

Biljana Belamarić
Dissertation Proposal:
Diminutives in Macedonian

Index

1. Proposal	2
1.1. Introduction	2
1.2. Limitations of Scope	6
1.3. Methodology	8
1.4. The Beginnings of a Theory of Diminutives	10
1.4.1 Characteristics of the Diminutive Suffixes	11
1.4.2 Diminutive Formation	15
1.5 Conclusions	17
2. Proposed Outline of Dissertation	18
3. Proposed Bibliography	23

1. Proposal

1.1. Introduction

The general topic of the dissertation is the treatment of diminutive nouns in the Macedonian language. In particular, the dissertation aims to answer the following five questions:

1. *What Macedonian suffixes are considered diminutive and what are their characteristics?*

Several sources (Koneski 1976, Stefanovski 1997, Kramer 1999) list the diminutive suffixes for Macedonian nouns, but they do not further elaborate on the characteristics of each of these diminutives. Relevant issues that are glossed over or left out include suffixal productivity; considerations of gender of the noun before and after diminutivization and the possible semantic and pragmatic implications of gender changes; and the role of the base noun in the semantics of diminutivization.

2. *How are the diminutives formed?*

While several sources (Koneski 1976, Kramer 1999, Friedman 1993, 2002) explain various morphophonemic aspects of diminutive formation, such as consonant mutation or dissimilation, there is no one comprehensive source which details diminutive formation in all its complexities. Furthermore, only Koneski and Stefanovski address the stackability (*prirastuvanje*) of diminutives, i.e. the possibility for a diminutive suffix to be affixed onto an already diminutivized noun. There are a limited number of suffixes that exhibit this characteristic and neither Koneski nor Stefanovski present a comprehensive review of this phenomenon.

3. *What do the diminutives mean?*

Because the semantics of diminutives in Macedonian have never been the focus of an in-depth study, it will be necessary to draw upon previous scholarship on other languages. Perhaps the most global study of the semantics of diminutives is undertaken by Jurafsky (1996), who synthesizes conclusions from synchronic and diachronic approaches, cognitive considerations, and the principles of universal grammar while surveying approximately 60 languages from various language groups from around the world. Wierzbicka (1980) examines the semantics of diminutives in Spanish to support her postulate of universal translatability. In the field of Slavic linguistics, only Stankiewicz has discussed emotive language, including diminutivity, in a pan-Slavic setting. Otherwise, the most prominent studies of diminutives have been focused on Russian and conducted by Polterauer (1981), Volek (1987), Andrews (1996), and others. Diminutivity in Bulgarian has also received extensive research, as exemplified by Williams (1996). The methods and insights from all of these studies can provide a foundation for examining the semantics of the Macedonian diminutive.

4. *Why, when, and how are diminutives used?*

Closely connected to the question of what diminutives mean are the questions of why, when, and how native speakers use them. Wierzbicka (1980) gives insights into why and when Spanish speakers employ diminutives, by pointing to diminutives as sources of expressing empathy towards objects, and not necessarily denoting their size. In Macedonian, the pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects of diminutive suffixes have been

addressed only by Stefanovski (1997) within the scope of diminutivity as an apologetic strategy. While diminutives may be used in this manner, a wider scope should be considered, which would include areas such as theories of communication; child language acquisition and child-directed-speech (CDS); scripted vs. non-scripted conversations; language in print vs. speech; and others.

5. *Who uses diminutives?*

There has been little research on social factors contributing to frequency of diminutive usage. Accepting the connections between diminutivity and CDS, age can be deduced as an important factor for the frequency of diminutive usage. According to Kempe and Brooks, diminutives are used more in CDS than in discourse among adults (Kempe and Brooks 2001: 226-227). Similarly, Jurafsky asserts that there is a greater tendency for children to use diminutives in “many if not most” languages in the world (Jurafsky 1996: 563). Neither source provides empirical evidence for their claims, nor have there been any studies testing this hypothesis in Macedonian.

Gender has also been pointed out as an influential criterion for the frequency of diminutive usage, with females exhibiting a higher frequency of usage than males. Kempe and Brooks (2001) relate this distribution to the tendency of primary caregivers for children to be female. The role of age and gender in expression of diminutivity is thereby restricted to the process of CDS. Due to this limitation, further research is needed to investigate the relationship between gender and frequency of diminutive usage in contexts outside of CDS.

Stefanovski (1997) delves into social status as a variable, but makes no scientifically testable conclusions regarding this factor, making instead unsupported generalizations about national socio-historical memory and consciousness. Empirical evidence from the area of sociolinguistics would either strengthen or disprove his claim and is essential before his conclusions can be accepted.

Defining the interlocutors in terms of social factors is a necessary component in the pragmatic and sociolinguistic study of diminutives. No matter what theory of communication one subscribes to, one has to concede that the interlocutors play an essential role in it. Understanding the social personae involved in the communication therefore provides an insight into the discourse strategies that motivate the use of diminutives.

