” is more common than the DIM suffix, whereas in Spanish it is the opposite. Jurafsky concluded, literally, that “for at least these periphrastic diminutives, then, the original sense of the diminutive seems to be Small, and not Child. Further study is needed to examine the origins and development of these periphrastics.” (p. 569). It is quite inconsistent and inelegant to conclude that for DIM affixes the original sense is “child”, but for DIM adjectives, the original sense is “little/small”.

Another study by Voeykova (1998) on Russian DIMs has also criticized Jurafsky. Voeykova observed that the “smallness” sense is very important for the child when acquiring DIMs in Russian. Even though both Voeykova (1998) and my study recognize the value of the arguments favoring the “child” meaning, it is necessary to point out that “this meaning is less relevant for the acquisition of language by a child in comparison to “smallness”, since it demands a very high degree of abstraction in all cases … about inanimate objects” (Voeykova, 1998: 112).

Just by considering the inconsistencies above, we can see the need for another proposal. As mentioned above, “littleness” seems to fit plausibly in many more examples than “childness”. Jurafsky himself argued that “the diminutive function (for the purposes of this paper defined as any morphological device which means at least “small”)) is among the grammatical primitives which seems to occur universally or near-universally”
“Littleness” fits more within the category of “grammatical primitives” than “childness”; all objects may be defined within a “littleness” range, and not necessarily within a “childness” range. If one of these two features is the core of the DIM, then, it should be the most primitive category: “littleness”. Even Lakoff, in an important point of departure for Jurafsky, describes basic-level status solely in terms of objects and recognizes that the relatively subjective notion of “littleness” is at the center of this conceptual category of “diminutiveness”, in part because it has many of the characteristics and the attractiveness of basic-level terms (fundamental in body-world connections). It is easy to use, it is the most contextually neutral term, and it is the first to enter most readers’ lexicons.

The “childness” sense, for example, finds hardly any relation to the DIM functions in Cantonese mentioned in Jurafsky (1996). On the contrary, “littleness” seems to be a sense that better accounts for such diverse uses. The partitive function can be interpreted as “a little of that”; resemblance with larger object can be interpreted as “sort of a little X”; as a marker of approximation, this Cantonese DIM (marked by tone) may be interpreted as “reddish or a little red”; the pragmatic hedge function may be interpreted as “a little favor” instead of “a favor”; the DIM marker of marginalized women can be interpreted as “just a little of a woman, not much (of a woman)”. Probably because of this, Cantonese DIMs also mark the [female] feature. Linking all these to a primitive category of “littleness” seems more plausible than linking those to the “childness” function. He mentions DIMs in languages such as Nahuatl, Ojibwa, Yiddish, Ewe, Londo, Hungarian, Boro, Kayah, Khase and Tboli. Interestingly, in all these languages the core sense is “little”, as he himself showed in the translations.
This proposal (of “littleness” as the core sense) shows more evidence for the common tendency in semantic extension and change. The reason for this is that the radial category for the diminutive extends the central physical domain of size to the other non-physical domains (a common trend in this type of semantic association) of gender, social power and others. In this way, it also provides further widespread evidence about the unidirectionality of semantic change from the physical to the social and conceptual domains discussed above.

In an Amharic example given by Jurafsky, the case of “this man-teacher” vs. “this woman-teacher”, where the only morphemic difference is the inclusion of the feminine marker with DIM functions in the second expression, is very revealing. There is a more direct connection between the idea of “this little teacher” and “this woman-teacher” than between “this child-teacher” and “this woman-teacher”. Probably because of the inferior status given to women in many societies, the metaphoric connection of “woman professional” = “little professional” is at play. It is important to note here that the same difference is observed in minimal pairs such as “book” and “booklet” in Amharic, where the DIM form makes “book” into a “booklet” (a little book; not necessarily a child book).

Many explanations about different DIMs in different languages and different uses of DIMs start from the littlenes sense in Jurafsky’s explanations. The “word chotto, whose central (and historically prior) meaning is something like ‘a little’, functions like a diminutive in Japanese” (p. 557). His lambda-abstraction examples also emerge from this core sense. “For the diminutive, this process takes the original concept small(x), which has the meaning smaller than the prototypical exemplar x on the scale of size, and lambda-abstracting it to lambda(y)(smaller than the prototypical exemplar x on the scale
y)” (1996: 555). The pragmatic hedges and politeness-marking functions he discussed are also based on this littleness concept. He mentions, for example, that “in a number of languages, including Tamil and Malagasy, this use of diminutives for politeness is even more grammaticalized, and the word for ‘a little’ functions generally like English ‘please’” (1996: 558). All his partitive and exactness examples find an explanation that connects to the basic idea of “littleness”.

In his examples of animal offspring, we can see that all of those DIMs can also be translated as “little”. For example, “a bear cub” can be a “little bear”. However, not all of them can be translated as “child” or “son”. For example, in “chicken” and “chick” (the latter had a DIM in the language cited), can we translate “chicken+DIM” as “the child of chicken”, or better and simply as “little chicken” or “chick”? The latter seems more plausible.

Furthermore, since metaphoric speech constitutes an essential element in the model discussed here, we need to at least superficially consider which of the two senses ([little] or [child]) fits more in what we know about metaphoric thinking. As it happens, the notion of size (in which “littleness” belongs) constitutes the base for many metaphors. The reason for this is that it has basic physiognomic and perceptual properties. In fact, Seitz (2001) distinguishes four key aspects of early or primary metaphors: perceptual (e.g., color, shape, size), enactive (movement, action), physiognomic (i.e., visual-affective), and cross-modal or synesthetic experiences. It is well established that humans exploit perceptual features such as shape, color, size and others when performing metaphoric thinking (Seitz, 1997). Even though size is not really a physiognomic feature (like facial features), it shares with physiognomy the visual property.
Children can exploit the physiognomic (i.e., visual-affective) basis of metaphor (Seitz & Beilin, 1987). Indeed, physiognomic perception has been well studied and there is an extensive literature (see Seitz & Beilin, 1987, for a review and empirical analysis of the physiognomic basis of metaphor). This perception may be bodily-based (motion, gesture, or bodily action; see Seitz, 2000 for a more elaborate discussion on this cognition-perception link). In his considerations in the psychology of visual perception, Arnheim (1988) indicates that people perceive a building, for example, because of spatial properties (lines, volume, size) that are distinctive in the visual dynamics of such solid structure, which is the perceived form. Thus, size (littleness) serves better as a base for metaphoric chaining (in our model of radial categories) than age-related properties (childness) since it shows more basic perceptual primitives. Other studies directly connect size with symbolism and physiognomic stimuli (Ultan, 1970; Lindauer, 1988).

Finally, and probably more importantly in support of the “littleness” core proposal, Lakoff (1987) listed five criteria for determining the central sense (what he also called “proto-scene”, derived from spatial scenes) of any category: 1) earliest attested meaning, 2) predominance in the semantic network, 3) use in composite forms, 4) relations to other spatial particles (contrast sets), and 5) predictability of other senses in the network. “Littleness” seems to be the earliest attested meaning for DIMs, even in Jurafsky’s examples. This notion of “littleness” dominates most links among senses (more than the “childness” notion), even though it is not necessarily the most common sense in modern Spanish uses of DIMs. Criteria number 3 does not support one proposal or the other. Criterion number 4 above is critical in Spanish morphological evaluativeness. As shown before, DIMs are part of a broader system: Spanish evaluative morphology. There is
 plausible symmetry and contrast in the system caused by the opposites “littleness” (DIMs) and “bigness” (AUGs). If we accept Jurafsky’s “childness” core proposal, then this symmetry and contrast is lost in the system, which is unfortunate from a linguistic perspective and criterion 4 is not met. The section on AUGs below elaborates more on this symmetric contrast in the system. The “littleness” proposal also satisfies the criterion of predictability (5 above), at least partially; admittedly as much as the “childness” proposal. Criteria 1, 2, and 4 above seem more critical to support the “littleness” proposal.

Studies on DIM’s meaning such as the one carried out by Savickienė (1998) in relation to Lithuanian L1 acquisition seem to oppose “smallness” as a semantic core for DIMs. Savickienė concluded that “the non-semantic meaning of the earliest diminutives disconfirms the assumption of smallness as central meaning of the earliest diminutives” (p. 133). My study agrees and disagrees at the same time with this conclusion. This agreement or disagreement depends on what she meant by “central meaning”. If it refers to the semantic core sense, then my study disagrees. The fact that the most important and common use of DIMs is [dear] does not oppose the idea that this sense may have emerged from the [little] core sense. We simply need to recall that important metaphorical and inferential semantic extensions are at play here. On the other hand, she does not present any argument regarding what the core sense could be. If “central meaning” means “most common use”, then my study agrees, and the next chapter comes back to this issue.

Admittedly, many uses of DIMs in the data analyzed here may be confused between [little] and [child] connotations, like the following two examples:
1) Male church singer: (introducing his next song):
“Tenemos un pequeño pájaro en mi casa”
*We have a small bird+DIM in my house*

2) A mother to her 6-year-old son: “¿Quieres piña?”
*Do you want pineapple+DIM?*

In both cases, the DIM may be ambiguous. A further look to the context (at times, the only help we have to accurately interpret EVALs) seems to indicate that example 1 has the [little] function, whereas 2 has the [child] connotation. In 1 there is no reference to the age of the bird whatsoever, thus it looks more as a reference to size. In 2, the same mother asked the same question to her husband without using the DIM suffix. Thus, this [little] vs. [child] debate is justified but regarding original denotations of such suffixes, my study takes a clear stand.

Because of all these arguments, the “littleness” proposal supported in my study renders the radial category graph shown in figure 3. This graph shows “littleness” as the core sense of DIMs primarily and “childness” secondarily; which are within a circle to signal this semantic core. All the other DIM functions/senses grow out of this core sense via linking chains and constitute pragmatics-driven uses; all those out of the circle. The pragmatic uses on top represent the affection category; the middle line shows the pragmatic category of attenuation, and the bottom line contains derogation-driven uses. Whenever two (or more) arrows point at a single function, it implies that that function may have two (or more) paths for semantic-pragmatic extension. Some functions do not directly connect to the core sense, which semantically distances those functions from the core sense and causes less semantic transparency. Yet, even those relatively obscure functions indirectly connect to the core, as this semantic network shows. Thus, this graph connects this section (DIM: core sense) to the next section of this chapter (DIM: chains).
Figure 3. New proposal for DIM’s radial categories

Let us keep in mind always that Figure 3 presents a description of the potential associations of the meanings and functions of DIMs in a particular speech community (the participants in the data collection process). We should not lose sight of the cultural relativity of the links in this graphic representation.

**Chaining Links**

The following are the (non-discrete but continuous) categories, senses or connotations observed in the data in relation to DIMs: endearment (or [dear], according to the type of notation used in semantic decomposition analyses), littleness ([little]), childhood ([child]), irony ([dear], [-little]), intensification (“very”), attenuation, euphemism, flirtation, femaleness ([female]), commiseration, and pejoration. These eleven uses of DIMs in the data are analyzed from a pragmatic perspective in the next chapter (Chapter 4). That chapter elaborates on each of these and the major pragmatic categories under which they may be classified. The present semantic analysis shows how all these notions are related.

Let us consider first the related notions of “child”, “little” and “dear”. The following may be one logical and natural connection between the [little] and [dear] functions. As Taylor (1995) put it: “Human beings have a natural suspicion of large creatures; small animals and small children on the other hand can be cuddled and
caressed without embarrassment or fear” (p. 145). This connection between the [little] and [dear] notions “is thus grounded in the co-occurrence of elements within an experiential frame” (p. 145). It is naturally embedded in human beings’ perceptions and previous experience. Without necessarily rejecting the previous proposal, my study suggests that there can also be another possibility. The previous hypothesis is of a more inferential nature (i.e., if then). The second possibility is of a more metaphorical nature. The notion of “littleness” or “smallness” may have been transferred from the size plane to the distance plane: The more distance between two people, the less intimacy and affection between the two. Thus, since the distance (between mother and child, for example) is so little or small, then it may reflect a high degree of affection or endearment; thus, there could be a metaphoric association between the [little] and [dear] meanings.

One example from the data that may show this connection between [dear] and [little] is the one below, where some people are celebrating the high school graduation of a teenager:

3) Young man: (reading a funny poem that he improvised for a teen highschool graduate) “Ron.CITO, gracias por ser un buen primIITO”

Ron.+DIM thanks for being a good cousin+DIM

Ron. was, at that moment, 17 years old, but he has been at church since he was born. Thus, most of the people at the party are friends or relatives that know him as a child and care for him very much. This is a celebration for Ron. to show their appreciation for him precisely. Even though he is not a child any more, he continues to be loved by these people, and they continue to call him “Ron.+DIM”.

Regarding the [child] and [little] connection, DIMs are normally associated with children because they are “little”. Thus, children and DIMs is a normal observed
connection cross-linguistically (Jurafsky, 1996; Melzi and King, 2003). We typically observe in children two main features: littleness and endearment. Children are LITTLE and they are DEAR to us. Even animals (at least most of them, especially those with some cortical endowment or limbic functions; e.g. mammals who bear live young) tend to love, protect and care for their offspring. According to the famous psychoanalyst Erikson (1950), generativity (which is embodied in the need to care for, raise, and mentor the offspring) is a crucial stage of development of many living beings. This readiness to parent, Erikson asserts, may be viewed as naturally built into our species.

Thus, it is not absurd to think that this may be (at least) a reason for the common connection of DIMs with endearment. Children are little and children are dear; thus, this “littleness” may be “dear”. This is based on a basic logic syllogism of the type “if … then” (Aristotle’s *Prior Analytics* in Smith, 1989).

There are two premises and one conclusion:

Premise A: If [+child] is [+little], AND…

Premise B: If [+child] is [+dear], THEN…

Conclusion: [+little] is [+dear] (henceforth, DIM = little and/or DIM = dear)

This, for some linguists, may be considered a type of semantic shift, where the word or morpheme takes on a new meaning often related to the original one.

Under this approach, we can then conclude that even though there is nothing “little” in the notion of “dear” (in pure semantic terms) of the DIMs, the common use of such affixes with the endearing function comes from the experiential association of children with features such as “littleness” and “endearment” (in logic terms). It seems to be an example of metonymy, since there seems to be an association by context. It is
empirically observable in many cultures and languages of the world that the language in children-oriented environments is heavily characterized by such morphemes. This is probably the reason why “little” and “dear” are the functions or “meanings” of the DIMs normally accounted for in the literature.

This endearment notion discussed above is the direct source for some uses of DIMs that my study labels as flirtatious. The “flirty” DIM is a semantic/pragmatic extension of “dear” to the sex or the sex-related arena. This DIM means “dear” but “sexually dear”. Thus, it is a type of endearment with sexual connotations, or in simple terms, sexual affection or interest. The following is an example:

4) “y junio (the calendar fireman for that month): Mig..MiguellITO” “Ay virgen santa!”
& June: Miguel...Miguel+DIM. “Wow, Holy Virgin!”

This DIM may mean “dear Miguel” but also “sexy/hot Miguel”. A young woman looks at firemen posing for a picture calendar. She obviously admires the physical appearances of these firemen models. For the speaker, this fireman is so sexy that she likes him very much. This may be a link between the [dear] and [flirt] function in a real-life context.

Let us now go to the opposite meaning of DIMs, in comparison to the three accounted for thus far. Many of DIM’s uses actually mean the contrary of [child], [dear], and [little], especially the last two. These are examples of irony or sarcasm, which represent the most difficult connotations or uses to argue for in this semantic connection. Furthermore, we also see that, according to Kruez (1996), the first and primary cues that may help signal irony are precisely the counter-factual ones. These two ideas, direct opposite and counter-factual, imply that when meant to be ironic, the DIM actually means “big” or more commonly “not dear or not appreciated”; the opposite of the common notions of DIMs (little, dear). It seems that through the agency of semantic
polarization, DIMs made a leap to the [-little] or [-dear] senses. Thus, semantic extension, association, or metaphoric speech on the one hand and semantic polarization on the other may be the ways or links through which this polysemy spreads. For example, whereas “littleness” connects to the ideas of “childness” and “dear” via semantic association/extension or via metaphoric speech, DIMs relate to irony via semantic polarization.

In relation to the other seemingly contrary sense of DIMs, that of intensification or “very”, there may be an important connection between this notion and the idea of endearment. This use is normally observed with bases for which the speaker shows some type of appreciation. For example, qualities that a certain entity is supposed or expected to have may be intensified (with the adverbial weight or function of “very”) via diminutivization of the adjective that describes such quality. For example, something that is supposed to be white, if diminutivized, may be interpreted as “very white”.

5) A homeowner asks a maid to do something
The maid: “enseguidITA”

\( \text{right-away+DIM} \)

In example 5 above, the maid knows the action is appreciated and expected by her boss, so she intensifies this adverb.

On the other hand, if something is not supposed to be white (for example, a black T-shirt), when modified by “white+DIM”, it may be interpreted as “a little white”. This can also be observed in adjectives such as “ugly”. When we hear words like “ugly+DIM” (\( \text{fe+ITO} \)), we normally interpret it as meaning “a little ugly”, and very unlikely or infrequently as “very ugly” because “ugliness” is an unexpected quality (we normally do not expect entities to be ugly). Here again we see an example of semantic extension or association, which shows up in the data in examples like the following:
6) “pero tú te mueres por las maduras…” “te gustan maduras. ¿Qué tan grandes?”

but you die for the grown-ups(female)+DIM. you like grownups. How big/old?

Aging is not a much appreciated characteristic in the groups analyzed. Thus, “grown-up” here is diminutivized, with a potential meaning of “a little old/grown-up”, not “very old”.

Regarding the [commiserative] function, we need to remember that children are typically considered defenseless, in need of protection, and dear to us. By extension, people or animals that are defenseless and need protection and affection share these characteristics with children. Here we find such an example in the data regarding a kitten:

7) Female host: (to one fireman interviewed in one TV program)

“¿Y uds. salvan a gatitos?”
& you-all save cats+DIM?

No doubt this is the reason of the use of the DIM with the commiserative connotation. Thus, once more, the pragmatic function may be connected to an original meaning or connotation, or in Jurafsky’s terms, a radial category.

The meaning of pejoration in some DIMs may be connected to the core sense of “littleness”. The pejorative force of DIMS may have to do with the notion that some entities are not supposed to have the [+little] feature. Professionals, for example, are not supposed to be “little doctors” (next chapter discusses this example further) or “little professors”. In cases like this, calling somebody a “little doctor” or a “little professor” (profesorcita/o) implies that the person is not really a professional, or that the person still has much to do and learn before becoming a respectable one. Similarly to some attenuating connotations, this pejorative function may reflect some type of base identity diminution as suggested by Hardman (2005, personal communication), or “debilitamiento del significado de la base” (weakening of the meaning of the base), as suggested by
Reynoso (2002: 941). The referent may be [+little] in some distinctive semantic features of the base (respect, professionalism, capability, credibility, and the like).

Let us consider now the polite DIM, and how it may be inferentially linked to the core sense [little] or to the [child] sense directly, and to the [dear] meaning indirectly. Probably the need to protect (face, for example) is more obvious in those that are little (children), who are typically seen as defenseless; thus, if someone needs protection and care, it is the child. We need to recall here that that this idea of protection and care relates directly or indirectly to the notion of face-saving and the concern for others, which are fundamentals in our understanding of politeness. This is clearly shown in Leech’s (1983) Politeness Principle, Goffman’s (1983) Face-Saving notion, and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) Politeness Theory. According to the principles suggested in the Politeness Theory, we all have a certain appreciation ([dear]) for all our addressees; probably not an affective [dear] but a societal [dear]. In fact, the attenuating functions discussed below and in the next chapter may have this “societal endearment” pressure. Henceforth, we can find a binding (in Jurafsky’s terms) between the polite DIM and the major common source of DIMs (child/little/dear).

Regarding the [attenuating] functions, which belong in the category of polite DIMs, we can relatively clearly establish a semantic/pragmatic association among all of these functions, including that of euphemism, to the [+little] idea. In utterances whose major goal is speech acts such as requests, for example, the speaker consciously or subconsciously attempts to instill in the listener’s mind the idea of “littleness”. Since requests, favors and other similar acts are very face-threatening (Goldschmidt, 1998), the speaker makes such acts “little”, and consequently, mitigates those acts. See example 8:
8) Carlos to Monica (Carlos is Monica’s brother and is visiting her):
“Monica, dame juguITO”

Monica, give-me juice-ITO

In an interview immediately after his utterance, Carlos said that what he really meant was “Please”. He recognized that had he said “juice” without DIM, it would have sounded rude and very demanding. In the case of euphemisms, DIMs mitigate, reduce or make the taboo (e.g., swearing words, terms associated with death such as serious illness) “little”.

Let us finish this discussion of semantic-pragmatic binding of DIM senses and force by considering those DIM uses that have to do with the [+female] feature. The [female] DIM is difficult to connect to a single core sense. This connection, whatever it might be, reveals a great deal about our perceptual and societal schemata. Its difficulty and its revealing potential constitute the motivation for discussing it at the end of this section. The [female] DIM may be connected to two different senses: [little] and [child]. Societal norms may motivate the little-female binding, whereas perceptual habits might motivate the child-female binding. The latter would be a cognitive-semantic association, whereas the former constitutes a pragmatic extension. In many societies female caregivers (mothers, nannies, grandma) and children are at times seemingly inseparable pairs. This might connect the notions of “child” and “female”. However, what seems to be more influential in the female-DIM connection is the perceived “littleness” of women, which may constitute a type of derogation of women in society. It is believed that “women are physically smaller and less powerful than men…in …folk categorization of …languages” (Jurafsky, 1996: 546). As discussed in Chapter 5, from a sociolinguistic perspective, this “littleness” may not be just physical but also in the value or appreciation of women in many modern societies. That chapter elaborates further and more clearly in this women
derogation aspect and its connection with DIMs. That is why Jurafsky connects the [female] meaning with the sense of [little]. Admittedly, even though the child-female connection may have cognitive and perceptual grounding, the little-female binding seems to be a more determining motivation in modern uses. (For a sociolinguistic perspective on specific examples from data, see Chapter 5.)

**Augmentatives**

**Core Sense**

Let us recall that one of Lakoff’s (1987) criteria for determining core semantics in radial category models is relations to other spatial particles or contrast sets. This criterion crucially influenced the choice of “littleness” over “childness” for the semantic core of DIMs in my study. Due to consistency and system symmetry, then, we need to conclude that the best contrast set for the [little] DIM is the [big] AUG. The other core sense suggested in the literature (i.e., [child]) fails to contribute to this contrast and symmetry that the [little]-[big] contrast provides to the whole system of Spanish evaluative morphology. In order for the [child] sense to account for this symmetry in the system, it would need to contrast to some abstract [-child] or [adult] sense, which has not been systematically formalized as the core sense for AUGs. If so, then it would create innumerable unfortunate and nonsensical interpretations. For example, if “car+DIM” somehow has to do with the child world, then “car+AUG” has to do with the adult world, which is hardly an accessible interpretation for Spanish speakers. If a “toy+DIM” is a child toy, then “toy+AUG” would be an adult toy, which is untrue from any perspective. First, intuitively it is very unlikely that any Spanish speaker would interpret “toy+AUG” as a toy for adults or an “adult toy”. Second, “toy+AUG”, really continues to be commonly interpreted as a child toy, even with the AUG suffix. Finally, “big” is the
opposite extreme in the range of the primitive category of size, which, as argued before, constitutes the base for many metaphorical and inferential associations. Thus, my study shows formal cognitive semantic support for the popular assumption of “bigness” as the core sense of AUGs. The following data example has this meaning:

9) (in the Despierta America TV program) “manOTA!”

A female host used this term to refer to a male host when he was touching -a little too much- a female model who was reporting on the weather conditions. It was like calling him “Big Hand!” As shown already, beyond speculation and folk knowledge, we find important psychological and linguistic evidence that formalizes this assumption.

**Chaining Links**

How can we connect all these various uses of Spanish augmentative suffixes? The search for an answer to this question again follows from the assumption that all these semantic-pragmatic extensions (of this and any other suffix that present this type of polysemy, according to Nerlich and Clarke, 2003) should emerge from a common source: “bigness”. The following are the AUG functions analyzed in my study: bigness, intensification, irony, pejoration, attenuation, euphemism, affection, and flirtation. As a summary and introduction to this discussion, figure 4 shows AUG’s core sense and the semantic chains. This graph is to be compared to the semantic mapping for DIMs above, in figure 3, since both follow similar principles of cores and chains.

[diagram]

Figure 4. Radial categories for AUGs
One of the most common functions of AUGs, apart from the “bigness” sense, is the intensifying function. The connection between the two seems obvious. As it happens, the “big” AUG normally attaches to nouns with gradable size, whereas the “very” (or intensifying) AUG normally attaches to gradable adjectives with no direct reference to size but to amount. The “big” AUG augments the size whereas the “very” AUG augments the quality of the base. The essential semantics or propositional meaning of both types of AUGs is “greater than the usual norm/standard”. The size of a “car+AUG” is greater than the standard car, at least in the subjective perception of the speaker. An *elegant* person or “elegant+AUG” person is often one that is elegant in a greater degree than normal or common expectations. Both share this property of “greater than”. For consistency with our arguments above regarding the core sense of AUGs, the notion of “greater than the standard or normal size of the base” in the “big” AUG was extended to “greater than the standard or normal quality of the base” in the “very” AUG. In this way, we conclude that the meaning “very” in the AUGs with intensifying functions emerged from the core sense of “bigness” via semantic extension.

This intensifying sense of AUGs gave rise to two seemingly opposing AUG functions: the pejorative and the affectionate functions. Both emerged precisely because of the “very” meaning. As mentioned above, the quality expressed by the base (normally an adjective) augments when an AUG attaches, whether it be a positive or a negative quality. This positive or negative dichotomy determines the affectionate or the pejorative function, respectively. For example, if adjectives such as “poor” are augmentivized, then it may have pejorative functions because of the negativity (socially speaking) of being poor or better, “*very* poor”. Grandi (2003), from a dynamic typology perspective in
Mediterranean languages, observed that AUGs express two conceptual categories: “big X” and “one who is/makes/has X in an exaggerate way”. This notion of exaggeration may have caused the pejorative connotations. On the other hand, if nouns such as “brother” or “friend” receive the AUG suffix without the “big size” referent, then these can reflect affection since it would imply something like “very much a brother” or “very much a friend”, which are normally positive properties that inspire affection. This “very” meaning can be further extended to have sexual connotations, which my study labels as the “flirty” AUG. In nouns that refer to attractive people or body parts, this flirtatious AUG may convey the idea of “very much of a woman/man”, for example. The pragmatic chapter (Chapter 4) shows the need to keep this affectionate DIM as a distinct category and not simply as the “very” AUG.

One function of AUGs that seems contrary to the core sense of this suffix is that of the attenuating or diminution function, what can be labeled as the “diminutive AUG”. There are two possible answers as to how this [attenuate/diminution] function of AUGs (only observed in two types of Spanish AUGs: ón/-azo) binds with the “bigness” sense. One is that it emerges from the pejorative function. Something that receives pejoration loses value. This value loss may have generated the interpretation that the base (for the AUG attachment) loses some of its inherent value or identity. It reflects, then, an identity diminution process, which resembles the properties described above for the pejorative DIMs. The other possibility is that the attenuating sense emerges from some uses of AUGs -ón and -azo labeled as nomina actionis in Pharies (2002). These types of AUGs can express the idea of sudden actions. Words like vistazo (look+AUG), apagón (blackout+AUG) normally express the idea of sudden and brief actions. Because of this
notion of brevity and “suddenness” in these words, this [brevity] feature may have been expanded to adjectives, thus producing a diminution of the identity of the base as shown in example 10 below.

10) Young woman to a female friend:
“pero esos zarcillos estan elegantONES”
*but those earrings are   elegant+AUG*

Example 10 refers to some earrings which may, in the opinion of the speaker, be not really “very” or “too” elegant but “somewhat elegant”. Indeed, one of the people present at the moment when interviewed said that this is how she interpreted this word, as meaning “sort of elegant”. Attenuating functions like this may have given rise to the euphemistic AUG because, like the euphemistic DIM, it mitigates the force of taboos such as illness, sex, or death related terms.

Finally, these cases of AUG’s uses with ironic functions correspond to a simple antithetical process also discussed when considering the ironic force of DIMs. Again, the core sense for this AUG function is the notion of “bigness”. The antithetical process goes from [+big] to [-big]. As any other ironic process, the ironic uses of AUGs convey, in a sarcastic way, the idea opposite to that expressed by the linguistic form (i.e., [-big] or “not very”).

**Superlatives**

The last of the Spanish EVALs analyzed here is the one with the least degree of frequency, productivity, and polysemy as table 1 and figure 1 showed. It is also the only one that most clearly shows a process of linguistic change or semantic shift. As discussed in the historical section of the previous chapter, the proto-semantics of such an affix reflects a pure grammatical function. It used to mark the relative superlative degree (the
most) in Latin as indicated in Pharies (2002) and Jörnvig (1962). Today, it has the core meaning of “very”.

Thus, it is essentially an intensifier, but to distinguish it from other EVALs with very similar functions, this represents the highest degree of all EVALs with the same function. Thus, we can label it tentatively as a “super intensifier”. Many cases of honorifics marking have been reported both in old and modern Spanish. Let us now semantically bind these three senses: “most”, “very” and honorific.

Considering that “the most” is the early attested meaning of this suffix, which is one of Lakoff’s (1987) criteria for determining core senses, let us assign to this sense the core function in this semantic mapping. How can “the most” generate the “very” sense? To be “the most” of X quality, an entity must be “very” of that X quality, at least in relation to the other members of a group. An element A with a property X is the most X only and only if it is also very X, with respect to the standards in a certain group or probably a particular person (speaker). Being “the most” entails or semantically/logically implies being “very”. There were no cases in which the SUPERL was used that it did not imply “very”. Probably this logical and inevitable entailment gave rise to the “very” meaning, which is one more example of inferential thinking. This is reflected in data examples like the one below:

11) Despierta America male host to the weather woman as she gave him the floor: “mi queridISIMA Jacki”

my dear+SUPERL Jacky (= my VERY dear Jacki)

Finally, it is not difficult to see how either meaning, “the most” or “very”, may relate to the honorific function. In Latin and early Spanish, a very common use of such an affix was with positive qualities such as “excellent”, which conveyed an idea of admiration. The Latin relative SUPERL clearly conveyed the idea of the “highest degree”
of all, which also may express an idea of admiration and respect. These facts explain clearly the honorific function of SUPERLs. It is important to note, however, that in many dialects of modern Spanish, the “most” sense has been lost. The core sense in modern Spanish tends to be the absolute SUPERL with the “very” meaning.

**Conclusion**

Despite the polysemy observed in Spanish EVALs in my study and elsewhere, for each of these Spanish affixes, there is a core sense that can be traced back to either the origin of such an affix in Spanish or to the inherent properties that characterize many of the functions of those affixes in modern Spanish. The diversity of functions can be explained from a cognitive semantic perspective using Lakoff’s (1987) Radial Categories and applying it to Spanish EVALs as Jurafsky (1996) applied it to DIMs in general.

The analysis in this chapter shows that the core sense of DIMs is “littleness”, the core sense for AUGs is “bigness”, and the core sense for SUPERLs is “very” (or high degree). From these core senses, the other many semantic-pragmatic nuances emerge via basically metaphorical and inferential thinking. Some inconsistencies of previous accounts have been considered, and this chapter has also presented cognitive linguistic evidence that supports appropriateness of the traditional grammatical terms used for these affixes: diminutives, augmentatives, and superlatives.

The semantic weights of such affixes have been connected but at the same time contrasted with their pragmatic force. These are two different but connected types of meaning. This chapter addressed the question about the core senses of these affixes and the possible metaphorical, inferential connections and “pragmatic strengthening” (Traugott, 1989) that explain this distinctive diversity and polysemy of Spanish EVALs.
The next chapter treats these different uses of EVALs from a pragmatic perspective. It focuses on the non-referential meaning which, based on analysis of specific examples from naturalistic data, complements the referential meaning and semantic extensions discussed here.
CHAPTER 4
PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS

The pragmatic analysis of this chapter starts with one of the conclusions of the semantic account shown in the previous chapter. Chapter 3 indicated that semantic extensions emerge through metaphorical/inferential connections and pragmatic strengthening. This last aspect is what constitutes a fundamental link between the previous chapter and this one. In the field of cognitive linguistics, two important assumptions are 1) that meaning extension is principled and motivated; and 2) that language is a usage-based system (Evans, 2005; Traugott, 1999). Evans (2005) suggests that this implies that meaning extensions may derive from situated use of language, which we know implies pragmatic motivations. Traugott (1989) more overtly indicated that the context dependent formation of situation-constrained meanings (i.e., semantic change’s actuation or the cause that motivates this), has a very important pragmatic ingredient. She calls this “pragmatic strengthening” because the new meaning can apply to other contexts that are seemingly unrelated to the original one (Traugott, 1988). Furthermore, Traugott has shown the important role of pragmatics in any theory of semantic change. Thus, one critical contribution of my study is that it provides one more piece of empirical evidence that shows that pragmatic pressure seems to cause semantic extension, shift, or generalization.

It is important to clarify, once again, that my study makes a distinction among the semantic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic aspects discussed here. Semantics deals with the propositional meaning or the sense (in Leech’s 1983 terms) of the affixes analyzed (i.e.,
“little” for DIMs, “big” for AUGs, and “very” for SUPERLs). The area of sociolinguistics deals with the group or societal context marking effects of these suffixes. All the other functions, or forces (in Leech’s terms), of such affixes are considered in the present chapter. These pragmatic motivations, according to Reynoso (2002), seem to be defined both by the perspective or position of the speaker in the discourse and by the relationship that the speaker herself/himself establishes with the entity referred to or with the audience.

Let us then focus now primarily on this essential pragmatic component of Spanish EVALs specifically. This chapter presents an analytical description of the data from a pragmatic perspective. The first section deals with aspects such as speech act coloring or what Kiefer (1998) refers to as “modification of the relative strength of a speech act” (p. 276) (i.e., the attenuation/mitigation or intensification of speech acts), pragmatic features, politeness, and face-saving. The discussion begins with the pragmatics of DIMs, then AUGs, and finally SUPERLs.

