

YOUNG ANIMALS AND DIMINUTIVES IN BULGARIAN AND OTHER SLAVIC LANGUAGES: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY WITH EMPHASIS ON DERIVATIONAL PARADIGMS

Stela Manova, Renáta Gregová

University of Vienna, P. J. Šafárik University in Košice

Abstract. Based on well-known facts about paradigms in inflection, we postulate paradigms in word-formation. The focus is on derivational paradigms that are closely related to inflectional morphology. In Slavic languages, diminutives have their origin in the Proto-Slavic **nt*-stems, an inflection class that comprised the young of animals in Old Bulgarian, e.g. *tel-ę* ‘calf-nom.sg’ → *tel-ęte* ‘calf-gen/loc.sg’. Additionally, Иванова-Мирчева, Харалампиев/Ivanova-Mircheva, Haralampiev (1999) claimed that in colloquial Old Bulgarian all diminutives belonged to the *nt*-stems, i.e. *-ę* marked diminutivization. Starting from nouns for animals, we analyze three word-formation families: diminutives of animals, nouns for young animals and diminutives of young animals. We demonstrate that those forms, if seen as paradigmatically organized, allow for a number of interesting observations. Intriguingly, while Bulgarian merged the paradigms of young animals and diminutives, e.g. *slon-če* ‘young elephant & elephant-dim’, and *-če* turned into a productive diminutive suffix, the other Slavic languages developed different derivational paradigms that also relate to diminutivization in different ways.

Keywords: word-formation, paradigms, diminutives, young animals, Old Bulgarian *nt*-stems, contrastive analysis

1. Introduction

Paradigms play a major role in inflectional morphology and there is much research on the topic, even whole theories of morphology are built on the notion of paradigm, e.g. Paradigm Function Morphology (Stump 2001 and later work).

In recent years, researchers have tried to transfer the notion of paradigm from inflection to word formation (van Marle 1984, Becker 1993, Bauer 1997, Booij 1997, a.o.), the idea being to use the achievements of the research on inflectional morphology for explanation of derivational morphology (Bauer 1997, Blevins 2001, Stump 2005, Štekauer 2014, Boyé, Schalehli 2016, Bonami, Strnadová 2018).

The advocates of the paradigmatic approach follow the belief that the lexicon is structured in terms of sets of paradigmatic relations that link members of morphological families, for evidence from psycholinguistics, see Schreuder, Baayen (1997), de Jong et al. (2000), del Prado Martín et al. (2005), a.o.; the relevance of the same idea has also been demonstrated for computational linguistics, see Pirrelli, Federici (1994), Pirrelli, Yvon (1999), Cotterell et al. (2017). The theory of Construction Morphology (Booij 2010) relies on the idea of paradigmatic relations between morphological families, too.

With respect to paradigmatic analyses in inflection, of particular interest have been peculiar paradigms, such that involve e.g. syncretism or missing forms, i.e. gaps (cf. Baerman et al., eds. 2010, Sims 2015). The idea of paradigmatic gaps is thus taken in Stump (2018) and applied to derivational morphology, although the relevant term for derivational morphology seems to be ‘blocking’: “the nonoccurrence of one form due to the simple existence of another” (Aronoff 1976: 43). For a comprehensive bibliography of research on blocking, see Rainer (2014).

In inflectional morphology, the term paradigm has been used in two senses:

A) All inflectional forms of a word or lexeme (depending on the theoretical framework; compare e.g. two recent books published by OUP: Blevins (2018) *Word and Paradigm Morphology* versus Spencer (2013) *Lexical Relatedness: a Paradigm-based Model*). (1) illustrates this use of the term paradigm with the Bulgarian noun *kniga* ‘book’:

(1) SG *knig-a* ‘book’, PL *knig-i*, SG DEF *knig-a-ta*, PL DEF *knig-i-te*

B) An inflection class, that is, all lexemes with the same inflection, as in the following example:

(2) *knig-a* ‘book’, *knig-i*, *knig-a-ta*, *knig-i-te*
sten-a ‘wall’, *sten-i*, *sten-a-ta*, *sten-i-te*

In other words, *kniga* and *stena* belong to the same inflection class in Bulgarian.