A preliminary survey of the literature in general and specifically in Macedonian finds a paucity of materials that might shed light on the questions above. Like other Slavic languages, Macedonian is rich in diminutive suffixes, but conclusions from research on diminutives in other Slavic languages do not entirely apply to Macedonian. The diminutive suffixes and their properties in Macedonian differ even from its closest linguistic relative, Bulgarian.¹ For these reasons it is necessary to detail the process of diminutivization in Macedonian in a survey such as the one proposed in the dissertation. Because diminutives are a widespread phenomenon in some languages, and not in others, I believe it is additionally important to explore the connections among diminutivity as a linguistic phenomenon, a cognitive construct, and a product of culture.

¹ As two examples, I point to the existence of a separate suffix -чиц- in Bulgarian (Williams 1996:25), which in Macedonian is only a phonologically conditioned variation of -ица; and the extremely limited productivity of the suffix -ле in Bulgarian (Williams 1996:26) as opposed to its relatively productive counterpart in Macedonian (Koneski 1976:290-291, Hristovski 1995: 35, and Friedman 2002:20).

In studying diminutivity in Macedonian, I take two approaches: a theoretical one, and a practical one. The dissertation follows this consideration by being divided into two parts: “Diminutives in Theory”, and “Diminutives in Practice.” Both sections address the issues elaborated above, with the former making predictions about what is expected in practice, and the latter confirming and/or disproving the various predictions. The conclusion of the dissertation will compare and contrast the two methods and yield answers to the questions asked at the beginning of the study and elaborated above.

A study of diminutives is valuable for linguists and language enthusiasts and could additionally be useful for teachers and language learners. Diminutives go virtually unmentioned in most Macedonian textbooks. This practice produces students who can recognize many noun stems but have low overall comprehension due to the high frequency of diminutive suffixes in authentic speech. By illuminating the aspects of diminutive usage, my research will provide a resource for textbooks that focus on production and comprehension of authentic language.

1.2. Limitations of Scope

According to Volek (1988: 415), diminutive derivatives are usually nouns and adjectives and less frequently verbs and adverbs. Macedonian boasts diminutives in all four categories, although in comparison with the diminutivized nouns, the other classes of words are marginally encountered and rarely discussed in the literature surveyed. While the major focus of the dissertation will be diminutivized nouns, the roles of diminutivized adjectives, adverbs, and verbs, as well as the interaction between these categories will

also be surveyed in order to present a complete picture of diminutivity in Macedonian. For the purpose of this proposal, however, the discussion will focus exclusively on nouns.

There are two methodologies that could yield insights into the development of diminutives, but will not be the focus of the dissertation, and these are the historical (diachronic) and the cross-linguistic (comparative/typological) approaches. It is not my intention to present a comprehensive historical study of the development of diminutives in Macedonian, nor a thorough comparative study of Slavic diminutives. By limiting my survey of Macedonian diminutives to the “here” and “now,” I am not, however, studying the phenomenon in a vacuum. Instead, I utilize historical and cross-linguistic data whenever they contribute conclusions useful for answering the questions posed at the outset of the research. Couching a cross-linguistic survey of diminutivity within a study of the Balkan Sprachbund may reveal relevant mutual historical influences among the languages. This type of study represents yet another uncharted area suggested for further research.

Research on Macedonian is of an intrinsically politicized nature because borders in the Balkans have historically been unstable and languages have become a symbol of nationality and distinctiveness from neighboring populations. In addition, the development of the Macedonian literary language is inseparable from the development of the Macedonian state. Therefore, similarities and divergences of Macedonian with neighboring languages, which are at times discussed in the dissertation, carry with them extralinguistic consequences, which have to be acknowledged. While the acknowledgement of this context is necessary, the context itself is not the driving force

behind the research. Instead, the undercurrents of the study are unbiased investigation and dispassionate interpretation of results.

1.3 Methodology

While the dissertation was motivated as a response to the lack of previous scholarship on diminutivity in Macedonian, it is precisely that lack that is the biggest hurdle in beginning an examination of diminutives. I plan to overcome this obstacle by using conclusions from diminutive research in other Slavic languages as a starting point.

An additional problem in the methodology of research is the seeming lack of corpora for Macedonian. This problem was identified by a team of Macedonian linguists in Macedonia and the U.S., who are presently working on remedying it. Through personal correspondence with one of the members of the team, I was able to receive a preliminary database of materials including newspaper articles, literary works, and legal texts in Macedonian and in translation. This database will be coupled with the reading selections of the second part of Horace Lunt's 1952 *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language* (Lunt 1952:105-185). The two text sources together represent an expanded corpus of written works both in original Macedonian and in translation to Macedonian, spanning time periods and genres from early hagiographic texts to present-day plays, short stories, and poems. This expanded corpus will serve as the primary source of written works for the research.