This order is consistent with the frequency, degree of polysemy and pragmatic multi-functionality (or “polypragmy”) of these Spanish EVALs. Based on the data and analysis it is obvious that DIMs are the suffixes with the most pragmatic functions, and the SUPERLs are the ones with the least pragmatic force. Recall that figure 1 shows the frequency of such Spanish semantic-pragmatic morphemes (i.e., diminutives, augmentatives, and superlatives) in the data corpus. In modern Spanish, it seems difficult at times to distinguish between the frequency of SUPERLs and AUGs. However, DIMs are indeed the most common, not only in the data here but elsewhere, as figure 1 showed.
According to the literature and the data and analysis in my study, we can conclude that the DIM suffix is essentially a semantic-pragmatic diminisher (e.g., it diminishes size, value, social distance, face threat). The previous chapter discussed how the three senses commonly associated with DIMs are often (and only) [little], [child] and [dear] (Mackenzie, 2001), and it also elaborated on the semantic aspect of this phenomenon. The present chapter elaborates principally on the pragmatic side of this suffix, with brief overviews of relevant semantic aspects. Apart from the [little], [dear] and [child] features or functions of DIMs, the remainder of the functions discussed in my study has received little or no formal attention in the linguistic literature.

The remainder of the pragmatic functions observed in the data may be associated more or less directly to one of these main uses of the DIMs (e.g., littleness, endearment), but ultimately they emerge from the “littleness” sense. Pragmatically speaking, modern Spanish DIMs seem to have taken three sometimes overlapping but distinct paths with respect to this original common source: the independent, the antonymous, and the relatively transparent paths. These three paths constitute the base for the three major pragmatic categories of DIM’s functions my study presents below. These paths roughly relate to different degrees of opacity in relation to how transparent or how opaque the relation of such path is with respect to the common point of departure for the three of them: the littleness sense. If we trace an imaginary opacity scale, the independent path roughly corresponds to the most opaque of all, the antonymous path is midway, and the transparent path is of course the least opaque of all. In other words, in modern Spanish, the meaning relation between the DIMs on the transparent path, for example, and the “littleness” sense is not obscure, at least not as obscure as the other DIM functions. The
independent path gives rise to the *affection* category, the antonymous path corresponds to the *derogation* category, and the more transparent path motivates the *attenuation* category. Each of these three categories manifests itself through different specific uses or functions, which this chapter discusses below.

The discussion below organizes the uses of DIMs first on its semantic-pragmatic range, and then the discussion focus mostly on the pragmatic uses. The first section describes the two senses that have been labeled as central senses of DIMs: [little] and [child]. These represent uses that tend to relate more directly with the propositional meaning of DIMs. Therefore, they are labeled as “semantics-driven” or “neutral” uses of DIMs. The second section examines pragmatic uses; those that fall under the affection, derogation, and attenuation categories.

Figure 5 below visually summarizes the presentation following it. This branching diagram starts with the quintessential function of DIMs: diminishing. The lines represent the relation “*manifests as*...” and the arrows represent the relation “*gives rise to*...” (for example, the DIM as a diminisher manifests as having semantic, semantic/pragmatic, purely pragmatic functions; the semantic sense gave origin to the pragmatic force). Dotted lines represents the relation “*manifests secondarily as*...”, which is the case of the derogation function of DIMs. I need to clarify here that the label “neutral” above is regarding pragmatic effects; the first two divisions of the diagram below ([little], [child]) are pragmatically neutral, since their pragmatic force is either null or minimal in comparison to functions such as affection, derogation, and attenuation (i.e., those considered not neutral and classified under the *pragmatic* label in the branching graph below).
Figure 5. Semantic-pragmatic functions of Spanish DIMs

Let us explore this in detail from a pragmatic perspective.

**Semantic/Neutral Uses of the Diminutive**

The pragmatic force in this type of DIM’s uses is either null or minimal. The effect or the interpretation of such DIMs relies mostly on the referential type of meaning; thus, context, societal norms, and maxims of conversation seem irrelevant or secondary to access an accurate interpretation of such uses. My study classifies the [little] and [child] senses in this category. This type of use represents just 22% of the data examples in the corpus analyzed here. Only around 100 tokens or diminutivized words in the corpus, out of 450 DIMs, may convey a relatively pragmatically neutral sense. It is important to clarify here that at times it is very difficult to decide in favor of one or another interpretation. For example, at times a DIM may have a “littleness” sense but it could
also have an “endearment” connotation. In such cases, they should be double-counted in
two different categories (littleness and affection, respectively), to do justice to the data.

Regarding these neutral senses, there are not really pragmatic effects other than the
effects that the pure and basic primary denotation of [+little] or the secondary sense of
[+child] may have. The only pragmatic-like issue in which the [+child] sense may have
some relevance is the societal group-marking effect that the sociolinguistic analysis (next
chapter) addresses. Recall that this relative absence of a pragmatic evaluative subjective
effect is what causes these uses to be labeled as neutral. The notion of “neutral” and
features used here fits within the approach of Tatevosov (2003) when analyzing Siswati
DIMs. Siswati has two diminutive affixes: the prefix *kwe-* and the affix -*ana*. There are
two possibilities for their combination with a noun. The combinations *kwe-*noun (22b) or
noun-*ana* (22a) yield a neutral diminutive meaning “little-noun”. As we can see,
Tatevosov also called the meaning “little” a neutral use of DIMs.

**The [little] DIM.** This specific use constitutes only 13% of the data, which is
relatively little if we considered that this derives most of the remainder of the DIM uses.
Even though this constitutes semantic centrality, a clear “little” meaning is only present
in 59 of all the 450 DIM tokens in the data; probably contrary to popular beliefs about
these suffixes, which are thought to mean [little] most of the time. Below there are some
representative examples of such use:

1) A Mexican guy telling a joke in the street: “…Un pollITO chiquITO….”

   A chicken+DIM little+DIM

The previous example obviously has the meaning of “small”, which is clear by the
other lexical item accompanying (little). This example no doubt refers to size. DIMs may
mean “small” even with the absence of explicit adjectives such as “little” or “small”, but
their explicitness makes it much more transparent, especially considering the DIM’s polysemy extensively discussed above. There are other cases with the “littleness” sense that do not necessarily translate as “small” but as “little” because they refer to amount and not necessarily to size. This was, precisely, one of the major reasons to label the core sense as “littleness” and not as “smallness”, because it can account for all these very related uses. Below there are two examples with the amount reference:

2) A university professor tells a grad student visiting at his office: “hay un dinero+DIM allí y decidimos dividirlo” *there’s a money+DIM there & we decided to split it up* (Referring to some travel funds promoted by the professor’s department)

3) A TV talk show female host to one of the female guests: “Idalia, ahora+DIM tocamos puntos importantes contigo” *Idalia, now+DIM we touched upon important points with you*

Example 2 refers to a little amount of money that the graduate student could receive as a travel grant. It was a relatively small amount of money. Example 3 has the “now+DIM” adverb, which is very ambiguous in Spanish. In this case, however, it may be translated as “a few moments ago”. This idea of “a few” is also expressed with the [little] DIM.

It is important to point out here a criticism of Reynoso’s (2002) perspective on this seemingly neutral or referential use of DIMs. Reynoso indicates that “si el diminutivo se usa sobre entidades susceptibles de ser disminuidas, la intención comunicativa se centrará en el uso del diminutivo como cuantificador dimensional” (if DIMs are used with diminishable entities –bases-, the communicative intention will focus on the use of the DIM as a dimensional quantifier) (2002: 940). This has many counter-examples. “Car” is in essence a gradable entity (or a diminishable one). It can be little or small under many criteria. According to Reynoso, “Car+DIM” means “little car”. However,
there are many cases in which this is not the case. “Car+DIM” can reflect affection, meaning “dear car”, or pejoration (bad car) for example. Thus, the semantic features of the base do not necessarily limit the referential or non-referential use of DIMs. What is definitely true is that this [little] DIM is used only with gradable bases, but gradable bases do not only or necessarily require the [little] DIM.

**The [child] DIM.** Chapter 5, the sociolinguistic chapter, elaborates on this use since this type of suffix has important sociolinguistic effects. In the diagram above, it was labeled as a semantic-pragmatic manifestation of the essential diminishing function of DIMs. The “pragmatic” label precisely coheres with the effects that this suffix may have at the sociolinguistic level. Even though my study supports the [little] sense as the core semantics, it is obvious that [childness] constitutes also some centrality in DIMs. This is probably the reason these two have been assigned to DIM core sense, and at times they are presented as the two central senses of DIMs (Jurafsky, 1996). Even though [child] may have emerged from [little] and not vice versa, we have to recognize the centrality of such a function in the meaning of modern Spanish DIMs. This is the reason [childness] is included under the semantic category above. Furthermore, this does not neatly fit under any of the pragmatic categories discussed below. Let us consider now DIMs that have more pragmatics-driven uses. These roughly correspond to the affection, derogation and attenuation functions mentioned above, both in the diagram and in the discussions in previous paragraphs. These are, symmetrically, the non-neutral counter parts of the senses discussed above. In other words, pragmatically these are not neutral because they have important pragmatic force.
Pragmatic Uses of DIMs

The pragmatics-driven uses represent 78% of the DIM uses in the corpus, which clearly shows the predominance of such uses in this data. All the purely pragmatic uses of DIMs may fall under one of the three categories mentioned above: affection, derogation, or attenuation. Each of these three categories manifests itself in specific uses of DIMs explained below.

The affection function

Despite the semantic centrality of the core senses mentioned above, [little] and [child], the [dear] function and its derivatives definitely, according to the data examined in my study, constitute the most common function of DIMs. Affection-driven uses represent 49% of all DIM uses in this corpus. In other words, this represents almost half of all DIMs. There are four specific affection-driven uses: the [dear] DIM itself and three important derivatives: the [intense] or intensifying DIM, with the meaning of “very”, the [flirt] DIM, and the [commiserative] DIM.

The [dear] DIM. The endearment connotation is the most common single function of DIMs. It represents 26% or approximately a quarter of the whole DIM data set. One of the most common uses in this respect is hypocoristics or endearing terms of address. In English, this would be similar to introducing a name with the word “dear” in informal situations like: “Dear Peter” (or the truncated form, “Pete”). The formal “dear” (used in formal letters, for example) is left out of consideration since it does not correspond to any DIM form in Spanish. No DIMs are normally found in formal letters in Spanish. Six Spanish speakers read a letter where three EVALs appeared: two DIMs and one SUPERL. They were asked to indicate if there was something wrong or unusual in the letter. Three could not answer the question (it is unclear if it is because they did not see
anything unusual or because they did not know what was unusual). One referred to a supposed orthographic mistake (which is not really a mistake in Spanish but in English). Another answered that the content was very poor for a person with a Bachelor’s degree. Another explicitly indicated that the writer first referred to her daughter formally (“Elena Franco”), but then referred to the same daughter as “Elenita” (Helen+DIM). Having words like “Elenita”, a hypocoristic, because the formal name was expected (Elena). In informal letters or encounters, then, it is possible to find this type of hypocoristics with DIMs (e.g., English “John” → “Johnny”; “Vick” → “Vicky”). In Spanish, it is common to diminutivize (and also truncate) many names or terms of address of people for whom we have an appreciation. Just like “mom” → “mommy” and “dad” → “daddy” in English, in Spanish we have Mama → mamita (Mom+DIM) and papá → papito (dad+DIM). The data corpus has examples such as “mom+DIM”, “grandma+DIM”; and “sister+DIM”. These last three examples refer to family members or relatives, since these are normally beloved people. All these uses mainly imply such meanings as “dear mom”, “dear grandma”. This use is observed mostly among people who know each other and whose relationship is characterized by some degree of intimacy, familiarity, or some special appreciation. Addressing a stranger or a socially distant person with a DIM would cause some degree of pragmatic infelicity.

It is necessary to point out also that there are inanimate entities that are diminutivized with this [dear] function as well. Examples of this endearing diminutivization of inanimate nouns are the following, where food items are described as something “dear” and appreciated:

4) Middle-age mother to her 30-year old son: “¿Quieres café, jugo y una panquequITA?”.

D’you-want coffee, juice & a pancake+DIM?
TV talk show female host: (the last piece of advice for some sisters in a fight) 
“Cuando se echen el café+DIM, me invitan”
**when you have your coffee+DIM (time), invite me**

A male who uttered another expression with a food item (“chicken+DIM”) was interviewed during the data triangulation time. In the informal interview we had, he explained that not using the diminutive with “chicken” would make the utterance lose some of the flavor he had in his mind. He meant to express that he really liked and enjoyed that chicken. Not only food items but also body parts may be diminutivized. When these words receive the DIM, these body parts often have the characteristic of being either beautiful or well liked by many (more on this below under the [flirt] DIM).

TV reports, interviews, and shows constitute the source of many data examples in the corpus. One such major program in the corpus is _Despierta América_ or “D.A.” (Wake Up America). It is a daily 3-hour morning magazine that includes news, interviews, music, jokes, skits, and many other sections. It is a source of information and entertainment for all the Spanish-speaking community in the USA, and especially in South Florida. One of the most important features is its degree of spontaneity (a live program), its informality, and the convergence of many dialects (the four hosts are all from different Hispanic countries). In a special report and interview with a musical group that had just produced a new Compact Disc, the interviewer refers to the content in this new musical production, which contains also _baladitas_ (ballads+DIM). It is to be interpreted as songs, with a ballad rhythm, that are very much liked and appreciated by the audience of that talk show and of course by the speaker, who is the interviewer. Thus, “ballads+DIM” may be interpreted as “those well-liked ballads.”
In another segment of the program, a young woman sends, a *besito muy grande* (kiss+DIM very big) to another woman who just solved a huge problem she had. This DIM here obviously has nothing to do with [little] since this “kiss” is “very big”, as we can see explicitly stated in the post-nominal modifying adjective phrase *muy grande*. This is a “dear kiss”, a kiss with love, and a special kiss with endearment. There was also reference to *calorcito* (heat+DIM), which can be interpreted as a hot weather that is actually liked or a hot day to enjoy. Some people were asked the question: “what is a ‘house+DIM’?” as part of the data triangulation. 100% of the respondents agreed that *casita* (house+DIM) is one’s beloved home (with no reference to size at all). Some said that this could give the idea of a house acquired with much effort.

Color terms were also diminutivized with the [dear] function in the data as shown in example 6 below, in which the speaker used the word “color” itself with a diminutive.

6) a 27-year-old female: “en ese complejo hay casas con unos colorCITOs”

*in that complex there are houses with such colors+DIM*

It has nothing to do with “little color”. The young woman who used it pluralized this word to refer to the different colors in which different houses in a very colorful complex had been painted. She was also informally interviewed at the moment she uttered that DIM. She explained after some time that she really liked the way the complex looked due to those diverse colors, and that is why she used the word “colors+DIM” instead of “colors”. The word *bronceado* (tanned), which is a skin color, is used with the DIM in the data. In the context presented, this does not mean “a little (bit) tanned”. This simply means “a nice tan color”.

Other entities are often also diminutivized in the data such as clothing items and money. The latter, again, does not necessarily mean “(a) little money” according to the
context. In the contexts in the data, at least in most of them, the idea is “that beloved money”; that money that we appreciate so much because of the difficulty in earning it. Also, many clothing items (e.g., sandals, shoes, clothe ornaments) are diminutivized to express the idea that those are beautiful and that those are much appreciated.

The following example reveals much regarding this inherent [dear] DIM function.

7) “yo le pedí la receta a Jorge y le dije que él mismo me la diera, bien escritica”
   I asked the recipe from Jorge & told him to write it himself, well written+DIM

The young woman who uttered it (another person interviewed at the moment of using the DIM) indicated that she was expecting a friend to write a recipe for her. She told that friend that he had to give the recipe to her “well written”. The “written” verbal participial is what she actually diminutivized first (bien escritica). It is important to note that grammatically speaking, we do not often find verbal participials with DIMs since they do not seem to subcategorize for evaluativeness. Yet, it was diminutivized and all the listeners could process the expression without major problems. She later informed that she simply meant that she expected for her friend to write that recipe in such a way that showed care or appreciation for her. She immediately gave another example to clarify her point. She said that when one of her Spanish-speaking bosses (her job is cleaning houses and offices) tells her haz una limpiadita allí (do some cleaning+DIM there), she normally interprets that as referring to a cleaning job expectedly with love or appreciation.

Which nouns or words receive this [dear] function more often may reflect something very important about many Spanish-speaking societies; the aspects of life that are very important, appreciated, and liked in the such culture. We have seen that family members receive many DIMs. We also observed that food items are diminutivized with certain frequency. Some places, like home and own businesses (regardless of size) are
much appreciated. Music and dance are other DIM’s favorites. Spanish-speaking people may also express, in many cases, a great appreciation for their own culture via diminutivization. In *Premio a lo Nuestro* (Award to Ours), which is an annual TV event where prizes or awards are given to important Hispanic show business people in the USA (something like a Grammy Awards event), one of the awards presenters said:

8) “nuestra sangrecITA y nuestro saborecITO”
*Our blood+DIM and our taste/flavor+DIM*

In the context of this utterance, this meant: “our dear/beloved blood or race”.

In relation to this affectionate use, we also see what may be called the “familiar/intimate DIM”. Most of the affectionate functions of the DIM express some degree of familiarity or intimacy. Thus, we may say that this suffix is also marking this type of (at least expected) closeness between the interactants. This is the reason many DIMs are used when addressing at or referring to family members, relatives, significant-others, close friends, and the like. We also find this [familiar] DIM used even among interactants that are not relatives whatsoever. In these instances, we may observe a desire of the speaker to bring some closeness or familiarity to interactions with people that are not relatives or good friends. It is a type of camaraderie building, as shown in example 9:

9) “¡saluCITA!” (final C is dropped, and -cita is added, instead of –ita, because of the stress on the last syllable. This is also observed in the “Attitude+DIM” example above.)
*cheers+DIM!*

A Mexican young man was giving a toast in one episode of *Casos de La Vida Real* – (Cases of Real Life). He was drinking with his friends and diminutivized the word “cheers!” It was diminutivized without necessarily having the [dear/intimate] connotation. In this case, a few men are celebrating that they have a job, and that they just
got paid. These are neither relatives nor good friends. These are just a type of drinking companions. They gather just for beer drinking and chatting.

In the *Despierta America* program, we observe a clear example of emphasizing the [-dear] concept via DIM withdrawal:

10) Young male host: (performs a funny character of an old Colombian woman, “Meche”). Meche (talking to the hairdresser Sammy) “Mira Samuel Suarez!..” (offends Sammy) *Look, Samuel Suarez*

This “Colombian woman” became uneasy because Sammy told her about many changes she needed to make in her face. Interesting here is the dropping of the hypocoristic and DIM in the name Sammy. Brown and Levinson (1987) described this as “withdrawal of positive politeness and its associated emotional support” (p. 110).

**The [flirt] DIM.** This represents a not very common extension of the [dear] connotation to the sex-related arena. We discussed above how body parts with the [dear] DIM, for example, may have this sexual connotation. The following interaction in a TV entertainment show (*Sábado Gigante* = “Giant Saturday”) shows this DIM connotation.

11) -50-year-old male host (in couples contest): “¿Qué es lo que tiene mejor tu novio?” What is the best part of your boyfriend?

- The girlfriend: “yo pienso que el cuelITO” *I think that the neck+DIM*
- Host: “¿Qué te gusta a ti más?” *What do you like better?*
- The girlfriend: “me gusta él completICO” *I like him complete+DIM*
- Host: “¿Qué tiene el cuello de él?” *What does his neck have?*
- Girlfriend: “Es suaveCITO” *It’s soft+DIM*

There is a certain witty humorous reference to the sex appeal of the body of the boyfriend. There is a reference to how much the speaker may like his physical
appearance. This [flirt] DIM is not only with body-related words but also other words in general.

In the example below, the expression “a friend” is diminutivized. This example comes up in the context of a family case story (in a “Jerry Springer”-like talk show in Spanish). A 19-year-old boy becomes the boyfriend of a 40ish-year-old woman, who used to be his mother’s best friend. The mother is obviously upset about it. The boy at one point has to admit that he has a particular relationship with a young girl, who he called amiguita (“friend+DIM”). This amiguita word has sexual connotations. They are also called amigo/as con derecho (“friends with rights”) in popular Spanish. These terms refer to dates. Thus, here, a friend is obviously not the same as a “friend+DIM”. The sexual connotation in “friend” is absent, unlike this type of “friend+DIM”.

12)-“ella es una amiga (pause, then he’s confronted). Lo que llamamos una amiguITA”
   She is a friend. She’s what we call a friend+DIM

13)-Female host of Viviana TV show: “Continuamos con el llamado ‘cosITO Rico’”
   we’ll continue w/the so-called ‘thing+DIM delicious’

The female host in l3 refers to the attractiveness of the guest, via this DIM.

**The [intense] DIM.** This is the second most common specific DIM function in the data. It represents around 16% of all the DIM tokens. The intensifying functions of the DIMs have been cited already by Alvar and Pottier (1987) but in a very marginal way. The only examples they cited were churros calentITOS (churros hot+DIM) with the meaning of “VERY hot”, and de rodillITAs y a mis pies (p. 87) with the meaning of “kneeling+DIM down and at my feet”. The former example is the only one that they clearly present with [+intense] effects. The translation they gave for the second example does not show [intense] functions. One possible reading of the “…kneeling+DIM
down…” expression is that of a man *completely* on his knees asking for something. If this is the case, then the adverb “completely” reflects the [intense] effect of such an affix; which is not clearly explained by Alvar and Pottier. However, the authors think that this use of the DIM is just stylistic and should not be really considered a morphological process. However, there is no reason for not considering this a morphological process. Even if it is just style, it is a style marked via affix (DIM) attachment; henceforth a morphological process with stylistic or pragmatic effects or a morphopragmatic process. Reynoso (2002) more clearly recognizes the intensifying value of “very” in examples such as “walking straight+DIM, with the head...”. We may call it an *augmentative* DIM. 14)-Female cook: “el puerco está limpiecITO”  
\[\text{the pork is clean+DIM}\]  
In sentence 14 above, for example, we can not conclude that this means “a little clean”. This was a cooking demonstration on TV. The pork someone is about to cook or eat cannot be just *a little* clean. It has to be *very* clean, in order for us to be able to eat it. The basic meaning of this augmentative DIM is “very”, that is why this is called the intensifying function of DIMs. Let us observe another example for further clarification. 15)-A female reporter (in her 30’s) interviewing a woman expert in wedding cakes. “asi que ya no son esos pasteles tradicionales que tenían que ser románticos, blanquITOs”  
\[\text{so, no more those traditional cakes that had to be romantic, white+DIM}\]  
Example 15 simply means that traditionally, people used to have very romantic and VERY white cakes. The diminutivized words in the two examples above (“white” and “clean”) were chosen as part of the questionnaires used, after ethnographic interviews took place. They were given in isolation. The participants had to answer the question: “What does ‘white+DIM’ and ‘clean+DIM’ mean?” More than 50% of the respondents interpreted the words “white+DIM” and “clean+DIM” meaning “very/rather white” and
“very/rather clean” respectively. It is very important to note that they interpreted the DIMs here as “very” even without a clear context. This just reflects how easily accessible this meaning of DIM is, which shows its frequency. This is not part of the traditional teaching of DIMs; and even more, this use has been relatively absent in formal accounts of Spanish EVALs, as shown above. Yet, the majority of the people still associate this DIM with the idea of “very” and not with the idea of “little”.

One unique aspect of Spanish DIMs (and all the other EVALs analyzed here) is that they can go through a process similar to that of partial or total morphological reduplication. More precisely, however, this is a type of iteration. This iteration has the main purpose of intensification. These iterative cases intensify even further the meaning of the base. The expression poquit-it-it-it-o (little-DIM-DIM-DIM-masculine) means “little, little, little” or “very very little” since the base means “little”. Igualititita means “equal/alike, equal/alike, equal/alike” or “very very equal/similar/alike” because the base means “equal/similar/ alike”. Finally, la primerititita vez means “the first first first time” or “the very very first time” because the base means “first”.

Jurafsky (1996) considers that this type of DIM relates to “littleness” somehow, in the sense that this diminutivization implies that something is very white or clean because it does not have dirt or just a little dirt. Thus, he argues that not all colors can receive this DIM because “white” may imply absence of dust or dirt but not colors like “blue”. That is why he shows the following supposedly ungrammaticality: azulito “a little blue”, but *“very blue”. This is simply not true. An expression like el cielo está azulito (the sky is blue+DIM) is very possible in many dialects of Latin American Spanish with the meaning of “The sky is very blue”, as much as “the prairie is green+DIM” with the
meaning of “very green”. Six people were interviewed about the meaning of the phrases: *El cielo está azulito* (the sky is blue+DIM) and *la pradera está verdecita* (The prairie is green+DIM). All of them associated these sentences with positive feelings like “a very sunny and beautiful day, a healthy prairie, nice prairie” and other positive comments. It is interesting to note here that these positive comments came mostly due to the force of the suffixes. One person even added that it meant that the prairie was “totally green”. Thus, it was never interpreted as “a little blue” or “a little green”. Recall from our discussion in the previous semantic analysis that this [intense] DIM connects more directly to [dear] than to [little].

There are still, admittedly, some questions unanswered in this respect. For example, this [intense] function is probably being extended to cases that are difficult to explain with the connection to [dear]. When informants were asked about the meaning of *viejito* (old+DIM), for example, some associated this with the idea of “very”. Some definitions they gave were: “a very old person” and “an old person with many problems (health, for instance) because of being very old”. It is difficult to conclude that this is connected to the idea of [dear] since “oldness” is probably not an expected and appreciated feature in people. This case is particularly interesting due to the diversity of definitions given for “old+DIM”. Other respondents associated this directly with the [dear] function. In this respect, some defined the term “old+DIM” as “very old person who reflects honesty and maturity”; “an old person that inspires tenderness or love”; and “an old person that is lovely or endearing”. Yet, another saw this as a pejorative word.

Finally, regarding this [intense] DIM, Reynoso (2002) observed a type of emphatic DIM (*segrito que ese fregadazo era para don Jesus* = “I’m sure that sink was for Mr.
Jesus”). This is also observed in the data in the example where a woman emphasizes that she only has one cookie left:

16)- A young mother: “Me queda unITA”

16) *is left one+DIM (ONLY one is left)*

This [intense] and emphatic DIM is better translated here as “only” than “very”.

However, this is basically still an intensifier.

**The [commiserate] DIM.** This is another uncommon function of DIMs. When expressing commiseration, someone or something (the referee or the referred entity) might be in a negative condition (e.g., pain, inferiority, and disadvantage) and in need of sympathy. According to Webster’s dictionary, to commiserate is “to condole or sympathize (with)”. It implies a certain degree of affection and compassion for those in disadvantageous positions. Alonso (1937) cites an example from the literature where a mendicant begs for food and uses many DIMs, especially in terms that referred to himself (e.g., poor+DIM, fainting+DIM). Alonso suggests accurately that the mendicant is trying to inspire the listener (a girl) with compassion or sympathetic affection. The mendicant seems to be presenting himself as worthy of pity via the use of such DIMs, which are *captatio benevolentiae* (“to capture benevolence”; Latin label by Alonso and others). The following example was extracted from the data corpus:

17)- (on a report on turtles hurt by seashore)

17) "Es dificil encontrar tortugUITAs vivas después de accidentes como éstos"

17) *It's difficult to find turtles+DIM alive after accidents such as these*

17) "pobrecITA" (several times)

17) *poor+DIM*

Example 17 above emerged in the context of a report on hurting animals. The main function of the diminutive in “poor+DIM” or “turtle+DIM” was to empathize with the
pain of the turtle and to express pity and compassion for the pain of this animal. The
turtle had been hurt by a boat in Florida and was referred to with a DIM. Yet, this turtle
was in fact big. One of the male hosts calculated the turtle’s age at around 70 years old.
Thus, obviously this DIM has no “littleness” connotation.

It is important to note here that commiserating is in itself a speech act (Boxer,
1993). We have here an example of a speech act being performed, not mitigated nor
attenuated (colored), by the DIM itself. In the word “poor+DIM”, we can argue that the
commiserating act is realized by the word “poor”; in other words, the base, not the affix
carries the [commiserate] notion. However, in “turtle+DIM” in example 17 the base has
no commiserating functions; yet, the speech act of commiserating is still at play in that
case. It seems clear that it is the DIM itself that is performing the act of commiseration.
This is admittedly unusual, since in most cases, EVALs color (e.g., mitigate, attenuate,
intensify) the speech acts; but in this case, the speech act itself requires the presence of
the affix to be performed.

One word of caution regarding this use has to do with the definition of
commiseration. If we consider commiseration as a way of (a person) identifying with the
sufferer, then this might be a type of endearment, which constitutes the main motivation
for including this under the affection category. If commiseration reflects inferiority or a
disadvantageous position, as mentioned above, then it might be classified under a
negative category. However, commiseration seems to emphasize a type of affection.

The derogation function

Of the three major pragmatic categories discussed in my study, derogation is the
one with fewest instances in the data. Derogation-driven uses represent the 14% of all
450 DIMs in the corpus. It consists basically of functions that somehow have a negative
connotation or effect, whether it is intentionally, unintentionally, consciously, or unconsciously. It involves three specific DIM functions: Irony, femaleness (see Chapter 5), and pejoration (in order of frequency). As with the case of [child] DIMs, the [female] DIM also marks a segment of the society, therefore it is analyzed from a sociolinguistic perspective in the next chapter. Next chapter makes clear why this is under the derogation-driven uses of DIMs. Now, we discuss the other three derogative functions, again, in order of frequency in the data.

**The [irony] DIM.** There are only 40 examples in the data that could be considered as having ironic functions, which is only about 10% of the whole DIMs data. Here, ironic examples have a sarcastic function with effects similar to those reported by Nelms (2001) such as humor and attention catcher but more importantly, derogation-like effects. Sarcasm and irony are normally linked together. Indeed, based on Nelms (2001), as cited in Boxer (2002), it is clear that irony is sarcasm’s corollary. Boxer defines sarcasm as “overt irony intentionally used by the speaker” (p. 100). Irony here is defined as “a method of …. expression in which the intended meaning of the word is the direct opposite of their usual sense” according to Webster’s College dictionary (Neufeldt, 1997).

The following are examples of such ironic function: “actitucita” (attitude+DIM) and “Carlitos” (Charles+DIM). These examples in the data do not mean “little/dear” attitude or “little/dear” Carlos, precisely. In the former example, a little girl was angry and protesting during a car trip. Instead of being a “dear” attitude, this was really an attitude a mother did not at all approve of her daughter, and the daughter was being reprimanded for that. Henceforth, here we find an explanation for this negative meaning
of “bad” of this DIM in these cases. In this case, the meaning is not [-little], like in other ironic DIMs. It is [-dear] instead of [-little] simply because nouns such as “attitude” are [-gradable] (in the little-big scale); thus, they cannot be assigned a rate or grade in the scale of “littleness”. Had this DIM not been interpreted or used with the “dear” (or its opposite “not dear” or “bad”) function, it would have been rendered ungrammatical because this is not a gradable noun, unless there were a semantic shift of the word “attitude”, which does not appear to be the case here.

In the case of “Carlitos” (Charles+DIM), the speaker introduces a male called “Carlos” while videotaping a visit of a church group to a park in Orlando. This “Carlos” is known at that church because of his many obligations in and out of church. He often arrives late at church events and always presents excuses referring to incidents occurring on his way. The speaker in the video introduces him as “Carlos+DIM, the complicated one”. Playing with this [dear] DIM and the adjective “complicated” makes this use ironic. It may be interpreted as the “dear but not so dear” Carlos. A clear example of the [-little] DIM is the following:

18) Host of a talk show: “conoceremos a la madre de esta criaturITA de 36 años”

We’ll meet the mother of this baby(creature)+DIM of 36 years old

A possible paraphrase for this is: “this absolutely [-little] boy, who thinks he is still little but is 36 years old already”. Thus, ironic DIMs basically mean either [-little] or [-dear].

The [pejorative] DIM. The least frequent function of DIMs is pejoration, probably because of the pressure of the very common function of endearment. Yet, admittedly, they exist, and we need to account for these uncommon uses as well. There are entities or nouns that inherently are not supposed to have a [+little] feature. For example, giants and basketball players are not supposed to be little. There are others which are more highly
valued if bigger (e.g., a house, a country). In other words, the bigger (or similar features) the entity is, the better or the more appreciated or expected by societal norms. For example, “house+DIM” may have a pejorative or condescending effect in some uses (we saw above that this same example may have positive [+affectionate] effects).

A sentence like “yes, they have a house+DIM” may mean something like “well, at least they have a place to sleep and eat. It is not much, though”. In the data, we have the example of “piano” used with a DIM. One of the listeners thought that this was a lack of respect or a sign of not sufficiently appreciating the piano under consideration. She explicitly said to the person diminutivizing “piano”, “don’t be disrespectful!”

Diminutivizing words like “car” also may have this condescending or pejorative effect in many occasions. In such cases, “car+DIM” may refer to that little car that somebody has (probably the speaker herself/himself) that is not very new or in good condition (like *cochecillo* –“car+DIM”- in Spain). Similarly, a “serenade+DIM” is not a well appreciated serenade, as the following example from the data shows:

19)-“Esa serenatICA majunche”

*that serenade+DIM horrible*

Many professions are regarded with high esteem in the Hispanic culture (and many other cultures). Physicians, lawyers and professors are among these professionals. In many Hispanic countries, both lawyers and physicians are called “doctors”. This was more common historically, but there are still many examples of this in contemporary Spanish. In *Doña Bárbara*, an early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century Venezuelan novel by novelist Rómulo Gallegos, one of the two main characters was a lawyer, and he was widely referred to as “doctor”. By his enemies, however, he was called *doctorcito* (doctor+DIM), also shown in the data as:
20)-A middle aged Venezuelan cop in a movie: “esa doctorCITA es una p…!” (swearing here, meaning “prostitute”) 
that female doctor+DIM is a p....

In both cases, a lawyer (or “doctor”) is referred to as “doctor+DIM” by enemies, obviously with an offensive and pejorative sense. In example 20, a detective got himself into trouble, and one female lawyer is after him. He said this after an interview with her and other high-rank officers.

**The attenuation function or polite DIM**

Before actually presenting the descriptive analysis of polite DIMs in the data, let us clarify the notion and important features of politeness in general, drawn from Leech’s (1983) politeness principle and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) Politeness Theory. In Brown and Levinson theory, politeness is understood as that basic instinct of interactants to preserve face; the face of the addressee, mainly, but also the speaker’s face (the concept of face is that of Goffman’s 1983, as explained below). Among the major assumptions of this Politeness Theory, some deserve special attention here due to their relevance to my study. This theory proposes that every “model” (or ideal) interactant has face (both negative, the need/desire to protect one’s space and freedom, and positive face, the image of self portrayed). It is also assumed that interactants want to maintain each other’s face (it is of mutual interest), and as a consequence, they will want to minimize face threatening. These assumptions apply to many uses of DIMs in the data via attenuating functions. In other words, by applying this theoretical approach to the data in my study, we can find reasonable explanations for many common uses of these Spanish DIMs.