In this paper, we analyze derivational paradigms similar to inflection classes and focus on the following derivational families:

- i. Diminutives of animals
- ii. Nouns for young animals
- iii. Diminutives of young animals.

The goals of the present study are threefold:

- to examine closely related derivational paradigms, some of which have their origin in inflection (Manova 2005). As already mentioned above, we focus on nouns for young animals (an inflection class, the so-called *nt*-stems in Old Bulgarian); diminutive of animals; and diminutives of young animals;
- to contribute to the better understanding of the nature of derivational paradigms;
- to show that a contrastive analysis of closely genealogically related languages is worth pursuing.

This paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we introduce the data and the method. The next three sections are devoted to Bulgarian (section 3), Russian (section 4) and Czech and Slovak (section 5). In section 6, we explain the three psycholinguistic experiments we carried out with 60 native speakers of Slovak. In section 7, conclusions are drawn.

2. Data and method

Our data come from the following Slavic languages that cover all three subgroups of the Slavic family: Bulgarian (South Slavic), Russian (East Slavic), and Czech and Slovak (West Slavic).

We collected 50 nouns for animals from each language as well as the respective nouns for diminutives of animals, young animals and diminutives of young animals. The 50 nouns for animals were distributed into the following semantic groups: 1) domestic animals, 2) wild animals, 3) exotic animals, 4) birds, and 5) insects. To make the data comparable and easily analyzable, we ordered all examples in all languages paradigmatically (word-formation paradigms).

3. Bulgarian

As can be seen from Table 1, for the majority of the nouns denoting animals, Bulgarian does not make a distinction between diminutives and young animals (Manova 2011), i.e. there is a single derivational paradigm for both diminutive nouns and young animals. Most domestic young animals are actually inflectional diminutives, as e.g. *zaek* ‘rabbit’ → young animal / DIM1¹ *zajč-e* (-e is an inflectional suffix), while young exotic animals are diminutives proper, e.g. *slon* ‘elephant’ → young animal / DIM1 *slon-če*. In other words, young animals and diminutives of animals often share the same form in Bulgarian, which is similar to syncretism in inflectional morphology. Depending on the starting point of the analysis, diminutives proper can also be seen as double diminutives: young animal / DIM1 *slon-če* → DIM1 / DIM2² *slon-č-ence*. There is a single uniform pattern for derivation of diminutives from young animals – by the suffix -ence, see Table 1. Finally, there are no gaps in the paradigms which is maybe due to the extensive syncretism, i.e. forms replace each other and there is thus no space for gaps.

Table 1: Young animals and diminutives in Bulgarian (sample)

No	English translation	Animal	DIM	Young animal	DIM of young animal
1.	sheep	<i>ovca</i>	<i>ovč-ica</i>	<i>agn-e</i>	<i>agăn-ce</i>
2.	goat	<i>koza</i>	<i>koz-ica</i> / <i>koz-le</i>	<i>koz-le</i>	<i>kozl-ence</i>
3.	cow	<i>krava</i>	<i>krav-ica</i> / <i>krav-ička</i>	<i>tel-e</i>	<i>tel-ence</i>
4.	hen	<i>kokoška</i>	<i>kokošč-ica</i>	<i>pil-e</i>	<i>pil-ence</i>
5.	duck	<i>patka</i>	<i>pat-e</i>	<i>pat-e</i>	<i>pat-ence</i>
6.	rabbit	<i>zaek</i>	<i>zajč-e</i>	<i>zajč-e</i>	<i>zajč-ence</i>
7.	horse	<i>kon</i>	<i>kon-če</i>	<i>kon-če</i>	<i>konč-ence</i>
8.	donkey	<i>magare</i>	<i>magar-ence</i>	<i>magar-ence</i>	<i>magar-enc-ence</i>
9.	goose	<i>gāska</i>	<i>gāsč-ica</i>	<i>gās-e</i>	<i>gās-ence</i>
10.	turkey	<i>pujka</i>	<i>pujč-ica</i>	<i>pujč-e</i>	<i>pujč-ence</i>

¹ DIM1 – first-grade diminutive or diminutive proper.