Additionally, I plan to use the internet as a corpus for researching less formal uses of diminutives. Although the internet capabilities in Macedonia are just beginning to develop, there are already hundreds of official websites for various spheres of

Macedonian life that can be searched through search engines such as Google, or through web-spiders which crawl the internet for given words and phrases. For example, a particularly helpful website has been <http://www.maturanti.com>, which contains the official yearbooks for high school seniors in numerous high schools from various parts of Macedonia for the last 5 years. The online yearbooks include student-written classmate descriptions, whose level of formality primarily resembles informal oral language. I believe that via these three resources: the developing Macedonian corpus, Lunt's selection of texts, and the internet, I will be able to examine the tendencies of diminutives during various time periods, and in various contexts and situations. Of particular interest to the dissertation will be the frequency of diminutive usage, the profile of users and situations when diminutives are employed, as well as what the users are trying to convey through diminutivization.

However, diminutivity is a primarily informal phenomenon, observed in the greatest frequency in oral language (Jurafsky 1996:563). Because no corpus can replace observation of real speech acts, I plan to do two types of surveys with native speakers in Macedonia. The first type will test production of diminutives in given scripted situations and will reveal native speaker tendencies in identifying diminutive suffixes, characteristics, formation, and meaning. This survey will in itself consist of two parts. In the first part, a representative sample of randomly selected speakers will be given a list of nouns and a list of all the possible diminutive suffixes and will be asked to create as many diminutives as possible using only those lists. They will also be asked to use the diminutives they have created in sentences. In the second part of the survey, the speakers will be shown pictures or video of various scripted situations, such as shopping, ordering

in a restaurant, or children's first interactions with pets, and asked to provide dialogues for the given situations. Each individual surveyed will be provided with a description of the entire survey, including my contact information. They will also be notified that their participation is voluntary and that they can stop at any point in time during the survey.

The second type of survey will observe unscripted speech in the interaction of children with other children and parents in two kindergartens in ethnically diverse areas of Skopje and will provide answers primarily to questions regarding diminutive semantics, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics. In order to conduct this type of survey, permission will be requested from the principals of the kindergartens, the teachers of the two selected classrooms, as well as the parents of the children involved. To assure minimal consequences of the observer's paradox, I will only collect data after first being present in the classrooms for at least one week.

The ability to test theoretical hypotheses through corpus research and through studies with native speakers in Macedonia is crucial for in order to create an empirically supported account of diminutive tendencies in Macedonian.

1.4. The Beginnings of a Theory of Diminutives

To illustrate some of the issues discussed in this proposal, I would like to now turn to a general analysis of diminutivity in Macedonian and point out preliminary problems as well as potential answers to the first two questions identified at the outset of the dissertation:

1. What Macedonian suffixes are considered diminutive and what are their characteristics?

2. How are the diminutives formed?

1.4.1. Characteristics of the Diminutive Suffixes

Macedonian distinguishes three genders of all nouns in the singular: masculine, feminine, and neuter. Nouns have standard morphological shapes, which generally correspond to gender: masculine nouns most often end in a consonant + Ø, feminine nouns in consonant + a, and neuter nouns in consonant + o/e. Not surprisingly, the diminutive suffixes can also yield nouns that are masculine, feminine, or neuter, i.e. suffix in a consonant + Ø, consonant + a, or consonant + e. Koneski (1976) outlines the following diminutive suffixes in Macedonian noting their respective genders:

Table 1. Gender of Diminutive Suffixes (after Koneski (1976))

Suffix	Gender		
	M	F	N
–ец	x		
–ок, –чок	x		
–ка		x	
–ица		x	
–ичка (–ица + –ка)		x	
–ченце (–че + –енце)			x
–це			x
–е			x
–че			x
–ле			x
–енце			x
–уле			x

Table 1 introduces the Macedonian diminutive suffixes, but in discussing the characteristics of these suffixes, the table does not go beyond noting their gender. Even just looking at the variable of gender in connection with diminutivization, there are various cognitive processes that can be identified and cognitive categories that can be noted.

Various diminutive suffixes can be added to nouns of all three genders. Since the suffixes are themselves marked for distinctive genders, the gender of the diminutivized noun can be different from the gender of the non-diminutivized noun.

Some diminutive suffixes can be added exclusively to masculine nouns. These are –ец and –ок/–чок both of which yield masculine nouns.

Other diminutive suffixes can be added exclusively to feminine nouns. These are –ка, –ица, and –ичка, all of which yield feminine nouns. Koneski (1976) notes that –ичка is a blend of –ица and –ка, but that –ичка is more often used than –ица and –ка, and therefore delimits their scope. While complex (stacked) suffixes increase the level of emotionality associated with a particular noun, the suffix –ичка does not. Therefore, Koneski does not consider –ичка as created by stacking, but by blending.² Another reason for this classification is revealed below in the discussion of stackable suffixes.

