

A comparative study of augmentation processes in Persian and Japanese Languages Based on the Theory of Evaluative Morphology



Reza Moghaddam Kiya*

Associate professor of Linguistics and a member of teaching staff at the Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

Email: rzmsk@ut.ac.ir



Seyyed-Ayat Hosseini**

Assistant professor in the Department of Japanese Language and Literature, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

Email: ayathosseini@ut.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

The current study is aimed at analyzing and comparing augmentation processes in Persian and Japanese languages based on the theory of evaluative morphology. According to evaluative morphology, a linguistic construction is evaluative if it conveys (consciously or subconsciously) a type of value of the referents or audience, according to the speaker's judgment. Morphology provides the speakers of a language with different means and ways for expression of evaluation in language and plays a dominant role in the formation of evaluatives. Diminutives and augmentatives are two main forms of evaluation in languages. As diminutives are much more common in languages and are generally formed by affixes specifically developed for this function, they are also investigated more pervasively than augmentatives. This is also true for Persian and Japanese linguistics where augmentatives, at least in the case of Persian, have so far been neglected or have only been sporadically touched upon in grammar books. The findings of this study showed that although Persian and Japanese belong to two different language families and are typologically placed in two different language types, both use compounding and reduplication as two dominant mechanisms for producing augmentatives. The present study aims to provide a detailed examination and comparison of these two mechanisms for the formation of augmentatives in two languages.

DOI: 10.22059/jflr.2020.305146.733

© 2020 All rights reserved.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received:

27th, June, 2020

Accepted:

5th, July, 2020

Available online:

Summer 2020

Keywords:

Evaluative Morphology, Persian, Japanese, Compounding, Reduplication

Moghaddam Kiya, Reza, Hosseini, Seyyed-Ayat (2020). A comparative study of augmentation processes in Persian and Japanese Languages Based on the Theory of Evaluative Morphology. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 10 (2), 434-447.
DOI: 10.22059/jflr.2020.305146.733

* Reza Moghaddam Kiya teaches General Linguistics and General English courses. His areas of interest are Persian discourse analysis, translation theory and practice and comparative linguistics.

** Seyyed-Ayat Hosseini is assistant professor in the Department of Japanese Language and Literature, at University of Tehran.

1. Introduction

Comparative Study of linguistic categories at different levels is one of the concerns of comparative linguistics. The results obtained from such studies can be utilized in language pedagogy. To this end, the current paper studies and compares the processes of augmentation in Persian and Japanese. Before getting into the discussion, an attempt has been made to provide a definition of the concepts evaluation, evaluative morphology and augmentation in particular in a bid to provide clear touchstones for the comparison of the two languages.

Linguistic evaluation is what the speakers of a language do every day by using different linguistic forms and structures. Thus, they attribute a value, validity or a strong point to things, activities or people. Evaluation can be practiced through lexical, semantic or morphological devices ([Hunston & Thompson, 2000](#)). In other words, human languages contain evaluative lexicon, syntax and morphology. According to [Grandi \(2017:3\)](#), evaluation is not limited to lexical level. It takes place in other linguistic levels as well. Morphology, however, plays a dominant role in production of evaluative constructions.

Studies on morphology have traditionally been categorized into inflection and derivation. As a result of the studies in the past decades on evaluative elements in

different languages, however, a new area termed as “evaluative morphology” has emerged. In the literature of this new area other terminologies including appreciative judgement, expressive morphology, and alterative morphology have also been coined to refer to this newly emergent area.

The new area in morphology was first introduced by [Scalise \(1984, 1986\)](#). When studying the morphological processes in Italian language, he observed that the features of the affixes used in Italian for augmentation and diminution are different from inflectional and derivational affixes. Thus, he suggested that such affixes be studied in evaluative morphology. According to his view, evaluative morphology should focus on those linguistic elements whose features are different from that of inflection and derivation although there may exist intersection between them.