This function of the DIMs has been accounted for in languages such as Greek. Sifianou (1992), for example, investigated this function of diminutives in English and in
Greek. Sifianou pointed out that in Greek, although the prototypical function of diminutives is to indicate [littleness], such affixes extensively also mark politeness. Furthermore, Greek diminutives serve to establish or reaffirm a solidary framework for verbal interaction. Thus, both names can be given to this DIM, the [attenuate] and the [polite] DIM because attenuation occurs because of politeness pressure. Let us see some preliminary examples of politeness in DIMs, which constitute 1/5 of the DIMs data.

In the following example, a male member of a church addresses the pastor by:

21) “Pastor, le guardé una pizzITA”
   Pastor, I saved a pizza+DIM for you.

According to the context, we can observe that there is no reference to the size of the slice of pizza (it was regular size). We can also observe that, unlike with other food items, this DIM does not express the idea of that pizza being delicious or especially good (it was a regular delivery pizza). The most plausible explanation for this use is that the speaker is being polite and respectful with the church pastor. This explanation is based first on the relationship of the two (pastor and church member), and secondly on the church member’s personality (always trying to help the church leaders). We can argue that the church member is trying to save the positive face of the addressee as being the pastor (as pastor, he also deserves to be served, and as pastor, he cannot be left without food). Furthermore, we can argue that there may be also an attempt to save negative face. It may be interpreted as if the church member is trying to avoid imposing on the pastor’s eating habits, eating preferences or eating time/schedule.

Another example of polite DIMs is the one found in a common farewell expression in modern Spanish: hasta lueguito (see you later+DIM). It can certainly be interpreted as having either attenuating functions (meaning “some time later, without specifics”) or
intensifying functions (meaning “see you in a bit”), depending how we interpret this reference to time. However, there are cases, like the one in the data, where it is difficult to argue for either interpretation. This message (see you later+DIM) was left in the answering machine of a colleague of the caller, whom he saw very sporadically. The relationship is mostly by sporadic emails or sporadic greetings on campus. The message was not interpreted as having the attenuating/diminutivizing or intensifying functions described above. It was used as a polite marker. He was calling at the colleague’s home (private space), and late at night (private time). Thus, probably it was a subconscious effort to preserve the addressee’s negative face. The following is the polite DIM at a service encounter (e.g., restaurant):

22)-A woman client to a waiter at a restaurant:
“¿nos trae la cuentica?”
Will you bring us the bill+DIM?

One of the major manifestations of this type of use is the function of mitigation, as example 22 may show. Let us look at this function more closely.

The [mitigate] DIM. This attenuating force emphasizes another very common function associated with the DIM according to all the literature reviewed above. This is in direct connection with speech act performance. This function of DIMs consists in reducing the degree of imposition or face threatening of speech acts. This DIM represents approximately 12% of all DIMs.

This facet of the DIMs in relation to pragmatic effects in the speech acts of requesting or demanding, for example, has been briefly discussed by Alonso (1937). He explained that “los diminutivos mismos piden y demandan, y con más eficacia, generalmente, que los imperativos y sus variantes gramaticales, precisamente por ser
medios indirectos de expression (Bally’s 1936 “expresividad linguistica”) p. 49. “The diminutives themselves request and demand, and with more effectiveness, generally, than the imperatives and their grammatical variants, precisely because they are indirect means of expression” (Bally’s 1936 linguistic expressiveness).

23)-“no, déjame mi agüita aquí”  
no, leave me my water+DIM here

Even though some may argue that the DIM in 23 above has the [dear] function, the fact that its absence makes this a very direct and uneasy demand or order contributes to the assumption that the most important function here is that of [mitigate], even if the [dear] connotation is true. These are two young women talking in the hearer’s house. The speaker is her sister-in-law spending a few days in that home. The hearer is cleaning up the table and is about to pick up the speaker’s glass of water. The context of this speech behavior requires the softening of this request. The following is another good instance:

24)-Young woman inviting another young woman to a birthday party:  
“bueno, si tienes un chancecITO”  
well, if you have a chance+DIM

In example 24 above the word “chance” is diminutivized. One young woman invites another young woman (from the same church) to a social gathering. To avoid imposing on the hearer’s time and plans, the speaker uses the DIM. Here, we have another act, invitation, being attenuated via diminutivization. In this particular case, there can be also a connection with the goal of saving the hearer’s face.

Now, why is it that DIMs are pragmatic attenuators par excellence? The reason is precisely their connection with the radial categories of [dear] and [little]. When asking a favor, for example, the hearer may subconsciously think that she/he is “dear” to the speaker, and henceforth, she/he cannot refuse to do the favor. Some people interviewed
and some respondents of the questionnaires directly mentioned that they would use DIMs when asking for favors, to soften that favor. Another possibility is that the hearer may understand this use subconsciously as meaning “little”. In the case of some types of playful insults (“silly” and “liar” in the data), for example, the insulting adjective may be mitigated by this “little” meaning. The hearer, then, does not see herself/himself as “silly/liar” but just as “a little silly/liar”. In the same speech act of asking for a favor mentioned above, we can also see how this [little] effect may mitigate the demand. It is just a “little” favor, after all, how can the hearer refuse to do it? By using the DIM as a pragmatic attenuator, the speaker tries to not impose on the hearer, and thus, saves the hearer’s face.

In addition to this, we can also find examples of attenuation in non-face-threatening acts such as assertion. The common Spanish expression *estoy comiendo* (I am eating+DIM), or other similar diminutivized participials, is an example of this assertion mitigation. In diminutivized expressions like *me compré un carrito, por fin!* (I bought me a car+DIM, finally!), the speaker may attenuate the assertion “I have a new car” to avoid committing or compromising herself/himself to higher expectations (i.e., “not a great deal of a car; don’t expect too much”). It resembles the English attenuator –*ish in expressions such as “see you at three-*ish”. Howard (1998) associates this suffix with the “approximation” function in cases such as “greenish”. This English suffix is often used to mitigate the degree of commitment, in this case to time and punctuality. When American English speakers hear this, then they know they cannot complain if the person arrives at three fifteen. In this respect, the [mitigate] DIM and the English suffix –*ish have similar illocutionary and perlocutionary force.
There is yet one more important polite attenuating function of DIMs; that of euphemism. According to Carnoy (1927), politeness and respect for the interactants is one of the main causes for which euphemisms are often used. Thus, there is an important connection between politeness and euphemism. However, due to the singularity of the euphemistic uses, this takes a different section in this chapter.

**The [euphemism] DIM.** Euphemism, in this particular work, is understood as “means by which a disagreeable, offensive, or fear-instilling matter is designated with an indirect or softer term. [They are used] to disguise an unpleasant truth, veil an offense, or palliate indecency.”, as Kany (1960: v) states.

In early-20th-century Spanish, Alonso (1937) cites an anecdotal example in this respect from Santo Domingo.

-A Judge: “¿cómo encontró a la pareja acusada?”
  *how did you find the couple accused?*
-Witness: “Pues, ¿qué se cree usté, señor juez?, *singando*” (obscene word)
  *well, what do you think Mr. judge?, f...ing (the F-word)*
-Judge: “use un lenguaje más decente”
  *use a language more decent*
-Witness: “bueno, pues, *singandito*”
  *o.k., well, f...ing+DIM*

Alonso assigns to this a politeness function. However, more specifically, this type of politeness is shown by using a euphemism. Swearing or obscene words are taboos, especially in formal and public contexts such a court of law, in the middle of a trial and in front of a judge. Because of this, the judge asks the witness to use a language more appropriate to the speech situation. The witness changes the simplex obscene word to the same word but with a DIM. The DIM is considered, by the witness, the only resource s/he needs for making the language more decent, acceptable.
There are 32 examples (approximately 9%) of this function in the data. The following has to do with the relatively tabooed topic of age.

25)- “habían cuatro viejITOs”  
*there-were 4  old-people+DIM*

Had the speaker said “4 old people” with no DIM, it would have sounded pejorative and very harsh. Actually, in the interviews and questionnaires, around 50% of the respondents agreed that the absence of –*ito* in viejito (old+DIM) sounds harsh and insulting. Age or reference to it is considered a taboo in some cultures or contexts. Old age is apparently an age many people do not want to get to, probably because of its closeness to death, to illness, or incapacity. Thus, a direct reference to old age has to be euphemized. This is very likely the reason for “old” to be diminutivized in this context.

Sickness-related situations are euphemized via DIMs in some of these examples. This is probably caused by the fact that sickness somehow relates to death, a taboo.

26)- “Ah, ¡¿está enfermiTA?!”  
*A, is she sick+DIM?!

The word “sick”, “enfermita” (sick+DIM) in example 26 euphemizes this taboo. On another occasion, when referring to some problems a person on a wheelchair was having, the word “problem” was diminutivized. The person in the wheelchair was a church member that suffered an accident and almost died. He miraculously survived the accident but was in a very unstable and critical condition. He had been suffering serious respiratory problems ever since. That is why “problem” is diminutivized (*problemita*). It was a big problem, really but one that had to do with this unfortunate situation (disease and death are probably the taboos here). There may be contradictions if we assign to
these uses a real “little” sense. For instance, it would be nonsensical to assign the
meaning of “little” to the word “bad+DIM” below:

27)- “mi compañero(trabajo) estuvo muy malITO. Lo desahuciaron”
my (work)mate was very sick(bad)+DIM. He was diagnosed terminal

The word “gossip” was also euphemized via DIMs. People are not supposed to
gossip. Gossiping is socially stigmatized (even though many may do it). Insults may also
receive mitigation via DIMs (e.g., “silly” and “disrespectful”), as example 28 shows:

28- “Como que el hombre sí es mujerieguecITO”
like --- the man really is womanizer+DIM
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Table 2. Frequency of use for DIMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic/pragmatic?</th>
<th>Major category</th>
<th># of uses/tokens (out of 450)</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantics-driven</td>
<td>Littleness</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses</td>
<td>Childness</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics-driven</td>
<td>Attenuation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses</td>
<td>Derogation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The apparent discrepancy in numbers is caused by the double-counting explained above.

**Augmentatives**

The other most important EVAL, from a pragmatic perspective, is the AUG. Let us
recall that “los sufijos aumentativos indican tamaño grande en su significado primario.

Los principales son –ón/a, -ote/a, y azo/a” (Hualde et al., 2001, p. 169). (the
augmentative suffixes indicate big size in its primary meaning. The principal ones are –ón/a, -ote/a, y azo/a. .. –azo). Now, this is not true only in Spanish but in many other languages. Grandi (2002) did a cross-linguistic study of AUGs in the Mediterranean area. He observed in this area two important trends: AUGs are significantly less widespread than DIMs and they are also polysemous. He argues that this polysemy consists in two major senses: “big” (often attached to nouns) and the meaning that has to do with an exaggerated quality or action, especially if attached to adjectives.

Grandi’s findings are consistent with the results of my study. My study labels this first tendency as the core sense of AUGs, as explained in Chapter 3. The second tendency is associated with the meaning of “very” in my study. These two tendencies are reflected in different specific uses of AUGs, as shown below. Regardless of this polysemy, we can conclude that AUGs in modern Spanish are essentially aggrandizing suffixes: they aggrandize size or quality. We begin with the account, based on the data, of the semantics-driven uses: “big” for –ote and –ón, and “hit” for –azo. After this, we concentrate on the major category of pragmatics-driven uses: the intensification functions (with the meaning of “very” and related meanings), and the seemingly opposite, attenuation function.

In a sense, AUGs and DIMs have the same major pragmatic categories: intensification, attenuation, derogation, and affection. The difference lies on the predominance of one over the others. For DIMs, attenuation and affection are the primary ones whereas for AUGs it is the intensification function that is the most predominant. There are other subtle differences that have to do with the connection between one function and the other and the quality of the function itself. For example, the attenuation
function in DIMs come from the “littleness” sense whereas the attenuation function in AUGs may come from the “brevity” sense of some AUGs, such as –ón, and –azo. In addition, the intensification function in DIMs affect mostly appreciated qualities, whereas the intensification of AUGs affects any quality. Below, we can see the distribution in frequency of these pragmatics-driven uses vs. the semantics-driven ones.

**Semantics-Driven Uses**

The “hit” –AZO. As recorded already in the literature, many uses of –azo imply the violent hit that is given with objects. For example, a “bat+AZO” may mean imply “a hit or punch with a (baseball) bat”. This use is still part of the senses of this suffix in modern Spanish as reflected in the data. In the following example, a famous Hispanic singer is referring to an experience she had with her ex-husband, also a famous Hispanic actor.

29) “se casó conmigo y al siguiente día me aventó un cenicerAZO”

he married me & the next day he threw me an ashtray+

The [big] AUG. There are different suffixes which meant “big” or something like that in the data: -ote/a, ón/a, -azo, and –al. The second one in the list is used in example 30 below, -azo in example 31, and the other appears in example 32.

30)-A “gossip reporter”: “Ernesto LaGuardia nos dió tremendo noticIÓN”

Ernest La Guardia (to)us gave tremendous news+

31) “Ya decidí hablar porque sólo con letterAZO, No!”

I decided to talk because only via letters+

32)- Widow: “¡Qué dinerAL me va a salir el velorio!”

what a money+

The [+big] meaning, based on semantic antithesis, gave rise to ironic senses of AUGs. Because it only appeared once in the data, there is not a separate section for this function. It was counted under the [big] senses. As figure 7 and table 3 show, this type of
use is relatively infrequent if compared with the pragmatics-driven uses in the data analyzed.

Figure 7. Frequency of uses for AUGs

Table 3: Frequency of uses for AUGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic/pragmatic?</th>
<th>Major category</th>
<th>Specific function</th>
<th># of uses</th>
<th>Specific function %</th>
<th>Major category %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantics-driven</td>
<td>“big”</td>
<td>[big]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“hit”</td>
<td>[intense]very</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attenuation</td>
<td>[mitigate]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[euphemism]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics-driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pragmatics-Driven Uses**

**The intensification function of AUGs.**

As can be noted from table 3, intensification is the primary pragmatic function of modern Spanish AUGs. It represents a little more than 70% of all the 93 uses of AUGs analyzed. Included under this category are the specific functions of [intense] (with the meaning of “very”, the [dear] (and directly related to this, the [flirt]) AUGs, and finally the [pejorative] AUG. It intensifies the quality via an adverbial function like “very”. 
Depending on the quality intensified, negative or positive, this intensification gives rise to affectionate or pejorative connotations. Let us first consider specific examples of this function without affectionate or pejorative connotations.

**The [intense] or “very” AUG.** This is the one single most common function of AUGs. It represents a little above half of all the AUGs under scrutiny here. In the example below, we find AUG attached to adjectives. The most suitable translation in English is that of “very” because of the adverbial function in the adjective phrase. In example 33, it modifies an adjective that describes a possible spot on the moon (which can be bought in the future) as “great/good”.

33-Female host: "Un acre pero padrOTOTOTOTE" (“en la luna”)

*An acre but good+AUG+AUG+AUG (in the moon)*

**The [dear] AUG.** This very uncommon use of AUGs emerges because of the attachment of AUGs to bases that in themselves express an appreciated quality or entity. In the data, one male greets another male, who he has not seen for a long time, with the following expression: *hermanAZO*! (brother+AUG!). In normal interactions in modern Spanish in many Latin American environments, this is interpreted as “beloved/appreciated/very dear brother!” The base “brother” in itself represents a positive quality: brotherhood, intimacy, friendship. With the attachment of AUG, the goodness of such quality is aggrandized and henceforth, it is interpreted as “very dear”. This type of use is also observed in expressions like *carrAZO* (car+AUG), where it may be translated as “geat car!” This “great” adjective implies that it is liked and appreciated. Therefore, these could be labeled as affectionate uses of AUGs.

**The [flirt] AUG.** As with DIMs, an affectionate suffix is extended to other arenas. Recall that the [dear] DIM was extended to the sexual arena and gave rise to sexual
connotations. The same happens with AUGs. The appreciated qualities of a man or woman are aggrandized with some flirtatious effects. The qualities, in this type of AUG, normally have to do with physical body or elements that may produce sexual attraction or pleasure. In the following example, the woman addressee of the greeting looked very sexy, and that is what the AUG reflects here; obvious sexual connotation. Interestingly here, the speaker contrasted the DIM with the AUG.

34)-In “La Jaula” (The Cage) comedy (bachelors bring single women to their home)

-One of the guys to one of the women: “Hola MartICA, no martICA no, MartOTA”

Hi Marta+DIM, no Marta+DIM no, Marta+AUG

35)-A young male introduces a famous Latin female model/singer; like Pam Anderson:

“¡qué cuerpAZO!”

what a body+AUG!

The young male host describes the sexually attractive body of the model/singer with this AUG. There were also examples of women describing or referring to men with AUGs with similar connotations. The data does not show a clear tendency regarding male vs. female preferences, but intuitively, it seems clear that this [flirt] AUG is more common among men addressing to women than vice versa, probably because men more often than women compliment the opposite gender (see Chapter 5 for more on this).

The [pejorative] AUG. The last specific function within the category of intensification is that of pejoration, which hardly occurred in the data. One example is very clear in this respect: solterón/solterona (single+AUG = bachelor). More than half of the people answering the question “what does solterón/solterona mean?” responded that it had pejorative connotations. Interesting here is the fact that the feminine version of such expression is the one with more obvious pejorative connotation. A woman, in many modern societies, is not supposed to be single after a certain age. If so, then it is a
negative characteristic. It is relatively true with men also, but there seems to be more negative effect in the singleness of a 30 or 40-year old woman than a man. That is why attaching an AUG to this word (single) exaggerates this negativity. This word (single+AUG), especially when describing women, often implies that that woman is not only single but also that she will probably never get married. Popularly also, features such as anger, depression, and obstinate character are believed to be distinctive features of “solteronas”. This is a clear pejorative effect.

The attenuation function of AUGs

This is the second most common major category of AUGs but is the less common of the two major pragmatic categories. It represents a fifth of all the AUGs in the corpus. As discussed before, it withdraws some of the identity of the base. We argued before that this meaning of AUGs may have emerged either from the pejoration function (because of the lose of value of base) or from the “brevity” feature in the nomina actionis -ón and –azo (the only AUGs that occur with this function). Regardless of the origin, this function implies a type of identity diminution; that is why we could label this the “diminutive AUG”. It manifests itself via the specific function of [mitigate] and subsequently, and in connection with the latter, via the [euphemism] function.

The [mitigate] AUG. As with DIMs, [mitigate] AUGs also attenuate speech acts. It minimizes the degree of imposition of a face-threatening act or it may reduce the negative burden of a word or expression. It can also simply diminish the value of the base identity. This is the second most common specific function of AUGs found in the data. It accounts for around 17% of all the AUGs. Here are some examples of such use.

36)-Weather forecast woman:
“Vamos a dar el último vistAZO al tiempo”
\[let's \text{ go to give the last view+AUG at weather} (=let's have a last brief look at climate)\]
Example 36 implies a very brief look at the weather, during the weather forecast of D.A. In example 37, the adverb *medio* (sort of) clarifies the attenuating function of this AUG when describing how much of the look of a rocker certain clothing style shows. Finally, example 38 occurred in a soccer game. The broadcaster meant that a certain player just touched the ball but could not really kick it. Again, as Reynoso (2002) asserted, “*se expresa un debilitamiento del significado de la base*” (p. 41) (it expresses a weakening of the meaning of the base). Hardman (2005, in personal communication) also observed this type of function in this type of AUG.

**The [euphemism] AUG.** This [mitigate] AUG or attenuating function of AUGs may be extended to taboos or similar expressions or topics. In Example 39 below at a church talk, the speaker (church pastor) referred to someone who founded several churches despite his poor reading skills. Illiteracy is a characteristic of uneducated people, often from low-income families. This is of course a social stigma; hence, a direct and clear reference to this characteristic is somehow a taboo in this public church environment. Adding the suffix –ón to this adjective-like base reduces the direct force of this potentially negative word.

39)-“hasta analfabetÓN era el hermano”
*Even illiterate+AUG was the brother*

Several insults or not positive attributes are also used with AUG. We need to note here that these examples of insults (or bad attributes) with AUG do not make a reference to “bigness” whatsoever. Actually, there is a reduction force in the contexts above. For
example, (phonetically transcribed with an intervocalic consonant inserted) [feyón] (Ugly+AUG), used when describing a hotel room where a famous singer spent the night, does not mean “very ugly” or “big ugly”, but something like “a little ugly”. The modifier _medio_ (sort of) also confirms the attenuating function of this AUG. Had the speakers not used the forms with AUG, they would have sounded very harsh and direct, which was not appropriate since he was a public figure with a role of entertaining people. Criticisms and rudeness would not contribute with the portrayal of the image he intended. Let us keep in mind that in many instances, directness is face threatening. Thus, the affixed words (with AUGs) make the reference to the bad attribute or insult an indirect one. This indirectness softens the taboo, and henceforth carries a euphemistic function. Because this indirectness is achieved mainly via AUGs, we can conclude then that these AUGs are euphemizers in these contexts.

As can be seen from both [euphemism] DIM and AUG, euphemization may be achieved not only via word substitution but also through word affixation. Evaluative suffixes such as Spanish augmentatives and diminutives then may be used pragmatically for euphemistic purposes. In the data, any instance of the use of these suffixes to reduce the force of a potential face-threatening act (FTAs) in Goffman’s (1983) terms is considered an example of euphemistic use. This euphemistic use has at least two implications important implications.

The first implication is that my study presents another euphemistic strategy not found in linguistic literature (neither on Spanish linguistics nor on the linguistics of euphemism). This not-accounted for strategy is word affixation; more specifically, via Spanish evaluative suffixes. Thus, affixation should be included in any comprehensive
list of euphemistic strategies. The examples analyzed in this paper show this other euphemistic strategy. The other implication is that this paper presents, also, another perspective on Spanish diminutives and augmentatives; namely, the euphemistic impact of such suffixes. The implication for this is that many traditional accounts of such suffixes in the Hispanic linguistic literature today are lacking an important aspect of Spanish evaluative morphology. Any comprehensive account of Spanish evaluative suffixes should include the pragmatic euphemistic function of such suffixes.

**Superlatives**

Superlativization, in general terms, is an intensification process. It either marks high degree/highest degree of a gradable quality or a feeling of exultant joy/pride. Because of the latter marking effect, Jörnvig (1962), in what represents one of the very first complete studies of Spanish SUPERLs, labels this suffix as “elative”, more than SUPERL. Jörnvig clarifies that there are other intensification processes in Spanish; some are more analytical than others (e.g., *muy* “very”, *harto/bien* “rather”), which are normally labeled in Spanish grammar as “periphrastic processes”. SUPERLs, on the other hand, represent the synthetic or non-periphrastic alternatives for the same process. It is very similar to the Hungarian excessive suffix (EXS) that Dressler and Kiefer (1990) investigated. They observed that Hungarian EXS –*leg* expresses the absolute highest degree of a property (in comparison to other entities which can have a high degree of such property), and it expresses emphasis and is often used to impress the audience.

Spanish SUPERLs are essentially semantic-pragmatic intensifiers in modern Spanish, as shown in the literature reviewed and the data analyzed here. Their pragmatic effects are minimal if we compare SUPERLs with DIMs or AUGs. It is the least productive and the most monosemous of all Spanish EVALs under scrutiny here. The
meaning of modern SUPERL is mostly “very”, which can be observed in all uses of such affix today. There are no instances in the data where we cannot associate the notion of “very” to the SUPERLs found. As we saw in Chapter 2, in the diachronic account of this affix, “very” may have not been the most common function of Latin SUPERLs. We see probably a semantic shift in this Spanish EVAL. Recall that this used to mean more often “most” and complied with grammatical rules in Latin. It was a grammatical suffix that constituted the relative superlative degree of adjectives, like “-est” (e.g., the longest) in modern English.

The major function today, however, is that of intensification, and secondarily we can see some uses connected to honorific functions. Externally, we can see how this suffix may mark formal or informal encounters. This is discussed in Chapter 5, when we consider some sociolinguistic issues. Let us see examples of these two specific pragmatic functions of SUPERLs: intensification and honorific.

**The [intense] SUPERL.** Jörnvig (1962) indicated that “hoy día el elativo sintetico expresa grado más alto que el procedimiento analítico con ‘muy’” (p. 73) (today, the synthetic elative expresses a higher degree than the analytical counterpart “very”), unlike early Spanish SUPERL. It is consistent with the data analyzed here where superlativized words express more than non-superlativized adjectives. Furthermore, Jörnvig asserts that due to the humanistic spirit dominant in that time, early Spanish SUPERL was mostly considered like a Latin ornament in the Spanish language (e.g., Sancho in Don Quixote II). Later on, once it was a definite part of the Spanish grammar and lexicon, this suffix acquired the property of giving a special force and meaning to the word it modified. This is precisely what motivates discussing this under the pragmatics of EVALs.
female TV host: (describing a coming show of a famous Hispanic singer in the USA)
“va a estar padrISISISISIMO”
*it’s going to be good* +SUPERL+SUPERL

It expresses, obviously, a very high value (for the speaker) of such show. It even increases this expressiveness by the partial iteration of the suffix itself. Of all the EVALs, this is the one that apparently more often presents such phenomenon of iteration. It is not strange if we consider the essential feature of SUPERLs (intensification) and the essential function of this iteration (intensification).

**The [honorific] SUPERL.** Even though this SUPERL may also mean “very”, it requires further attention because of its effects, which may be distinct from a simple “very” meaning. In this instance below, we have a reference to God in the context of a public prayer. This particular speech event, public prayer, has an important feature: It exalts God. This context requires the exalting of God, and it is partially achieved via an honorific. Exalting, as suggested by Armon (2005, personal communication), requires the mobilization of all linguistic resources possible: hence SUPERLs, association with heaven, and others. In this case, the SUPERL is one more of these resources to exalt or honor God.

male praying: “Amantisimo Padre Celestial”
*lover* +SUPERL Father Heavenly

Another reason for associating the honorific function to this instance is the linguistic environment; not only the speech situation. The word *Amantisimo* is followed by two words with high honorific-like connotation: “Father” and “Heavenly”. This use is similar to other relatively common uses of this suffix in formal encounters such as “Reverendísimo” (Reverend+SUPERL) and “Excelentísimo” (Excellent+SUPERL), which were not recorded in this corpus. The former has been used to introduce important
pastors or church leaders and the latter to introduce the president of a country. This seems to be the only EVAL with such function, contrary to Jurafsky’s (1996) arguments in relation to a supposed honorific DIM. Jurafsky cited Virgencita (Virgin+DIM) and Diosito (God+DIM). These terms do not represent honorifics. They simply have an affection purpose. It is like saying “Dear Virgin” or “Dear God”.

Conclusion

The Spanish DIM is essentially a semantic-pragmatic diminisher; the AUG suffix is essentially a semantic-pragmatic aggrandizer; and the SUPERL is a semantic-pragmatic intensifier. Pragmatically speaking, the DIM is primarily a speech act attenuator and an affective binder, whereas the AUG is an intensifier. The pragmatic functions of SUPERLs are minimal, and they always correspond to the propositional meaning of “very”.

The pragmatic functions of Spanish EVALs seem more relevant than (or at least as relevant as) the semantic senses of such suffixes, if we consider their frequency and productivity. Pragmatically, these suffixes have a very diverse range of functions and effects. At least in the data analyzed here and in other studies, pragmatic functions account for more EVALs than semantic senses.

DIMs are classified under three major pragmatic categories: affection, attenuation and derogation (in order of frequency). These are realized via specific functions such as [dear], [flirt], [intense], [mitigate], [euphemism], [pejoration], [irony]. AUGs are classified under two major pragmatic categories: intensification (the most common) and secondarily attenuation. We find specific AUGs such as [intense], [irony], [dear], [flirt], [mitigate]. As can be seen, both DIMs and AUGs have similar functions but they differ in
the predominance of distinct categories. Finally, SUPERLs, the least pragmatic of all EVALs, is basically an intensifier, and secondarily it may have an honorific function.

As can be seen, common traditional theoretical linguistic fields such as semantics and (syntax)morphology do not account for all the nuances of Spanish EVALs. Leaving the pragmatics of EVALs aside is unfortunate if we want to deeply understand the meaning and uses of these Spanish affixes. The semantic chapter showed that there is much more to EVALs than their simple propositional meanings. Thus, my study concludes that on the one hand, pragmatic analyses are indeed necessary to fully understand linguistic processes like the ones analyzed here. On the other hand, my study shows one more piece of empirical evidence for the need of integrated accounts of language use and structure. Both fields of linguistics, theoretical and applied, complement each other. The next chapter shows the relevance of one more of these applied theoretical fields: sociolinguistics.
CHAPTER 5
SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

This chapter deals with EVAL functions that have to do with aspects such as group marking, social distance, and social context marking. These are sociolinguistic aspects in nature, and in my study, they are kept separate from pragmatic functions that have to do with speech act performance. This separation requires further explanation.

The broad definition assumed in this work for sociolinguistics is that of Holmes (1992). Holmes defines sociolinguistics as the study of the relationship between language and society. In general, sociolinguists try to explain language differences in different social contexts, functions of language in the society, and how language is used to convey social meaning. Both Hymes (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980) include sociolinguistic aspects in their theory of communicative competence, as mentioned before. Canale and Swain explained that Hymes’ reference to speakers’ knowledge of contextual appropriateness of particular linguistic forms has to do with sociocultural competence. This type of knowledge that they labeled as “sociocultural” refers to the social meaning or value of a given utterance. This type of knowledge or competence is “the basis for judgments as to the appropriateness of a given utterance in a particular social context” (p. 16; Canale & Swain, 1980), which is consistent with Hymes’ Ethnography of Speaking; an important methodological approach in my study. Thus, this type of competence is a fundamental target of analysis in my study.

When discussing applying sociolinguistics, Boxer (2002) recognizes a difference between micro and macro aspects of the field, which is also discussed by other authors.
such as Fishman (1972a) and Romaine (1994). Macro-sociolinguistics deals with phenomena involving communities at large such as multilingual societies. Phenomena such as language planning, language and nations and the like are within the macro perspective of sociolinguistics. Micro-sociolinguistics, on the other hand, involves face-to-face interactions, person-to-person verbal encounters, and the study of areas such as pragmatics and discourse. Macro-sociolinguistics (also sometimes called sociology of language) starts with society and analyzes language in it. Micro-linguistics (often focused on monolingual interactions) begins with language and analyzes the social forces that influence it. Thus, my study emphasizes a micro perspective of sociolinguistics supplemented by macro-sociolinguistic aspects whenever necessary. For example, there is reference here to aspects such as gender and language, which in Boxer’s (2002) words “spans both micro and macro-sociolinguistics” (p. 3).

In brief, for organization and presentation purposes, my study sub-divides the fields of sociolinguistics and pragmatics. We already have seen that there is a clear interface between the two, and the latter can be considered a sub-field of the former, at least in the notion of sociolinguistics considered in this section. In this chapter, unlike the pragmatics chapter, the focus is primarily on aspects such as group marking, society contexts, and society power structure, which are clearly better fitted with the sociolinguistic label.

This chapter consists of three major sections: 1) Group marking effects, 2) Context marking, and 3) Power and society considerations. In the first section, this chapter discusses in detail the following functions of Spanish evaluative suffixes: the [child] DIM, the [+female] DIM, and the dialectal DIM. The other major function category is that of context marking. In this respect, this chapter discusses the style or register (degree
of formality) functions of EVALs in general and of SUPERLs in particular. The third and last major category this chapter covers is that of society and power. This last section presents general reflections on the notion of power in society as reflected in particular uses of Spanish EVALs. Unlike the other two major sections of this chapter, this goal of this last section is to provide the reader with food for thought more than to state conclusive remarks.

**Group Marking**

The term “group identity” refers here to the marking of one person (speaker, listener, or another referent) as part of a particular society segment. It includes “in-group identity markers” within a politeness approach (Brown & Levinson, 1987), but it also includes group marking without reference to politeness and group marking from the outside (not only markers of membership in the interactants’ group but markers that even outsiders use to mark group membership). Terkourafi (1999) shows that in the Greek culture in general, solidarity in in-group relationships motivates widespread diminutives use. In the data analyzed here, at least, DIMs mark three distinct groups of people: children, women, and ethnic/nationality groups. Some uses of DIMs imply that the referent (of such DIM word) has some degree of [+child] ([child] DIM), [+female] ([female] or gendered DIM), or [+ethnic/nationality] (“dialectal” or “regional” DIM).

**The [Child] DIM**

Traditionally, DIMs have been associated with children. In fact, as established before, Jurafsky’s (1996) model assigns the [+child] function to the core semantics of such suffix. Melzi and King (2003) have also studied this connection between Spanish diminutives and children. In a study on Russian DIMs, Andrews (1999) also found, after analyzing many responses to questionnaires, that “teenagers believe that morphologically
complex diminutive forms are used considerably more frequently in conversation with small children than nonsuffixed, simplex lexical forms” (p. 90). Based on statistical analyses, Andrews observed support for the hypothesis that children receive direct exposure to a significantly high percentage of complex diminutivized words.

In his discussion of vocative acts or English terms of address more specifically, Schneider (2003) has indicated that children are not normally addressed in English speaking societies with full forms of their names. Rather, adults use diminutives or diminutivized forms of the children’s names. Schneider points out that –ie or –y DIMs (e.g., doggIE, puppY, RonnY) are the standard forms for addressing children, at least in American English. These, he added, are not often used with grown-up children, unless the parents ignore or are reluctant to accept the growing and adulthood of their sons or daughters. Addressing adults with DIMs, he argued, normally violates politeness norms. These facts clearly show the [+child] function of English DIMs.

Thus, in the data and all the examples cited below, this use of the DIM marks this segment of the society, the children. The use of this type of diminutivization may reflect [+child] features of different types of interactants; the referents, the recipients (listeners), or the users (speakers) of such DIM. Since the data under analysis in my study come from adults, children as users of DIMs was not observed, but it is also well-known that children use many diminutivized words, not only in Spanish, but also in English (e.g., doggie, daddy, mommy; Schneider, 2003). Schneider (2003) pointed out that, especially in early years, children have the tendency of excessively using diminutivized words, and even multiple DIMs (e.g., Auntie Lizzie).
Close to 10% of diminutivized words in the data under analysis in my study have this age group marking effect. Out of around 470 DIM words in the data, 43 may be said to have this group-marking effect. There are two particular speech situations in the data that are characterized by an extensive use of [+child] diminutives. Two church events addressed to children took place during data collection: children’s camp and vacation (summer) Bible school. Many words in these two speech situations have this type of DIMs. The reason for this abundant use of [child] DIMs is simply the type of audience of such events, children.