There is only one diminutive suffix that can be added exclusively to neuter nouns, and that is –це, for non-diminutivized nouns suffix in –о. This suffix does not change the gender of the noun.

Four diminutive suffixes can be added to masculine or feminine nouns only, and these are –ченце, –е, –че, and –ле, all yielding neuter diminutivized nouns. In contrast to –ичка, the suffix –ченце was created by stacking the suffixes –че and –енце, and therefore denotes a greater level of emotionality than either –че or –енце.

There are no diminutive suffixes that can be added to masculine and neuter nouns to the exclusion of feminine nouns. Likewise, there are no diminutive suffixes that can be added to feminine and neuter nouns to the exclusion of masculine nouns. This skewed

² Williams (1996:53-54) treats the suffix –ичка in Bulgarian as a diminutive of a second-degree found in free variation with the first-degree diminutive –ица, and shows that speakers' evaluations of the emotiveness of the first and second-degree diminutives with these two suffixes are varied.

distribution suggests that at least for the purposes of diminutive formation, the masculine and feminine nouns form a coherent conceptual category separate from the neuter nouns. Additionally, transformation from non-diminutivity to diminutivity can have one of two consequences: either there is no change in gender or there is a change to neuter. Convergence to neuter is more prevalent, since the suffixes that are universal for all three genders (–енце and –уле) also always yield neuter nouns.

These conclusions are illustrated in table 2.

Table 2. Change in Noun Gender Due to Diminutivization

Masculine nouns can take the following diminutive suffixes:	Gender of Resulting Diminutive		
	M	F	N
–ец	x		
–ок, –чок	x		
–ченце (–че + –енце)			x
–е			x
–че			x
–ле			x
–енце			x
–уле			x
Feminine nouns can take the following diminutive suffixes:	M	F	N
–ка		x	
–ица		x	
–ичка (–ица + –ка)		x	
–ченце (–че + –енце)			x
–е			x
–че			x
–ле			x
–енце			x
–уле			x
Neuter nouns can take the following diminutive suffixes:	M	F	N
–це			x
–енце			x
–уле			x
Note: when change in noun gender occurs, it is always in the direction of neuter.			

As mentioned above, at times one diminutive suffix can be affixed to another. According to Koneski (1976), this practice produces emphasis on the emotive characteristics of the diminutive. I term the process of adding a diminutive suffix to an already diminutivized noun “stacking” (Koneski’s *prirastuvanje*). The diminutive suffixes that are added on are “stackable”, and those that permit stacking onto them are “base suffixes”.³ In Macedonian, all the diminutive suffixes are base suffixes, but only –енце and –уле are also stackable. These suffixes are the same two suffixes which can be affixed to nouns of any gender yielding a neuter diminutivized noun. There are two questions that arise from this discovery:

1. *What role does the convergence to neuter gender play in the expression of emotiveness?*
2. *Do the stackable suffixes appear after any and all base suffixes or are there some that do not allow stackable suffixes to be attached to them?*

I believe the corpus- and survey-based research I have proposed will shed light on these questions. The first question can be answered through a comparison of emotiveness expressed with neuter versus non-neuter diminutivized nouns both in the corpus and in the sentences which the native speakers will be asked to compose in one of the surveys outlined in section 1.3. The second question can be answered primarily through investigating the types of stacked diminutives in the corpus.

³ Volek (1988: 416, 419) terms diminutives that have two diminutive suffixes “diminutives of a second degree”, but she has no terminology for the suffixes that allow a second suffix to be added on, nor for suffixes that are added on to create diminutives of a second degree, nor for the process of suffixation resulting in such diminutives. Williams (1996:8) also follows Volek’s classification.

1.4.2. Diminutive Formation

For the most part, I will leave the formation of diminutives out of this preliminary survey, because the processes in connection with diminutive formation are not as idiosyncratic as other aspects of diminutivity in Macedonian. I will note here only that the more in-depth look at diminutive formation in the dissertation will examine two processes that play a role in diminutive formation: retrograde assimilation and dissimilation. Both processes are prevalent with the suffix *-че*, but while retrograde assimilation (devoicing of the final consonant of the noun when the diminutive suffix begins with a voiceless consonant) is a phenomenon common for nearly all Slavic languages, dissimilation with *-че* (g, s, z, š, ž, st, sk, šk, zd → v/_če) is “peculiar to Macedonian” (Friedman 2002: 14).