² DIM2 – second-grade or double diminutive.

4. Russian³

Russian keeps young animals and diminutives of animals apart and both groups of nouns follow different derivational patterns, see Table 2.

There is only one suffix (*-onok* / *-ěnok*) for derivation of young animals.

Table 2: Young animals and diminutives in Russian (sample)

No	English translation	Animal	DIM	Young of animal	DIM of young animal
1.	sheep	<i>ovca</i>	<i>ov-ečka</i>	<i>jagn-ěnok</i>	<i>jagněnoč-ek</i>
2.	goat	<i>koza</i>	<i>koz-očka</i>	<i>kozl-ěnok</i>	<i>kozlěnoč-ek</i>
3.	cow	<i>korova</i>	<i>korov-ka</i>	<i>tel-ěnok</i>	<i>telěnoč-ek</i>
4.	hen	<i>kurica</i>	<i>kuroč-ka</i>	<i>cypl-ěnok</i>	<i>cyplěnoč-ek</i>
5.	duck	<i>utka</i>	<i>utoč-ka</i>	<i>ut-ěnok</i>	<i>utěnoč-ek</i>
6.	rabbit	<i>zajac</i>	<i>zajč-ik</i>	<i>zajč-onok</i>	<i>zajčonoč-ek</i>
7.	horse	<i>lošad'</i>	<i>lošad-ka</i>	<i>žereb-ěnok</i>	<i>žereběnoč-ek</i>
8.	donkey	<i>osěl</i>	<i>osl-ik</i>	<i>osl-ěnok</i>	<i>oslěnoč-ek</i>
9.	goose	<i>gus'</i>	<i>gus-ěk</i>	<i>gus-ěnok</i>	<i>gusěnoč-ek</i>
10.	turkey	<i>indejka</i>	<i>indjuš-ka</i>	<i>indjuš-onok</i>	<i>indjušonoč-ek</i>

Importantly, *-onok* / *-ěnok* can also be used for derivation of diminutives (or nouns with meanings similar to diminutives) that do not have anything to do with animals, e.g.: *čertěnok* 'imp' from *čert* 'devil', *povarěnok*, colloq. style for 'a boy assisting a cook', derived from *povar* 'cook' (Шведова/Švedova 1980: 201). The different suffixes for derivation of diminutives of animals are phonologically determined, i.e. the selection of the suffix (primarily) depends on the termination of the base noun. There are more gaps in the paradigm of diminutives, see (3) and (4) below than in that of young animals (5), which can be explained by the fact that young animals are closer to inflection than diminutives.

- (3) Nouns for animals that cannot be diminutivized:
lev 'lion' (**lvik* is hard to pronounce)
soroka 'magpie' (the expected form *soročka* means 'shirt')
- (4) Rather potential than actual diminutives:
olen 'deer' → ?*olen-čik*
lastočka 'swallow' → ?*lastočeč-ka*
aist 'stork' → ?*aist-ik*
vorona 'crow' → ???*voronoč-ka*

³ We would like to thank Dmitri Sitchinava for his help with the Russian data.

- (5) Problematic (but attested in older texts) nouns for young animals:

obez'jan-ěnok (from *obez'jana* 'monkey')

vš-onok (from *voš'* 'louse')

5. Czech and Slovak

The formation of the nouns for young animals in Czech and Slovak is quite systematic. As illustrated in Table 3 below, the suffixes *-e/-ě* and *-če* derive young animals in Czech, see also Fuková (1984) and Černá (2016). Slovak uses the suffixes *-a/-ä* and *-ča*, see Table 4 below, as well as Buffa (1973), among others; for the derivation of the diminutives, see Gregová (2015).