In evaluative morphology a variety of linguistic forms with different semantic functions are studied including diminution, augmentation, attenuation/approximation, endearment, contempt, and prototypicality. It should be noted that these semantic functions are not always actualized through affixation. Other morphological devices may be used for constructing evaluatives including reduplication, internal variation in stems or in grammatical gender, variation in tone or a mixture of these methods ([Grandi 2017:2-3](#)).

Finally, as for the definition of augmentation, it is a process through which

an evaluative element is added to the base word and the resultant lexical form indicates the intensity or augmentation of one or a number of the semantic features (such as degree, amount, size, etc.). Furthermore, in augmentation, an object or concept may be evaluated either on the basis of its objective characteristics (shape, dimensions...) or on the basis of the speaker's feeling toward it (i.e. subjective criteria).

2. Discussion

As for the detection of evaluation, [Hunston and Thompson \(2000:13\)](#) contend that there is no consensus among the linguists on its scope, categorizations and definition. According to them, in order to detect evaluation, one should note to the signs signifying the fact that something has been compared with a norm, a social value has been expressed, or a personal view and evaluation has been voiced. [Grandi \(2002:13\)](#) argues that an evaluative element attributes a value to a concept that is different from norm and that the attributed value represents at least one of the four main evaluative meanings of "small, big, good and bad". In his view, the semantic functions of the evaluative constructions can be organized into two categories: The evaluative functions that are descriptive (or quantitative) and those that are qualitative (or subjective view). In other words, a given item (object, person, action, etc.) may be evaluated on the basis of its objective characteristics (shape,

dimensions) or on the basis of the speaker's feeling and mental criteria. The former denotes the evaluative meanings of small/big, while the latter denotes all the associative meanings of endearment, contempt, augmentation, diminution, etc.

Yet, it should be noted that in the evaluative forms, the descriptive (big vs small) and subjective meanings (good vs bad) often co-occur and that it is difficult to differentiate between a merely quantitative and a merely qualitative phrasing. For this reason, [Körtvélyessy \(2012\)](#) has introduced an approach to evaluative morphology according to which evaluative morphology can be viewed as a continuum where the prototypical augmentatives or diminutives express quantitative meanings more or less than the default value/norm. The default value itself is relative and language-specific. It may be influenced by culture, the traditions of speech community and people's experiences.

2.1. Augmentation in Persian Morphology

The phenomena of diminution and diminutive affixes have been widely discussed in Persian grammar books. Augmentation, however, has remained unnoticed, notwithstanding the fact that Persian language does have augmentivizing devices with such meanings as augmentation, intensification, endearment and contempt.

Compounding and reduplication are the two most important processes of augmentation in Persian language. Compounding is widely used for creating new words including the augmentative ones. Investigating the structure of compound words shows that many of them have in principle been syntactic phrases which have lost their syntactical signs and have become compound words due to the fact that some words frequently collocate (Shaghghi 2007). The existence of some syntactic phrases with the words “*madar*” (mother) and “*shah*” (king) in modern Persian (such as the “*mother of battles*” (*madar e jangha*), or “*the king of the gentlemen*” (*shah e mardan*) is indicative of the fact that some augmentative structures used to be syntactic phrases.

Another fact about the compounds is that they can semantically be endocentric or exocentric. In the endocentric compounds, one of the words is the head and the other one is modifier or restrictive, but in the exocentric compounds, none of the words is head. Both of them are modifiers. Such compounds are usually categorized under adjectives. The head in an endocentric compound can be on the left or on the right of the compound. It means that the head can be the first or the second word. In Persian augmentative forms there exist both endocentric and exocentric compounds, but in all the endocentric augmentative compounds the head is the second word.

Persian language uses various morphemes for augmentation. “*Shah*” (king), “*madar*” (mother), “*Xar*” (donkey), and “*Gondeh*” (gigantic) are the most important morphemes used in the processes of compounding and reduplication for augmentation. In classical Persian other morphemes also were used for augmentation. A mention can be made of “*meh*” (great), “*vala*” lofty”, “*narreh*” (masculine), “*Gav*” (cow), “*phil*” (elephant), “*Geran*” (heavy) and the like. Here are the prime examples: (high-value) والاگهر (high-ranking) والامقام، (male) مه‌مغان (great Magi) مه‌بانو (great lady) (lion) نره‌غول (a cow-sized) نره‌شیر ()، (an) گاوصندوق (a cow-sized safe) گاوزنبور ()، (elephant-sized foot) فیل‌پا (an elephant-like) (big-eyed) گران‌شکم (big-bellied)، (big-eyed) گران‌چشم ()، (power) فیل‌زور. These morphemes are no longer productive. It seems that their resultant compounds have become lexicalized.