A more interesting subtopic of diminutive formation in Macedonian involves nouns that cannot be diminutivized. There are several categories of this type of nouns, such as:

1. Deverbal nouns, which in Macedonian are constructed with the *-ње* suffix:

јадење ‘food’; *прашање* ‘question’

2. Nouns expressing feelings:

љубов ‘love’; *љубомора* ‘jealousy’; *омраза* ‘hate’; *завист* ‘envy’

3. Certain categories concerning measurements of time:

- a. Hours as units of time (note that ‘minute’ and ‘second’ can be diminutivized)

- b. Times of day:

мугра ‘dawn’; *утро* ‘morning’; *ден* ‘day’; *вечер* ‘evening’; *ноќ* ‘night’

- c. Days of week (including the noun *недела* ‘week’ or ‘Sunday’)

- d. Months (including the noun *месец* ‘month’)

e. Seasons:

пролет ‘spring’; *лето* ‘summer’; *есен* ‘fall’; *зима* ‘winter’

f. Time periods greater than a year:

век ‘century’

It is interesting to note that units of time smaller than an hour, such as *минута* ‘minute’ or *секунда* ‘second’, and the noun *година* ‘year’, can be diminutivized. While the former can be explained due to the diminutives’ denotation of small size, the existence of the latter does not follow the same logic and has to be explained differently.

Another category that at least partially belongs with the ones above is the class of abstract nouns. Unlike in Russian, where an abundance of abstract diminutivized nouns is encountered (Volek 1988:415-416), in Macedonian most abstract nouns do not have diminutives. A notable exception is the noun *слобода* ‘freedom’, which has the diminutive *слободица* ‘sweet freedom’.

In my preliminary research, I encountered several nouns which did not fit in any of the categories above but have no diminutive counterparts; a few examples are *образец* ‘form’, *формулар* ‘form’, *документ* ‘document’, *записник* ‘police report’, *тужба* ‘complaint’, *резолуција* ‘resolution’, and others. Although these terms have to do with administration and politics, putting them in such a broad category would not be representative of reality, as there are other words used in administration and politics which can form diminutives; for example *закон* ‘law’. Further research will certainly reveal other classes of words which also do not form diminutives.

The brief survey presented in section 1.4. paints a very general picture of what Macedonian suffixes are considered diminutive, what some of their characteristics are,

and what issues arise when discussing diminutive formation. This survey only begins to illustrate the significance of the opportunities for research in the area of Macedonian diminutivity. Since these questions have received the most attention in the scholarship on Macedonian, it is reasonable to expect that even larger problems will arise in the quest for answering what diminutives mean; when, where, and why they are used; and by whom.

1.5. Conclusions

In this proposal I have outlined the five main questions that I will attempt to answer in the dissertation. I will pursue the answers from both theoretical and practical perspectives and rely on previous scholarship on diminutivity in other languages as a basis for constructing a theory of diminutivity in Macedonian. Through original research, I will further confirm and/or disprove the predictions of the theoretical approaches to diminutivity, and conclude with final observations regarding the five issues relevant to this research: characteristics of diminutive morphology and suffixation; diminutive formation; semantics; pragmatics; and sociolinguistics.

The value of this research lies in the creation of an empirically supported framework for describing the behavior of diminutive suffixes in Macedonian. This framework can, in turn, provide a basis for further comparative studies of diminutivization in other languages. The significance of the research and the dissertation, however, is not limited to the area of theoretical linguistics. Rather, examining the process of diminutivization and the usage of diminutives will also facilitate the inclusion of this topic in textbooks for teaching Macedonian and other diminutive-rich languages.

2. Proposed Outline of Dissertation

Preface

- why I was interested in Macedonian diminutives
- importance of diminutives in Macedonian language study
- what I hope to achieve with this survey
- thanks

Introduction

1. Purpose – comprehensive and authoritative resource for the study of Macedonian diminutives; questions answered:

- Who are the suffixes?
- How are they attached onto words, i.e. how are diminutives formed?
- What do they mean? Jurafsky (Lakoff and Johnson), Wierzbicka, Andrews, Volek
 - Small
 - Endearing
- Why do we use them?
- When/How do we use them?
- What are the characteristics of diminutives?
 - Koneski and Street/Giles: suffixes, higher pitch, (gestures?)

2. Primary focus is on nouns, with adjectives and others glossed over – why so?

3. Methodology:

- Problems:
 - lack of material on Macedonian diminutives

- Solutions:

- Overview of what is available and valuable
- Methods of collection of data
- Corpora
 - Part II of Lunt's grammar
 - Mitrevski
 - Internet (<http://www.maturanti.com>, for example)

4. Situating Macedonian diminutives within Slavic studies of diminutives?

5. Approach: surveying theory for its predictions and comparing them with practical results from research on Macedonian diminutives

Part 1: Diminutives in Theory

1. Phonology and Morphology

- adjectival suffixes from Russian article?

