<div align="center">

SLE Workshop Proposal:
Prosodic augmentation: the systematic expression of evaluation through prosodic means

</div>

57th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea
University of Helsinki
21-24 August 2024

Organizers: Olga Lovick (University of Saskatchewan); olga.lovick@usask.ca
Martin Kohlberger (University of Saskatchewan); martin.kohlberger@usask.ca

Keywords: evaluation, prosody, augmentation, natural discourse, typology

The study of evaluation in linguistics has focused primarily on morphological means, e.g. Scalise (1984), Bauer (1997), or Grandi and Körtvélyessy (2015). Yet there are a number of languages where evaluation is expressed systematically by prosodic means. Lovick (2023) describes a process she calls "prosodic augmentation" in Upper Tanana (Dene/Athabascan, USA/Canada), where evaluation is expressed only through prosodic means. Stem vowels are lengthened to at least three times their usual length and often pronounced with noticeably raised pitch; in the practical orthography this is represented through colons following the vowels (1).

(1a)	Dineh cho:::h!	vs.		Dineh choh.
	man big			
	'An enormously big man!'			'A big man.'
(1b)	Altha:::::ł!	vs.		Altthał!
	'She was running as hard and far as she could!'			'She was running!'
(1c)	Shudehka:::t.	vs.		Shudehkat.
	'He kept asking me questions.'			'He asked me a question.'
(1d)	Ji::::gn hǫǫłįį.	vs.		Jign hǫǫłįį.
	'There were lots of berries.'			'There were berries.'
(1e)	ahne::::gn'	vs.		ahnegn'
	'a long way in the upland direction'			'in the upland direction'

The semantic effects depend somewhat on the lexical item. With adjectives and verbs describing property concepts, prosodic augmentation expresses that the quality expressed is present in abundance (1a). With other verbs, it can express increased intensity or speed (1b) or repetition (1c). With nouns, it indicates abundant quantity (1d), and with directional adverbs, increased distance (1e). The data shows that prosodic augmentation is an iconic pattern, where some sort of semantic increase (in amount, length of time, distance, intensity, or number of repetitions) is signaled through special prosody.

In other languages, prosodic augmentation might be restricted to certain word classes but is still systematic and pervasive. Kohlberger (2020) notes that in Shiwiar (Chicham, Ecuador) quantifiers such as *nukap* 'much' and *maʃ* 'all' may be intensified in two ways: either by a process of reduplication (e.g. *nukap nukap* 'very much' *maʃ maʃ* 'absolutely all') or by producing a sudden and extreme high pitch excursion on the accented syllable of the word, often accompanied by an

increase in vowel duration (e.g. [nukǎːp] or [mǎːʃ]). However, in a 30-hour corpus of natural discourse, the prosodic strategy is by far the more frequent.

These patterns differ from similar uses in Indo-European languages in their systematicity. Gussenhoven (1999) describes such a pattern as an ad-hoc strategy for the expression of evaluation in English, which is usually expressed morphosyntactically. In Upper Tanana and Shiwiar, prosodic augmentation is a highly systematic process and, more importantly, the main strategy for prosodic augmentation.

Comparable phenomena with some systematicity have also been reported in Yup'ik (Eskaleut, Woodbury 1985), Japhug (Tibeto-Burman, Jacques 2013) and Nivkh (isolate;Gruzdeva 1998). Woodbury's (1985) careful account of prosodic patterns in Yup'ik discourse illustrates several pragmatic functions, such as the expression of increased intensity and surprise. Jacques (2013) finds a special prosodic pattern associated with the first use of an ideophone in Japhug discourse. While in Japhug, this pattern is used only for ideophones, Gruzdeva (1998) observes that in Nivkh, a similar prosodic pattern applies to many different lexical categories.

Clearly, such patterns are not infrequent in the world's languages, and have intrigued linguists for almost four decades. Yet at the same time, a broad understanding of such phenomena is lacking. We suspect that this may reflect a bias toward written and/or major languages, similar to what has been argued by Fischer (2011) with respect to reduplication.

The main goal of this workshop is to arrive at a more nuanced understanding of this phenomenon from a typological perspective. As such, we want to bring together researchers working on prosodic augmentation and similar processes to investigate the following questions:

- How common is the expression of evaluation through (solely) prosodic means in the world's languages?
- Are such patterns typically restricted to certain lexical categories or to certain types of discourse?
- Which evaluative functions are expressed prosodically? Are some functions more common than others?
- Does prosodic augmentation compete with other (morphosyntactic) evaluative strategies? If so, under what conditions is the prosodic strategy preferred?
- Which prosodic means (manipulation of pitch, segment or syllable duration, nasality, vowel or consonant modification, etc.) are being employed in this process?
- What methodological considerations are necessary in order to collect and analyse data that accurately represent the use of prosodic augmentation in natural discourse?

We invite submissions for 20-minute talks that address any of the above questions or related issues. In-depth studies of one particular language or language group as well as areal (or other) overviews are welcome. Please submit a 300-word abstract (excluding references) to the workshop organizers (olga.lovick@usask.ca; martin.kohlberger@usask.ca) by **15 November 2023**. If the workshop proposal is accepted, contributors will be asked to resubmit a 500-word abstract by 15 January 2024.

References

Bauer, Laurie. 1997. "Evaluative Morphology: In Search of Universals." *Studies in Language* 21 (3): 533–75.

Fischer, Olga. 2011. "Cognitive Iconic Grounding of Reduplication in Language." In *Semblance and Signification*, edited by Pascal Michelucci, Olga Fischer, and Christina Ljungberg, 55–81. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grandi, Nicola, and Lívia Körtvélyessy, eds. 2015. *The Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gruzdeva, Ekatarina. 1998. *Nivkh*. Munich: LINCOM.

Gussenhoven, Carlos. 1999. "Discreteness and Gradience in Intonational Contrasts." *Language and Speech* 42 (2–3): 283–305.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2013. "Ideophones in Japhug (Rgyalrong)." *Anthropological Linguistics* 55 (3): 256–97.

Kohlberger, Martin. 2020. *A Grammatical Description of Shiwiar*. Amsterdam: LOT.

Lovick, Olga. 2023. *A Grammar of Upper Tanana, Volume 2: Semantics, Syntax, Discourse*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Scalise, Sergio. 1984. *Generative Morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Woodbury, Anthony. 1985. "The Function of Rhetorical Structure: A Study of Central Alaskan Yupik Eskimo Discourse." *Language in Society* 14: 153–90.