2.1.1. Augmentation through the Process of Compounding in Persian Language

In this section, cases of augmentation with the morphemes “*شاه*” (king), “*خر*” (donkey), “*گنده*” (gigantic) and “*مادر*” (mother) are discussed. The reason for selecting these morphemes is that their

resultant compounds are true cases of augmentation in Persian.

2.1.1.1. The Morpheme “شاه” (King)

Considering the oldness of the word “king” and the role played by the kings throughout the history of Iran, it is not surprising that the word “king” in Persian has been used for augmentation. In Persian dictionaries including The *Dekhoda Dictionary*, the denotations and connotations of this word have been explained. Its denotative meanings are “original, God and a great one). Some examples are (the best verse of a poem) “شاهبیت”, (main flight-feather) “شاهپر”, (big-sized black mulberry) “شاهتوت”, (a kingly work, masterpiece) “شاهکار”, (leaf spring) “شاهفنر”, and (main or central pipe) “شاهلوله”. It is noteworthy that most of the augmentative compounds with the morpheme “شاه” (king) are endocentric with heads on the left, although some exocentric compounds can also be found as in (kingly fruit) “شاهمیوه” which refers to the fruit of pear. Semantically speaking, in many of these compounds the objective and subjective meaning of “big size” co-occur.

Table 1: Augmentation with the morpheme “شاه” (king) in Persian with the senses of “main”, “major” and “big”

	the word	type of the compound	objective (quantitative) meaning	subjective meaning
1	شاهرود shahrud	endocentric left head	long and main river	
2	شاه میوه shahmiveh	exocentric		kingly fruit, valuable nutritious
3	شاهبندر shahbandar	endocentric left head	main or central port	important
4	شاهراه shahrah	endocentric left head	main road, highway	
5	شاهکلید shahkelid	endocentric left head	master key (prototypicality)	
6	شاهدزد shahdozd	endocentric left head		king of the thieves highly- skilled (thief)

2.1.1.2. The Morpheme “خر” (donkey)

In the past, this morpheme has been used in the words (a donkey-sized fly) “خرمگس”, (a donkey-sized neck, thick neck) “خرگردن”, (big blue bead) “خرمه‌ره”, (crab) “خرچنگ” and the like. It seems that these compounds have become lexicalized in modern Persian. However, new compounds with this morpheme like “خرپول” (filthy rich) and “خرشانس” (filthy luck) indicate that the morpheme is still productive. Among the augmentative compounds with the morpheme “خر” (donkey), both exocentric and endocentric compounds can be found, but all compounds are head left. Semantically speaking, some compounds with this

morpheme are prototypical augmentative structures in which the quantitative/objective meaning of the bigness (in terms of size) co-occurs with the subjective meaning in the speaker's mind (low-value and uselessness). As a result, the morpheme means both bigness and weakness. It is no longer productive as it used to be.

Table2: Augmentation with the Morpheme “خر” (donkey) in Persian with the senses of “bigness”, “attenuation” and “contempt”

	The word	type of the compound	Objective (quantitative) meaning	Subjective meaning
1	خرمههره kharmohreh	endocentric left head	big blue bead	of little value
2	خرپول kharpul	exocentric	filthy rich	contempt
3	خرمگس kharmagas	endocentric left head	a donkey-sized fly	annoying
4	خرگردن khargardan	exocentric	a donkey-sized neck	contempt
5	خرشانس kharshans	exocentric	having filthy luck	contempt

2.1.1.3. The Morpheme “گنده” (giant)

Table 3: Augmentation with the Morpheme “گنده” (outsize, gigantic) in Persian with the Senses “gigantism”, “contempt” and “attenuation”