2. Diminutive suffixes as inflectional or derivational devices?

- Macedonian contributions to enlightening this question?
 - Inflection vs. derivation in Macedonian, attrition of analytic devices and favoring of synthetic devices for inflection, and yet diminutives are analytic, perhaps this shows that diminutives remain analytic due to focus on or at least influence of perception of them as derivative devices?
- Other Slavic languages
 - Can't shed a light here because rich in both inflection and derivation?
 - What about Bulgarian?

- Other languages rich in one and not in other?
 - Can't shed a light here because perhaps not as rich in diminutives? Why not rich in diminutives? Can we suppose historical attrition or perhaps never there in the first place? Think more about this.

3. Semantics

- cognitive aspects (Jurafsky (Lakoff and Johnson), Wierzbicka)
- Andrews
- Volek

4. Pragmatics and sociolinguistics

- child acquisition (Olmstead and Kempe/Brooks)
- communication accommodation theory (Roloff/Berger)
- apologetic strategy (Stefanovski)
- Russian article on diminutive usage

5. Conclusions

- what to expect in practice
 - Choice of words/suffixes for diminutives
 - CDS; gender and age as social factors for diminutive usage
 - Scripted/non-scripted situational use; social status as factor in diminutive usage (eg. apologetic strategy predications)

Part 2: Diminutives in Practice

1. Meet the Macedonian Diminutive Suffixes

- descriptions of each suffix a la Andrews (36-117)

- Noun
- Adjective
- Other
- differences between certain suffixes perceived or not? (Bulatetska – not in UKR)
- differences between diminutivized adjective + neutral noun and neutral adjective + diminutivized noun? (Bulatetska – not in UKR)

2. Tendencies of Macedonian Diminutives

- which words have diminutives, which ones do not and why?
- cognitive aspects?
- special issues if any with the changing gender of nouns as they take on diminutive suffixes
 - Ukrainian conclusions? (gender transformation of nouns as a strategy of reduction of the psychological distance between interlocutors)
 - simplification - relating back to CDS and Olmstead, Kempe/Brooks
- when/where do diminutives occur in language (personal research?)
 - scripted vs. non-scripted situations (Masha Polinsky: Russian immigrants to America – all that's left is diminutives, no formal settings for non-diminutive usage)
 - orally vs. in writing
 - pragmatic/semantic conclusions based on results of survey(s)

3. Conclusions

- match and mismatch between conclusions of theory and practice
 - Choice of words/suffixes for diminutives

- CDS (Elissa Newport, “motherese”); gender and age as social factors for diminutive usage
- Scripted/non-scripted situational use; social status as factor in diminutive usage (eg. apologetic strategy predications)

Appendix 1: Data from survey(s)?

Appendix 2: Index of Macedonian diminutive suffixes (a la Andrews’ glossary 150-254)

3. Proposed Bibliography

Morphology/Word-Formation/Derivation

- Andrews, Edna. 1989. "Suffix –k-a/-ka in modern Russian." In *From Sign to Text: Semiotic View of Communication*, ed. Yishai Tobin, pp-pp. Philadelphia, NJ: J. Benjamins.
- _____. 1996. *The Semantics of Suffixation*. Munchen: LINCOM Europa.
- Bratus, B.V. 1969. *The Formation and Expressive Use of Diminutives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fentslova, Marie. 1985. Rol' znachenia iskhodnogo slova pri obrazovanii znachenia deminutiva, issledovannaia na materiale razgovornoj rechi ruskogo i cheshskogo iazykov. *Ceskoslovenska Rusistika* 30:5 (October), 221-227.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1993. "Macedonian." In *The Slavonic Languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett, 249-305. London: Routledge.
- _____. 2002. "Macedonian." *Languages of the World/Materials* 117. Munich, Germany: Lincom Europa.
- Gracia, Luisa and Lidia Turon. 2000. On Appreciative Suffixes. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica: An International Journal of Linguistics* 47:1-4, 231-47.
- Haas, Mary R. 1972. "The Expression of the Diminutive." In *Studies in Linguistics in Honor of G.L. Trager*, ed. M. E. Smith (Janua linguarum, Series maior 52). The Hague: Mouton, 148-152.
- Hraste, Mate. 1954. *Sufiksi za tvorbu deminutiva i augmentativa u cakavskim govorima srednje Dalmacije*. Zagreb, Croatia: Zbornik radova Filozofskog Fakulteta u Zagrebu, knjiga 2.
- Hristovski, Aleksandar. 1995. *Gramatika na Makedonskiot Jazik*. Skopje: Aleksandar Hristovski.
- Karaangova, Margarita. 1976. Sufiksi za emotsionalna otsenka sus spetsialna konsonantna karakteristika v beloruskiia i bulgarskiia ezik. *Sopostavitel'no Ezikoznanie/Sopostavitel'noe Jazykoznanie/Contrastive Linguistics* 1:5, 116-125.
- Klimas, Antanas. 1974. Studies on Word-formation in Lithuanian. *Lituanus* 20:3, (Fall), on website http://www.lituanus.org/1974/74_3_05.htm
- Kolomiets, K.T. 1988. Slovoobrazovatel'nye formy prilagatel'nykh s umenshitel'no-laskatel'nym znacheniem v slavianskikh iazykakh: Sovremennoe sostoianie i doistoricheskoe razvitie. *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk, Serii Literatury i Iazyka* 47:6 (November-December), 550-558.
- Koneski, Blaže. 1986. *Istorija na Makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje, Macedonia: Kultura.
- _____. 1976. *Gramatika na Makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje, Macedonia: Kultura.
- Kramer, Christina. 1999. *Macedonian for beginner and intermediate students*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lunt, Horace. 1952. *A Grammar of the Macedonian Language*. Skopje, Državno Knigoizdatelstvo na NR Makedonija.
- Markov, B. 1988. *Obrazuvanje na pridavkite vo Makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Ogledalo.
- Mladenova, Olga. 2001. Neuter Designations of Humans and Norms of Social Interaction in the Balkans. *Anthropological Linguistics* 43:1 (spring), 18-53.
- Munro, Pamela. 1988. "Diminutive Syntax." In *In Honor of Mary Haas*, ed. William