Many Spanish nouns related to the specific activities for the children were diminutivized: “drawings+DIM”, “animals+DIM”, “fish+DIM”, “contests+DIM”, “song+DIM”, “balloon+DIM” among many others. When the activity leaders gave instructions (in Spanish) to the children, they used many DIM words: “seated+DIM”, “quiet+DIM”, “closed eyes+DIM”, “eat all+DIM the toast+DIM”, among others. Andrews (1999) also observed that this [child] DIM, in Russian, is more frequent with certain types of words. In her study, she observed that many animals were diminutivized, as well as body parts, parents and siblings, clothing items and other inanimate objects normally associated with children. Andrews observed that proper names and naming in general are the most common types of lexical items for the use of DIMs in discourse. We see this type of use clearly marking a child-like environment. It is obviously marked by the explicit presence of children, who are the main participants of this event. In the examples cited above, “drawings”, “fish” and “animals”, for instance, were not necessarily small; actually, the size of the drawings of the animals was irrelevant.
Eventhough they do not refer to littleness, these nouns are diminutivized, simply to mark the audience or participants in the event: children.

Apart from this speech situation-marking effect, the [child] DIM also marks audience. During another church activity, a male in his thirties gave a sermon to children. He made an extensive use of [child] DIMs. Religion-associated nouns such as “God” and “Jesus” were diminutivized. It is necessary to mention here that “God” and “Jesus” are obviously very far from having the “little” feature, at least in the beliefs shared by this religious group. Thus, this DIM has nothing to do with the littleness of the referents but the “childness” of the audience.

Parents and caregivers also use many DIMs when the audience is a child. Here there are two examples of this. The first one is a mother talking to her 5-year-old son after blowing a little bit of air on a piece of fish to cool it off, and the other is the grandmother talking to the same child, trying to find out if he had had breakfast already.

1) “viste, te quemaste. Ese que estaba ahí ya estaba soplado+DIM 
you see? You got burnt. That one there was already blown+DIM

2) “¿tiene hambrecita?”
   have hunger+DIM? (are you hungry?)

These audience-marking effects have been also used for advertising purposes. A Univision (Spanish-speaking TV channel) TV cereal commercial, for instance, utilized the following expression:

3) “sabores tostaditos”:
   flavors toasted+DIM

The only person shown in the commercial was a child. Children are obviously the intended audience in this commercial. This type of advertising appeals to this particular
audience, and this DIM contributes to that commercial purpose. Another instance of this audience-marking effect of [child] DIM in the advertising world is the following:

4) “ah, ¿sacaron un disco también para los más pequeñINes?”
   *ah, you made a record also for the most little+DIM (ones)?*

   After this utterance, both the female host in this musical production launching interview and the male singer used many DIMs because they were talking about music for children. When promoting the “CareBear” movie in Spanish, this was translated as los cariñosITOs (The CareBear+DIM). Obviously, this movie was targeted at this particular segment of the population, hence the DIM.

   We have seen so far two important aspects of the [child] DIMs: speech situation and audience marking. Let us examine instances of referent marking. In this particular use, the [child] DIM is mainly marking the age group of a particular referent.

5) “(esa parejITA tiene) tres añITOs”
   *this pair+DIM (of twins) is three years+DIM old*

6) “mira que Linda! Esa carITA, esos ojITOs” (in the Happy B-Day time for children)
   *look how beautiful! That face+DIM, those eyes+DIM*

7) 40-year-old mother: “le compramos juegoITOs”
   *We bought him games+DIM*

   Example 5 refers to a 3-year-old pair of twins; example 6 describes a child feature, and example 7 refers to games that parents bought for children. In this last instance, “games+DIM” does not necessarily refer to “little” games; actual size or value seems irrelevant here. This DIM implies that this is a children’s game.

**The Gendered DIM**

As in the case of children, we also traditionally assume an important connection between women and diminutives. Baker and Freebody (1989) found, for example, that the adjective “little” (or, in broader terms, the notion of diminution) is applied more
frequently to girls than boys. Gleason, et al. (1994) found in a laboratory setting, where both mothers and fathers of young children participated, that mothers used a total of 248 DIMs whereas the fathers used only 185. Even though there was a difference, this difference was not statistically significant. However, these authors found significant difference in the language addressed to the young children. Mothers, they reported, produced twice as many DIMs to girls as to boys when the children were about 30 months old. They concluded that “girls did indeed hear more diminutives than boys at all ages studied” (p. 69).

Later on, Andrews (1999), in her study of Russian DIMs, observed that her interviewees (mostly teenagers), regardless of gender, believed that female speakers use DIMs more frequently than males. Her study, based only on students’ responses to questionnaires about the frequency of use of DIMs, seems to support the observation that “males appear to use diminutives less than females” (p. 97). This, of course, is not a definite conclusion of actual frequency of use, since her analysis was based on what her participants believed to be the actual frequency. In fact, Andrews recognizes that perception of usage and actual usage are distinct categories. However, it does show what average people feel about this particular phenomenon. Probably more important, from Andrew’s conclusions, is the fact that males indicated that they did not like it when people used DIM forms in conversations with them, whereas the majority of female speakers indicated that they had no preference. Andrews clarifies that it is not strange that women use more DIMs than men, especially in conversations with children, since the quantity of female discourse in this context is much greater than male discourse. In other contexts, it seems very hard to see a significant difference. That is why one of Andrews’
conclusions was that at the level of discrete utterances, the frequency of DIM use may be relatively similar between females and males. On the other hand, another conclusion of Andrews was that women are more likely to use DIMs with a broader range of interlocutors than men.

The [+female] use of DIMs seems to hold true for English also, according to Schneider (2003). As pointed out above, Schneider believes that, at least in some English-speaking societies, addressing adults with DIMs may violate politeness. However, he added that this is especially true when used for adult males. Regarding terms of address, Schneider also found that titles, including the M-forms (Mr., Mrs., Miss, Ms.), are not used with DIMs. However, there is an important exception; “little Miss” and “Missey”. Thus, the only title that is often diminutivized, both at the synthetic and at the analytical level in English, is “Miss”. Here we see a combination of both [+child] and [+female] marking. Much more revealing, probably, is the fact that Schneider’s corpus presents many occurrences of “Aunt+DIM” (in his kinship terms of address) but “Uncle+DIM” occurs only once. The only difference between “aunt” and “uncle” is precisely gender; [+female] and [-female], respectively. The [-female] kinship term hardly ever has the DIM, whereas the [+female] term is often diminutivized. Because of this and other similar findings, he concluded that female relatives and females in general are addressed much more frequently by –ie forms than males.

In Spanish this does not seem to be different. Recently, Fischer-Dorantes (2001) found the adjective “little” more with girls than with boys in Mexico school textbooks. In Spanish this is easy to observe, since adjectives are normally marked for gender. Thus, the adjective “little” in her study more frequently had the feminine marker [a] than the
masculine marker [o] when referring to children. Fischer-Dorantes also found more DIMs when describing girls than boys in the school textbooks she analyzed. Another recent study by Makri-Tsilipakou (2003) shows that women in Modern Greek culture are the primary recipients of DIMs (even though it was also found that men were the primary users).

This connection between women and diminutives, for some, may be in direct relation with the natural connection between children and women. According to scientists of the CNR Institute of Neuroscience, Psychobiology, and Psychopharmacology in Rome (D'Amato et al., 2004), there is an important mother-child bonding, and this is neurologically based. Contributions from psychoanalytic and attachment theories and day-care research by Frankel (2004) have also shown the exclusivity of the mother-child bond. Even though children seem capable of forming multiple bonds, beginning in the first year of life the mother-child bond retains central importance. My study concluded that there is evidence that this core connection remains intact and has first priority in a child's mind regardless of other opportunities to relate.

However, in modern use of Spanish EVALs as discussed below, this connection between women and diminutives may be related to a tendency in some societies to consider women in a subordinate status. This, based on the relevant literature reviewed, will be further discussed here as a manifestation of the infantilization of women (Brown and Gilman, 1960; Henley, 1977; Wolfson and Manes, 1980; Wolfson, 1989). The idea or feature of [littleness] or [childness] is somehow assigned to women, which is particularly observed when DIMs are used with [+female] terms but not with the corresponding [-female] counterpart as shown below.
In the data analyzed here, admittedly, this use is not very frequent. It only represents approximately 4% of all the DIM words. Only 16 words were clearly diminutivized with the [+female] DIM when in contrast with [+male]. Despite the relatively small frequency of this type of DIM, it still needs to be accounted for. Let us now look at specific examples from the data which show this connection and this [+female] function of DIMs. The following three examples come from the popular TV program *Despierta America* (Wake Up America).

8) Host R. Gonzalez (A male host)  
“Para los gordos y gordITAs”  
*for the fat (men) and fat+DIM (women)*

9) Gisselle: (female host) in a section with children”  
“Aqui tengo mis princesITAs y mis principes”  
*here I have my princesses+DIM & my princes*

10) Roxana (a female guest host):  
“Y ahora, la SeñorITA Junio, y el Señor Junio”  
& now, Miss+DIM June, and Mr. June

These three examples are insightful in that they do not necessarily refer to the users or the recipients of DIMs, but the referents. In this respect, there is reference to third parties not necessarily present in the conversation. The use or non-use of such an affix marks the gender of the referents as plus or minus female ([± female]). The [+female] referents were diminutivized whereas the [-female] were not. In reference to example 9, it is noteworthy that the masculine of “princess+DIM” is hardly ever used in Spanish. When used, they often have [+female] connotations. In example 8, on the other hand, we notice a type of euphemistic DIM (“fat+DIM”), but this is only used with the feminine adjective. It is probably caused by the fact that women receive more social pressure to keep in shape. Wolfson (1989) observed how women –in many societies- are expected to
be as attractive as possible. A woman’s appearance has traditionally been her job. For example, women are supposed to be interested in clothing, jewelry, hairstyles, adornment, and also in home and children. Wolfson believes that looking attractive is for women one aspect of acting out a socially conditioned role, which should then be seen as role performance regardless of the woman’s professional status. Wolfson asserted that this is why women receive many more compliments than men.

In many Latin American cultures, being an overweight man is not necessarily considered an unacceptable attribute or despicable physical feature. However, and probably unfairly, women are normally expected to be physically attractive, and being slim is one of these expectations. Modern Western societies seem to condone obesity in males more than in females. Actually, important male athletes may have these obesity features, unlike female athletes. That is why “fat” is euphemistically diminutivized in its feminine version but not in its masculine one. There is a clear gender marking effect in this respect.

Example 10 requires further discussion, since it was included in the quasi-ethnographic questions used for data triangulation. The question the participants answered was: “Why do you think the word señorita (Miss or Mrs.+DIM+Feminine marker) is common in Spanish but not its masculine counterpart (Mr.+DIM+masculine marker)?” Most interviewees (both males and females) pointed out that señorito (Mr.+DIM) is inappropriate for males. A “Mr+DIM” is given a [female] connotation, many indicated. One of the interviewed people even mentioned that one possible cause for men obviously disliking the word señorito is because it is normally associated with being a virgin (which is what “Miss” or “Mrs.+DIM” normally implies in Spanish), and
this is not expected for men in Spanish-speaking societies. Male chauvinism seems to be a characteristic of many Spanish-speaking societies, and this may be the reason for highly valuing virgin females but not virgin males. Also, in literary works such as *Fortunata y Jacinta* by Galdós (late 1800’s), *señorito* may connote a spoiled upper middle class male, as suggested by Armon (2005, personal communication).

Let us see another example with [+female] effects.

11) *Despierta America* female host: (referring to the “de cargo” fashion style for women).
“la moda con los cinturones”
*the fashion with the belts* +DIM

This DIM may have gender connotations, according to the context. This section of the program addresses fashion topics, and the specific audience is women. The host and guests talked about clothing items normally associated with women (e.g., women’s belts). This is similar to another speech event recorded, which consists of an interview with a hairdresser and some of his recommendations for women’s hair care and hairdos. Obviously the audience and the topic is [+female] (everybody in this TV segment was female, except the actual hairdresser, who seemed a homosexual male). In this segment, there were many DIM words (e.g., “Horse tail+DIM”, “bread+DIM”, “donkey tail+DIM”; which were basically hairdo styles).

12) The Mexican (male) host introducing a female joke-teller:
“MartITA Rojas”
*Martha+DIM Rojas*

The previous example, also from the *Despierta America* Program, shows a male speaker diminutivizing the name of a female he is introducing. The speech situation here is a joke-telling contest, in which this woman participated with two other men. The only name that this host diminutivized was the woman’s name.
During a 3-month internship in the Central American country of El Salvador, I worked for a non-profit Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). A young female receptionist used to page the different employees of this organization when someone came for them at the reception desk. When paging, some female names were diminutivized, especially those with the cleaning job or with very low rank in the company and low social status. There was never a male name used with the DIM. Let us remember that paging consists of a public call which all the people in the institution can hear. At this public level, diminutivizing a male name seems to be inappropriate. This suffix seems to have gender marking effects in such contexts; indeed, they are highly relevant marking effects.

In a TV program called Trato Hecho (Deal) from Los Angeles, California, the male host, in his forties and well-dressed (obvious difference between the host and the audience, who were either in casual clothes or in costumes), used about fifteen DIMs in a 30-minute period. This shows that even this type of person (male, adult, leading role in the situation, obvious higher status than the audience) may use many DIMs, which is opposed to the idea of men’s limited use of DIMs. However, the recipients of his DIMs were almost exclusively females, to whom he also referred using terms equivalent to “beauty” and “honey”. Only one of his DIMs was not addressed to a female but a fake pig figure. More revealing is the fact that in one occasion this host brought two contestants to the main floor: one female and one male of approximately the same age. In around five minutes, the host addressed the female with three different DIMs and none to the male.
Another EVAL, namely AUG, may have a marginal effect in the data. There were only three AUGs used as vocatives or direct terms of address: Martota (Martha+AUG, a young woman’s name), Muchachones (Young People+AUG, especially males), and Hermanazo (brother+AUG). These were uttered only by males. This use of AUGs, especially of –azo, does not seem to be a feature of female speech. However, this should be taken cautiously since there are very few examples in the corpus. This requires further observation and analysis. To conclude this [+female] DIM discussion, it is necessary to clarify that in spite of the many fuzzy areas and the relatively low frequency of this [female] DIM, my study and many others indicate that some of these suffixes indeed have a group-marking effect. However, as can be seen here, this use is relatively infrequent, and the common belief than women use much more diminutivization than males does not hold true in the data analyzed in my study.

The Regional EVALs

Reynoso (2001) presented a very good summary and critique of the studies of the uses of Spanish DIMs. She said that in the field of Hispanic linguistics, two major conclusions have been drawn. On the one hand, many researchers attribute to the Spanish DIM a very important dialectal marking function (especially distinguishing Peninsular vs. Latin-American Spanish). On the other hand, there are other researchers that attribute to this type of suffix only a stylistic function. The first type of conclusion, Reynoso argues, is problematic primarily because of the difficulty of concretely describing a dialect that we could label "Latin American" because of the many linguistic variations on this continent (Lipski, 1994). However, DIMs do have dialectal marking functions, as shown in the data of my study and the arguments below. Reynoso seems to accurately indicate that dialectal marking functions are not the primary ones in modern Spanish. Alonso
Hualde et al. (2001) recognizes this dialectal marking of DIMs. They stated that the DIM –illo is particularly frequent in Andalusian Spanish and also in some parts of South America, whereas the DIM –ico is more frequent in Caribbean Spanish and also in the Extremadura and Aragonese regions of Spain. It may have historical connection with the way migration took place from Spain to the Americas. Mackenzie (2001) explains that Spanish colonial administrative division created Viceroyalties and Audiences in the Americas. Canary Islands and Andalucia emigrants settled in the Caribbean. If we connect these Viceroyalties and Audiences with the Caribbean region, we can conclude that probably that is the reason for the commonalities among the Caribbean countries in this respect. In general, Hualde et al. (2001) recognize that diminutives are more frequent in the Andean regions of South America and in Mexico.

Reynoso (2002) compared specifically modern Spanish in Madrid and Mexico. Via quantitative analysis, that study contrasted the two types of uses of DIMs: the semantic or referential sense (meaning “little”) and the non-referential or pragmatic force (without the “little” meaning). She observed that Madrid’s Spanish does not present a significant preference between these two types of uses; whereas Mexico City’s Spanish presented a clear significant preference for the pragmatic use.

There are probably five major obvious dialectal differences in relation to DIMs.

- The –ico vs. –ito dialects.
- The use of some regional/local diminutives such as –illo, -in, -aco, -ingo
- The “now+DIM” distinction.
• Excess vs. relative absence of DIMs

• Semantic vs. Pragmatic preferences.

The last two are more general and are the ones observed by Reynoso (2002), as mentioned above. The first and second differences were not clearly observed in my study. These two differences, however, are well known. For example, Costa Rican Spanish and Caribbean Spanish are known for having the –ico DIM as an allomorph for -ito in roots with final [t] (Alonso, 1937). Even though Alonso did not assign the label “Caribbean”, he did mention specific countries in the region such as Puerto Rico, Cuba, and Dominican Republic. While many Mexicans say patito (duck+DIM), many speakers from countries such as Venezuela, Colombia, Costa Rica and others say patico. Actually, Costa Ricans are often referred to, especially by other Central Americans, as ticos, precisely because of this abundant use of –ico.

In a dialectological study on formal aspects of Spanish DIM formation, Ambadiang (2001) indicated that many scholars in the field tend to associate the particular use of DIMs in Latin American Spanish to the enormous wealth of formal markers, affective or honorific tones, and formulas that characterize the indigenous languages in the Americas in general –abundant DIM uses and the very productive property of DIM formation. Ambadiang (2001) suggests that another distinctive feature of DIMs in American Spanish is their semantic and pragmatic complexity. Ambadiang also suggests that DIM iteration (a reduplication-like phenomenon of the type poquitiito –little+DIM+DIM+DIM) does not seem to be a part of Peninsular Spanish DIMs. Another difference is that Spanish American varieties have DIMs attached to non-Spanish words, unlike Peninsular Spanish.
Ambadiang observed differences in DIM formation between these two major varieties of Spanish (Peninsular and American). Furthermore, Ambadiang observed important differences not only “interdialectal” (Peninsular vs. American Spanish) but also “intradialectal” (differences among American Spanish countries). For example, Colombia has iteration with both DIMs, -ico and –ito, whereas other dialects only iterate with –ito. Bolivian and Chilean Spanish (the ones most distant from Peninsular Spanish in DIM formation according to Ambadiang’s study), for example, use the allomorph –cito/a in monosyllabic words whereas many other varieties of American Spanish use the allomorph –ecita/o for the same bases. He seems to hold the hypothesis that the more convergence between a certain variety of Spanish American and indigenous languages, the more distant this Spanish dialect is from Peninsular Spanish regarding DIM formation.

Some early grammarians and dialectologists, experts on areas such as Chile, Argentina, Andalusia, Central America, Mexico, and others have even indicated, as cited by Alonso, that “el diminutivo es una de las más decisivas características del habla de nuestro pueblo” (the diminutive is one of the most decisive characteristics of the speech of our people) (1937: 52). Even though Alonso criticizes this generalization (because a Mexicanist, for example, may be ignoring what happens in Andalusia, where DIMs can be excessive also), he recognizes that this excessive use of DIMs is a regional feature and not a general one, or one not considered essential part of what may be called general standard Spanish. As the date of Alonso’s study shows, this dialectal feature has been observed since a long time ago, and the same tendency seems to continue today.
In relation to the data presented here, let us go back to the “now+DIM” distinction mentioned above. The present corpus of data did show such distinction. Some countries use *ahorita* (“now+DIM”) with the meaning of “right now”, whereas others use the same word “now+DIM” with the meaning of “later”. The DIM in the “right now” meaning obviously has an intensification function, whereas the DIM with the meaning of “later” has an attenuating effect. The Cubans interacting in the sequences below, for example, might have a tendency to emphasize the attenuating use of *ahorita*. The Puerto Ricans in the same interaction, on the other hand, might prefer the intensifying use of *ahorita* (right now). This was shown in the following example from the data:

13-Pastor’s wife (from Cuba):
“ahorITA (to a girl who asked when)‘el ahorita  mio que es de aqui a un rato”
                      *Now+DIM*                             the now+DIM mine that’s ..........later

14-Puerto Rican male and church member: “no es como el ‘ahorITA’      Puerto Riqueño”
                                      *It isn’t like   the  now+DIM Puerto Rican*

15-Another Puerto Rican male: “el     ahorita    de ella –(pastor’s wife)- es “later”
                      *The nowDIM of hers                          is       later*

This verbal interaction took place during a Children’s Summer Camp activity when the children met inside the church building. A young girl wanted to know when another activity was going to take place. When the Cuban female answered “now+DIM”, the participants entered in the discussion above. The interactants seem to be discussing the topic at the meta-linguistic level. They are not only using the word but are also talking about the word. One possible reason for this quasi-metalinguistic awareness is the apparent frequent misunderstandings that such words cause in similar interactions. It seems to be so common in cross-nationality verbal interactions in Spanish that people have had to learn about this in these multi-national settings.
It is difficult to tell what makes some speakers emphasize the [intense] function over the [attenuate] function. Alonso (1937), for example, cited a Mexican linguist (D. Mariano Silva y Aceves) who believed that some ways of speaking of Mexicans’ follow from their psychology as a group, especially that habit of attenuating (commonly achieved via diminutivization). Alonso suggested that this may be a feature also of all the American Spanish dialects and some peninsular dialects; but he mentions this more as a question to investigate than a conclusion. Even though much language change has no doubt taken place since 1937, the attenuating functions observed in DIMs seem to be still a feature in many Spanish-speaking societies today. Regardless of the reason why one group emphasizes one DIM function over the other, the fact is that this emphasis of one pragmatic function over the other shows a dialectal difference, and this difference could tell us something about the cultural values of certain speech communities.

In multi-national settings, these ethnic/nationality issues may have sociolinguistic effects. It is important to note that many of the sources of the data under scrutiny here are Spanish-speaking environments in the USA. As such, different Hispanic nationalities converge. People from some countries may have pre-formed opinions or stereotypes in relation to people with different nationalities with whom they often interact. These may cause social judgments about others’ language. Particular features of these different nationalities inevitably appear in these multi-national linguistic encounters. This fact often raises certain meta-linguistic awareness of some of these linguistic differences in the interactants, as shown in the data and analysis here. These differences emerge in different regions, but when converged with other regions. They may cause group-marking. We can conclude here that, in agreement with Alonso (1937), this dialectal DIM
has an “evocation” power. Evocation as defined by Bally (1936) in his theory of linguistic expressivity means the property of linguistic forms to evoke place of origin when used out of such context or place. Alonso mentions specific examples in this respect: -*iño evokes Galicia, -*in Asturias, -*uco Santander, -*iyo Sevilla, and –*ico Caribbean Spanish among others. This type of DIM, thus, presents this evoking property.

Not only DIMs but also AUGs may have this group-marking or dialectal effect (admittedly, much less than DIMs). Hualde et al. stated that “.. –azo más extendido en Sudamérica, y –ote es más común en México” (2001: 169) (–azo more widespread in South America, and –ote is more common in Mexico).

**A Marginal Group-Marking Effect: Social Class**

Social class was not a sociolinguistic variable clearly defined and observed during data collection and analysis in my study. However, in my 3-month internship in El Salvador, as mentioned above, these social-marking effects were marginally observed. In addition, other studies have addressed important aspects of social class marking that are necessary to mention here. Conclusions of those studies indicate that the use of excessive DIMs, especially in particular contexts, is a feature of low-social class membership. In the case of the euphemistic DIM, for example, an early study (Kany, 1960) recognized variation in the usage of euphemisms across social classes. More specifically in the Spanish language, the use of euphemistic DIMs has been shown to be socially constrained in Puerto Rico, in relation to the socio-economic variable (Lopez, 1997). Not only does this suffixation have this euphemistic function, but Lopez found that euphemisms may have a certain social marking function. Alonso’s (1937) early work already noticed that the allomorphs -*ito and -*illo also varied according to social class in some occasions. He reported that at that time, -*ito was preferred by the high class, and
–illo characterized more rural contexts and more playful language, which were not features of high class people. As can be seen, authors in three different periods of time (early, mid, and late 20th century) also observed some DIMs as social-class markers.

Recall that one of my main observations during the internship in Central America (already discussed in the [female] DIM section) was that females’ names were the only ones diminutivized during name paging. Yet, not every female’s name was diminutivized, but only those of apparently lower status. Their lower social status was apparent from the variety of language they employed (very distinct from the language of the educated people in the institution), the apparent socio-economic level (based on physical appearance, clothing, and transportation), their very low level of education (elementary level), and their type of job (janitorial/custodial). Thus, this DIM seems to be marking not only [+female] features but also [+low] features in relation to social class. Again, this needs further analysis, with more clear social categories, better specified sociolinguistic variables, some statistical considerations, and a much bigger sample.

**Societal Context/Speech Situation Marking**

In this section, two major aspects are considered: style and social distance. These two aspects have significant relationships to the types of speech situations in which a linguistic interaction takes place. Register or style (terms here used interchangeably) here specifically refers to the degree of formality in everyday interactions. Social distance, on the other hand, refers to the degree of familiarity of the participants in an interaction. These two interrelated aspects are expressed via the use or non-use of EVALs.

As mentioned above in the dialectal marking discussion, Reynoso’s (2001) summary and critique of the studies on the uses of Spanish DIMs found that both dialectal marking and stylistic functions were very important conclusions about DIMs in
the literature she reviewed. Regarding the latter perspective on Spanish DIMs as a stylistic marker, it is necessary to agree with Reynoso that if this is all we have to say about Spanish DIMs, we leave much unexplained. However, even though there is much more than that to Spanish EVALs, as has been shown thus far, stylistic functions are indeed part of the effects of such affixes. In the following section, the focus is on the formal vs. informal styles, and familiar vs. non-familiar contexts as expression of these stylistic effects.

The Informal EVALs

DIMs and AUGs as informal context markers

Romaine (1994) discusses the notion of style in relation to registers. She states that style can range from formal to informal depending on social context. She explains that stylistic differences may be reflected at the lexical level (vocabulary choice), at the syntactic level (more passivization in formal English), and at the phonological level (e.g., colloquial pronunciation of singin’ instead of singing). However, my study shows that the morphological level (which is missing in Romaine’s explanation) also reflects stylistic differences. As we saw above when considering the issue of politeness, Sifianou (1992) pointed out that Greek DIMs may be used as politeness markers. However, Sifianou clearly stated that DIMs marked friendly and informal politeness. In his discussion of some early studies of the Spanish grammar, Jörnvig (1962) pointed out that there has been some reference to the [-formal] marking effect of EVALs. In an example, he showed that suffixes like AUGs were much more used in early-20th-century colloquial (informal) Spanish than in the books (formal) of the same time. Pragmatically, Kiefer (1998) asserts, DIMs like the Australian English “–ie” express informality, and therefore, they are not appropriate in formal contexts.
One hour of interviews in El Salvador with CARE personnel rendered virtually no EVALs. There was only one DIM (uttered by a woman) and one SUPERL (of the type of SUPERL that may be of formal nature, like “much+SUPERL”). The interviews had two purposes for the present research. On the one hand, part of my job in this Central American country was writing an annual report for the institution. This implied talking to CARE personnel and revising their documents. On the other hand, one of the intentions was to collect spoken language data for further linguistic analysis.

The reason for the absence of EVALs in these interviews is the [+formal] nature of the context. The formality of the speech situations was caused by various factors. One trigger for the [+formal] linguistic style was the presence of the outsider interviewer. Another motivator for formal language was the nature of the topics (the institution’s dynamics and results). A third reason for this degree of formality was likely the interviewees’ awareness of being tape-recorded. Finally, the contexts where these interviews took place were normally work-related (e.g., office, field trip). It is widely agreed that work environments normally require a certain degree of formal aspects in the language used. The interviewees were never overtly informed that this was a formal interview. However, the obvious presence of the above factors causes a change in style or tone, from informal features to formal ones. This is clearly a part of native speakers’ subconsciously mastered communicative competence. These arguments constitute pieces of important empirical evidence of this [-formal] marking of many EVALs, especially DIMs and AUGs. SUPERLs have a distinct behavior in this respect, which is discussed below.
The formal vs. the informal SUPERL.

Two types of SUPERL relate to style marking. On the one hand, we have the -ísimo that marks informal contexts, as much as any other Spanish EVAL studied so far. Everyday examples of this informal SUPERL are: buenísimo (good+SUPERL), grandísimo (big+SUPERL), partially reduplicated SUPERLs such as padrïsisisimo (great+SUPERL +SUPERL), among many other such examples. On the other hand, we have the formal SUPERL, which is characterized by being attached to titles, mostly, with the purpose of honorifics. Examples of this formal SUPERL are the following titles or terms of address: Reverendísimo (Reverend +SUPERL), Excelentísimo (Excelent+SUPERL), and Amantísimo (loving+SUPERL), the only formal SUPERL in my study’s corpus. Before we continue, it is important to note that for many lexical items there are two forms of superlatives: Fortísimo vs. fuertísimo (strong+SUPERL), grosísimo vs. gruesísimo (wide+SUPERL), novísimo vs. nuevísimo (new+SUPERL). The main feature here is that this represents a pair of learned (the first in the pair) vs. non-learned or colloquial words (the 2nd in the pair). Both types of words exist in modern Spanish, but they usually reflect level of education and probably social status. The difference lies on the base for these superlativized words. The base that presents the common Latin-Spanish changes (i.e., [o] diphthongization to [ue] or [we]) represents the colloquial form, and the ones without this change represent the learned words and those more common among educated people. Even though the learned vs. colloquial distinction is mostly caused by the base, it should be noted here that the SUPERL attachment triggers the base change. Without the SUPERL suffix, these learned bases are either infrequent (e.g., groso) in modern Spanish or are not used at all (e.g., novo).
It was discussed already that historically this suffix experienced a type of shift in which it spreaded to many informal contexts. It may have been very common in formal contexts in Old Spanish because of the learned status it had. In Jörnvig’s (1962) discussion, it seems plausible to conclude that the two major [-formal] characteristics of the suffix were its high frequency and its high productivity. The learned suffix (in formal contexts) became relatively infrequent, and it was only attached to a limited number or types of words, mainly titles and honorifics and usually with adjectives. However, Jörnvig (1962) cites many SUPERLS with the informal properties with many different bases: adjectives, nouns, adverbs, verbals, and others (señorísimas, Mrs.+ SUPERL+plural; poetísimo, poet+SUPERL).

**Familiar/intimate vs. non-familiar encounters**

The [+familiar/intimate] function of DIMs was connected to the [+dear] function discussed in the previous chapter. It is worth mentioning here because it may mark not only the addressee or the referent in the linguistic interaction as [familiar], as in the case with the [dear] functions, but also whole context or speech situation. In these cases, there is a reference to social distance in the context given. Schneider (2003), for example, showed that some DIMs (e.g., Georgie-Porgie, Annie-Pannie) may be relatively stable terms of address for adults in minimally distant relationships.

Braun (1988) extensively discussed the topic of terms of address and showed how the choice of one or another is constrained by sociolinguistic variables. As shown so far in my study, there is no doubt that the linguistic choice of a particular term of address, either with DIM or without DIM, for example, is constrained by variables such as gender, age, and social status/distance of the interactants.
Finally, it should be noted here that many kinship terms are diminutivized (e.g., dad, mom, aunt, grandma). In the data under analysis here, we observe “mom+DIM” and “grandma+DIM”. Even though there are other kinship terms (e.g., “aunt”, “uncle”), only “mom” and “grandma” were diminutivized. There are only two instances of “grandma” in the data, and both were diminutivized; unlike “mom”, which is also used without DIM. The abundance of the [familiar/intimate] DIM with these terms of address reflects precisely the [+familiar] type of interaction in which these are used. Addressing close family members, thus, may trigger the [familiar/intimate] DIM, which at the same time may have an effect on the marking of the type of this interaction.

**Societal Power Structure and EVALs**

The conclusion drawn from Sifianou’s (1992) comparison between English and Greek DIMs is that they reveal different underlying cultural norms and values: a preference for distance and formality in English, versus a tendency for intimacy and informality in Greek. The latter seems to be also a common characteristic of many Hispanic cultures, at least as shown in the data for my study.

In his discussion of SUPERLs, Jörnvig (1962) observed that in the origin of this suffix in Spanish (as a learned suffix according to our discussion above) the use or non-use of such learned/formal suffix had important social impact. Those who had more education and consequently more knowledge of Latin used this original SUPERL more. On the other hand, the low level of education and the scant knowledge of Latin of those in low-social classes kept them from using this suffix frequently, at least early on. Thus, the early period of the emergence of this suffix in Spanish showed a clear distinction between these two social classes: the class with power (The “Clas-issimus”) and the class without power (the Class, plain). In fact, most SUPERLs (normally with titles and
honorifics) were used in reference to members of the “Classissimus”: The Roman/Spanish Nobility and the Catholic Clergy (undoubtedly, the class with power). Finally, Jörnvig referred to literary records in which names and adjectives for people of high importance were added the SUPERL suffix, whereas “very” was used with people of less importance, in a time when the synthetic elative (-ísimo) started expressing a higher degree than the analytical elative muy (“very”).

The findings are important for historical sociolinguistics, since they show how Spanish EVALs have and have had important sociolinguistic effects. In this case, we can see how social pressure motivated a linguistic change. The linguistic change here consists of the introduction of Latin –issimus into early Spanish on the one hand, and then the new meaning and uses of modern Spanish -ísimo on the other hand. The social pressure, according to Jörnvig (1962), consisted of the desire of the high class to speak more Latin-like (which sounded more scholarly, more educated, more fashionable at the time) on the one hand, and on the other hand and later on, the desire of the low-social class to speak “better” or more like the high social class; a clear manifestation of linguistic insecurity. Alonso (1937) also showed how this distinction related to rural vs. urban speech; the latter with more Latinisms like –issimus than the former.

In relation to [female] DIMs, Yokoyama (1991) believes that one reason for this apparent greater frequency of DIMs in females is the traditional subordinate status of women in society. In research in gender and language, it has been suggested that this type of gender-sex based language is caused by the sexism inherent in many cultures, especially those with an Indo-European origin (Hardman, 1993). Miller (1977) presents records of various traditions that treated women at best as second-class citizens. Recall
that the speech community analyzed here is of Indo-European tradition. In reference to
the English language, or more broadly, to English-speaking societies, Schneider (2003)
asserted that the DIM M-Forms referred to above ("little Miss" and "Missey") are
normally used by male speakers, which may reflect "the traditional power relationship
between the sexes in society" (p. 144). One of Andrews’ (1999) conclusions in her
analysis of Russian DIMs was that the relationship between the speaker and the listener
was one of the most important determinants of DIM use. Laalo (1998) observed that
“almost all diminutive formations in Finnish have a positive meaning component but at
least naikkonen (from nainen “woman”) has a pejorative meaning” (p. 141). This, of
course, reflects a great deal about the hierarchy and power structure of a society.