	The word	type of the compound	Objective (quantitative) meaning	Subjective meaning
1	گنده گو گنده- پران، gondehparan, gondehgu	exocentric	making grandiose claims	contempt
2	گندهلات gondehlat	exocentric	big hooligan	contempt
3	گندهبک gondehbak	exocentric	with an outsize frame of body	contempt
4	کله گنده kallegondh	exocentric	bigwig	important

2.1.1.4. The Morpheme “مادر” (mother)

In a paper entitled as “the mother of all morphemes”, [Matissof \(1991\)](#) has discussed the metaphorical meanings of the words “mother” and “child” and their grammaticalization in Arabic, English and Southeast Asian languages. The contrast between the words “mother” and “child” in Persian is not as much as it is in East Asian languages, but the collocations of these words in Persian are the same as the East Asian languages. Its associative meaning is “origin” and “source” as in “مادرچاه” (the source well in a kanat), “مادر خرج” (a person who is in charge of a kitty), “ام الفساد” (the mother of all corruption), and “ام القرا” (the mother of all cities). In Persian language, the other augmentative functions of this word - as it is common in east Asian languages- has been given to the word “شاه” (king). This signifies a regional orientation in cultural Iran where the king was identified with God and origin.

There are few compounds in Persian in which the morpheme “مادر” (mother) means the source or origin. Many compounds with this morpheme have been syntactic phrases which have undergone a metathesis and have become compound words. There are, however, examples with no metathesis as in “the mother of maps” “نقشه مادر” , “the mother

Table4: Augmentation with the Morpheme “مادر” (mother) in Persian with the Senses of Origin and Source

	The word	type of the compound	Objective (quantitative) meaning	Subjective meaning
1	مادرچاه madarchah	endoocentric left head	the source well in a kanat	origin, source
2	مادرخرج madarkharj	exocentric	a person who is in charge of a kitty	source
3	مادرشهر madarshahr	Endocentric Left head	The metropolis	main
4	مادرسناد madarsanad	endocentric	the mother of documents	source

2.2. Augmentation through Reduplication

Reduplication is another productive and frequently-used process of word formation and of forming augmentatives in Persian. In this process, new words are formed through repetition of a given morpheme. The repetition can be complete or incomplete, with addition or without addition. In other

words, the base word can be repeated fully or partially. In the process of repetition, another morpheme may be added or part of the stem word may be erased. In any case, the result of reduplication is the formation of a new word with a meaning different from the base word.

Dabir Moghaddam and Maleki (2016)

contend that the reduplicated words in Persian can have different meanings depending on their contexts of usage. Investigating the variety of reduplicated words in Persian shows that their main function is augmentation (intensification, density and abundance signifying comparison and evaluation) or duration and distance. The reduplicated words in Persian that are categorized under augmentation are mainly total repetitions. Their meanings are qualitative, i.e. they convey the speaker’s feeling or view. Yet, examples of added reduplication also can be found. In the following table, you can find some reduplicated words together with their meanings.

Table 5: Augmentation through the Process of Reduplication in Persian

examples	meaning	the word	
hezarhezar khaterkhah darad. she is the beloved of myriads of boys.	indicate numerousness a myriad of/myriads of	هزارهزار hezarhezar	1
gusht ra tekketekke kard. she cut the meat to many pieces.	indicate intensity to cut to pieces	تکه تکه tekketekke	2
nameh ra parehpareh kard. she tattered the letter (or tore it apart into many pieces).	indicate intensity tatter, make ragged	پاره پاره parehpareh	3
lebasash surakhsurakh bud. his dress was full of holes.	indicate augmentation full of holes, perforated	سوراخ سوراخ Surakhsurakh	4
muhayash ferfery ast. he has curly hair.	indicate augmentation curly	فرفری ferfery	5

3. Augmentation in Japanese

The present section will focus on the mechanisms used in Japanese language for augmentation. Augmentation processes in Japanese, in a very similar way to Persian is divided into two groups, namely, compounding and total reduplication. These two processes will be introduced in detail, but before that, it is necessary to provide some information about the morphology and word-formation in Japanese language.

