

Guest Editors' Preface:

Latest Developments in Evaluative Morphology

Angeliki Efthymiou, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece
& Dimitra Melissaropoulou, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece & IMS-FORTH

We are happy to announce the publication of the Special Issue “*Latest Developments in Evaluative Morphology*”, following up the homonymous half-day workshop that took place from June 25 to 28, 2025, at Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovakia, within the frame of the Word-Formation Theories VII & Typology and Universals in Word-Formation VI Conference. Most of the papers presented during the workshop were submitted for publication and underwent a peer review process, leading ultimately to this 6-articles special issue.

The articles featured in this special issue delve into various facets of evaluative morphology spanning innovative evaluative markers and/or categories, productivity, competition and combinability issues, borrowability of evaluative morphology in contact settings, peripheral evaluative constructions and their status within evaluative morphology, encompassing languages such as Dutch, Finnish, Latvian and Greek. The analyses employed are of both quantitative and qualitative nature, having their empirical approach to linguistic generalizations as their common denominator.

More specifically, the paper “**Borrowed Approximative Morphemes in Finnish Collocations**” by **Daniel Ebner** offers a corpus-based account of the usage of three borrowed morphemes in Finnish collocations: *feikki*, *kvasi-* and *pseudo-*. Whereas lexicographically they are treated as semantically overlapping, this study reveals that the overlap among these three morphemes is rather restricted, since they diverge both in terms of productivity and in terms of register, acquiring thus distinct roles in the evaluative system of the language.

The paper “**Heterogeneity in Non-Prototypical Evaluative Constructions: Evidence from Modern Greek in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective**” by **Angeliki Efthymiou** adopts a cross-linguistic perspective to investigate non-prototypical evaluative constructions. Using Modern Greek as a case study, it identifies the main types of these constructions, analyzes their formal and semantic properties, and proposes a classification of evaluative morphological constructions along a continuum of prototypicality. The analysis shows that non-prototypical evaluative constructions do not constitute a uniform category, with some constructions being more peripheral and displaying distinct semantic and grammatical features. Evaluative constructions derived from markers that merge evaluative and non-evaluative meanings within a single lexeme are generally more peripheral than those derived from polyfunctional markers, which can also produce formations with non-evaluative meanings.

The paper “**Evaluative Compounding in Dutch: Productivity and Competition in Simile-Based Constructions**” by **Kristel van Goethem** investigates evaluative compounding in Dutch, focusing on its productivity and interaction with corresponding phrasal constructions.

The findings of the study show that phrasal evaluative constructions are generally more flexible, productive and creative, whereas evaluative compounds, though frequently attested in Dutch, are often (semi-) lexicalized and may involve grammaticalized affixoids. Furthermore, phrasal constructions favor animate fillers, while evaluative compounds attract inanimate fillers, suggesting a functional division of labour between both patterns. At the level of specific expressions, however, the relationship is much more nuanced and may be characterized by overlap or competition.

The paper **“Pejorative and Meliorative Prefixoids in Dutch”** by **Jack Hoeksema** investigates pejorative and meliorative prefixoids in Dutch, situating them within the broader domain of evaluative morphology. The study provides a detailed analysis of pejorative and meliorative compounds, focusing on their semantic properties, diachronic development, productivity, and distribution across text types. Using data from historical sources, the SUBTLEX-NL subtitle corpus, and Dutch Twitter, the article traces changes in the relative prominence of different semantic classes of prefixoids over time and highlights register-sensitive usage patterns. The findings of the study show that meliorative prefixoids are less frequent and semantically more restricted than their pejorative counterparts.

The paper **“On the Borrowability of Evaluative Markers and Categories: Insights from Asia Minor and Italic Greek”** by **Dimitra Melissaropoulou** delves into the borrowability of evaluative markers in intense contact settings. The study reveals that evaluatives align fully with the recipient system tendencies, in line with other derivational elements/categories. The frequency of use and the properties of the elements under question in the model language is proposed to have a strong impact on their (non-)borrowability, while morpho-phonological equivalence seems to enhance the transfer or evaluative functions in already existing elements even with a different reading or the formation of paradigmatic relations between native and borrowed evaluative markers. Lastly, sociolinguistic parameters, i.e. salience, is proposed to play an additive role in the potential (non-)transfer aligning with the combinatorial approaches, as more adequate accounts of contact-induced change.

The paper **“Productivity of Lithuanian Diminutives in Relation to Other Denominal and Deverbal Categories of Nouns”** by **Jurgis Pakerys, Agnė Navickaitė-Klišauskienė and Virginijus Dadurkevičius** tests quantitatively the productivity of Lithuanian diminutives. The results of their study reveal that, although productive, Lithuanian diminutives are not at the top of the system; action nominals appear to be more productive, highlighting the versatility of the category and its strong connection not only to the lexicon but also to pragmatic and discourse-oriented uses, an area where more detailed studies could prove particularly enlightening.

Lastly, the paper **“Ordering of Intensifying Prefixal Elements in Modern Greek Taboo Nouns”** by **Eva Sisamperi and Nikolaos Koutsoukos** addresses the cumulation of intensifying prefixal elements in Modern Greek taboo nouns, using a morpheme-by-morpheme approach. Their findings show that in line with previous research on affix ordering, the number of attested combinations is significantly smaller than the number of possible ones, while

polysemy, semantic prominence and the degree of intensity expressed by the elements are shown to account for the occurring orderings. Finally, frequency is also shown to play an active role in the relative ordering of prefixes, with more frequent elements tending to be positioned farther from the base.

We extend our heartfelt appreciation to the members of the permanent editorial board for hosting this issue as well as for their steadfast support and guidance throughout the editorial journey. Additionally, we express our gratitude to all anonymous reviewers who kindly accepted to contribute to the reviewing process, providing very insightful feedback and general suggestions for the quality of the overall publication.

Angeliki Efthymiou
Department of Primary Education
Democritus University of Thrace
Nea Chili, P.C.-68131
Alexandroupoli
Greece
e-mail: aefthym@eled.duth.gr

Dimitra Melissaropoulou
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
School of Philosophy,
Department of Italian Language and Literature,
Thessaloniki GR-54124,
Greece
e-mail: dmelissa@itl.auth.gr