One theoretical framework within the realm of sociolinguistics that addresses these
aspects of gender and power mentioned above is Brown and Gilman’s Power and
Solidarity framework (1960). These authors exemplified some of these issues with their
well known discussion of the pragmatic distinction of V-T (Fr. vous-tu) pronouns. They
developed a complete theory of Power-Solidarity. Some of the major points relevant to
my study have to do with linguistic choices being made based on this dichotomy of
power or solidarity. A person may decide to address a person with a tu pronoun
(equivalent to first-name basis treatment in English) just to show solidarity. Other people
may opt for the vous form (the formal and the more socially distant treatment) when they
consider the addressee to have a higher status than their own. More specifically in my
study, in reference to DIMs, for example, forms with such suffixes may be equivalent to
the tu pronouns in the case of address terms, and the non-suffixed (non-DIM) forms are
equivalent to the vous choice.
The Australian (pseudo)DIM –ie, according to Wierzbicka (1984) and Kiefer (1998) expresses solidarity because they “are inappropriate in speech situations in which solidarity is excluded” (Kiefer 1998: 276). Depending on the context, a diminutivized term of address (such as a first name or a title) may show either a higher status of the speaker (mother to child, man to woman –in the speaker’s judgment) or a desire to express some degree of affection or familiarity (i.e., solidarity). Thus, the seemingly opposing forces of power and solidarity determine a great deal of DIM use. This can also be seen in cross-class (social class) interactions, as mentioned earlier. Does the speaker belong to a higher social class? If so, does s/he want to still maintain a friendly environment in their interactions? Or, is it important to show distance? All these questions come to play when opting for EVAL or NON-EVAL forms, as shown above.

Brown and Gillman (1960) furthermore indicate that non-reciprocal address forms (for example, a person using DIMs in the name of the addressee but not expecting to be treated with DIMs) carry with them normally the implication that the addressee is somehow subordinate to the speaker (e.g., children). In the realm of Communications studies, Erbert and Floyd (2004) recognize how (especially non-reciprocal) affectionate expressions can be perceived by the receiver of such expression as a threat to her/his negative face because the sender may be “attempting to alter the nature of the relationship… or to manipulate them” (p. 267).

Terms of address reflect a great deal of this power structure of societies. Hymes (1974) states that "one value of terms, or modes, of address as a focus is that it makes so clear that the relation of linguistic form to social setting is not merely a matter of correlation. Persons choose among alternative modes of address, and have knowledge of
what the meaning of doing so may be that can be formally explicated" (p. 111). Another researcher in the sociolinguistic field, Gumperz (1972) also points out that even though one term or another (one with DIM and the other without the DIM, for example) does not necessarily change the nature of the information conveyed (a form of address) but “it does determine how the person addressed is to be treated, and to what social category he is to be assigned. Selection among such grammatically equivalent alternants thus serves social rather than linguistic purposes” (p. 206).

As Henley (1977) has demonstrated in her research, “dominants” (either by social class, age, occupational position, race, or gender) are most commonly referred to by their last names (often prefaced by titles such as "Mr."). Henley points out that "dominants" are (socially/organizationally) allowed to refer to "subordinates" (e.g., younger people, employees, lower class people, ethnic minorities, women) by their first names. Referring to dominants more as “Mr.” or by last names (“formal”), and to subordinate more with 1st names (“informally”) linguistically assigns to the dominant an adult-like status while marking the subordinates in an infantilizing way.

Wolfson and Manes (1980) particularly observed service encounters and forms of address. They found that opting for one form of address or the other is one way in which speakers express and influence their position regarding others in a particular linguistic interaction (p. 79). In their study, Wolfson and Manes noticed that in parallel or equivalent circumstances, two forms of address (“sir”, which implies respect, and the “zero address form”) exist for males and a third one (apart from the previous two) for women; a term of endearment. They observed that in cases where males receive the "sir" treatment, females receive the “dear” treatment rather than the apparently corresponding
term "ma'am". They concluded that "whenever two or more forms can occur within the same frame with no change in referential meaning, their differential usage is likely to carry social meaning" (p. 82). It is very rare to find terms of endearment (including DIMs) addressing males in service encounters, and apparently if any, it is never used by a male addressing another male (p. 91).

In Spanish, many terms of address are diminutivized, which may have the effect of affection, pejoration, subordination or infantilization with respect to the addressee. It is necessary to note to recall here the example given above about the diminutivized names of females in El Salvador institution mentioned above. It seems to be in line with Wolfson and Manes when they assert that “women are frequently addressed by terms of endearment even in situations where the speaker is a total stranger or a nonintimate with whom the female addressee is not in a position to reciprocate such terms” (p. 168).

Therefore, it seems plausible to conclude that using DIMs to address women regardless of status, much more than men, may be “a subtle and powerful way of perpetuating her subordinate role in society” (Wolfson, 1989:173). It may be disguised, as Wolfson points out, as feeling of friendliness or solidarity, but this difference in the use of linguistic resources such as DIMs in address forms may be heavily loaded with connotations of subordinate status of females in society. Wolfson cited an example of a series of interactions that were recorded in which one woman after another was addressed by a salesclerk as “hon” or “dear”, while men in the same line, asking for service from the same clerk, were regularly addressed as “sir”. There were no instances of the reverse occurring. It is well known that in modern Spanish, only the female equivalent of
“Mister” is often diminutivized (Señorita, “Miss”, literally, “Mister+DIM and feminine marker)

Examples like these show a common use of DIMs with address terms for females, which can result in infantilization of women, as mentioned above. These types of non-reciprocal terms mentioned above show the subordinate status of women. DIMs are used with children because they are subordinate to adults. In the same token, women may be considered subordinate to men, just as children are subordinate to adults. "It signifies condescension...because this non-reciprocal behavior is normally associated with interactions with children" (Wolfson, 1989: 90). This type of usage implies the subordinate and perhaps even child-like status of the addressee, in this case, women.

**Conclusion**

Evaluation (in language) in general, both analytical and synthetic, may have important sociolinguistic effects. In the Spanish language, EVAL suffixes such as DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs have evolved sociolinguistic effects over time. Currently, in modern Spanish, they have such impact. The two major sociolinguistic effects considered in this chapter have been: a) Group marking effects, and b) Context (speech situation) marking.

In relation to the first type of effect, we observed how three distinct groups or segments of the society may be marked more or less by the use of suffixes such as DIMs and AUGs. More specifically, we saw how children, women, and different ethnicities or nationalities are marked by what we termed the [child] DIM, the [female] DIM, and the dialectal DIM, respectively. In relation to the second type of effect, we saw how the use or non-use of DIMs, for example, may mark certain speech situations or contexts of society in the [+formal] and [-formal] range. We noted how DIMs and AUGs normally
are used in informal contexts, whereas SUPERLs are of two types in this respect: the [+formal] SUPERL and the [-formal] SUPERL. Some types of superlativized words, especially those labeled as learned words, have a formal nature, whereas superlativized colloquial words have a [-formal] effect.

We can conclude that some information about societal power structure can be obtained by analyzing the use of Spanish EVALs in everyday linguistic interactions. DIMs, for example, are commonly associated with segments of the society that traditionally have been bereft of influential power or status in the community at large, namely women, children, and low social classes. Therefore, without passing judgment on what is right or wrong, these particular linguistic phenomena analyzed here, Spanish morphological evaluativeness processes, may shed some important light on the dynamics of power structure in Spanish-speaking societies. As Reynoso (2002) put it, it is definitely important to continue to study “este fenómeno morfo-pragmático, cuyo desarrollo en el español parece estar fuertemente vinculado a la relación lengua y cultura” (this morpho-pragmatic phenomenon, whose development in Spanish seems to be strongly linked to the language and culture relation) (2002: 942). More refined analyses are needed to generalize these conclusions to other societies with similar morphological processes.
Spanish Evaluative Morphology in my study involves processes such as diminutivization and augmentativization prototypically, and marginally processes such as (absolute) superlativization and pejoration. These processes represent relatively productive and frequent suffixation in modern informal Spanish. It is unfortunate that many studies fall short of offering clear and complete accounts for these processes. The lack of sufficient integrative formal research on the pragmatic and sociolinguistic implications of such suffixes constituted a major motivation for my study, which has yielded several overarching conclusions.

The integrative nature of this analysis is observed in the three major lines of focus (or research questions), which represented the main thrust of this investigation:

• The *ways* in which Spanish evaluative suffixes (EVALs) affect speech act performance (pragmatic focus).

• The *effects* Spanish evaluative suffixes can have in linguistic interactions in society (sociolinguistic focus).

• The (semantic-pragmatic) *connection* of the various and many meanings and uses of such affixes (semantic focus).

The definition of *evaluativeness* in general is a fundamental starting point. Evaluativeness, as a primitive linguistic category, involves both semantic features (e.g., “littleness”/“bigness”) and pragmatic features (e.g., “attenuation”, “admiration”, “endearment”, “modesty”). Categories such as “littleness”, “childness” and “endearment” may have been elevated to a postulate based on observations of this type of marking in
many languages and cultures in the world. Languages often mark this linguistic category via diminutives, augmentatives, pejoratives, and other related morphemes. Evaluatives may exhibit different morphosyntactic behaviors from language to language, even though they tend to preserve similar semantic and pragmatic connotations cross-linguistically. Marking this feature analytically (e.g., in English), or synthetically (e.g., Spanish or Fula) may depend on historical, cultural or cognitive factors. Evaluative morphology is precisely the marking of this feature at the synthetic level. However, evaluativeness implies cross-linguistic semantic/pragmatic connotations at different grammar levels. This primitive category, then, seems to cross boundaries of grammar levels/components, languages, and even cultures.

In Spanish, one of the main features of this type of morphological marking is its very diverse polysemy and polypragmy. However, despite the polysemy observed in Spanish EVALs in my study and elsewhere, for each of these Spanish affixes there is a core sense that can be traced back to either the origin of such an affix in Spanish or to the inherent properties that characterize many of the functions of those affixes in modern Spanish. The diversity of functions can be analyzed from a cognitive semantic perspective (Radial Categories).

The analysis in my study shows that the core sense of DIMs is “littleness”, the core sense for AUGs is “bigness”, and the core sense for SUPERLs is “very”. From these core senses, the many other semantic-pragmatic nuances emerge via basically metaphorical and inferential thinking. Some inconsistencies in previous accounts have been considered, and my study has also presented cognitive linguistic evidence that supports
the appropriateness of the traditional grammatical terms used for these affixes: diminutives, augmentatives, and superlatives.

The semantic weights of such affixes have been compared and contrasted with their pragmatic force. These are two different but interrelated types of meaning. My study has addressed the issue of the core senses of these affixes and the possible metaphorical, inferential connections and pragmatic strengthening that explain this distinctive diversity and polysemy of Spanish EVALs. However, more importantly for the goals of my study is that it treats these different uses of EVALs from a pragmatic perspective. It focuses on the non-referential meaning which, based on analysis of specific examples from naturalistic data, complements the referential meaning and semantic extensions discussed here.

The pragmatic functions of Spanish EVALs appear to be more relevant than (or at least as relevant as) the semantic senses of such suffixes, if we consider their frequency and productivity. Pragmatically, these suffixes have a very diverse range of functions and effects. In the data analyzed here and in other studies, pragmatic force accounts for more EVAL uses than semantic sense.

DIMs may be classified under three major pragmatic categories: affection, attenuation and derogation (in order of frequency). These are realized via specific functions or features such as [dear], [flirt], [intense], [mitigate], [euphemism], [pejoration], [irony], for example. AUGs can be classified under two major pragmatic categories: intensification (the most common) and secondarily attenuation. We find specific AUGs functions or features such as [intense], [irony], [dear], [flirt], [mitigate]. As can be seen, both DIMs and AUGs have similar functions, but they differ in the
predominance of distinct categories. Finally, the SUPERL, the least pragmatically diverse of all EVALs, is basically an intensifier, and secondarily it may have an honorific function.

As can be seen, common traditional theoretical linguistic fields such as semantics and (syntax)morphology do not account for all the nuances of Spanish EVALs. Leaving the pragmatics of EVALs aside is unfortunate if we want to deeply understand the meaning and uses of these Spanish affixes. My study has shown that there is much more to EVALs than their simple propositional meanings. This is in line with Miller’s (personal communication) discussion on the relation among grammar, meaning, and the language faculty. Miller observes that the meaning of *meaning* is diverse. The meaning we attach to what we hear is not only determined by grammar but also by other knowledge. He argues that first there is an idea or meaning in our minds, and then grammatical structures contribute more meaning (interpreted at LF). However, both Miller and my study show that this is not the end of story to our understanding of utterances. Other meanings (e.g., interpretations, implications), then, are provided by context and various types of (real-world) knowledge. Apart from grammatical knowledge, Miller indicates that there are cultural, pragmatic, and conceptual types of knowledge. All this together constitutes our language faculty. Pragmatics, then, which implies situational, attitudinal, and task contexts, is an important part of the language system. Thus, in this respect my study presents two important conclusions: 1) pragmatic analyses are indeed necessary to fully understand linguistic processes such as the ones analyzed here; and 2) my study shows one more piece of empirical evidence for the need
for integrative accounts of language use and structure. Both fields of linguistics, theoretical and applied, complement each other.

In the realm of sociolinguistics, evaluation (in language) in general, both analytical and synthetic, may have important effects. In the Spanish language, EVAL suffixes such as DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs have had sociolinguistic effects over time. Still now, in modern Spanish, they may have such impact. Some major sociolinguistic effects considered in my study are: Group marking effects, and Context (speech situation) marking. These are discussed further below.

In relation to the first type of effect, we observed how three distinct groups or segments of the society may be marked more or less by the use of suffixes such as DIMs and AUGs. More specifically, it was discussed how children, women, and different ethnicities or nationalities are marked by what has been termed here the [child] DIM, the [female] DIM (which may have important derogatory implications, as discussed in my study), and the dialectal DIM respectively.

In relation to the second type of effects, my study demonstrated how the use or non-use of DIMs, for example, may mark certain speech situations or contexts of society in the [+]formal and [-]formal register/style range. It was noted how DIMs and AUGs normally are used in informal contexts, whereas SUPERLs are of two types in this respect: the [+]formal SUPERL and the [-]formal SUPERL. Some types of superlativized words, especially those labeled as learned words, have a formal nature, whereas superlativized colloquial words have a [-]formal effect.

My study also shows how the use or non-use of EVALs reflects what members of a particular society believe regarding their hierarchy of status and power. As shown above,
child/woman/low-class-related terms are more likely to be diminutivized than other terms that have nothing to do with women, children or low-class members. In other words, those segments of the society that traditionally have been bereft of influential power or status in the community at large are the ones that are more likely targets of diminutivization. Therefore, Spanish morphological evaluativeness processes may show some important elements of the dynamics of power structure in Spanish-speaking societies today as shown in the data and in the discussions above.

**General Findings**

Diminutives, augmentatives, and superlatives in the Spanish language (or Spanish EVALs) are all parts of a major linguistic phenomenon: subjective evaluation via morphology. Preliminarily, these are semantic suffixes, which morpho-syntactically can be seen as the head constituents of EVAL phrases. Furthermore, in their morphological nature, these are classified neither as inflectional (no grammar compliants) nor derivational (on many occasions, they seem to have been bereft of any individual differentiating propositional meaning). From a theoretical point of view and as a starting point, then, my study proposes to label them simply as semantic evaluative affixes. My study shows that fundamental major uses of these suffixes go beyond pure basic semantic morpho-syntactic features.

On the one hand, the type of evaluation that Spanish EVALs express can be at the semantic or referential level (“little”, “big”, “very”), which implies a subjective appreciation of dimensional and gradable features of the entity to which they refer. On the other hand, this evaluation can be at the pragmatic or non-referential level (e.g., “endearment”, “derogation”, “politeness”), which implies an emotive or social appreciation of the entity to which they refer or the audience in the linguistic interaction.
As can be seen from the previous analyses presented, this second type of evaluation may be more common and more relevant in the use of EVALS in many dialects of modern Spanish, especially in the Americas (main focus of my analysis).

In conclusion, the three main categories of the morphological apparatus called Spanish Evaluative Morphology in my study represent three distinct but related major functions. The Spanish DIM is primarily a semantic-pragmatic *diminisher*. The Spanish AUG is primarily a semantic-pragmatic *aggrandizer*. The other column of this whole Spanish morphological evaluativeness is the Spanish SUPERL, which is essentially an *intensifier*. The following diagram attempts to visually show this range of meanings, particularly at the semantic/propositional level:

$$diminisher\ (DIM) \leftrightarrow \ ------ \rightarrow aggrandizer\ (AUG) \rightarrow \ Intensifier\ (SUPERL)$$

The diagram above shows a somehow idealized abstract (pseudo-mathematical) plane, which is crucial for performing the subjective evaluation that characterizes this type of evaluative morphology. Speakers evaluate entities or concepts in this range. On this line or imaginary plane, we can find concrete gradable features such as size, distance and amount (the more to the right, the more the value). However, there are also (and probably more commonly) more abstract features such as value, appreciation, and intimacy, which are hard to clearly show in this plane. This graph represents simply an attempt to somehow visualize the Spanish evaluative morphology (propositional) system. As an abstract idealization, it, of course, fails to show everything there is to show, since it shows propositional or referential values but does not clearly show non-referential (pragmatic) ones. Important pragmatic aspects (e.g., affection) are missing in the diagram. It is not necessarily the case that the more to the right (on the plane), the more affection,
and vice versa. We already know that the DIM suffix, the leftmost point on the plane, is the one that, paradoxically, expresses affection more prototypically. Yet, the graph above is still a conceptual visual tool, especially if we recall that the affection feature may have emerged as a metaphorical or inferential extension from that plane, which now seems to function independently from its original core sense.

Many names have been given to these types of suffixes or this type of morphology: affective, emotive, expressive, quantitative, and evaluative morphology. My study favors the *evaluative* label since it is the only one that seems to account for all the different uses and effects of such Spanish suffixes. These are several reasons for rejecting the other labels proposed in the literature. The “affective” label does not account for the referential uses mentioned above, since the adjectives “little” or “big” do not necessarily relate to affection. The label “emotive”, much like the “affective” label, misses this referential or pure semantic use of Spanish EVALs, which is the same problem “expressive morphology” shows. “Quantitative”, on the other hand, seems to emphasize the dimensional features of Spanish EVALs. However, my study has shown that many uses of Spanish EVALs have nothing to do with quantitative appreciation; for example, the non-referential functions mentioned above. The term *evaluative* is the only one that may involve both pragmatic and semantic uses (i.e., referential and non-referential meanings) as explained above.

It is sensible to include the suffixes analyzed in my study (DIMs, AUGs, and SUPERLs) in a single study, since all of them share important similar features, as observed in the previous discussions, in the analyses, and in the data presented. The first obvious commonality is that they all express a type of evaluation of the entity represented
by the bases they modify. They all attach to adjectives, especially gradable adjectives. They all show a certain level of potentiality for (total or partial) morphological iteration or similar properties (poquitititito = “little+DIM+DIM”; carrotote = “car+AUG+AUG”; bellissisisima = “beautiful+SUPERL+SUPERL+SUPERL”). It is interesting to note here that these are the only Spanish suffixes that show such a property with such connotations (of intensification of the base). Morpho-syntactically speaking, these are evaluative heads; probably this is why such iteration may take place. Regarding meaning and function, they are polysemous and polypragmatic since they have different (semantic) senses and different (pragmatic) forces. They all may mark informal and/or familiar speech situations. Thus, it is indeed necessary to put all these suffixes together in a single analysis, which has helped us see such affixes as distinct parts of the same major morphological phenomenon: Spanish evaluativeness.

In my study, this morphological phenomenon has been accounted for from three different but connected perspectives: semantic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic. From the point of view of semantics, we have observed that the different meanings or functions of these three types of affixes all converge to or emerge from a single core meaning, which has provided the answer for the last of the three research questions. DIMs, for example, have the basic meaning of “little”, “AUGs” mean “big”, and SUPERLs mean “very”. Via a cognitive semantic model of radial categories and semantic networks, we concluded that all the distinct uses of DIMs in the data may be connected, through interconnected chains and links, to this basic meaning. This does not imply, however, that we observe the [little] feature in all of these uses. In this semantic mapping or network, there may be nodes which are so distant from the core center (for DIMs, this would be “little”) that
they may not be associated with the concept of “littleness”, such is the case of the [dear] or the [intense] DIMs, for example. The [dear] connotation, as a specific instance, now may be totally independent (synchronously speaking) and different from the [little] function. Examples such as Diosito! (God+DIM) prove this point. In this context, there is obviously no reference to the idea of little. God is the Supreme Being and the biggest being of all according to the beliefs of the person uttering this expression. AUGs, on the other hand, have the core meaning of “big”. Again, there are functions of AUGs that have nothing to do with “bigness” (e.g., the attenuating functions). Finally, SUPERLs have the meaning of “very”, and this meaning does show up more or less in every use of such affix. This is the EVAL suffix with the least semantic diversity and the fewest pragmatic effects.

Recall that the three pragmatic categories assigned to DIMs in my study (i.e affection, politeness, and derogation), even though distinct, are cognitively and semantically interrelated, as shown in this analysis. A politeness theory approach helped us formally understand and categorize many of these otherwise unexplainable uses. In the data analyzed here, pragmatic force of DIMs accounts for most diminutivized words. In other words, in the data and analysis presented here, this suffix is more a pragmatic suffix than a semantic one. It has been noted in the literature that even in dialects where the “littleness” sense is very common (e.g., Madrid’s Spanish), pragmatic uses of DIMs are relatively as common as the semantic uses. In many other dialects (e.g., Cuba, Venezuela and Mexico), the pragmatic uses of such affix seem to be much more common. AUGs, on the other hand, also present similar categories as DIMs (e.g., affection and derogation); however, one major pragmatic function is that of intensification. This intensification
force of AUGs is probably the node closest to the core semantics of “bigness” in the radial category model for this suffix. Apart from intensification (under which affection and derogation-like uses can be classified), the second major pragmatic category of AUGs is that of attenuation; which apparently represents an antithetical sense of intensification. It seems to be that through the agency of semantic polarization, AUGs made a leap to attenuating connotation. Thus, AUGs sub-divide into two major and seemingly opposing categories: intensification and attenuation. Finally, SUPERLs are clearly and primarily pragmatic intensifiers.

It is important to note here that some of these different pragmatic categories may be found, at a minor or major scale, in all three suffixes. This furthermore shows how these three types of affixes contribute to the same goal of evaluativeness marking at the morphological level. For example, all three suffixes have affection and intensification properties. DIMs tend to emphasize the first of these two, where as AUGs and SUPERLs show much more the intensifying uses, which is the primary one in SUPERLs. This pragmatic analysis has answered research question number one: How do Spanish Evaluative suffixes (EVALs) affect speech act performance?

Question two, which refers to the effects that Spanish evaluatives can have in linguistic interactions in society, has been the focus of the sociolinguistic analysis. The semantics and pragmatics of Spanish EVALs discussed in my study have indirect sociolinguistic effects or what could be considered part of the *metamessage* of such affixes\(^1\). Spanish EVALs may have three major sociolinguistic effects: group marking, speech situation/context marking, and (societal) power marking. Many of such effects are explainable under a Power and Solidarity framework. These are indirect or side-effects
because even though the first conscious motivator for using such affixes may not be the ones discussed in this section (e.g., group marking), they inevitably produce this type of sociolinguistic marking. It is part of a metamessage because it goes beyond the message (or the words) itself, but inevitably it is part of what is being conveyed (consciously or subconsciously). DIMs, for example, tend to mark certain segments of the society more than others (e.g., children, women, and lower-class or uneducated people). In a similar fashion, the use or non-use of such affix may reflect an important dialectal distinction as extensively discussed in the literature. AUGs may behave similarly, especially in the social class and dialectal marking functions. In the case of the SUPERL, it is necessary to note here that the most important issue of such Spanish suffix is the fact that it is the only one that has obviously suffered a clear and definite linguistic change in comparison to its Latin etymon, in which it was mostly a grammatical affix marking the relative superlative degree of comparative adjectives (“the most”). This fact has had crucial sociolinguistic effects such as formal vs. informal marking and educated vs. uneducated speech, as discussed in the sociolinguistic chapter (Chapter 5). Unlike SUPERLs, which may mark either informal or formal contexts, depending on the type of SUPERL (learned vs. unlearned SUPERL, for example), DIMs and AUGs only mark informal contexts.

Implications

Implications for Theoretical Linguistics

One important theoretical aspect addressed here is the definition of pragmatics. The major proposal of my study is that pragmatics (and related aspects such as micro-sociolinguistics, for example) is an essential element and component of the language system. Whether it is considered part of grammar or not is the object of another discussion. What is very clear, in light of the discussions above, is that people normally
do not process language without consideration of pragmatic aspects, as shown in the discussion of types of knowledge above. Both for production and comprehension of language, interactants resort to implicatures, presuppositions, maxims, status of participants, context and other pragmatic aspects if aiming at successful communication. Otherwise, it would be almost impossible to explain the great diversity of uses of Spanish EVALs in modern dialects.

More importantly, this takes us to the basic theoretical question of “What exactly constitutes language?” The proposal of my study is, again, that whatever the answer for this question is, which is out of the direct scope of my study, pragmatics should be somehow part of that answer, if this answer is to be an accurate, integrative and complete one. In other words, both language use and language structure should be part of what we understand as language. My study simply claims, then, that the field of linguistics will benefit also from integrative approaches to language study.

**Implications for Applied Linguistics**

One clear implication of my study in the field of applied linguistics is in the pedagogical field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). My study on Spanish EVALs has important pedagogical implications for the field of Spanish L2 instruction, particularly. Research has shown that pragmatic proficiency and grammatical knowledge do not necessarily develop simultaneously and that pragmatic emphasis may be lacking in our SLA classrooms/textbooks (Kasper and Rose, 2001, 2002). Smith and Carvill (2000) give an illustrating anecdote. In China, a Chinese driver hit a bus with American tourists, and then he became extremely frightened. Many Chinese gathered debating, which the Americans did not understand. The translator explained to the confused Americans that the Chinese driver did not feel forgiven. The translator further explained that the driver
and the rest of the Chinese around were expecting a word of forgiveness directly from the Americans. Neither the textbook nor the phrase book the American team leader had “counted forgiving among the essential language functions a foreigner might need.” (p. 56). It is obvious also, as research has shown, that pragmatic errors are less often excused than grammatical errors. It has also been noted that emphasis on pragmatic issues may be very minimal or marginal in foreign language contexts, probably caused by the pressure to cover grammatical knowledge. Given that pragmatic competence is indeed part of communicative competence, and that pragmatics is one of the various types of knowledge of the language faculty, there seems to be a mismatch between what we expect our students to do (or at least what we know they should be able to do) when they finish a foreign/second language course and what we actually prepare them for.

Pragmatics is part of everyday interactions of native speakers of any language. Language users (need to) perform speech acts; they normally (need to) say more than they actually utter; they obey conversational maxims; they need to "color" (mitigate/aggravate) speech acts; they need to obey appropriate norms that are not in grammar rules (e.g., politeness; social distance). For achieving a good level of communication, then, our foreign language students need to achieve a good level of pragmatic competence. Thus, the inclusion of a pragmatic component is crucial for better preparing our learners to communicate effectively and appropriately in the target language. The least we can do as teachers is including this component at least in some sections of our curriculum or lesson plans. Textbook writers and program directors should also take this into account if aiming at more effectiveness of their foreign language teaching/learning materials and programs. The teaching of pragmatics is indeed
a feasible task. Some scholars have done it and suggested it. Smith and Carvill (2000) also remind us that in the American Standards for Foreign Language Learning one can find that “even if students never speak the language after leaving school, for a lifetime they will retain the crosscultural skills and knowledge, the insights, and the access to a world beyond traditional borders” (1996: 24).

The proposal here in this sense is basically and specifically to include the pragmatics of Spanish EVALs in our L2 Spanish classrooms. As we already saw, Spanish EVALs have important pragmatic uses that should be learned by our L2 learners. There is a need to teach not only speech acts or language functions, but also the degree of compromise, force, affection, and involvement in such linguistic acts. For example, when giving an order, using the Spanish DIM may attenuate the burden of such an order. This is what my study refers to as the “coloring” of speech acts or functions. This may be a new ingredient in the teaching, acquisition, and development of L2 pragmatics of Spanish. This skill probably has to be achieved developmentally. The ability to “color” (attenuate or express affection in) a certain speech act comes after the ability to perform such a speech act since coloring is a secondary function (first a speaker feels the need to ask for a favor, or request something, and then the context may pressure to mitigate or intensify those functions). My study proposes first the inclusion of such a “coloring” ingredient in L2 classrooms and secondly the inclusion of this focus on coloring strategies taking into account developmental stages of pragmatics.

Also, EVAL suffixes are frequent in modern Spanish. I carried out a brief survey to observe the frequency of these suffixes in modern Spanish TV, for which popular TV programs of UNIVISION (well known Spanish-speaking channel in the USA based on
Miami, Florida) were selected. On five separate days (January 11, 12, 20, 24, and February 10), I counted the number of Spanish EVALs uses in intervals of 30-minute periods at different times of the day (morning, afternoon, and night). The average found was 58 EVALs per hour. This relative high frequency of EVALs is another reason to teach them in our L2 classrooms.

In conclusion, Spanish evaluatives have important pragmatic connotations and functions and they may be very frequent in modern Spanish interactions. Consequently, in any process of pragmatic teaching or acquisition in L2 Spanish classrooms, these suffixes should be part of the process. Use of Spanish DIMs with pragmatic effects, for example, is very natural in L1 acquisition, but it has not been taken much into consideration in Spanish L2 pedagogy. During this investigation, not a single Spanish textbook was found that described effectively such pragmatic facets of these suffixes. Thus, morphopragmatic awareness unfortunately may be lacking in some SLA approaches. We know little about morphological acquisition. Furthermore, what little knowledge we do have does not sufficiently connect morphological processes with pragmatics in areas such as SLA.

My study proposes that Spanish L2 instruction might benefit from making students aware of, among other things, the EVALs’ pragmatic functions and morphological forms, and should take into account the learners’ developmental stages. Thus, an integrated approach that takes into account morphology and pragmatics may be in order2.

Limitations and Further Research

The aspects discussed in this section represent issues that could be further explored. One important element of Spanish EVAL morphology was purposely left out of formal consideration; the pejorative suffixes or PEJs (e.g., –uelo, -uco). There are several
reasons for having left Spanish PEJs out of consideration in my study. One reason is that morho-syntactically they behave differently from the other EVALs. For example, they are hard to classify as gradable constituents (they are not gradable in the sense of the other EVALs), and they do not go under the type of iteration that the other EVALs do (*flacuchochucho = “thin+PEJ). The other reason is that we may say that PEJs have already received pragmatic treatment. The label “pejorative”, in itself, could be considered of pragmatic nature. Thus, any account of the meaning and uses of such affixes is, in a sense, pragmatic. Finally, PEJs are relatively scarce in many modern Spanish dialects when compared with the productivity of the other EVALs.

Another limitation of my study is in connection with quantitative analyses and sociolinguistic variables. Due to the qualitative nature of the study, the only quantitative issue considered was frequency of EVALs. However, more quantitative analyses with statistical measures could make the findings more generalizable. Socio-linguistic variables such as social class, education, and age did not constitute fundamental variables in the analysis. These variables can definitely affect EVALs usage, and thus, should be further investigated. Further formal quantification of the participant variables may help us provide a clearer picture of Spanish morphological evaluation.

Another potential limitation is the type of speech communities analyzed. Recall that many of the data analyzed come from a religious speech community, which can be very structured and with clear expectation in language performance. This group has a common cause and spiritual commitment. This probably affected the predominance of positive over pejorative uses, for example. It would be useful to do similar studies with very different types of speech communities.
One final limitation observed has to do with dialectological considerations. The participants were not formally assigned to an ethnic/nationality group. However, many pragmatic uses of EVALs in modern Spanish seem to hold cross-dialectally (e.g., the [dear] connotation and the attenuating functions). Admittedly, there are differences from dialect to dialect, as discussed in the dialectal marking of DIMs in the sociolinguistic chapter. Also, the conclusions of my study refer mostly to varieties of Spanish in Latin American countries, without further specifications. The label “Spanish” in the title of my study should be understood from this perspective, since my data reflects different varieties of the Spanish language in the Americas. It would be insightful to observe specific varieties in the Latin American world, and also the specific varieties in Peninsular Spanish, which is absent in my data.

**Conclusions**

Regarding the use of Spanish evaluative morphology in modern dialects of Spanish (especially in Latin American regions), it seems that its pragmatics is at least as important as its semantics and its morphology. This conclusion of my study is not an isolated one. This conclusion agrees with Savickienë (1998), who analyzed the acquisition of DIMs in Lithuanian in a longitudinal child case study. Through a quantitative and qualitative analysis, Savickienë concluded that “the primary meaning of diminutives used in child and input speech is pragmatic, expressing endearment” (p. 133). She also added that this crucial importance of pragmatics characterizes not only Lithuanian DIMs and but also DIMs in other Indo-European languages. In non Indo-European languages, this relevance of DIM’s pragmatics over DIM’s semantics seems to be similar. In Hebrew, Ravid (1998) reported that i- (Hebrew has other DIMs) diminutivization is more pragmatic than semantic. In Italian, De Marco (1998) showed that children use DIMs first pragmatically
(with notions such as “dear”, for example) and then semantically (with the “small”
notion), when they acquire the semantic opposite of DIMs (i.e., the AUGs).

To conclude, EVALs are primarily pragmatic, not semantic (or referential), suffixes
in many dialects of modern (Latin American) Spanish. As primarily pragmatic, they
involve important socio-cultural and psychological nuances in everyday interactions.
They shape, modify, or express much about the nature of linguistic interactions. Spanish
EVALs use and perception, as shown here, constitutes empirical evidence for the fact
that, as Boxer (2002) put it, “what we do with words affects our most important
relationships.” (p. 45)

Notes

1 This is according to Bateson (1972) and the later application of the term metamessage
to linguistic interactions in society by Tannen (1986).