3.1. Japanese Morphology

Typologically, Japanese belongs to agglutinating languages in which a stem can take several inflectional and derivational affixes, and each affix has a unique meaning or grammatical role. [Ito & Mester \(2015\)](#) study the word formation processes in Japanese and try to make a distinction between compounding and affixation in this language. In their view, both processes are attested in Japanese, but in affixation a grammatical morpheme (an affix) is added to a stem while in compounding two lexical morphemes (roots) join together and make a new word.

Adopting Chinese logographic characters (kanjis) in Japanese has resulted in most characters to have two different types of phonetic forms: a Japanese phonetic form which is in fact the pronunciation of the Japanese word equivalent to the Chinese character and a so-called a “Chinese”

phonetic form which is a form close to the Chinese pronunciation of the character. For example the character 山 “mountain” is pronounced as /yama/ in original Japanese words and /san/ in Chinese loans. *Yama* is the Japanese and *san* is the Chinese word for “mountain”.

A large number of words have been coined in Japan in the past centuries by combining two or more kanjis. Although many of these words have Chinese phonetic forms, they are not necessarily Chinese loans. As most of these words are actually formed by Japanese speakers, they are called Sino-Japanese words. This situation has encouraged many scholars to conclude that both Chinese and Japanese pronunciations are different forms of identical morphemes. For instance, [Miyake \(1999\)](#) analyzes the Japanese honorific morphemes *o* and *go* and proposes that they are actually allomorphs of the same honorific morpheme which can be displayed by the character 御. This abstract morpheme emerges in the form of /o/ in Japanese and in the form of /go/ in Sino-Japanese nouns.

Morphemes that contribute in augmentation process in Japanese may appear with either Japanese or Sino-Japanese forms. Thus, in the present study following [Miyake \(1999\)](#), for each augmentative morpheme we consider an abstract morpheme and demonstrate it with the relevant kanji character.

3.2. Augmentation through compounding in Japanese

As mentioned earlier, [Körtvélyessy \(2012\)](#) holds that in augmentative expressions, descriptive (or quantitative) and qualitative (or subjective) meanings often co-occur and it is difficult to differentiate between a merely quantitative and a merely qualitative phrasing. A close examination of Japanese augmentative structures reveals that the majority of these structures have qualitative and subjective meanings and only in some cases one can find quantitative meanings alone. Nevertheless, as mentioned before, the two types of meanings are inseparable in most cases. Another interesting point about Japanese augmentative structures is that exocentric compounds are very rare in these structures and most of them contain a head. In the

following sections nine morphemes that are frequently used for augmentation in Japanese will be introduced and their morphological and semantic characteristics will be discussed.

3.2.1. The morpheme 大 “big, great”

The morpheme shown by the character 大 means “big” and “great” in Chinese and Japanese. When combined with Japanese words this morpheme appears with its Japanese pronunciation (/ō/) and when added to Sino-Japanese words with its Sino-Japanese Japanese pronunciation (/dai/). Augmentation through using the morpheme 大 is very common and productive in Modern Japanese. Table 5 shows some examples of augmentation through the morpheme 大:

Table 5: Augmentation through the morpheme 大:

A) Augmentation through the allomorph /ō/			A) Augmentation through the allomorph /dai/						
1	大 /ō/ «big»	+ 川 /kawa/ «river»	→	大川 /ōkawa/ «big river»	2	大 /dai/ «big»	+ 木 /boku/ «tree»	→	大木 /daiboku/ «big tree»
3	大 /ō/ «big»	+ 雨 /ame/ «rain»	→	大雨 /ōame/ «heavy rain»	4	大 /dai/ «big»	+ 地震/jishin/ «quake»	→	大地震 /daijishin/ «major quake»

3.2.2. The morpheme 真 “real”

This morpheme means “truth, reality, genuineness” when it occurs alone. When added to Japanese words this morpheme

appears with its Japanese pronunciations (/ma/, /man/), and when added to Sino-Japanese words with its Sino-Japanese Japanese pronunciation (/shin/).