- Shipley. The Hague: Mouton, 539-555.
- Polterauer, Ilona. 1981. *Die Deminutiva in der moderner Russischen Schriftsprache*. Dissertationen der Univ. Salzburg. Vienna, 148.
- Stankiewicz, Edward. 1954. Expressive Derivation of Substantives in Contemporary Russian and Polish. *Word* 10:57-68.
- _____. 1961. Grammatical Neutralization in Slavic Expressive Forms. *Word* 17: 128-145.
- _____. 1962. The Interdependence of Paradigmatic and Derivational Patterns. *Word* 18: 1-22.
- _____. 1964a. Problems of Emotive Language. In *Approaches to Semiotics*, ed. T.A. Sebeok, *Janua Linguarum* 15: 239-264.
- _____. 1964b. Emotivniot jazik i negovata lingvistička interpretacija (translated by Aleksandar Cukeski), *Makedonski jazik* 15: 101-138.
- _____. 1986. *The Slavic Languages: Unity in Diversity*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stefanescu, Ioana. 1992. On Diminutive Suffixes. *Folia Linguistica: Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europae* 26:3-4, 339-356.
- Trommelen, Mieke. 1984. *The Syllable in Dutch: with special reference to diminutive formation*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.
- Usikova, R.P. 1985. *Makedonskii Jezik*. Skopje: Makedonska kniga.
- Vaseva, Ivanka. 1977. Narechiia s suffiksom sub'ektivnoi otsenki v ruskom i bolgarskom iazykhah. *Sopostavitelno Ezikoznanie/Sopostavitel'noe Jazykoznanie/Contrastive Linguistics* 2:6, 9-22.
- Vasil'kova, N. N. 1982. Vasha sliapochka na bolvanochke. *Russkaia Rech: Nauchno-Populiarnyi Zhurnal* 2 (Mar-Apr), 83-86.
- Weijer, Jeroen van de. 2002. "An Optimality Theoretical analysis of the Dutch Diminutive." *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2002*, Broekhuis, Hans and Paula Fikkert eds., 199-209.
- Williams, Mariana Stoyanova. 1996. *Diminutivity in Bulgarian: A Formal and Semantic Study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Dissertation.

Semantics

- Jurafsky, Daniel. 1996. Universal tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive. *Language: Journal of the Linguistic Society* 72:3, 533-578.
- Popoff-Bocker, E. 1973. A Semantic Approach to the Diminutive Suffixes in Russian. In *VII Miedzynarodowy Kongres Slawistow w Warszawie 1973*, 408-409. Warsaw: PAN.
- Vaseva, Ivanka. 1977. Narechiia s suffiksom sub'ektivnoi otsenki v ruskom i bolgarskom iazykhah. *Sopostavitelno Ezikoznanie/Sopostavitel'noe Jazykoznanie/Contrastive Linguistics* 2:6, 9-22.
- Volek, Bronislava. 1987. Emotive Signs in Language and Semantic Functioning of Derived Nouns in Russian. *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Eastern Europe* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Press 24.
- _____. 1988. "Semantic Properties of Noun Diminutives: Based on Czech and Russian Data." In *American Contributions to the 10th International Congress of Slavists*, ed. Alexander M. Schenker. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 415-421.