2 Since this is a study primarily on pragmatics, a specific pedagogical proposal does not
seem appropriate here. However, it would be helpful to look at the possibility of
combining communicative approach techniques with elements mentioned above. The
results of this might be the object of further studies.
APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE 1

1) ¿Qué es una solterona? y ¿qué es una soltera? ________________________________
   ¿Qué es un solterón? y ¿un soltero?_________________________________________

2) ¿Qué es un rico? ____________________________________________________________
   ¿Qué es un ricachón? _______________________________________________________
   ¿Alguna diferencia? _________________________________________________________
   ¿Y pobre vs. pobretón?_____________________________________________________

3) ¿Qué significa ‘limpiecito”? __________________________________________________
   ¿y blanquito?____________________________________________________________

4) ¿Cuándo tú dírias ‘ese viejo’? ________________________________________________
   ¿Cuándo dirías ‘ese viejito’? _________________________________________________
   ¿Por qué?_________________________________________________________________

5) ¿Por qué se escucha más ‘señorita’ y no tanto ‘señorito’?________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

6) Imagina que un amigo tuyo tiene un familiar querido muy enfermo. ¿Cómo tú crees
   que esa persona diría?: a)”mi familiar está enfermo”, b) “está enfermito” , c) “está
   enfermote”, o  d) “está enfermísimo”? (escoge una) ¿Tienes idea por qué?
   ___________________________________________________________

7) Si alguien dice: “Mi casita”, y de hecho la casa es grande, ¿qué entonces podría
   significar “mi casita”?________________________________________________________________

8) ¿Quiénes o quién tú crees que use más palabras con ‘-ito’ o terminos parecidos?
   __________________________________________________________________________

9) ¿Qué tú crees que puedan significar las siguientes expresiones?
   a) De verdacita________________________________________________________________
   b) Me queda unita________________________________________________________________
   c) Bueno, espero que se ponga mejorcita_______________________________________
   d) ¿Qué tal los numeritos? ( en un juego de basketball)___________________________

10) ¿En qué situaciones definitivamente no usarías ese tipo de palabras (con –ito u –ote, o
    –ísimo, o palabras por el estilo)?
   __________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE 2

1) Si hay algo un tanto extraño en la siguiente carta, por favor subráyalo.
En el espacio de abajo, trata de poner en palabras (si puedes), ¿qué es lo extraño en lo que subrayaste?

“Muy respetada Profesora María Velasco,

Soy la madre de una de sus alumnas, Elena Franco. La presente tiene como motivo formalmente hacer de su conocimiento que mi hijita estará ausente durante la primera semana de abril. Por una semana, estaremos visitando a mi madre. Ella quisiera muchísimo ver a Elenita, y queremos darle ese placer ya que está muy enferma. Espero pueda entender esta situación familiar.

Sin más a que referirme, se despide de Ud. muy respetuosamente,

_____________________
Lic. Rosana Franco”

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2) ¿Qué significan las siguientes expresiones?
‘el cielo está azulito’:______________________________________________________
‘la pradera está verdecita’___________________________________________________

3) Completa las siguientes frases:
(Del verbo ‘conversar’)
‘conversador’ = Persona que________________________________________________
‘conversón’ = Persona que__________________________________________________

(Del verbo ‘trotar’)
‘trotador’= Persona que____________________________________________________
‘trotón’ = Persona que______________________________________________________
### APPENDIX C
**OTHER EVAL SPANISH SUFFIXES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUFFIX</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>(LANGUAGE) ANCESTOR</th>
<th>ORIGINAL FORM</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acho</td>
<td>riacho</td>
<td>Mozarabic asturiaLeo</td>
<td>āculum (+alia)</td>
<td>Orig. instruments w/little importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajo</td>
<td>migaja</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pej. now; also came from collective -alia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allo</td>
<td>clerigalla</td>
<td>Other Romance</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pure pejorative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancho</td>
<td>garrancho</td>
<td>Hispanic Latin</td>
<td>anco + ulus</td>
<td>Dim + pejorative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asco</td>
<td>peñasco</td>
<td>Pre -IE</td>
<td>-asko- ??</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culo</td>
<td>corpuscul</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>-culus/m</td>
<td>Dim. (sense lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco</td>
<td>diableco</td>
<td>o.u.o.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Orig. DIM?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejo</td>
<td>azulejo</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>(i)culus</td>
<td>Dim &amp; pej.; Atte-now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elo</td>
<td>cerebelo</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Ellus</td>
<td>Lost Dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ete/a</td>
<td>ampollela</td>
<td>Catalan Aragonese</td>
<td>-et –eta (ittus)</td>
<td>Pej (productive now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dim (not productive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ico</td>
<td>villancico</td>
<td>Vulgar Latin</td>
<td>*iccus</td>
<td>Pure Dim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illo</td>
<td>hombrencill</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>-ellus</td>
<td>Pure Dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>chiquitin</td>
<td>Portu./Galician</td>
<td>-inus</td>
<td>Dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingo</td>
<td>blandingo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>-ng-series</td>
<td>Dim &amp; ate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ino</td>
<td>blanquecino</td>
<td>Portu./Galician</td>
<td>-inus</td>
<td>Dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iño</td>
<td>campiña</td>
<td>Portu./Galician</td>
<td>-inus</td>
<td>Dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ito</td>
<td>carrito</td>
<td>Hispanic Latin</td>
<td>-ittus</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oco</td>
<td>fiestoca</td>
<td>PreRoman</td>
<td>-occu</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orro</td>
<td>aldeorro</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>-VrrV</td>
<td>Dim-pej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ucho</td>
<td>casucha</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>-us + -culus (reanalyze corpusculum= corp- usculum)</td>
<td>Dim, but more as Pej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uco</td>
<td>almendruco</td>
<td>o.u.o.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dim-pej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ueco</td>
<td>ranueco</td>
<td>Pre-Roman</td>
<td>Occu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uelo</td>
<td>polluelo</td>
<td>Late Latin</td>
<td>olus, old LAT dim but lost against –ulus</td>
<td>dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujo</td>
<td>papelujo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>V vary–Vjo</td>
<td>pej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulo</td>
<td>puellula</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>-ulus</td>
<td>Dim lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u/oncho</td>
<td>flacuncho</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>-un + -culus</td>
<td>Pej., mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
DATA

1-At a chat room of Venezuelans abroad (http://www.terra.com.ve/foros/)
“sí, europa es lo maximo….sobretodo el sueldeCIto que me gano
Yes, Europe is the best………… especially the salary-DIM that I earn
que en venezuela ni que fuera
that in Venezuela not even if I was

politico lo ganaria, eso si lo gano honrradamente…
a politician it I’d earn, but hey, it (I) earn honestly...

…amigo venezolanos, no sean conformistas con
…friends (from) Venezuela, don’t be resigned with

sueldos tan miserios...” (02/09/2003)
salaries so tiny/little/miserable”

2-Male adult to the children during the “Children’s sermon” time
“DiosITO, JEsusITO, amiguITOs, etc”

3-two females in their 30’s, talking about a certain man:
“Como que el hombre si es mujerieguecITO”
like --- the man really is womanizer+DIM

4-ahorITA vs ahora ??????????
now+DIM vs now

5-A. to M. (early 30’s female friends. A. is a guest at M.’s mum’s place):
“no, dejame mi’ aguITA aqui”
no, leave me my water+DIM here

6-C. to M. (C. is M.’s brother and is visiting her):
“M., dame juguITO”
Monica, give me juice-ITO

(In a seudo-ethnographic interview immediately after his utterance –since I was there myself, C. said that what he really meant was “Please”. He recognized that had he said “juice” without DIM, it would have sounded rude and very demanding)
7-In a soap opera in Spanish:
“enseguidITA”
right-away+DIM

8-Church pastor, referring to a church-planter in some place of Latin America:
“hasta analfabetON era el hermano”
Even illiterate+AUG was the brother

(This person Ni. referred to planted several churches despite his poor reading skill)

9-Two male friends: “Que carrAZO hermano!”
what a car+AUG, bro

10-Pastor and I talking while he was helping me move (Feb 26/2003)
(NI. used the following suffixes:
a-‘Ni.-ito’
Ni.+DIM (He said that he is called that way by those involved in his upbringing).

b-‘conciertazo’
concert+AUG (a tremendous, very good, concert; which impacted him a lot)

c-‘conciertICO’
concert+DIM (concert that did not impress him much)

d-‘habian cuatro viejITOS’
there-were 4 old-people+DIM
Had he said “4 old people” with no DIM, it would have sounded pejorative

e-‘tecladITO’
keyboard+DIM (referring to a keyboard he was given. It did not have as many resources as others he knows. He clarified that this keyboard was not necessarily small)

f-‘cantatICA’ (Cuba is an –ico dialect)
musical+DIM

11-Nora (Carlos’ mother) to Carlos:
“Quieres café, jugo y una panquequITA?”
D’you-want coffee, juice & a pancake+DIM?

(Nora seemed a little bit mad but she shows that she’s not angry with the son by using this diminutive when talking to him. Had the DIM not been used, the son would very likely have thought that mom was angry at HIM.

12-M. to MaE, a friend, when this friend came for his son when Monica was baby-sitting:
Monica: Ma E., ya comiste?
Ma E., already (you)ate?

Ma E.: Bueno, agarre algo ahi cuando me vine.  
    Well, I-grabbed something there when I left

Monica: porque yo tengo alli pollITO  
    Because I have there chicken+DIM

(The idea here is that the chicken is not much. M. seems to be trying to tell Ma E: “don’t think it’s a perfectly cooked chicken; it’s not a big deal; don’t expect too much”)

13-At a musical rehearsal at church:  
Ivon: “Victor, tu vas a tocar el pianITO”  
    Victor, you will play the piano+DIM

Ma E: “Bueno, y esa falta de respeto??”  
    Well, why that disrespect

14-(Pastor and I at his church office, when I let him use my laptop to check his emails)  
Victor: “Ya chequeaste tus emails?”  
    Already checked your emails?

Ni.: “si tenia un mensajITO alli, sin mucha importancia.”  
    Yes, I had a message+DIM there, w/out much importance

15-My wife and I:  
Monica: "Ah, tu eres bobo"  
    You’re silly

Victor: "No me-digas bobo"  
    Don’t call-me silly

Monica: "Ah, tu no me dices boba a mi?"  
    You don’t call ME silly (to me)?

Victor: "no, boba no, bobITA"  
    No, ‘silly’ no, silly+DIM

Monica: "Ah, bueno"  
    Oh, then?

Victor: "Es lo mismo, boba y bobITA?"  
    Is it the same, silly & silly+DIM?

Monica: "no"…. (thinking)
16-Don P. (~60 years old) to me while we were doing some construction work:
“la ‘troca’ esta un poco fallONa’ (unsure if this is an adjectivizer or actual AUG)
the truck is a little flawed+AUG or ADJ?????

17-M. to Fav., a friend of hers (by email)
“Víctor y yo nos la hemos pasado bien ocupadITOS este verano (2003)
Victor & I (we) it have spent very busy+DIM this summer

18-E. (on a trip to a church camp at Camp Joy):
a-“De verdaCITA”.
Really+DIM
b--"con esa actituCITA"
with that attitude (referring to a bad attitude of her daughter’s when asking for food)
c--En todo el “mediAZO’ = “en el mismo medio”
in all the middle+AUG = on the very middle+AUG

19-M. dijo (en viaje de regreso a G’ville despues de Camp Joy con los P. family):
“Me queda unITA”
is left one+DIM (ONLY one is left)

20-M.P. (en mismo viaje de regreso):
“Medio dificiLON” (medio dificilon)
a little difficult+AUG (or ADJ.)

21-“cubanAZO” (A Cuban living in the USA with still strong & obvious Cuban customs)

22-M. to Sf. (inviting her to a prayer service)
“el culto dura solo una horITA”
the service lasts only one hour+DIM

23-Inspector Rodriguez (IR) to Alicia Machado (an ex-Miss Universe) in a funny show
called “Que Locura” (How crazy).
"tu eres falta de respetICO"
you have lack of respect+DIM
(In this program, IR is a fake inspector or TV station guard. He is often at the gate
entrance and catches victims (famous people) there. He pretends he does not find their
names in the guests list, so he doesn’t let them in. They often become very angry.)

24-DESPIERTA AMERICA (Wake Up America!, a Hispanic American program with a
diversity of sections: news, jokes, musicians, guests, interviews, etc.) (Ago 25/2003)
a-One of the “Despierta America” female hosts (Gisselle)
‘vamos a una pausITA y regresamos BIEN rapidITO”
let’s go to a break+DIM & we’ll return very fast+DIM
b-Host R., host, to the weather lady as she gave him the floor: ‘mi queridISIMA Jacki’
my dear+SUPERL Jacky

c-The Mexican male host, Fernando (in the Birthdays section): ‘X niño cumple 3 años’

X child turns 3 years (old)

d-Female host: "cumple 5 añITOs; 2 añitos"  (Gooch’s (1967:17) “transference”)

turns 5 years+DIM;  2 years+DIM

Host R.: "cumple 1 año"

Turns  1 year

e--Another female host (a blond young lady called ANA):

"ya regresamos con mas chismecITOs desde Mexico”

we’ll be right back with more gossip+DIM from Mexico

f-The narrator (only the voice is heard):

“mas tarde llega a casaITA…”

later arrives at house+DIM

g-Fernando to a Mexican music group:

“la epoca de machos, machos, de machAZOs”

the era of machos, machos, of machos+AUG

(referring to the era of the Mexican Revolution)

h-Ana:

"los pobrecITOS"

the poor+DIM

(this was in reference to the polar bears rescued from suffering)

i-“chiquITITO” (Host R., referring to the new cell phones)

small+DIM+DIM

25-Hypothetical example (from my own intuition):

“Escribio un poemITA/cancioncITA” etc…

(s/he)wrote a poem+DIM/song+DIM

(IF we say “X artist wrote X poem/song+DIM, the diminutive may reflect a sense of
inferiority of the speaker towards that poem/song.

26-In comedy TV show “Que Locura” (Aug. 30/03):

a-Rene (Venezuelan singer): “Poco profesional es este programITA”

little professional is this program+DIM

b-Inspector Rodriguez: (to Chiquinquira, an actress)

"Tu eres faltICA de respeto"

You have lack+DIM of respect
27-DESPERTA AMERICA (Sept 2/03)

a-Weather forecast lady:
“Vamos a dar el ultimo vistAZO al tiempo”
let’s go to give the last view at weather (=let’s have a last brief look at climate)
(this augmentative seems to have diminutivizing functions)

b-Giselle: (in a phone discussion with street people that called the program to answer the question “Who drives better? A woman or a man?”)
“hola IrmITA”
Hello Irma+DIM

(this DIM probably had the intention of empathizing with the other woman she was talking to since this was a woman-man debate)

c-Giselle: (referring to a fashion style for women called “de cargo”).
“la moda con los cinturoneITOs”
the fashion with the belts+DIM
Note: This DIM may have gender connotations, according to the context.

d-Luis Magagna (a young guy, very refined, who is in charge of finding show business gossip, or interesting news about actors, singers, etc. famous for Hispanics)
“volvemos en unos momentITOs mas”
we’ll return in some moments+DIM more (we’ll be back in a few minutes)

e-Luis Magagna: “Ernesto LaGuardia nos dio tremendo noticION”
Ernest La Guardia (to) us gave tremendous news+Aug

28-In a TV cereal commercial in Univision (Hispanic TV channel). The only person showing up in the commercial was a kid.
“sabores tostadITOs”:
flavors toasted+DIM
I think this commercial was clearly addressed at children particularly; henceforth the use of the DIM. This is probably an instance of the ‘commercial power’ of DIMs.

29- “Despierta America” (Sept 4/03)
a-Host R.: "nos das un consejo, asi en una manera concentradITA" 
(to) us give some advice, like in a manner concentrated+DIM

b-Giselle: "con permisITO dijo MonchITO"
with permission+DIM (excuse me+DIM) said Moncho+DIM

c- a (female) cook:“el puerco esta limpiecITO”
the pork is clean+DIM
This really means “very clean”. Thus, here the DIM means “very” (Aug function)

d -"nos resultara un caldITO bieeeen sabroso"
(to)us will result a soup very delicious (we’ll end up with a delicious soup)

e-Host R. (to the cook): “no puedo echar un poquito mas de salsa de tamarindo”

  Can’t (I) put a little more of sauce of ….”

30-In “La Jaula”
(“The Cage” is a comedy program that often presents a group of bachelor mid-40 guys bringing single women to their apartment. They are just womanizers. (Sept 7/03)

-One of the guys to one of the women: “Hola Martica, no Martica no, Martota”

Hi Marta, no Marta no, Marta

(Obvious sexual connotation. The woman looked very hot & sexy, and that’s what the AUG reflects here)

31-"hay unos mas recatados"

there are some more conservative??

32-“salga y disfrute del calorito”

go out & enjoy the heat

33-In “DESPIERTA AMERICA”

Ana: (giving some news about some anise drink from Japan that the FDA does not approve.)

“hay una anis estrellado que es bastante malo”

there’s an anise (drink) that is rather bad

(there seems to be here a contradiction: augmentative ‘bastante’ with DIM. There may also be here a euphemistic function)

34“salutiTA”

cheers

(when giving a toast “salud!” -cheers!- a Mexican guy in the “Casos de La Vida Real” - Cases of Real Life- show –Sept 11/03) He was drinking with his friends.

35-In “DESPIERTA AMERICA”:

“que duro esta, que rico!”

how hard you are, how nice!

(a girl to a Venezuelan soap opera star, referring to the strong and firm muscles of his arms; which she felt when he hugged her)

36-DESP. AMERICA: ‘hay hombres que usan su crema’

there are men that use their cream

37-DESP. AMERICA:

“manota”
hand+AUG
(Ana Canseco told the Mexican guy host when he was touching -a little too much- a female model who was reporting on the weather conditions)

38-Ana Canseco (DESP. AMERICA):
“hombres q' se cuidan mucho fisicamente –cutis, uñas…- pero son muy pero muy hombrecITOs”
men who take-care of selves much physically-face, nail..- but they're very but very men+DIM
(Defining what a “metro-sexual” was)

39-A man interviewed about the metro-sexuals:
‘tengo las uñas de los pies bien arregladITAs’
I have the nails of my feet well taken-care-of+DIM

40-Luis Magagna (DESPIERTA AMERICA) interviews Marta Susana, a talk show host. Marta Susana (Host of another talk show of this Hispanic channel):
“hay que tener algun vicio.NO bebo, no me drogo por lo menos un cigarrITO, dejame!!”
there has to be some vice. I don't drink, do drugs...at least a cigar+DIM, let me (do it)

41-Giselle (DESPIERTA AMERICA):
“al que lo quieren, tiene que tener bien su corazoncITO”
him who is loved, (he) has to have well his heart+DIM

42-Monica (my wife to a friend):
“pero esos zarcillos estan elegantONES”
but those earrings are elegant+AUG
(meaning: “sort of elegant”, in Nora’s -Monica's mum- opinion)

43-DESP. AMERICA:
a)-The Mexican host guy during the sports section:
“Es especial para jovenes. Si tienes entre 18 y 25 años esto es para ti. Ahi te va jovenAZO”
It's special for youth. If you're between 18-25 years old it's for you. There you have young+AUG

b)-Mexican host: (referring to a esthetic treatment):
“ah, entonces se lo hace una vez y a los 3 meses se va y se hace un chequeaITO”
ah, then you do it once and 3 months later is gone and you do a check+DIM

44-Monica, talking to Yoleth on the phone inviting her to a birthday party
“bueno, si tienes un chancecITO”
well, if you have a chance+DIM

45-Monica to Juanfer (one of her brothers):
“Ese cuaderno es tuyo? Y Esto tambien? (riendose), ayyy, popITO (ironico)”
that notebook is yours? & this also? (laughing) ayyy, pop+DIM (Ironically)
(She was teasing him because he had a childish or female type of notebook)

46-Ana Canseco (Despierta America, Oct 9/03): a-“Oye, se reunion bastantITA gente”
(Wow! A good number of people gathered!) listen, gathered many+DIM people

b-Host R.” “y dinerITO!!”
& money+DIM

On a report on a hats store famous in California:

c-“Un sombrerITO que cuesta nada mas y nada menos miles de dolares”
a hat+DIM that costs nothing more & nothing less (than) thousands of dollars

d-“Hasta el Papa escogio su modelITO”
even the Pope chose his model+DIM

e-“Este sombrero les gusta arremangaITO hacia abajo”
this hat, (they) like rolled+DIM towards the bottom

f-“Los precios empiezan en los 40 dolarITOS hasta los 3 mil dolares”
The prices begin in the 40 dollars+DIM until the 3 thousand dollars

47-Dr Cps., a university professor, told me:
“hay un dinerITO por ahi y decidimos dividirlo”
there's a money+DIM there & we decided to split it up
(referring to some travel funds promoted by the LIN Dept & the RLL Dept)

48-a) Ana Canseco: (referring to a soon-to-be show by Gloria Stefan)
'padrISISISISIMO'

good+SUPERL+SUPERL

b- The Mexican guy host (referring to a belly dance): “eso es un ejerciciAZO”
that is an exercise+AUG

c-Ana Canseco: (in an interview with an alleged astrologer about shoes and signs)
"Bueno, hoy nos hablaran de la moda y que tiene que ver con los zapatITOS"
well, today we will hear about fashion & what it has to do with the shoes+DIM

49-DESPIERTA AMERICA (Oct 15/03)
a-Ana Canseco (announcing a twins contest in El Salvador):
"No hay dos personas igualITITAS"
there are no two people equal+DIM+DIM

b-Ana Canseco:
'El maquillador nos trae otros truquiTOs para los machos, para que se pongan más papasOTEs!'

*a make-up expert brings other tricks+DIM for machos, so they can get more 'papi'+AUG*

(Note: 'papi' or something similar is often used in informal Spanish with sexual connotations in reference to a hot guy, very handsome or sexy. 'Mami' is the female equivalent)

c-La catira: "Un acre pero padrOTOTOTOTE" (en la luna) (in the moon)

*Ana Canseco: An acre but good+AUG+AUG+AUG*

d-La catira: "Dos millones de lotecITOs". (en la luna)

*two millions of lots+DIM (in the moon)*

e-(on a report on turtles hurt by seashore)

"Es dificil encontrar tortuguITAs vivas despues de accidents como estos"

*It's difficult to find turtles+DIM alive after accidents such as these*

(The turtle Ana was referring to was actually big because the Mexican guy host calculated it was about 70 years old)

(The turtle had been hurt by a boat in Florida.

f- Ana: "pobrecITA" (several times)

*poor+DIM*

(Probably here we have the DIM being used to express certain empathy, pity and compassion for the pain of the turtle)

50-DESPERTA AMERICA (Oct 15/03)

During the section of a hairdresser. He’s a guy in his 40s with very refined manners. His name is Samuel, but he’s usually called “Sammy”.

a-El samisAZO (the name of the section of the program)

*the Sammy+DIM*

b-Giselle: "que usen sus chancletITAS"

*Let-them use their shower-shoes+DIM*

c-Sammy (the refined hair-doer):"LOS cepillITOs para que se cepillen sus pies".

*The brushes+DIM so they brush their feet*

d-A Mexican guy telling a joke in the street: “Un pollITO chiquITO”

*A chicken+DIM little+DIM*

51-(In an interview with a Mexican band that fused two Latin rhythms)

a-'Si, la bachtITA'

*yes, the bachtITA*

(probably because this band isn't from a bachata region. So, this is their own version of bachata)
b-Ana: "ah, sacaron un disco tambien para los mas pequeñINes?"

ah, you made a record also for the most little+DIM (ones)?

(After this point, they used a lot of DIMs because they were talking about music for children)

c-Host R., the Venezuelan host: (performing an old Colombian lady. "she" talks to Sammy)

"Mira Samuel Suarez!.." (and then offended Sammy)

Look, Samuel Suarez

This Colombian 'lady' got mad because Sammy told her about a lot of changed she needed to make in her face. Interesting here is the dropping of the hypocoristic & DIM in the name Sammy

(This was of course a little performing sketch)

d-Luis Magagna:

"Hola Ana Canseco, despues te doy el chismerÍO de la fiesta del Gordo y la Flaca."

Hi, Ana Canseco, later I'll give you the gossip+AUG of the party of "El Gordo y la Flaca"

e-“Bueno, entonces lo tiene muy calladITO”

well, then it, he has very quiet+DIM

(referring to a gossip Luis Mg., famous Latin singer, has not told)

f-“el hotel estaba medio fellON”

the hotel was a little ugly+AUG

(referring to a show business guy who left a hotel with cockroaches)

52-DESPERTA AMERICA (Oct20/03)

a-A contest called "Los IgualITOs") (the equals+DIM) took place. (They were supposed to find imitators of the hosts of the show.).

I think there is a double pragmatic effect. It marks the playful character of the contest, and this DIM is also a type of AUG.

b-Ana Canseco: “Vamos a los felices muchachONES y muchachONAS”

Ana Canseco: let's go to the happy boys+AUG and girls+AUG

(referring to the birthday people they were about to announce, often kids.)

c-“Escuela de MachAZOs”

School of Machos+AUG

(It was a funny mini skit with the Mexican guy host and a Mexican band)

d- A Despierta America host to a make-up expert, who was showing how to avoid wrinkles and was referred to an oil product to use:

“Y donde encontramos ese aceitITO”
& where can we find that oil+DIM?

The make up expert: (at the end of the interview)
"Así que no gaste su dinero+DIM"
so, don’t spend your money+DIM (in unnecessary things)

e-“1500 dólares por noche”.
1500 dollars+DIM a night
(A little ironic here, and probably insinuating that $1500 was nothing for them –J.Lo & Ben Affleck, who were seen in a Vegas hotel)

53-MARTA SUSANA (A talk show):
A Mexican lady guest of low social class:
“La primera vez que le pegue” (referring to the very first time she hit her daughter)
the first+DIM time I hit her

54-(in ‘premio a lo nuestro’ –Award to Ours-, Feb 5, 2003):
“Premio a lo Nuestro” is an annual TV event where prizes or awards are given to important Hispanic show business people in the USA. Something like a Grammy Awards event.

a) The host: ‘tengo que rebajar unos kilogramos’
I have to lose some kilos+DIM (or pounds)

b) One of the awards presenters: “nuestro sangre y nuestro sabor”
Our blood+DIM and our taste/flavor+DIM

55-In “la copa de oro”, 2003 (Gold Soccer Cup)
“la gente del Barcelona esta preocupada”
the people of Barcelona Football Club are worried+AUG

56-A talk between Ros. (Mexican Monica’s hairdresser) and me:
Ros.: “Esta Monica? ……………Esta acostada, esta enferma”
Is Monica in? …………… She’s lying down, She’s sick

56-a) Ros.: “Ah, esta enferma+DIM?”
Ah, is she sick+DIM+DIM?

56-b) Ros.: “Bueno, digale que me llame, si?, me hace el favor+DIM”
ok., tell her to call me, please? Can you do me that favor+DIM

56-c) Ros.: “Bueno, hasta luego, que siga mejor+DIM”
Wel, see you later, may she be better+DIM

Note: she sounded very nice and polite on the phone. My wife also told that she did in fact sound very nice, tender, lovely…
57-Ma E:  (at a prayer service, Feb 24/04, during thanksgiving time)
“Gracias a Dios porque esta Juancarlos mejor, ya que estuvo malITO, muy malITO”
   *Thanks to God because Juancarlos is better, since he was bad(sick)+DIM, very sick+DIM*

58-Monica: “Le ayude a hacer 20 postreCITOS”  (Feb 28/04)
   *I helped her to make 20 desserts+DIM*

   (Monica a Ly. talking about the deserts she helped Eva to make for lunches to sell for Centroamerica) The feeling is that she did help, probably not much because she was sick, but she did help

59-DOMINGO Feb 29/04
a-Gonz. C. (Preaching about sexual temptations):
   “quizas diga: no importa. Nadie me ve.; ha(ironic), tengo noticias para uds. hermanITOs”
   *maybe you say: no problem. Nobody sees me; ha, I have news for you, brethren+DIM*

b-Elz.: (after he and I were searching on the Internet for songs.)
   “No te preocupes. Despues yo busco con calmITA”
   *don’t worry. Afterwards, I’ll look with calm+DIM*

60-“la ultimITA”
   *the last+DIM (meaning the very last)*

61-Echale canela a la chicha, que le da un saborCITO (Ly. to Monica) March 5, 2004
   *put some cinnamon powder to the ‘chicha’ (rice drink); it gives it a taste/flavor+DIM*

62-Monica to me: “tienes tiempITO sin ayudar”
   *you have a while+DIM without helping*

   (she wanted me to help her with the dishes but when she came to the kitchen, they were not done. She was disappointed, but at the same time she knew I was very busy that week)

63-Male friend (to me): “hey, (looking at a grill for sale at Home Depot),
   “cuando tenga mi propia casa. Tendre uno de esos. Para hacer mi carnITA, mi polIITO”
   *when I get my own house, I’ll have one of these to prepare my meat+DIM, my chicken+DIM*

   (My friend then told me that “carnITA” implied something more delicious, more enjoyable –I asked him why didn’t he say simply “carne” or “pollo”)

64-Host R. (Venezuelan young guy visiting the church in Gainesville):
a-  “No, fritanga esta medio flojON”
   *No, ‘Fritanga’ is a little slow+ AUG*

b- “Medio malAZO”
   *A little bad+ AUG*
65-DESPiERTA AMERICA (MARCH 11, 2004)
a-Ana Canseco (gossiping about Hispanic actors/actresses/singers)
“su hermana no dijo nada. estuvo calladITA”
her sister didn’t say anything. She was quiet

b-“si se sabian que habian sus problems aqui y alla, pero no se sabia…..”
we did know that they had their problems now & then, but we didn’t know...

c-Host R.:
“A donde vamos ahora, CarlITOs?” (asked a guest about next segment of the program)
where are we going now, Carlos?

d-News announcer (finishing the 2nd segment of news & announcing the next one-The Weather) “seguimos aqui en CasITA”
we continue here at House/Home

66- DESPiERTA AMERICA (MARCH 11, 2004)
a-Ana Canseco: (at an interview)
The interviewee suggests asking questions
She said: “si, debemos preguntar porque a veces nos quedamos aqui calladITOs”
Yes, we must ask because sometimes we remain there, quiet

b-“ok, vamos a comprar; ya tenemos el dinerITO, pero huuuy, nos sale un dinerAL.”
Ok, let’s buy; already we ave the money, but, wow, it costs money

       c-‘Bueno, ahora seguimos, Ahora volvemos con la pachangONA de Lupita D’Alesio’
       well, in minutes we continue; we’ll be back with the party of Lupita’s

67- DESPIERTA AMERICA (MARCH 11, 2004)
a-Carlos: (A guest, from “Desayuno Alegre”
(After a parody by Host R. and Gisselle, rapping)
“Oye, como que se queda el ritmITO, uno no puede parar”
look how this rhythm remains (stuck), one cannot stop

b-(At some moment, this guest said “estoy orgulloSISIMO de estar aca”
I am proud to be here

       c-Host R.: “miren esos cachetICOS!” (referring to the cheeks of a baby in a picture)
       look at those cheeks!

       d-A Despierta America commercial:
“Participen Y competiran por este carrAZO!!”
participate & you’ll enter in the contest for this car
68- DESPIERTA AMERICA (MARCH 11, 2004)

a-Luis Magagna: (After Ana Canseco said hi to him) ‘Aca, Un poquito desveladON’

here, a little restless

b-Luis Magagna: “Nos echaron un chisme medio raro; de un regalITO”

we were told a gossip a little strange; about a present

DIM

69- DESPIERTA AMERICA (MARCH 11, 2004)

Expert on a new therapy for beauty

a-(A middle age woman said ‘poquitICO’ different times).

“Un poquITICO de Valium, antes de la operacion.”

A little+DIM+DIM of Valium, before the surgery

b-“la estamos tratando con cariñITO”

we are treating you with dearness/love

DIM

6-ANA CANSECO: “Oye, LuisITO, te quiero mucho”

Listen, Luis+DIM, I love you much

Luis Magagna: “Igualmente, Un besOTE!”

The same, a kiss

AUG

d-Ana Canseco:

“Luis Ponce nos cuenta de todITITO lo que paso detrás de la filmacion de su nvo. Video”

Luis tells us about everything+DIM that happened off camera in his new video

70- DESPIERTA AMERICA (MARCH 11, 2004)

a) Luis Fonsi, a new Hispanic singer (on a phone interview with La Catira)

“tengo la voz un poquITO ronquITA” (I had a concert last night)

I have my voice a little+DIM rusky

b) “Bueno, nos quedaremos en Mexico un mes enterITO”

Well, we will stay in Mexico a whole month

c) “por lo general las visitas son cortITAs, pero nos quedamos mas”

genearly, the visits are short+DIM, but we stay longer
71-DESPIERTA AMERICA (MARCH 11, 2004)
Gisselle: “que ojazos”
What eyes!
(referring to the eyes of a one-year old kid during the children segment)

72-Programa “CONTROL” (March 13, 2004) Section: What would you say to the cockroaches?”
A young guy:
“Mi vecino siempre me llama a la policia. Le diria a las cucarachas que hagan el party alla”
my neighbor always calls the police against me. I’d tell the roaches to have the party there
(Notice the word “party” in Spanish)

73- 

a-Monica: “Bueno, porque necesitamos una maquina mas”
well, because we need one more machine
(Monica said this to an acquaintance of hers, with whom she does not have an intimate friendship. She sounded a little bit uncomfortable to ask for a favor: a sewing machine, when they were sewing the costumes for a passion play at church)

b-Ly.: (In the same situation):
“Pidele unas tijeras”
ask her for some scissors
(Ly. obviously needed some big scissors to finish up some costumes. She was already using small scissors but she needed ones bigger)

74-Que Locura: (March 20, 2004)
El Inspector Rodriguez:
“La bendita guerra de los sexitos”
the blessed was of the sexes

75-At Ron.’s (a teenager who grew up in church and now graduated from high school. He’s now leaving for another city to study) high school graduation party:
(there was a slide show with pictures. One had Ron. as a little boy scout) A woman at the party said:
-“Ron.Cito!”
Ron.