Table 6: Augmentation through the morpheme 真

1	真 /ma/ «real»	+	上 /ue/ «up»	→	真上 /maue/ «just above»	2	真 /ma/ «real»	+	正直 /shōjiki/ «honest»	→	真正直 /mashōjiki/ «perfectly honest»
3	真 /ma/ «real»	+	白 /shiro/ «white»	→	真白 /masshiro/ «pure white»	4	真 /ma/ «real»	+	冬 /fuyu/ «winter»	→	真冬 /mafuyu/ «midwinter»

3.2.3. The morpheme 激 “intense”

This morpheme means “violent, to get excited, enraged, chafe, incite” when it occurs alone. When added to nouns or adjectives, it shows the subjective evaluation

of the speaker and intensifies the meaning of the noun or the adjective. As shown in the examples in table 7, in most cases this morpheme adds a negative nuance to the meaning of the compound.

Table 7: Augmentation through the morpheme 激

1	激 /geki/ «intense»	+	変 /hen/ «change»	→	激変 /gekihen/ «upheaval»	2	激 /geki/ «intense»	+	臭 /shū/ «smell»	→	激臭 /gekishū/ «sharp smell»
3	激 /geki/ «intense»	+	減 /gen/ «reduce»	→	激減 /gekigen/ «sudden fall»	4	激 /geki/ «intense»	+	暑 /sho/ «heat»	→	激暑 /gekisho/ «intense heat»

3.2.4: The morpheme 過 “exceed”

This morpheme has one Japanese (/sugi/) and one Sino-Japanese allomorph (/ka/) and it denotes “overdo, exceed, go beyond,

error”. First let us take a look at the Sino-Japanese allomorph (/ka/). This morpheme means “very” and “too much” and adds a negative nuance to the meaning of the compound.

Table 8: Augmentation through the morpheme 過

1	過 /ka/ «exceed»	+	大 /dai/ «big»	→	過大 /kadai/ «excessive»	2	過 /ka/ «exceed»	+	半 /han/ «half»	→	過半 /kahan/ «majority»
3	過 /ka/ «exceed»	+	勞 /rō/ «work»	→	過勞 /karō/ «overwork»	4	過 /ka/ «exceed»	+	言 /gon/ «say»	→	過言 /kagon/ «exaggeration»

The Japanese allomorph (/sugi/) which is derived from the verb *sugi-ru* “to pass, to exceed” can also combine with verbs and adjectives and usually denotes “to overdo, to exceed”. This compounding is very common

and productive and adds a negative nuance to the meaning of the compound.

3.2.5. Other augmentative morphemes

Besides the four morphemes introduced above, at least five other morphemes take part in augmentation processes in Japanese. The present section introduces them briefly.

The morpheme 超 “super”

This morpheme means “super-; ultra-; hyper-; extreme” and it is semantically similar to the morpheme 過 introduced above. It appears as the Sino-Japanese allomorph /chō/ and combines with nouns:

超 /chō/ «super» + 電導 /dendō/ «conductance»

→ 超電導 /chōdendō/ «superconductivity»

The morpheme 主 “main”

This morpheme means “lord, chief, master, main thing, principal” in Chinese and Japanese and when combined with a word as an augmentative morpheme it denotes “main” and “important”.

主 /shu/ «main» + 食 /shoku/ «food»

→ 主食 /shushoku/ «staple food»

The morpheme 母 “mother”

This morpheme which means “mother” in Chinese and Japanese when added to Sino-Japanese words appears as the Sino-Japanese allomorph (/bo/) and signifies “main, chief, and big”. Sometimes this morpheme appears as the Japanese allomorph (/omo/) which

might be related to the morpheme 主 (/omo/) “main, chief”. [Matissof \(1991\)](#) has discussed the metaphorical meanings of the word “mother” and its grammaticalization in East Asian languages. It is worth mentioning that a large number of the words containing this morpheme in Japanese are in fact Chinese loans and studying Old and Middle Chinese will help us gain a better understanding of this morpheme and its combinations. Many of the words containing this morpheme in Japanese have subjective meanings, but in some cases the objective meaning “big in size” co-occurs with the subjective meaning “main, important”. Compound formation with this morpheme is not a productive process in Modern Japanese.