- Vorotnikov, Iu. L. 1988. Miloe i maloe. *Ruskii iazyk v shkole: metodicheskii zhurnal* 6 (Nov.-Dec.), 62-66.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1980. Translatability and Semantic Primitives: Diminutives. Chapter 2 of *Lingua Mentalis*. Australia: Academic Press, 53-59.
- _____. 1984. Diminutives and Depreciatives: Semantic Representation for Derivational Categories. *Quaderni di Semantica: Rivista internazionale di semantica teorica e applicata/An international journal of theoretical and*, 5:1(9) (June), 123-130.

Socio-linguistics/Pragmatics

- Bulatetska, Ludmila. 1996. "Linguistic Means of Expressing Distance between Interlocutors in Ukrainian."
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. and Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi 2001. "Morphopragmatics of diminutives and augmentatives: On the priority of pragmatics over semantics". In *Perspectives on Semantics, Pragmatics, and Discourse: A Festschrift for Ferenc Kiefer*, Kenesei, István and Robert M. Harnish (eds.), 43-58.
- Hentschel, Elke. 2003. "Serbian. The expression of gender in Serbian". In *Gender Across Languages: The linguistic representation of women and men*. Volume 3, Hellinger, Marlis and Hadumod Bußmann (eds.), 287-309.
- Giles, Howard et al. 1987. "Speech Accomodation Theory: The Next Decade and Beyond." In *Communication Yearbook 10*, ed. M. McLaughlin, 13-48. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1978. "How Does a Language Acquire Gender Markers?" In Joseph Greenberg, ed. *Universals of Human Language* vol. 3, 49-82.
- Perelmutter, Renee. 2001-2003. Glosses.net: Inflection vs. derivation, online at <http://www.glosses.net/archives/000201.php>
- Stefanovski, Ljupčo. 1997. The Apologetic Strategy in Macedonian. *Balkanistica* 10, 372-380.
- Street, Jr., Richard and Howard Giles. 1982. "Speech Accomodation Theory: A Social Cognitive Approach to Language and Speech Behavior." In *Social Cognition and Communication*, ed. Roloff and Berger, 193-226. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Šipka, Danko. "A Taxonomy of Cross-cultural Differences in Slavic Languages." <http://www.asu.edu/class/reesc/asugh/xcult.pdf>
- Trigo, Loren. 1991. Scales and Diminutivization. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 578-583.
- Worth, Dean S. 1987. "Formal and Aesthetic Functions of Diminutives in the Russian Lament." In *New Studies in Russian Language and Literature*, ed. Anna Lisa Crone, Catherine V. Chvany, 279-290. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Child Acquisition

- Dalakakis, J. 1997. "Developmental Language Impairment and Diminutive Formation in Greek." In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, I-II, ed. Elizabeth Hughes, 115-123. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.
- Ely, Richard. 1996. "Why Didn't You Talk to Your Mommy, Honey?" Parents' and

- Children's Talk about Talk. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29:1, 7-25.
- Frigo, L. and McDonald, J.L. 1998. Properties of Phonological Markers that Affect the Acquisition of Gender-like Subclasses. *Journal of Memory and Language* 39, 218-245.
- Garvey, C., and DenBebba, M. 1974. Effects of age, sex, and partner on children's dyadic speech. *Child Development* 45, 159-161.
- Gillis, Steven. 1998. *Studies in the Acquisition of Number and Diminutive Marking*. Wilrijk, Belgium: Universiteit Antwerpen.
- Helfrich, H. 1979. "Age markers in speech." In K. R. Scherer and H. Giles (Eds.), *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jakobson, R. 1968. *Child language, aphasia, and phonological universals*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kempe, Vera, and Brooks, Patricia J. 2001. The Role of Diminutives in the Acquisition of Russian Gender: Can Elements of Child-Directed Speech Aid in Learning Morphology? *Language Learning* 51:2 (June), 221-256.
- Kernan, Keith T. and B. G. Blount. 1966. The Acquisition of Spanish Grammar by Mexican Children. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 8:9 (December).
- Olmsted, Hugh. 1994. "Diminutive Morphology of Russian Children: A Simplified Subset of Nominal Declension in Language Acquisition." In *Alexander Lipson: In Memoriam*, preface by Charles E. Gribble, 165-209. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Welkowitz, J. et al. 1976. Conversational congruence as a criterion for socialization in children. *Child Development* 47, 269-272.

Other

- Crystal, D. 1975. *The English Tone of Voice: Studies in intonation, prosody, and paralinguistic*. London, St. Martin's.
- Hoenigswald, H. M. 1971. Diminutives and Tatpurasas: The IE Trend toward Endocentricity. *Journal of IE Studies* 5:2, 9-13.
- Kouwenberg, Silvia, and Darlene La Charite. 2001. "The Mysterious Case of diminutive yala-yala." In *Due Respect: Essays on English and English-Related Creoles in the Caribbean in honour of professor Robert Le Page*, ed. R.B. Le Page, Robert Brock, Pauline Christie, pp-pp. Barbados: University of the West Indies Press.