76-People started giving little talks at this graduation party for Ron.:

a-Erlinda: ‘quiero decirles que este muchacho que ven acá, aunque es más grande que mi’
want-I to tell-you that this boy that you see here though is more big than me

b-Abuela: “bueno, yo soy la abuela de Ron.”
Well, I am the grandma of Ron.
c- Jth. Francisco: (reading a funny poem that he improvised for Ron.)
   “Ron.cito, pito culITO, gracias por ser un buen primITO”
   Ron.+DIM butt+DIM thanks for being a good cousin+DIM

d- Mama: “Bueno, aunque crezca, siempre sera (ALL: Ron.cITO)….mi bebe”
   Well, eventhough (he)grows always (will)be Ron.+DIM my baby

e- Yoleth: “bueno, Ron. seguiara siendo… mi Ron.CITO” (all laughed)
   Well, Ron. (will)continue being my Ron.+DIM

f- Pastor Al.: “aunque suene muy raro decirte Ron.CITO, siempre seras nuestro Ron.CITO”
   eventhough (it)sounds very strange call-you Ron.DIM, always (will)be our Ron.DIM
   (people: si, si…) yes, yes…

77- (at the same graduation party)
   Elz.: “Un permisITO” (carrying a chair from a table to another)
   A permit+DIM

78- Vacation Bible School (or EBV in Spanish) (2003)

a- Suh.: “quien estuvo conmigo en la clase de EBV: quien leyo la Biblia todos los dias?
   Those that were with-me in the class of EBV: who read the Bible all the days?

   esta semana? A.J?, Mlsa.? Que les he dicho yo cuando no leemos la Biblia? El espíritu se
   this week? A.J? Mlsa? What to-you have said I when don’t read the Bible? The spirit
   pone..? bien delgadITO, verdad?”
   gets very skinny+DIM, right?

b- “Todos los niños buscaban los versos rapidos porque les daba.. concursITOs
   All the kids looked up the verses rapidly ’cause them-gave.. contests+DIM

79- Vacation Bible School (or EBV in Spanish) (2003)

79-a) Puppets: “hola amiguITOs”
   Hello friends+DIM

79-b) “vamos a cantar una cancioncITA con uds. antes de despedirnos”
   let’s go to sing a song+DIM with you before of saying bye

80- Children Summer Camp, at a kids’ game (2003)

a- Carlos T.: (leading a kids’ game; the “hot potato”).
   “Cuando la musica pare, el que tenga la bombITA canta conmigo una cancion”
   When the music stops the one having the balloon+DIM sings with-me a song
b-J. Rf. Colon: (trying to get his son a little space in the circle where children were for a game) “Con permiso,… dale un huequITO ahí”
*With permission (=excuse me) give HIM a room there*

c-Carlos: (to the kids, before Ta. started giving them the camp shirts out) “Todos tienen que estar sentadITOs”
*all have to be sitting*

Children Summer Camp, the kids met inside the temple (2003)
d-Ta.: “ahorITA (to Mimi, who asked when)”el ahorita mio que es de aqui a un rato”
*Now the now+DIM mine that’s ………later*

e-Davicito: “Mami” (Ta. didn’t hear him or did not want to pay attention to him then), …”Mami!!” “Mami!!” (Ta. didn’t hear).….”MamITA”” (Now, Ta. did hear?????)
*Mum Mum Mum Mum+DIM*

f-J. Rf. Colon: “no es como el ‘ahorITA’ Puerto riqueno”
*It isn’t like the now+DIM Puerto Rican*

g-Carlos T.: “el ahorita de ella –Ta.- es ‘later”
*The nowDIM of hers –Ta.- is later*

h-Ta.: “vamos a cerrar los ojITOs y vamos a orar”
*Let’s go (&) close the eyes & let’s go to pray*

i-Jth.cITO =/= Jth. (Jth.cITO = Jth. Jr)

81-Children Summer Camp, (in food time, with the kids): (2003)
a-Carlos T.
“Pastor, le guarde su pizzITA. Una de pepperoni y.. (Pastor laughed & so did Carlos)
*Pastor, to-you (I)saved your pizza one of pepperoni &..

b-MaE: (to Si.ita when the kids were giving kisses to parents and grandparents)
“Oye, y a tia, a tia no le vas a dar un besITO?”
*Listen, & to aunt, to aunt aren’t you going to give a kiss+

c-Nasira: (when she realized that little Isabela was trying to take Si.ita’s hand but could not ‘cause Si.ita kept on running) “ah, isabela quiere la manITO de Si.a”
*Oh, Isabel wants the hand of Si.a’s*

d-Ni. (while videotaping the kids having breakfast) “TostadITAs!”
*Toasts+

e-Carlos T.: “Tostaditas” (low voice)
*Toasts+DIM*

f-Ni.: “JHN-cito se la come toda. TodITA. TodITA”.
g-Ni.: “Jn.-qui!” (Ni. & others call Jn.-Carlos ‘Juanqui’)

h-Ni.: (videotaping) y Si.ita!! Mira Si.ita alli. La comidITA’ (focusing on her food). & Si.a+DIM, look Si.ita there. The food+DIM

82-At a church concert, by a middle-aged male singer, Rn.:
a-Rn.: (introducing his next song. He was narrating a past event when one day he was in his house praying and painting relaxed): “Tenemos un pequeño pajarITO en mi casa

We have a small bird+DIM in my house

b-Rn. (Introducing a song that told about a kid):
“el nino y su papa vivian en un ranchITO’

The kid & his dad lived in a shack+DIM

c-Rn.: (at the end of the song “I’ve not offered a garden of roses”. Rn. referred to Jesus’ eternal companionship):
“Y Jesus nos dice que siempre estara cercaITa de ti”

& Jesus to-us says that always (will)be near+DIM of you

83-FERIA HISPANA (Hispanic Fair)
a-Carlos S.: “Se me olvido la botellITA de Havana Cuba”

I forgot the bottle+DIM from Havana Cuba

b-Carlos T.: “Mientras, mollejITA, abuchuelas, etc, a 50 centavITOs”

meanwhile, molleja+DIM, beans+DIM, etc, fifty cents+DIM

(while selling food at the fair and waiting for another country group to perform)

c-Ni.: hey! “Denmen un filITO ahi”

give me a space+DIM there

(Ni., while videotaping, was asking some room to be able to audiotape Virginia)

84-A friend to me, saying hi:
“hermanAZO!, que mas?!”

brother+AUG, what’s up?

85-At a church men meeting:
a) Chris. (a 30-year-old young guy)

“Estuve en Guatemala, y estuve con mi familia, pero solo fue un pasON”

I was in Guatemala, & I was with my family, but only (it)was a pass+AUG

In this example, Chris. meant that his time with his family was very little. He explained that he was a whole week in his home country, but he only spent two hours sharing with his family.
b) Ni.: “Yo le preparo un langostON”

*I to-him prepare a lobster+AUG*

In here, there was no reference necessarily to the size of the lobster but probably to the
great taste of it. Ni. reported what a Chef in Cuba said”

Examples 86-97 come from TV Program ‘Despierta America’ (May 17 Monday, 2004)

86-Host R., The Venezuelan host is giving some news about Christian Castro’s ex-wife
auctioning her wedding dress. This ex-wife said that
“el dinero que se recoja se donara a la Fundacion de Amigos del Nino con Cancer”
*the moneyDIM collected will be given to the Friends of Children with cancer Foundation*

87-a) A female reporter, Paola, (in her 30’s) interviewing a lady expert in wedding cakes.
“asi que ya no son esos pasteles tradicionales que tenian que ser romanticos, blancoITO’s”
*so, no more those traditional cakes that had to be romantic, white+DIM*

87-b) The same reporter speaking about hair-dressing styles by ‘Sammy’:
‘peinados para que luzcan bellISIMAs’
*hairdos for them to look beautiful+SUPERL*

87-c) She advised humourosly that the brides should have them so…
“el novio va a caer rendIDITO al suelo y le dara el ‘si’ inmediatamente”
*the boyfriend will fall surrendered+DIM on the floor & will say ‘yes’ immediately*

88-The news reporter after Paola passed it back to her.
“y te ves preciosa PaolITA, lista como para casarte otra vez…”
& you look beautiful Paula+DIM, ready for like wedding again

89-a) Jennifer Pena, advertising one of her new songs: “es una cancion buenISIMA”
*it’s a song good+SUPERL*

89-b) Host R.: (Interviewing Jennifer Pena)
“Y vemos un cambio de imagen en ti tambien, te vemos un poco mas ‘chenchualONA’”
*we see a change of image in you as well, we see you a little more sensual+AUG*

89-c) Gisselle (the host), interviewing Jennifer Pena
“te ha tocado estar ahora en medio de un chismecITO bastante duro”
*it has been your turn now to be in the middle of a gossip+DIM rather hard”*

During the “Sammisazo” time:

90-a) Sammy: (describing how to do a certain hairdo)
“y por supuesto hacerlo fuera de la cara, bien estiradITO”
& of course, to do it out of the face, rather stretched+DIM

90-b) ‘cruzas la parte de arriba muy suavecITO’
cross the upper part very softly

90-c) He used several diminutives: ‘colita’, ‘ganchillos’, ‘panecitos’, ‘rabito de burro’, etc
Horse tail+DIM ‘bread+DIM’, donkey tail+DIM, etc

91-Giselle: “Hay que lindo!!” “Me esta (Fernando) ensenando una foto de su hijITO”
how beautiful. (Fernando) is showing me a picture of his son

92-a) ‘esta pareja tiene una parejITA de gemelas” (on a report on sextuples)
this couple has a pair+DIM of twins

92-b) ‘(esa parejita tiene) tres añITOs’
(this pair of twins) is three years+DIM old

93- The Mexican: (giving news about a crocodile found with broken arms on the street)
“va a andar con su brazITO asi” (the alligator with the splinter)”
he will be with his arm+DIM like this

94-On an “El Gordo y la Flaca” commercial
“Cazamos a Luis Mg. en su yate …y armo tremendo reventON”
we captured Luis Mg. in his Yatch..and he made a huge party+AUG (breakage+AUG)

95-Host R., about to finish the interview with Jennifer Pena for her to sing
“dentro de un ratITO vas a cantar”
in a while+DIM you’ll sing

96-“vea la forma de reducir esas rulITAs ?? que tanto le incomodan”
see the way to reduce those rolls+DIM that so much bother you (to lose weight)

97-a) An expert on wedding dresses fashion, talking about what the bride needs.
‘lo primerITO que tiene que saber [sic] es su cuerpo’
the first+DIM (thing) that she has to know is her body

97-b) The host asking the dress expert some questions:
‘y el detallITO de las plumas?’
& what about the detail+DIM of the feathers?

97-c) The host asking more questions:
‘elegantISIMO, no es cierto?’
elegan+SUPERL, isn’t it?

This is a sort of ‘Jerry Springer’ type of show. Its title is “Family Cases”. They bring different family members with different problems and they talk about those problems in
the show, with the supposed goal of solving the problems. They bring real people, and the discussion tends to be spontaneous, led by the host.

98-The female blond host in the 20’s:
“muchISIMAs gracias”
Many+SUPERL thanks

99-a) “muchISIMO tiempo”
much+SUPERL time (without seeing the family)

99-b) “que sientes tu Manuel ahorITA (en estos momentos)?”
what do you feel Manuel now+DIM (at this moment)?

99-c) ‘detengame ahi tantITO, porque hay mucho q relatar’ ‘vamos a unos comerciales’
stop there a while+DIM ‘cause there’s a lot to say. Let’s go to commercials

(During commercials)
100- An ex-wife of Andres Garcia: (with a hand-signal like throwing an ashtray)”
“se caso conmigo y al siguiente dia me avento un cenirAZO”
he married me & the next day he threw me an ashtray+AUG (???)

101-Narrator: (of the commercial for this ‘Cristina’ program)
“escandalos del galanAZO Andres Garcia”
scandals of the movie-star+AUG Andres Garcia

102-a) (Back to CASOS DE FAMILIA)
ya platicamos un poquITO con Idalia y Manuel. Ahora converaremos con…JOse.’
We talked a little with Idalia & Manuel. Now we’ll talk with Jose

102-b) (The host to one of the guests)
“Idalia, ahorITA (a few moments ago) tocamos puntos importantes contigo”
Idalia, now+DIM we touched upon important points with you

102-c) ‘gracias a Dios ya te me controlaste un poquITO’
thanks to God you already got control of yourself (for me) a little+DIM

102-d)
‘el saludo de Uds. bien (a mama y hermano) les veo la sonrisOTA,. a tu hermana tan frio’
the greeting of you-all good (to mon & brother) I see the smile+AUG, to your sister, cold

102-e) One of the guests, Idalia the daughter
’a mi me daban las sobras de ella (sister she didn’t want to see).me dolia desde chiquITA’
to me they gave the remainders of hers it hurt me since little+DIM

102-f) ‘OK Jose, ahora yo te volteo la pelotITA. Por que TU no fuiste a buscarla a ella?’
OK, Jose, now I flip over the ball+DIM to you, Why did you not go for her?
103-a) Giselle: (Interviewing an old lady that dances with a cup on her head)
‘AY, virgen santISIMA!’
wow, virgin holy+SUPERL!

103-b) ‘Aquí SI que hay azuquITA en la cintura’
here there IS indeed sugar+DIM in the waist

103-c) ‘tenemos 20 segundITOs para irnos (a comerciales)
we have  20 seconds+DIM to go   (to commercials)

104-a) Ana Canseco: (Interviewing Gisselle, a Merengue singer from Puerto Rico)
‘estas contenta. te nombraron la gran mariscal o la reinITA del desfile Pto Rico en Nva Y
you’re glad.They named you Great Mariscal or the P. Rico in N.Y. parade’s queen+DIM

104-b) Gisselle (The meringue singer)
‘contenta porque represento a mi islITA chiquITITA’
glad      because I represent  my island+DIM little+DIM

104-c) Ana Canseco:
"bueno, tienes tambien baladITAs, y un poquITO de todo”
Well,    you have also ballads+DIM & a little+DIM of everything

104-d) Gisselle: (the singer)
“mi hijo esta grandISIMO, cumple 10 años en junio”
my son   is      big+SUPERL, he’ll be 10 years in June

104-e) Ana Canseco:
“ya vistes los bomberos? Estan buenISIMOs”
already saw the firemen? They’re hot+SUPERL

105- Ana Canseco: (Passing the turn to Neida, the news announcer)
“Hola NeidITA”
Hello, Neida+DIM

106-Neida:
(in an interview-news section about a lady with problems with immigration)
‘ha     llorado      muchISIMO      porque teme               ser deportada”
(she)has cried much+SUPERL because she’s afraid of being deported

107-Gisselle (Despierta America Host)
‘un besIITO muy grande” (for the lady who just solved her deportation problem)
a kiss+DIM very big

108-The Miami Dade Fire Dept spokesperson,while presenting the 2005 firemen calendar
‘donamos a otros tambien porque siempre hay un poquITICO de dinero left-over’
we donate to others also because always there’s a little+DIM+DIM of money leftover

109-“y junio (the calendar fireman for that month): Mig..Mg.ITO” “Ay virgen santa!”
& June: Mg….Mg.+DIM. “Wow, Holy+SUPERL Virgin !”

110-Doña Meche: ‘Aquí esta mi calendario.Aca esta Agosto, aayy con mi gordITO bello’
Here is my calendar. Here is August, ooh! With my fat+DIM (guy) beautiful
(Doña Meche in the picture with a fat guy, hand-in-hand)

111-Commercial narrator promoting a special Cristina program:
‘ven a celebrar con nosotros el reventON del año!’
come & celebrate with us the party+AUG of the year

112-Song “Nothing left” (no queda nada), by Giselle, the Merengue singer
“Oye, no te confundas, que aqui no queda ni el humITO”
listen, don’t get confused, that here nothing is left, not even the smok+DIM
(this is said during the song without music, like speaking)

113-a) Host R. (at the beach) introducing his workmates from the radio station
“y Roxana –bellISIMA- Garcia”
& Roxana-beautiful+SUPERL- Garcia

113-b) “y el queridISIMO Javier Romero”
and the dear+SUPERL Javier Romero

114-a) Gisselle (the host): “Javier ven aca un segundITO”
Javier, come here a second+DIM
114-b) “El se lo va a poner ahorITA” (A bathing suit)
He’ll put it on now+DIM

115-Host R.: “ya va, ya va, que yo quiero saludar a OswaldITO tambien”
wait, wait, that I want to say hi to Oswald+DIM also

116-(In the Spain Prince’s wedding with Letizia)
“No le daran sombrillas, solo por un aguacero. Deben aguantar la llovIZNA pequena”
there won’t be umbrellas, only in strong rain. They must bear the rainDIM(sprinkle) small

117-Neida:
“Bueno, ahora quiero aprovechar de mandarle un besITO a Elba, la niñera de mi sobrina”
well, now I want to use this time to send a kiss+DIM to Elba, babysitter of my niece

118-Neida: (humorously)
“Ahora paso a Ana, la princesITA mexicana, que la acompana el conde de Caracas”
now I pass to Ana, the princess+DIM Mexican accompanied by the Count of Caracas
119-Host R.:
“gracias Reina de Honduras.Nosotros aquí hablando de algo importante, verdad Ana?”

120-Host R. and Ana informing about what is common among the non-Royal people who married Royal people. One commonality was that they did not show interest in the Prince’s treasures. Ana said that they probably said:
“I, with simple stones am OK”

121-a) Ana “Cuidado que los principes se pueden convertir en simples sapitos”
“Watch out that the princes may become simple frogs”

121-b) Host R.: ‘Si, se pueden convertir en simples sapos.Con el beso se convierten en sapos’
“Yes, they may become simple frogs with a kiss they become frogs”

122-a) Roxana “bellisima” (to one of the fireman models)
‘A ver Rudy, una modeladita una caminadita por favor para poder contemplar la ropa’
“let’s see Rudy, a modeling, a walk please so we can see the outfit”

122-b) Roxana: (to another model)
“Mg.ITO, una vueltita por favor, Mg.ITO”
“Mg. a turn, please, Mg (with a little sexy tone)”

122-c) Roxana:
“Y ahora, la Señorita Junio, y el Señor Junio”
& now, Miss June, and Mr. June
(Gisselle was humorously modeling with one of the models. Notice that the lady is called with the DIM but not the guy)

122-d) Roxana: (to one of the firemen)
“Y uds. salvan a gatitos?”
& you-all save cats?

122-e) Gisselle
“Veo los colores azulitos” (referring to the clothes of the firemen)
“I see the blue colors”

123-A guy in the audience at the beach:
“Quiero saludar a mamita en Ecuador” (He sounded a little weird)
“I want to greet my mom in Ecuador”

124-Host R. de Molina (In a commercial break during Despierta America)
“cachamos a Juan Gabriel imponiendo moda…de sombreros”
“we spotted Juan Gabriel making fashion… of hats”
228

D’fern (half-woman half-man character interpreted by Fernando-Despierta America)
“Vamos a hacer todo este pasITO que es el pasITO del caballITO” (beach dancing)
let’s do all this step+DIM that is the step+DIM of the horse+DIM

Neida (joking before starting news narration)
“D’fern tiene las piernITAs un poco blancas.”
D’fern has the legs+DIM a little white

A female news reporter from Madrid
“Madrid esta preparadISIMO para la gran ceremonia (Boda Real)”
Madrid is prepared+SUPERL for the great ceremony (the Royal Wedding)

Neida: “hay que estar, mas flaquITO, no” (after news about obesity in the world)
We have to be more thin+DIM, right?

Ana
“bueno, el calorcITO esta riquISIMO por aca. Tremenda soleada que nos estamos dando”
well, the heat+DIM is great+SUPERL here. A huge sun-taking we are having

Ana
‘creo .[Letizia] va a entrar redondITOA[on the Royalty] porque tiene un carisma increible’
I think will fit round+DIM (very well) because she has an incredible charisma

Prof. Sayago (Astrologist giving predictions about the Prince and Letizia wedding)
“Es posible que en el 2005 haya un varoncITO”
It’s possible that in 2005 there’ll be a boy+DIM

During commercials

Narrator (Commercial on ‘Univision.com’)
“puedes encontrar de todo. RopITA para tu bebe”
you can find everything. Clothes+DIM for your baby

(Sf., my wife’s friend, called in that moment)
“No, aqui, llamando a MoniquITA, para ver que hacemos esta semana”
no, here, calling Monica+DIM so we can see what to do this week

Back to DESPIERTA AMERICA
El General (’The General‘):
“este es mi ambiente, la playa y con tantas chicas bien ricas y apretadITAs”
this is my atmosphere, beach and with so many girls hots and stretched+DIM

Ana:
“Y muchas gracias a toda la gente que vino desde tempranITO”
& many thanks to all the people that came since early+DIM

CASOS DE FLIA (May 21/2004) “Hispanics Vs Hispanics”
136-a) Judith Grace:
“MuchISISISIMAs gracias”
many+SUPERL thanks

136-b) “a pesar de los años que tengo soy nuevecITA en este pais”
in spite of the years I have here, I’m sort of new+DIM in this country

136-c) “Ud. se preocupa por la Guerra de Iraq? Tenemos otra aqui cerquITA”
d’you worry about the war in Iraq? We have another here, near+DIM

137-A store in Gainesville: “mi tiendecITA”
My store+DIM

138-An Univision program: “La EscuellITA VIP”
The school+DIM VIP

DESPIERTA AMERICA: (July 6/2004)
139-Host R. (the Venezuelan host)
“Ah, con razon la copITA”
ah, that’s the reason for the cup+DIM
(It was a big wine cup, remembering the birthday celebration cup of Host R. de Molina, from “El Gordo y la Flaca”)(It was comic sketch about cups)

140-Ana Canseco to Gisselle:
“Una competencia de llorones. Oye tu eres buena porque a ti te sale la lagrimITA rapido”
a competition of criers. Listen, you’re good ’cause you bring out a teardrop+DIM fast

141-Ana and Gisselle (news about some tiny hens from Europe)
“ unas gallinas chiquITITAS” “ los gallos chiquITO s” “ gallITOs”
some hens little+DIM+DIM the rooster little+DIM rooser+DIM

142-Gisselle:
”Me recuerdo del café de mi abuelITA. Era el unico café que yo tomaba”
I remember the coffee of my grandma+DIM. It was the only coffee I drank

During Commercials
143-Narrator: (about the “LA Escuelita program”)
“y llega a la escuellITA, Ana BArbarITA” (This is a famous sexy Mexican singer/actress)
and to the school+DIM comes Ana Barbara+DIM

144-a) Back to “Despierta America”
Neida: (news announcer)
“y ahora con un grupo que han estado aqui desde tempranITO”
& now to a group that has been here since early+DIM
(presenting the “La Autentica de Jerez” Band).
144-b) A “La Autentica de Jerez” member”:
“Se celebra con el tamborAZO”
it is celebrated with the drum+AUG

During commercials
145-Narrator: “Otro contricante para el charroAZO famoso?”
Another rival for the charro+AUG famous?
(In an announcement about a festival party, where a famous Mexican singer, and others, would be)

146: Back to Despierta America:
(In an interview with a young fashion designer from Colombia, Esteban Cortazar)
Ana Canseco:
“Oye y eso de ‘el nino genio de la moda’?”
Listen, & what about that of ‘the genie kid of fashion’?

Esteban Cortazar: (The young refined fashion designer)
“No, no, no. No Sali de una botellITA”
no, no……I did not come out of a bottle+DIM

CASOS DE FAMILIA (July 6/2004) (‘en Guerra por la sobrina’)
147-Host (Judith Grace):
“Un besOTE para San Antonio, TX”
A kiss+AUG for St. Antonio, TX

148- Judith Grace:
“Tu la tienes muy facilITA porque tu estas con tu esposo sola,
you have it very easy+DIM ‘cause you’re with your husband alone
& not with his family, so you don’t have to deal with his family
(The host was talking to the wife of a guest in the program who was very sad because he did not have his family with him. He was brought up to give advice to those in fight with their own sisters/brothers –main topic of that program)

149-Judith: “Como encuentras a tu hermano? GuapetON verdad”
How do you find your brother? Handsome+AUG, right?

150-Judith Grace: “Yo les pido un aplauso, pero rapidIN”
I ask for a round of applause, but rapid+DIM

151-Judith: “Yo se que estas contento de ver a tu hermanITA despues de 10 anos
(I know you’re happy to see your sister+DIM after 10 years)
(It was a grown up sister, around 35 years old)”

152-Judith: (the last piece of advice for the sisters in fight)
“Cuando se echen el café, me invitan”
*when you have your coffee (time), invite me*

153-Judith:
“bueno, pero aclaren eso. Es o no enojona. Porque tiene que estar claro”
*well, but, clarify that. Is she or not an angry person? Because that has to be clear*

154-3:30 pm soap-opera (July 7, 2004)
two bad-girl characters in a soap opera:
“ahora solo te falta que se te muera la enfermita”
*now the only thing left is that the sick person dies*
(ironic, speaking about what’s needed for one of the girls to be left alone with her lover.)

Recording from EL SALVADOR:
155-El cojolillo is the tree of the ‘cojol’ fruit. This –illo is being used as a
distinguisher (Cojol, fruit; Cojolillo plant). A lexicalization process

The PRIETOs (my family) Video (July 2003)
156-a) Nali: “Mandale un saludito a tu tío Chino”
*Send(him) a greeting to your uncle Chino*

156-b) Nali: “Mira, mira a tu mamá, Que raro! Comiendo…. Mira, mira, comiendo”
*Look, look at your mom, how strange! Eating! Look, look, eating*

156-c) Nali: “Esta es la hija chiquitica de Ruth”
*This is the daughter little of Ruth’s*

156-d) Ruth: “One, Two…. Ten, hasta llega mi ingles, mi panita”
*…. until there my English, my friend*

156-e) Ruth: “Mandenle una peluquita (to mom)”
*Send a wig to mom*

156-f) Judith: “Un besito a mi gordo bello”
*A kiss to my fat(dear) beautiful*

156-g) Nali: ‘no hablan nada. La única q’ hablo fue esta muchachita’
*they don’t speak/say anything. The only who spoke was this girl*

156-h) Nali: (Dec. 2004) “Este es el más tranquilito de la casa (Ironic)”
*This is the most quiet of the house*

157- Nali: “Te acordaras de Bk. C., la que se la pasaba jugando con un palito?”
*D’you remember Bk. C., the one always playing with a stick?*
Bk. C: “Con una palita?”
*With a stick?*
Nali: “Con un palo”
   With a stick

Despierta America, May 14, 2004

158-a) Ms. Garrido:
- “vamos a ver las condiciones del tiempo rapidITO”
  let’s see the conditions of the weather quickly+DIM

158-b) Va a ser un mal Viernes y se lo digo bien TempranITO
   It’ll be a bad Friday and to-you I say (it) rather early+DIM

Contest: “Cuentame un Chiste” (tell a joke)
159-a) “NerviosISIMO”
  nervous+SUPERL

159-b) “JesuscrITICO” (A Jesus very small, in a joke)
   Jesus Christ+DIM

159-c) “un chiste rapidITO”
  a joke quickly+DIM

159-d) The Mexican (guy) host introducing a female joke-teller:
   “MartITA Rojas”
   Martha+DIM Rojas

159-e) A Mexican lady telling a joke about “un marranITO” (a pig+DIM):
   She used many DIMs. She diminutivized all the animal names (lion, tiger, etc.)
   160) My wife to my son, while having dinner
   “viste, te quemaste. Ese que estaba ahi ya estaba sopladITO”
   you see? You got burnt. That one there was already blown+DIM
   (mom blew a little bit of air on a piece of fish to cool it out).

161) My father-in-law, telling me what he had done with friends a while ago:
   “nos tomamos unos vinITOs”
   we drank some wines+DIM

COPA AMERICA 2004 (Important biannual soccer competition in the Americas)
July 7 (Mexico-Uruguay game)
162-a) Narrator(the 3 narrators were guys in the 40’s from 3 different Hispanic countries):
   “el compañero de Mexico debe estar viendo el juego porque es un fanaticAZO del futbol”
   our workmate from Mexico must be watching the game since he’s a fan+AUG of soccer

162-b) “Hace mucho tiempo que no vemos a X. Hace un ratITO ya”
   long time ago that we don’t see X. It’s already a while+DIM ago
“Quiere jugar unos metrÍCOS adelante”
he wants to play (a few) meters ahead

“esta soplando mucho el viento ese...y se lo regalo”
it’s blowing much, that wind+DIM...& I give it away to you (I don’t want it)

“estuvo muy movido el tema de...”
was very moved+DIM the topic of... (There was a lot of talk about a certain topic)

CHURCH TRIP TO a Theme Park in Orlando” (March 15, 2003)

“No, my wife is sick, she bought me here &...well...”

“Ahi esta Carlos (T.), Carlos el complicado...de Puelto Rilco”
There is Carlos (T.), Carlos+DIM the complicated one...from Puerto Rico

“El chamACO ya viajando (refiriendose a Luquitas, de bebé)”
the boy+DIM already traveling (referring to little Luke, a baby)

“Alla va durmiendo, el chiquitIN”
there is sleeping, the little+DIM

‘llego la familia, el familiON, el familioN completo aqui’
arrived the (pastor) family, the family+AUG, the family+AUG complete here

’esta saliendo ya el van de Rf.IM Colon’ (29-year old guy with wife & 2 kids)
It’s leaving already, the van of Rf.+DIM Colon

‘aca tenemos a NilITO’
here we have Ni.+DIM

“Sube esa ventana Fd., un poquito más” (door window was still open 1 inch)
pull that window up, Fd., a little+DIM+DIM bit more

‘Erk. la estrella (appears Tif.)la estrellITA (and then Vs.) la estrellEZA’
Erk., the star the star+DIM the star+AUG
(Erk. is about 10 years old, Tif. about 8, and Vs. about 12)

‘Aqui nos estamos refrescando en la sombra porque el sol esta un poco picante’
here we are freshing up by the shadow+DIM because the sun is a little hot

(Introducing three of the party having lunch),
‘Don P., La niña , El papa, el cubanAZO, Ed.’
Mr P., the little girl the dad, the Cuban+AUG Ed.

’estamos en el mismo lugar,un poquito juntos pero no importa’ (some missing)
we’re in the same place, a little together, but no problem

163-m) ‘aquí tenemos a Don P. comiéndose su manzana’
here we have Mr. P. eating his apple

163-n) ‘los más viejos somos los que estamos cansados’
the most old are the ones that are (we) tired

163-o) “huele, huele a oveja”
it smells, it smells like sheep, yes

163-p) Elz. (praying) “amantísimo Dios Padre Celestial…”
Loved God Heavenly Father

JTH.’s (an ex-missionary) VISIT
164-a) Monica (In the Children’s camp)
“cuentenle los dibujos que hicieron” (tell the pastor what you did today)
tell him about the drawings that you did

164-b) “estamos tratando de hacer animales”
we’re trying to make animals

164-c) “vamos a hacer un pez”
we’re gonna make a fish

165) Jth. (Ni.’s brother)
‘vamos a leer rápido allí’
let’s read quickly there

166) ‘es como una foto instantánea. Primero no ve pero espera un ratito y ya lo ve’
it’s like instantaneous photos. First, you can’t see but wait a while & then you see

167) ‘no se podía entrar. El barco lo dejaban lejos y se entraba en un bote pequeño’
it wasn’t accessible. The ship remained far and you could enter on a boat little
(In Fiji Islands with cannibals)

168) “los latinos somos igualitos a la gente en los países árabes”
we Latin are equal to the people in the Arabic countries
(He meant Arabs and Latins physically looked a lot alike)

169) ‘Luc. dice: ‘te vi y manda fotos. Es un musulmán como yo con chiva y narizón’
Luc. says ‘I saw you’. He sends photo & it’s a Muslim like me, with beard & he’s nose

170) ‘el challenger se hizo papilla” (lexicalized?)
The Challenger became potato pudding
171) ‘la estadia en el cosmos es un vacílON’

*staying in the cosmos is a joke*+AUG

172) Yn.: “Mira! Tremendo platOTE de comida (de Ram.)”

*Look! Huge dish*+AUG *of food (of Ram.’s)*

173-a) Yth.: “(Cual fue la) palabraITA?”

*Which one was the word*+DIM?

173-b) Yn.: “PALabrOTA!”

*Word*+AUG

174) Ly.: “tuvimos que ir a otro lugar porque en Sam’s vendían un paquetON completo”

*We had to go to another place because at Sam’s they sold a whole pack*+AUG

175) Monica ‘Hay unas partes simplIONAs y otras dulces” (of a water melon she gave me)

*There are parts simple*+AUG *& others sweet*

176) Wendy’s salad commercial (with skinheads)

“tiene cebollas, dos pedazos de pollo, tomatITO, …”

*it has onions, two pieces of chicken, tomato*+DIM

177) ‘El Metido’, funny character in ‘LENTÉ LOCO’ (a hidden camera show)

“esta tan viejITA que ya no puede pegar duro”

*She’s so old*+DIM *that she can’t hit hard any more*

178-a) Narrator (COPA AMERICA 2004)

“Mexico ya hizo cambios en este partidAZO”

*Mexico already made changes in this match*+AUG

178-b) “Ya volvemos a este SUPER partidAZO Mexico-Argentina”

*we’ll be back to this super match*+AUG *Mexico-Argentina*

LA HORA PICO (The Rush Hour, a funny show)

179-a) “me llamo pompin, pompin, NO pomposo” (to a gay character)

*I am Pompin, Pompin, not Pomposo*

179-b) Gay: “Pero no importa, pomplIN y ejercicio y después pompON”

*But, no problem, pomp*+DIM *& exercise & then pomp*+AUG

SABADO GIGANTE:

180- Don Francisco: “y con Uds. el guapetON, Javier Romero”

& with you, the handsome* AUG, Javier Romero*

181- Don Francisco (in a contest for couples) “Que es lo que tiene mejor tu novio?”

*What is the best part of your boyfriend?*

181-a) The girlfriend: “yo pienso que el cuellITO”


I think that the neck

181-b) Don Francisco: “Que te gusta a ti mas?”

What do you like better
- The girlfriend: “me gusta el complementationICO”
  I like him complete

181-c) -Don Francisco: Que tiene el cuello de el?

What does his neck have?
-Girlfriend: “Es suave”
  It’s soft

181-d) Don Francisco: “Javier, te gusto ese chiste mio?”

Javier, did you like that joke of mine?

182) COPA AMERICA 2004 (Mexico-Argentina July 10)
Narrator: “Ahi esta enfrentamento del defensa”
  There he is, in front of the defense

183) Gisselle (Despierta America commercial)
“conozca la dieta que le desintoxica y le da un empujamento al animo”
know the diet that (to you) des-intoxicate & gives a push to your cheers/desire

COPA AMERICA Summary (3:30 pm, July 11)
184-a) By The female host, Roxana, of REPUBLICA DEPORTIVA (Sports Republic)
“punterazo, golazo, cañonazo”
kick with the tip of the shoe, goal, strong kick (like a cannon)

184-b) “Y quien sera la mama de esta copa?”
  & who will be the mom of this Cup

184-c) “esta carita de angel (the most beautiful of the fans)”
  this face of angel

184-d) “y como estan los numeros?”
  & how about the figures?

COPA AMERICA (Brasil-Costa Rica)
185-a) Narrator
“Brasil prometio despues del pitazo final que mejorarian”
Brazil promised after the final whistle that they would improve

185-b) Narrator “el balon pasa un poquito mas alla de la linea”
  The ball passes a little beyond the line

185-c) “Brasil sale a jugar desde temprano”
Brazil starts to (really) play early+DIM (means ‘very early in the game’)

185-d) “Luisao deja (the ball) ahi cortITO”
Luisao leaves -------- there, short+DIM

185-e) “El arquero de Brasil es medio atajadorCITO (atajo mucho, no sale…etc)”
the goalie of Brazil’s es a little catcher+DIM. He caught a lot, he doesn’t go out…etc

185-f) “a lo mejor le da de rozON (a player seems to have hit the goalie)”
he may have kicked him with just a (quick tiny) touch+AUG

185-g) ‘chuta, mete el centrITO…’ (a player centers the ball)
he shoots, puts it in the center+DIM...