母 /bo/ «mother» + 艦 /kan/ «warship»

→ 母艦 /bokan/ «main warship, mother ship»

母 /omo/ «mother» + 屋 /ya/ «room»

→ 母屋 /omoya/ «main building, central room»

The morpheme 親 “parent”

This morpheme is used in a similar way to the morpheme 母 “mother”. It means “parent” and also “intimacy, relative, familiarity”. In augmentative compounds it appears as the Japanese allomorph (/oya/) and denotes “main, big, and boss”. In most cases it has subjective meaning, but in some examples such as *oyayubi* “thumb” it refers to size. Compound formation with this morpheme is not a productive process in

親 /oya/ «parent» + 柱 /hashira/ «pillar»

→ 親柱 /oyabashira/ «main pillar»

The morpheme 正 “correct”

This morpheme when appears alone means “correct, justice, righteous”. In augmentative structures, it is pronounced as (/sei/) and denotes “justics, exact, right, correct, fare”.

正 /sei/ «correct» + 門 /mon/ «gate»

→ 正門 /seimon/ «main gate»

In addition to the morphemes discussed above and their Japanese and Sino-Japanese allomorphs, many new Augmentative morphemes have entered Japanese mostly from European languages among which one can name super- mega- ultra- and so on.

3.3. Augmentation through total reduplication in Japanese

Japanese in a similar way to Persian uses total reduplication for augmentation. However there is a major difference between the two languages in this respect: Japanese lacks a general morpheme to mark plurality and plurality is not marked explicitly in most cases. Therefore, total reduplication is used as a mechanism to mark plural nouns, i.e. singular nouns become plural when they are reduplicated. This process however is not productive and the nouns that undergo this process form a closed list.

Total reduplication is also used for

augmentation. Unlike plurality, which is a quantitative phenomenon, in augmentation through total reduplication we usually can find the subjective evaluation of the speaker. In such cases, the word after being reduplicated semantically becomes “bigger, stronger, and more intense”.

山 /yama/ «mountain»

→ 山々 /yamayama/ «mountains»

我 /ware/ «I»

→ 我々 /wareware/ «we»

破れ /yabure/ «tear»

→ 破れ破れ /yabureyabure/ «tattered, ragged»

深い /fukai/ «deep»

→ 深々 /fukabuka/ «very deeply»

The second example above shows formation of a plural pronoun by reduplicating the singular pronoun. [Salehi and Davari-Ardakani \(2013\)](#) study these types of pronouns in Japanese and compare them to Persian personal pronouns. As can be seen in the above examples and the examples in section 2.2, augmentation through reduplication is very similar in Japanese and Persian. Particularly we can compare *yabureyabure* in Japanese to پارِه‌پاره in Persian which are structurally and semantically similar.

By a comparative study of augmentation mechanisms in Persian and Japanese, we achieved some generalizations that can be used for verification of the principles of evaluative morphology. On the other hand, the comparison of these mechanisms clarified certain similarities and differences between the two languages that can be benefited from in teaching Japanese language. The present study showed that compounding plays the key role in augmentation in both Persian and Japanese. Compounding for augmentation in both languages does not change the parts of speech of the words. For example, nouns remain nouns after the process of augmentation. Unlike the derivational processes that change the parts of speech, the part of speech of the resultant words in the evaluative process does not change despite the fact that a new word has been constructed. Therefore, the findings consist with [Scalise' \(1984.1986\)](#) view that the rules of evaluative morphology are different from that of inflection and derivation. Thus, evaluative morphology can be a separate domain.

According to [Grandi \(2005:4\)](#), all the languages that have both augmentative and diminutive structures use affixes for diminution, but for augmentation, they may use other processes including compounding and reduplication. The results from this study confirm his generalization to Persian language. Persian language uses various affixes for diminution, but as for

augmentation, it uses both compounding and reduplication. The case is different for Japanese, because, it uses compounding – not affixes- for both augmentation and diminution.