Table 3: Young animals and diminutives in Czech (sample)

No	English translation	Animal	DIM	Young of animal	DIM of young animal
1.	sheep	<i>ovce</i>	<i>oveč-ka</i>	<i>jehn-ě</i>	<i>jehň-átko</i>
2.	goat	<i>koza</i>	<i>koz-ička</i>	<i>kůzl-e</i>	<i>kůzl-atko/ kozl-átko</i>
3.	cow	<i>krava</i>	<i>krav-ička</i>	<i>tel-e</i>	<i>tel-átko</i>
4.	hen	<i>slepice/kůr</i>	<i>slepič-ka</i>	<i>kuř-e</i>	<i>kuř-átko</i>
5.	duck	<i>kachna</i>	<i>kachn-ička</i>	<i>kachn-ě</i>	<i>kachň-átko</i>
6.	rabbit	<i>králik</i>	<i>králíč-ek</i>	<i>králíč-e</i>	<i>králíč-atko</i>
7.	horse	<i>kůň</i>	<i>kon-ík</i>	<i>hříbě</i>	<i>hříb-átko</i>
8.	donkey	<i>osel</i>	<i>osl-ík</i>	<i>osl-e</i>	<i>osl-átko</i>
9.	goose	<i>husa</i>	<i>hus-ička</i>	<i>hous-e</i>	<i>hous-átko</i>
10.	turkey	<i>krůta</i>	<i>krůt-ka</i>	<i>krůt-ě</i>	<i>krůť-atko</i>

As shown in tables 3 and 4, none of the nouns for young animals functions as a diminutive noun in Czech and Slovak but all young animals can be further diminutivized and each language exhibits a uniform pattern (Pavlovič 2012).

It should also be mentioned that there are a few instances of young animals derived by the suffix *-íče / -íča* in both languages, e.g. Czech *orel* 'eagle' → *orl-íče* and Slovak *orol* 'eagle' → *orl-íča*. The pattern is, however, considered unproductive. Thus, in both Czech and Slovak there are different paradigms for diminutives of animals and young animals.

Regarding paradigmatic gaps, like in Russian, gaps occur in diminutivization. For example, in Slovak *jazvec* 'badger' does not have a diminutive because *jazvečík* (formally *jazvec* + *-ík*) developed a different meaning and now indicates a dog used for the hunting of badgers and foxes (Králik 2015: 242). Another peculiar case represents *lastovička* 'swallow'. The form was originally a diminutive from *lastovica*. However, *lastovička* became lexicalized and is now used as a neutral noun (Králik 2015: 319).

Table 4: Young animals and diminutives in Slovak (sample)

No	English translation	Animal	DIM	Young animal	DIM of young animal
1.	sheep	<i>ovca</i>	<i>oveč-ka</i>	<i>jahň-a</i>	<i>jahn-iatko</i>
2.	goat	<i>koza</i>	<i>koz-ička</i>	<i>kozľ-a</i>	<i>kozľ-iatko</i>
3.	cow	<i>krava</i>	<i>krav-ička</i>	<i>tel'-a</i>	<i>tel-iatko</i>
4.	hen	<i>sľiepka/kura</i>	<i>sľiepoč-ka</i>	<i>kur-ča</i>	<i>kur-iatko</i>
5.	duck	<i>kačica/kačka</i>	<i>kač-ička</i>	<i>káč-a</i>	<i>kač-iatko</i>
6.	rabbit	<i>králik</i>	<i>králič-ek</i>	<i>králič-a</i>	<i>králič-iatko</i>
7.	horse	<i>kôň</i>	<i>kon-ík</i>	<i>žrieb-ä</i>	<i>žrieb-ätko</i>
8.	donkey	<i>osol</i>	<i>osl-ík</i>	<i>osl-iča</i>	<i>oslíč-atko</i>
9.	goose	<i>hus</i>	<i>hús-ka</i>	<i>hús-a</i>	<i>hús-atko</i>
10.	turkey	<i>morka</i>	<i>morč-ička</i>	<i>morč-a</i>	<i>morč-iatko</i>