185-h) ‘lentISIMO Ferreira, por eso lo alcanzaron”
slow+SUPERL Ferreira, that’s why they got him

185-i) “Costa Rica esta concentradISIMO”
Costa Rica is concentrated+SUPERL

185-j) (X player) “Es un chamACO tecnico”
is a boy+DIM technical

185-k) “pobrISIMO, bien pobre el planteamiento de Brasil”
poor+SUPERL, very poor the performance of Brazil’s

185-l) ‘pelotAZO, zapatAZO’
bball+AUG (the ball is hit hard), shoe+AUG (a hard kick, with the shoe, to the ball)

185-m) A reporter with Brasil fans “Aca estamos, FernandIÑO, celebrando el gol”
Here we are, Fernando+DIM, celebrating Brazil’s goal

185-n) “Un tapadodON lo que hizo el arquero!!!”
a block+AUG+AUG what the goalie did

185-o) “en poquISIMOS minutos Brasil le cambio el juego”
in few+SUPERL minutes, Brazil (to them) changed the play

185-p) “quedan 20 minutos larguITOs (a little over 20’) sufridITOs para costa Roca”
(still) left remain 20 minutes long+DIM suffering+DIM for Costa Rica

185-q) “la (the ball) dejo pasar comodITA para su amigo…”
he let it pass/go comfortable+DIM (easy) for his friend

185-r) “miren nada mas la copITA, la copITA America”(showed a gold big beautiful cup)
look, look, the cup+DIM, the cup+DIM ‘America’
LENTE LOCO (Crazy Camera; a hidden camera show)

186-a) “Que hubole viejITA?!!”
what’s up, old+DIM?

186-b) “Era una bromITA”
it was a joke+DIM

186-c) “esa risITA dasela a todos los amigos de Lente Loco (estas en Lente Loco)”
that smile, give it to all the friends of Lente Loco (You are in a hidden camera)

186-d) “es una broma señora, ahí esta la camarITA”
it’s a joke, Ma’am, there is the camera+DIM

187-a) “tienes que darle un besITO muy chiquITITO”
you have to give it (an iguana) a kiss+DIM very small+DIM+DIM

187-b) “lo que tienes que hacer es abre la boquITA asi y le das un besITO”
what you have to do is, open your mouth+DIM like this & give it a kiss+DIM

187-c) “claro, tiene lenguITA (the iguana)”
of course, it has a tongue+DIM

187-d) “Pero (el besito) tocaITO (the girl to kiss the iguana said)”
but (the kiss+DIM) just a touch+DIM

AFTER PARTY of the “ACAPULCO DE NOCHE”(Night Acapulco) show

188-a) “el traje de Avalon, medio transparentON”
the dress of Avalon, a little transparent+AUG

188-b) “X actriz mostrando sus piernITAs”
X actress showing her legs+DIM

188-c) “este es un trajeCITO bastante tradicional”
this is a dress+DIM rather traditional

188-d) “y ese piedrON lo trae X artista que le combina con ese vestido”
& that stone(gem)+AUG X actress wears it. It matches her dress

188-e) “si te gusta el look medio rockerON te presento a…”
if you like a little rock-like+AUG look, I introduce you to...

189) “aca esta el galanAZO de Acapulco”
here is the (handsome male) movie-star+AUG of Acapulco

190) “Y que dicen de esta gorrITA invertida??”
& what about this upside down hat+DIM
191) “Ana Barbara impresionó a todos su espectadores”
   Ana impressed all her spectators

192) “todos los artistas estaban disfrutando juntos del ambiente en Acapulco”
   all the actresses/actors/etc enjoyed together of the environment in Acapulco

193) ’y los artistas tuvieron su tiempo para limar asperezas (to rehearse)”
   & show-business people had their time arrange details (to rehearse)

194) ‘y también disfrutamos de la mamá de Ana Barbara”
   & we also enjoyed the mom Ana B.

195) y los de Panama llegaron con su reguetón sabrosón’
   & those from Panama arrived with their reggae delicious

196) ‘(en un momento) y ya veremos quien llegó solo’
   (a moment) & we’ll see who arrived alone

197-a) ‘bien tostada’ (literally, well toasted)
   well tanned

197-b) ‘vean el color de esta modelo’
   observe the color of this model (A female model with a great tan)

197-c) ‘no los huracanes del norte sino los cuerpos (fat, here) del norte’
   no, not the ‘hurricanes of the North’ but ‘the bodies of the North’

CATWOMAN movie commercial:
198) “parte gatita y 90% peligrosa”
   in part a kitty & 90% dangerous

199) Sf.:
   “en ese complejo hay casas con unos colores”
   in that complex there are houses with such colors
   (she said it was because the colors were varied & beautiful)

200) Sf.:
   ‘un hombre que entienda. Los hijos se ponen difíciles cuando se ponen caprichosos’
   a man understanding. The children become difficult when they get cranky

201) Monica: “Hay una soltera”
   There is a single female

202-a) Ly.:
“yo le pedí la receta a Jg. y le dije que el mismo me la diera, bien escritICA”

I asked the recipe from Jg. & told him to write it himself, well written+DIM

(Ly., in a little interview I had with her said that it had to do with dearness. She expected Jg. to give her the recipe with ‘carino’).

202-b) Ly.: It’s like, she said, when somebody tells you
“hazme una limpiadITA allí”
do me some cleaning+DIM there
This is an expected cleaning job with love or appreciation

203) Carlos: “No no voy a ‘La Tienda’ porqur ahi te cobran la entradITA”
No, I’m not going to the store because there they charge you for the entrance+DIM

204) Carlos” “mi papa se levanta y ya saca el temITA del dinero y las deudas”
My dad gets up & immediately brings up the topic+DIM of money & debts

COPA AMERICA commercial:
205) “vamos a ver el juegAZO Colombia-argentina”
let’s see the match+AUG Colombia-Argentina

206) “Henao es una arquerAZO”
Henao is a goalie+AUG

207-a) Narrator (Colombia-Argentina game, semi-final) ‘
“hubo un rosON de la pelota”
there was a (quick, tiny) touch+AUG to the ball

207-b) ‘lo tenia adelantITO” (ahead but very near)
he had him ahead+DIM

Casos de Familia (July 29, 2004): (the case was an old lady whose 49-year old son and 30-year old granddaughter –with her husband & kid- lived in her house and she was tired of this)
208-a) ‘por que tiene a su hijo en su casa si esta bastante mayorCITO?” (49 years old)
why do you have your son in your house if he’s rather grown+DIM up?

208-b)An old lady: “como va a encontrar si sale bien prendidITO” (with fancy outfit)
How will find (a plumbing job) if he leaves the house well dressed+DIM

208-c) Granddaughter’s husband:
“Ya nos vamos, pero primero arreglamos un asuntITO”
ok, we’ll leave but first we’ll solve a matter+DIM

208-d)“Arreglamos unas cuentITAS tu y yo”
we solve some issues+DIM, you and me
209) Mr. F. GirAl.:  
“Bueno, se esta dando un gustAZO Monica” (during our vacation trip to Clearwater) 
well, Monica is giving herself a taste/pleasure+AUG  
(Note: Monica loves the beach).

210) “tomelo con calMITA. No se emocione mucho, Mg., porque ud esta enfermo”  
take it easy+DIM. Don’t get s excited, Mg., because you are sick)

211-a) Cristina S. (in her program about the most hated guests)  
“ella dice que no quiere un pobretON”  
_she says that she doesn’t want a poor+AUG_

211-b) “Ella sigue buscando su ricachON”  
she keeps looking for his rich+AUG (guy)

212) Monica: “baja tu camisITA”  
get your Tshirt+DIM off (the car)

NOTE: In this case, Monica, my kid and I were in the car. We were about to get off the 
car and Monica said that. Now, for a few seconds I didn’t know if she was being ironic, 
sort of scolding or reprimanding me for having left a shirt in the car, or if she was telling 
my kid, in a nice way, to take a T-shirt we had just bought him at school. If she was 
talking to my kid, then I would interpret this DIM as an endearing and polite reference. 
The T-shirt then would be ‘that beautiful, cute, small Tshirt we just bought for our kid’. If 
she was talking to me, then this Tshirt was THAT tshirt I always leave in the car. The 
Tshirt she already told me to take out of the car but I had not done it. She would be 
complaining in this case. It turned out to be my kid the one she was talking to.

213) Monica to me:  
“dame la sabanITA”  
give me the (bed) sheet+DIM  
Monica told me she said “sabanita” instead “sabana” in order not to sound so rude. I had 
the sheet with me on the sofa, which she does not like at all. So she was indeed 
complaining or reprimanding me.

214) As. (“Profesor Espanol”): “Vi a (Dr.)H., y nos pusimos a hablar un ratAZO”  
_I saw (Dr.) H. & we got to chat/speak a while+AUG_

215) Ly.: “Carlos me pidio que le trajera unas peliculITAs”  
_Carlos asked me to bring some movies+DIM_

(Ly. told me afterwards when I ‘pseudo-ethnographically’ interviewed her, that Carlos 
told her this because it implied for her to move all the way from her place to Carlos’ 
place. So, he did not we want to sound harsh or imposing to Ly.)

_Despierta America., Oct. 7/2004_
216) Jacky Garrido (the weatherwoman):
“y nuestra gente de Texas seguirán con su calor”
& our people from texas will continue with their heat

217) Ana Canseco: “vamos a una pequeña pausa”
let’s go to a little pause/break

218) N.Y. reporter (mid-30 lady) “Nos calentamos las dos juntas”
we warm each other together
(She was with Daisy Fuentes in a cold day in N.Y.)

219) The “CareBears” movie was translated as “los carinos” in Spanish
(during COMMERCIALS). This shows the endearment aspect of “Care” with DIM.

220) “como te fuiste a casar con un pobretón”
how did you end up marrying a poor
(In a commercial about “Amor Real”, a new soap opera)

During an interview of the NY reporter with Daisy Fuentes (about a fund raising for breast cancer fight foundation)
221-a) ‘las notas adhesivas’
the sticky notes
(referring to ‘sticky notes’ that were forming a giant pink ribbon in N.Y. City)

221-b) ‘mi mama se encontró un bulto en su seno’ (Daisy Fuentes)
my mon found herself a bulk

221-c) The NY reporter: “Como va la boda”
yo soy malisima para eso’ (to prepare a wedding) –Daisy Fuentes
I am terrible for that

221-d) Reporter to Daisy Fuentes: “yo te doy la bendición pero tu estás sola en esto”
I give you my blessing but you are alone

222-diaper commercial: ‘para que andes cómodo con tus amiguitos’ (like talking to baby)
so you can be comfortable with your friends
(During a report on new telephone inventions with imaging/video)
223-a) “tienen como 300 espejos”
they have around 300 mirrors
(Ana Canseco reporting on a new telephone where the image of the speaker can be seen)

223-b) Fernando: “en ‘star wars’ presentaron un aparato”
in Star Wars they showed a machine
(Fernando the Mexican host referring to a similar phone machine in that movie)

223-c) Gisselle: ‘yo quiero que inventen uno donde se pueda dar un beso y se sienta’
I want them to make up one where we can send a kiss+DIM and feel it

Ana Canseco (reporting on J.Lo)
224-a) “J.Lo. ahora sí guarda el secretITO” (about keeping the romance)
J.Lo. now yes, she does keep the secret+DIM

224-b) “J.Lo. ahora esta celosISIMA porque Ben Affleck anda con otra actriz”
J.Lo now is jealous+SUPERL ‘cause Ben Affleck is with another actress

224-c) “la otra actriz esta bellISIMA”
the other actress is beautiful+SUPERL

224-d) “ahora Ben Affleck esta afeitadITO”
now Ben Affleck is shaved+DIM

225) ‘si tiene stress, aca le daremos el truquITO’ (Gisselle)
if you have stress, here we will give you the trick+DIM

226) “A BB player se iba a quedar calladITO con este hit” (Fernando in the sports news)
[A baseball player] was about to remain silent+DIM with this hit

227) A Venezuelan lady, sending greetings to Vzla.
“A mi flia en Venezuela, Los quiero y extrano mucho. BesITOs”
to my family in Venezuela, I love you and miss you much. Kisses+DIM

228) “pongan muchISISIMA atencion”
pay much+SUPERL+SUPERL attention
(Ana, about to announce the “Camino a Viña” contest)

229) “mira que Linda! Esa carITA, esos ojITOs” (in the Happy B-Day time for kids)
look how beautiful! That face+DIM, those eyes+DIM

230) Ana Canseco: “aqui tambien yo tengo mi moñITO”
here also I have my ribbon+DIM
(here I also have my ribbon+DIM for the breastcancer society)

231) NY reporter: “Daisy Fuentes nos dijo que su mama se toco una pelotITA en el seno”
Daisy Fuents told us that her mom touched a ball+DIM in her breast

232) ‘es especialITO el señor’
is special+DIM the mister
(Ana describing a new character by Fernando, ‘the old American scientist inventor’)

233) ‘y aguITA a correr’ (an invention of Japanese for sounds in the bathroom) by Ana
& water+DIM, run!
234) In a section on cooking:
234-a) ‘ya estoy cocinando la cebollITA’ (a female chef in her forties or fifties)
   * I’m already cooking the onion+DIM

234-b) ‘le pones la lechuguITA, el tomatITO, chillITO, quesITO’ (the chef)
   * you put the lettuce+DIM, tomato+DIM, chili+DIM, cheese+DIM
   (None of these expressed the idea of little in that context by the way)

234-c) ‘esto se lo pones al ladITO’ (the chef)
   * this, you put it by the side+DIM

234-d) ‘y el cilantrITO arriba’ (the chef)
   * & the cilantro+DIM on top

234-e) ‘el queso yo me lo como solITO’ (the chef)
   * the cheese, I eat it by itself+DIM

234-f) ‘gracias por esta receta sencillITA’ (Ana Canseco)
   * thanks for this recipe (so) simple+DIM

235) in the section of Giselle with the children”
   “Aqui tengo mis princesITAs y mis principes” (DIM was not used for boys)
   * here I have my princesses+DIM & my princes

236) COMMERCIAL on a Kellogs Cereal:
   “con rodajITAs de banana”
   * with slices+DIM of bananas

CASOS DE FAMILIA:
237-a) Host: “trajimos a Sonia con mentirITAs blancas”
   * we brought Sonia with white lies+DM
   (a daughter that did not know she was going to meet her father after 28 years)

237-b) The host to Sonia: “Como ves la sorpresITA que te teniamos?” (her father showed)
   * how about this surprise+DIM we had for you?

237-c) Host: “Sonia, crees que te habiamos traido solamente para darte la vueltecITA?”
   * did you think we had brought you all the way just for the round/trip+DIM?

238) “Fuiste la unica mujercITA que tuve?”
   * you were the only woman+DIM that I had
   (A mother in her 30’s talking to her daughter to the TV cameras because she can’t see her for many years)

239) The host to the 16-year old son of the mother who lost her daughter:
   * ‘apoya a tu mama. Yo se que lo has hecho pero un esfuerCITO mas”
support your mother. I know you have done it but, more effort+DIM

240-a) “Aunque Barbados es pequenITO”
        however, Barbados is little+DIM
        (Examples #240 were during a chatting session I had with Venezuelan female friends who live out of the country now. Barbados, Canada, and USA were in this chatting)

240-b) “y cabia dentro del huracan completITO”
        and it fitted inside the hurricane complete+DIM

240-c) “PobreCITOs!”
        poor+DIM!

240-d) “estaban asustadITOs”
        They were scare+DIM

MOVIE “DETRAS DEL PARAISO” (‘behind Paradise’)
(A little crash between a young woman and a funny old guy)
241-a) Old guy: “Le dio a mi carro! Que esta nueveCITO!”
        you hit my car! Which is new+DIM!

241-b) Old guy: “que bueno! Que esta vivITA y coleando”
        how good! That you’re alive+DIM and ‘kicking’

241-c) Old guy:
        ‘mi compañero(trabajo) estuvo muy malITO. Lo desahuciaron’
        my (work)mate was very sick(bad)+DIM. He was diagnosed terminal

242-Young guy (movie star): “y el trabajo que nos costo el teatrITO con los jibaros”
        And how much work it was for us the performance/! With the indigenous

243-Old guy: “Ojala esta carcacha no explote como globITO”
        I wish this junk-car wouldn’t explode like a balloon+DIM

“CALIENTE” (Hot) PROGAM (Oct 9/2004)

244-a) “Le regalaremos 100 dolarITOs en efectivo a la ‘cantaautora’ ‘caliente’”
        We will give away 100 dollars+DIM cash to the ‘hot’ ‘singer-author’
        (Singing contest with two Latin female models, sexy girls)

(Introducing the contestant singers)
244-b) –“Marisol: Una vuelteCITA, a ver!!”
        Marisol, a turn+DIM (turn around), let’s see

244-c) -Oye, vieron el soleCITO?”
        Listen! Did you see the sun+DIM?
(referring to a sun tattoo on the back, close to the bottom, of one of the girls)

244-d) -Que lindo el soleCITO!!!
   *How beautiful the sun+DIM*

(Introducing a famous Latin female singer/model/Lorena Herrera; like Pam Anderson)

245-a) “que ojAZOs!”
   *what (a pair of) eyes+AUG!

245-b) ‘que cuerAZO!”
   *what a body+AUG!

245-c) Lorena Herrera: “Ahi tienes la vuelteCITA”
   *there you have your turn+DIM* *(she turned around for him to see her)*

245-d) Lorena: “Te vengo a cantar una canciónCITA del nuevo CD”
   *I’ve come to sing (to you) a song+DIM of my new CD*

245-e) Host (A young male in his 20s): “Lorena, estas solterITA?”
   *Lorena, are you single+DIM?*

245-f) Lorena: “Si, y los hombres me gustan chaparrITOs”
   *yes, and the men, I like them short+DIM*

245-g) Lorena: “con ojos claros y bronceadITO”
   *with clear/light eyes and (skin)tanned+DIM*

246-Host: “Oye Lorena, que te parece si ahora te presento unos chamacONes”
   *Listen Lorena, how about if I now introduce to you some dudes+AUG*

[Introducing “Los Ilegales” – ‘The Illegals’ band]

247-Host: “Si, aca estamos caliente con ese soleCITO”
   *yes, here we are hot with that sun+DIM*

248-Host: “seguimos despues de comerciales con el tremendISIMO ‘caliente’”
   *we continue after some commercials with the tremendous ‘hot’ (show name)*

249-Host: “Niños, padres, etc, todos alla en casITA”
   *children, parents, etc all, overthere at home+DIM*

250-Host: (to Lorena, in reference to a little butterfly tattoo on her back)
   “Alguna otra cosITA, un areTITO, aparte de esta mariposITA que tienes en la espalda?”
   *some other thing+DIM, ring+DIM?, apart from the butterfly+DIM you have on the back*

251-Lorena: “le mando un besOTE bien grande a mis diseñadores”
I send a kiss very big to my (clothes)designers

252-Host: “Tremendo merengAZO!” (after a merengue group performance) tremendous Meringue! (Latin music rhythm)

PROGRAM “CONTROL” (Sat. Oct. 9/2004)
253-Mexican band singer: “A la gente le gusta el paso de la nalgadITA”

to the people who like the step of the butt slap

254-a) Rambo (A Latin character): “Quien la viera tan santITA!” (at a museum) (ironically) who could see her so saint!

254-b) The host/interviewer (girl in her early 20s): “Rambo, Debes tener esto muy apretadITO”
Rambo, you must have this very tight

254-c) Interviewer girl:(compares the 2 Rambos): ‘aquel esta como muy blanquITO’(The statue of Rambo) that one is like very white

255) Another interviewer girl (on a report on a rickshaw ride in Miami): “Cuanto cuesta este paseITO?” how much is this ride?

256-a) Main host (on a report on nude painting class) “esta chica va a clases sin nada de ropa y le pagan” this girl goes to class with nothing of clothes and she gets paid

256-b) Host: “bueno, se preguntaran cuanto vale esta claseCITA. $2000” well, you may wonder how much is this class DIM. $2000

257-Monica to Victor E. (while having lunch) “Los pies juntITOs” the feet together

258-Monica to me (she brought me food to the couch hoping that it remained clean) “no me hagas reguerITO” don’t make a mess

259-Neida Sandoval (Despierta America newswoman) “hasta la cara se le puso rojITA”
even the face turned red

This happened after two politicians (one Democrat and one Republican) commented on the results of the last debate. The Democrat was on the studio with the reporter and he went red in the face. There are probably two pragmatic effects here; the intensifying
effect (“very red”) and the attenuating effect for face saving, since he is an important Hispanic politician (going red in the face might be face threatening)

260-A young lady (in her mid or late twenties)
“yo se como conseguir el perdón de mi esposITO”
*I know how to get forgiveness from my husband*
This was a character in a soapopera, and she performed a very bad lady/wife. She had just been unfaithful to her husband with his best friend. She was talking to her lover after the husband discovered them and they both escaped. There is the ironic ([-dear]) effect, since obviously she does not love her husband.

261-a 40-year-old mother:
“le compramos jueguITOs”
*We bought him games*
This does not necessarily refer to a ‘little’ game. The actual size or value of the game is probably orrelevant here. The DIM just indicates that this is a child game. ([+child])

262-a) Reporter:”Este es el DanzON”  (differentiator: danza =/= danzon)
*this is the dance*
262-b) “y se viste elegante asi. Con esa floreCITA” (dear=beautiful)
and you dress up so elegant. With that flower
262-c) Asi, asi, suaveCITO, despaCITO
*like that, like that, soft, slowly*
262-d) The other reporter (Fernando) on the studio, giving a demo:
“tiene que ser un cuadrITO” (pure DIM –little)
*it has to be a square*

263-Ana Canseco: “Estare con’Recodo’ y el Lunes les cuento todITITO lo que paso”
*I’ll be with ‘Recodo’. on Monday I’ll tell you everything*

264-a) (in ‘Don Francisco’ on Oct. 16/2004, a 3-hour Saturday show with different entertainment: contexts, jokes, singers, interviews, etc)
(Invisible) Narrator:  ‘Don Francisco, asi puede rebajar esa panCITA…’
*Don Francisco, that way you can reduce that belly*

b) ‘con esa bailadITA’
*with that dancing*

265-Don Francisco: “esta solterISIMA”
*she’s single*
(introducing an attractiva young woman contestant in the singing contest, -“El Chacal”)*
266-Giselle (Despierta America, Oct 19/2004): “hazlo por media horITA cada dia”
doit during half an hour+DIM each day
(this was in reference to a meditation/relaxation exercise a guest was recommending to
the audience to do in order to handle stress)

267-a) Mid-30s female host of “CASOS DE FAMILIA” (Oct 19/2004):
“que gustAZO que nos deje entrar en casITA”
what a pleasure+Aug that you let us enter your home+DIM

267-b) “un besOTE para nuestro coordinador”
                   a kiss+Aug for our coordinator

267-c) “Gracias por una cartITA muy bella que recibi”
                              thanks for a letter+DIM very beautiful I received

268-Host introduced the topic: “Vago, vete de mi casa” (Lazy! Get out of my home!)
a) Host to the step-father: ¿que edad tiene el muchachITO? (36 years old)
                   how old is this boy+DIM?

b) Host: “vamos a recibir este regalOTE para Don Lazaro” (She invited the big son in)
                let’s receive this present+Aug for Don Lazaro

c) The step-son: “Bueno, hay altas y bajas”
               Well, there are ups and downs
Host: “pero la tuya fue un bajONONON”
               But your was a down+Aug+Aug+Aug

d) “O sea ud llega cansadITO a casa y encuentra a su hijastro”
you mean, you arrive tired+DIM to home & find your step-son

e) Host to the step-son: “yo te veo enterITO compadre”
                   I see you complete+DIM friend

f) (To the step-son’s girlfriend, a 50-year-old lady)
Host: la culpa no es tuya, tu eres un angellITO alli
              The fault is not yours, you are an angel+DIM there

g) Step-son’s girlfriend:
“Lazaro (step-father) accepts it porque Isabel (the mother) le echa una lagrimITA y ya”

h) Host: “conoceremos a la madre de esta criaturITA de 36 años”
                Let us meet the mother of this baby(creature)+DIM of 36 years old

i) Mother (to the girlfriend): “vete y le das la papITA en la boca”
                   Go and you give him food+DIM in his mouth
j) Mother: “cogen sus bulICOs y se van de mi casa”
   Get your suitcases+DIM and leave my home

k) Host: Eres abusivo. No hay otra palabra para ti, PapacITO, disculpame
   You are abusive. There’s no other word for you, Papi+DIM, sorry

l) Mother: Sale de puntillITA al baño para que yo no escuche
   She leaves like sneaking to the bathroom so I can’t hear her

m) Don Lazaro: “no, los dos estan bien gordITOs”
   No, both are rather fat+DIM

n) Mother: “Dos boquITAs mas!? no, no!”
   Two mouths+DIM more?! no, no!

269) Soap opera “Sabor a Ti” (Oct 19/04)
269-a) The lover (a young guy in an SUV with her lover, after his friend -his lover’s husband- discovered them in his bed).
   “Solo esto me faltaba para completar la nocheCITA”
   just this I needed in order to close/complete the night+DIM

269-b) Husband (totally angry): “Y yo como un mismISIMO cretino!”
   And I, like a very+SUPERL jerk! Stupid!

269-c) A young guy: “Un cafeCITO bien cargadITO, por favor”
   A coffee+DIM, rather charged+DIM (very black, a lot of caffeine) please

269-d) A grandma to her grandchild, who was very scared:
   “quedate tranquilITO”
   remain calmed down+DIM

269-e) “Esa serenatICA majunche”
   that serenade+DIM horrible

270-Monica: “¿te conte que mi mama dijo que vio al tio Carlos bien malITO?”
   did I tell you that my mom said she saw Uncle Carlos rather sick+DIM?

271-Sf.: “A mi me gusta el beisbol, pero eso se volvio medio chimbIN en Vzla”
   I like baseball, but that became sort of bad+DIM in Venezuela

272-a) (The interviewer to El Metido)
   “Cuidado que este esta un poco grandeCITO”
   be careful that this one is a little big+DIM
   (En El Metido de Lente Loco, a ‘hidden camera show’) Oct Sunday 23
the victim was a little bit taller than the tall interviewer, and the victim was also muscular.

272-b) El Metido: “Ah, CrespITOs tan lindos!” (referring to the hair curls of the big guy)
   Oh, curls+DIM so beautiful!

273) Female Newsreporter in her 40s (Afternoon News)
   “Ahora los japoneses inventaron una maquinITA para que sueñe bonito”
   now the Japanese invented a machine+DIM so we can dream beautifully

274) Gisselle (Despiert America Host):
   “si planifica su viajeCITO para este fin de semana, cuidado con los hotels ‘embrujados’”
   if you plan your trip+DIM for this week-end, be careful with the ‘haunted hotels’

275-a) Ana Canseco (reporting on the weather):
   “En el norte esta verdeCITO” (50 farenheit and less)
   in the North is green+DIM

275-b) “En el sur esta medio amarillITO” (60 and more)
   in the South is sort of yellow+DIM
   (the green section looked very (plain) green, but the yellow section had orange and reddish spots also)

276-Fernando (In the sports section): “miren ese atrapadON, atrapadON!”
   look at that catch+AUG, catch+AUG
   (He was announcing a GREAT catch by a professional football player; a receiver)

277-Gisselle: “Ahora nos vamos de Cayo Hueso a Indonesia”
   Host R.: “CerquitITA!!, cerquitITA!” (laugh) (Probably an irony use)
   Near+DIM!!, near+DIM!

278) Ex-addict (50-year-old lady) converted to Christianity:
   “teniamos una casa donde todos estaban BIEN apretadITOS”
   we had a house where everybody was rather tight+DIM
   She was talking about a Christian place for addicts “The Home of the Nazarene”

279) Gisselle: “Yo no te dije mentiroso, yo te dije mentirosITO.”
   I did not call you a liar, I called you a liar+DIM
   (during a report on liars)

280-a) corsets modeling- (a report by Ana Canseco and a guest):
   Designer (40-year-old lady) “se ve hermostITO”
   It looks beautiful+DIM

280-b) Ana: “El corset nos hace cinturITA”
   the corset gives us a waist+DIM
281) Ana: “Ya le daremos el secreto para rebajar esas indeseables librITAs de mas”
soon we’ll give you the secret to lose those unwanted pounds+DIM extra

282-a) Fernando: (on an interview with a Mexican North Music Duet)
“Su ritmo es ranchero, ranchero, ranchero, rancherOte”
your rhythm is country, country, country, country+AUG

282-b) The singer: “Si, bueno, norteñoTE” (musica norteña)
yes, well, northern+AUG

283) Neida Sandoval (reporting a Halloween party for animals)
“Los animalITOs grandes y pequeños…”
the animals+DIM big and small...

284) Indigenous woman in Ecuador (on a report on weaver women)
“este tejido/fur es mas gruesITO”
that weaving/fur is more thick+DIM

285) (after announcing birthdays. The last one was a young girl in “Halloween” theme)
Fernando: “ella va a ser bruja” (referring to the last little girl)
Host R.: “Fernando!” (like chastising Fernando for calling the little girl ‘witch’)
Gisselle: “brujuITA” (like minimizing the insult; euphemistic?)
Witch+DIM

286-a) Reporter (on an interview with a person with an algae treatment for losing weight/cellulites):
“Vale barriguITA?!”
also for belly+DIM?! 

286-b) Guest: “traiga el sarapITO mas calientITO que tenga…”
bring the hot-cloth+DM most hot+DIM you have

286-c) “…y nos ponemos calorCITO en la celulitis”
& we put ourselves heat+DIM in the cellulites
286-d) Reporter: “son secretITOs que no nos cuestan mucho”
they’re secrets+DIM that do not cost much

287) “Family Cases (Oct 26)” Host: “no te da cosITA? No atender a los hijos”
don’t you have a thing+DIM not taking care of these children

288) “yo le compre ropITA buena” (Family Cases)
I bought them good clothes+DIM

289) The Host: “Hay gente que hace milagritoTEs y la gente se asombra de lo que logran”
there are people who do miracles+DIM & people are awed due to what they do
(Family Cases)
290) The Host: “Baje, Senora, porque me quedo muy arriba”
   come down, Mrs, because you are very up
(one lady in the audience of “Family Cases” wanted to talk)

291) “y lograr que sea un lugar caliente donde vivir”
   and being able to make this a warm place to live
(commercial on a project for a better home)

292-a) The host (Family Cases): “Yo se si a mis amigas le gustan chaparros, morena.”
   I know if my friends like them (boys) short, brown-skin

292-b) The 40-year-old mother of a young boy who is dating her best friend:
   “estoy enojada porque ella vio crecer a mi hijo y convertirse en hombre”
   I am angry because she saw my son grow up and become a man

292-c) The young boy with the old lady girlfriend:
   ella es una amiga (pause, and then he’s confronted). Es lo que llamamos una amiguita
   She is a friend. She’s what we call a friend

The 292 examples refer to a single family case where a 19-year-old boy becomes the
boyfriend of a 40ish-year-old lady, who used to be his mother’s best friend. The mother
is really angry about it. The boy at one point has to recognize that he’s going out with a
young girl, who he called a ‘friend’. This ‘amiguita’ word has sexual connotations.
They are also called ‘amigo/as con derecho’ (‘friends with rights’) in popular Spanish.
Thus, here, a friend is obviously not the same as a friend.

293-As.: “hasta luego” (he left a message on the answer machine asking me a favor)
   until later

Despierta America: (Oct 28/04)

294) Fernando: Les voy a dar una receta muy sencilla
   I’m gonna give you a recipe very simple
   (about tipping)

295) Ana: “Pero bien tapizada” (de oro),
   but very well glazed (with gold)

This was in the context of a report on the most expensive (gold) ice-cream of the world.

296) Viviana’s (sexy beautiful actress lady in Venezuela) “Confidencias” show (Oct 30)
296-a) “las muchachitas se mueren por ti”
   the girls die for you

296-b) “pero tu te mueres por las maduritas”…”te gustan maduras. Que tan grandes?”
   but you die for the grown-ups you like grownups. How big/old?

296-c) “las muchachitas no son echaTAs pa’lante. Apenas estan en secundaria”
   the girls are not upfront. They are just in secondary school
296-d) “la novela se acaba pero todavía queda mas de ‘cosITA Rica’”
    the soap opera ends but still we have more left of ‘thing+DIM delicious’

297) With another guest of Viviana’s, a young Colombian actor (Novoa):
297-a) Young actor: “Emails me parece impersonal. Prefiero la llamadITA”
    emails look impersonal to me. I prefer the call+DIM

297-b) Viviana: “Me cuentas al regreso cómo esta el corazCITO de Novoa”
    tell me when we come back how is the heart+DIM of Novoa’s

297-c) Viviana: “Continuamos con el llamado ‘cosITO Rico’”
    we’ll continue w/the so-called ‘thing+DIM delicious’

298-a) Derbez’ Comedy show: (as a ‘ghost hunter’ in a silent movie)
    “Ya decidi hablar porque solo con leterAZO, No”
    I decided to talk because only via letters+AUG, No”

298-b) Eugenio (to the ghost): “Ya viste que bien esta la viudITA”
    did you already see how good(hot) is the widow?

298-c) Widow: “Que dinerAL me va a salir el velorio!”
    what a money+AUG is the funeral going to cost

299) Narrator on Commercial for the Derbez show: “Diciembre viene cargadITO”
    December is coming charged/heavy+DIM

300) TV Commercial: “le invitamos a un fiestON de las brujas”
    we invite you to a party+AUG of Halloween

301) early-30’s female talking to me: “La vieja me dijo que…”
    The old(lady) told me that...

Victor: “La vieja??”
    The old(lady)?
Female: “Bueno, una viejITA”
    Well, an old+DIM (lady)

Victor: “Y ahora por que viejITA?”
    & now why old+DIM?

Female:
    “Ah, porque no queria que sonara tan duro, …pero es que ella no nos dio el trabajo”
    oh, because I didn’t want it to sound harsh,..but the thing’s that she didn’t give us the job

302-A middle aged Venezuelan cop in a movie:
“esa doctor es una p…!" (swearing here, meaning ‘prostitute’) 
that female doctor is a p.....
(The detective cop got himself into trouble, and one female lawyer, who are often called ‘doctor’ in many Hispanic countries, is behind him. He said this after an interview with her and other high-rank officers)

303-My mother-in-law
303-a) to her grandson (my son)
“tiene hambrecita”
have hunger? (are you hungry?)
(at a Resort, and all the family together. His grandma is asking the 5-year-old boy if he has had breakfast already)

303-b) to me
“tiene hambrecita”
have hunger? (are you hungry?)
(a a Resort, and all the family together. My mother-in-law knows I have been working by myself at the hotel and not eating the whole day. She thinks I must be very hungry)

304-my wife:
“deme uno”
give me one
(My wife saw many gift certificates on a table at one of her friends’ house. She’s joking with another friend about that, and she said that she wanted to tell that house’s owner to give her one of those gift certificates)

305-J. D.i (a brother-in-law cooking meat on a grill, in Venezuela)
“la carne ya estaba medio blandita”
the meat already was sort of soft

306-A lady client to a waiter at a restaurant in Venezuela:
“nos trae la cuenta?”
Will you bring us the bill?
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