As for the differences and similarities between Persian and Japanese in augmentative structures, some new results were obtained by this study. One of the similarities is that in both of the languages throughout the history a variety of morphemes have been used for augmentation, a few of them however have become lexicalized. As an example, the speakers of modern Persian use “شاه‌دانه” (hemp) as a single word not as an evaluative structure in which a value or quality is ascribed to a given type of seed. Likewise in Japanese, many words with the morpheme “大” (in the sense of big/huge) have become lexicalized. Moreover, Persian compounds with morphemes “خر” (donkey), “مادر” (mother), “گنده” (giant) and their counterparts in Japanese with morphemes “major”, “mother”, etc. include both exocentric and endocentric compounds. Japanese seems to have less exocentric augmentative structures, though this claim requires verification. Moreover, in both of the languages, the two types of the augmentations presented by [Grandi \(2005\)](#) – qualitative and quantitative evaluative - can be found.

Finally, both Persian and Japanese use

reduplication in the same way for augmentation especially augmentation with qualitative evaluation. The difference is that Persian has both full and added reduplication, but Japanese has just full reduplication for this purpose. Japanese uses full reduplication for pluralization and augmentation, but this process in Persian is used for duration as well. It can, however, be argued that the concepts of pluralization in Japanese and duration in Persian – both expressed via reduplication - are related to the general concept of augmentation. It may seem that augmentation is more widely used in

Japanese than in Persian - though it needs verification via comparative statistical analysis of Persian and Japanese augmentative elements - the fact of the matter is that word formation in Japanese through compounding and reduplication is easier and more common than in Persian. Moreover, In addition to compounding, Persian frequently uses syntactic phrases which are normally expressed as compounds in Japanese. So, one may imagine that these processes are widely used in Japanese.

References

- Dabirmoghaddam, M. & Sima Malekei (2016) Formal and Semantic Analysis of Total Reduplication in Persian. *Journal of Linguistics & Khorasan Dialects Biannual*, 8(14). 1-23.
- Dehkhoda, A. A. (1998). Dehkhoda dictionary. Second Edition, Tehran: Tehran University Press (UTP).
- Grandi, N. (2002). Development and spread of augmentative suffixes in the Mediterranean area. In P. Ramat & T. Stolz (Eds.), *Mediterranean Languages* (pp. 171-190). Bochum, Germany: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer University Press.
- Grandi, N. (2005). Sardinian evaluative morphology in typological perspective. In I. Putzu (Ed.), *Sardinian in typological perspective* (pp. 188–209). Bochum, Germany: Brockmeyer University Press.
- Grandi, N. (2017). Evaluatives in Morphology. [Online] Available: Oxfon Online publication .
- Hunston, S. & Thompson, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ito, J. & Mester, A. (2015). Word formation and phonological processes. in Kubozono Haruo (Ed) *The handbook of Japanese phonetics and phonology*, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG. 363-395.
- Körtvélyessy, L. (2012). Evaluative morphology from cross-linguistic perspective. Paper presented at the Universals and Typology in Word-Formation II conference, Košice, 26–8.
- Matissof, J. A. (1991). The mother of all morphemes: augmentatives and diminutives in areal and universal perspective. In Ratliff Martha & Schiller Eric (eds.), *Papers from the first annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistic Society*, Tempe, AZ, 1991: 293-349.
- Miyake, Y. M. (1999). *The Japanese deferential prefix o: A natural history* (Doctoral dissertation), University of Michigan.
- Salehi, Z. & N. Daravi-Ardakani (2013). A comparative study of pronominals in Persian and Japanese. *Foreign Language Research Journal*, 3(2), 201-242. doi: 10.22059/jflr.2013.57271
- Scalise, S. (1984). *Generative morphology*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.
- Scalise, S. (1986). *Generative Morphology*, 2nd edn, Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.
- Shaghaghi V. (2007). *An Introduction to Morphology* (in Persian). Tehran SAMT Publications.