6. Psycholinguistic experiments

To reveal the nature of the derivational paradigms, we designed three psycholinguistic experiments in which 60 participants divided into three groups (20 in each group) took part. All subjects were students from P. J. Šafárik University and were not paid for their participation. The first group of subjects was asked to write only the nouns for diminutives of animals. The second group was asked to write only the nouns for young animals. The third group was asked to write both forms. If participants did not know forms, they were told to skip the example and leave the space blank. Participants wrote only one derivation per stimulus. The following 15 nouns served as stimuli for the experiments: *elephant, lion, leopard, giraffe, hippo, crocodile, tiger, bison, cheetah, rhinoceros, ostrich, koala, panda, cockatoo, kangaroo*.

Native speakers were more confident when only a single form had to be produced, i.e. a lesser number of paradigmatic gaps in the production of either young animals or diminutives. When both forms had to be written, more alternative forms were produced for young animals (i.e. the majority of the nouns were formed with the derivational suffix *-iča*, but inflectional forms with *-a* popped up as well).

Young animals

Task 1: Write a single form – 3 instances of forms with *-a* (out of 15 stimuli), all other forms were derived by the suffix *-iča*.

Task 2: Write both forms – 6 instances of forms with *-a* (out of 15 stimuli), all other forms were with *-iča*.

Diminutives (there are alternative patterns for derivation of diminutives in Slovak, thus alternative forms were expected):

Task 1: Write one form – 4 instances of alternative forms (out of 15 stimuli); alternative forms are forms that are not listed in Table 4, e.g. *krokodílko* instead of the paradigmatically correct form *krokodílik* (derived from *krokodíl* ‘crocodile’; in Slovak, masculine nouns terminating in *-C* get the diminutive suffix *-ík/-ik/-ek*).

Task 2: Write both forms – only 2 instances of alternative forms (out of 15 stimuli).

Although there are different suffixes for derivation of diminutives and only one pattern for derivation of young animals, the paradigm of young animals seems to be less robust than that of diminutives. There was also a suffix transfer from diminutives to young animals but not vice versa, e.g. for some speakers the diminutive *koal-ka* derived from *koala* also means ‘young koala’ (3 participants replied that way). This transfer is opposite to what we observed in Bulgarian and Russian where the forms developed from young animals to diminutives.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, we investigated three derivational families (diminutives of animals, young animals and diminutives of young animals) in terms of word-formational paradigms with data from Bulgarian, Russian, Czech and Slovak. The paradigms of young animals and diminutives from animals are closely related but that relation is different in the different languages. In Bulgarian, suffixes that derive young animals began to be used as diminutivizers, which led to a collapse of the differentiation between the two paradigms and to numerous syncretic forms. Thus there are no gaps in the paradigms in Bulgarian. Russian keeps the two patterns strictly separate, but it is possible to use the suffix *-onok/-ėnok* for derivation of diminutives (or nouns similar to diminutives) from nouns which do not mean animals and there are more gaps in the paradigm that derives the diminutive nouns, i.e. like in Bulgarian, young animals seem to be the dominant paradigm. In Czech and Slovak, the two paradigms differ and one cannot use the suffixes for derivation of young animals as diminutivizers. Three psycholinguistics experiments with native speakers of Slovak showed that the paradigm for derivation of young animals in Slovak is less robust than that for derivation of diminutives. In Slovak, the suffix transfer seems to be from diminutives to young animals, which is thus entirely in contrast to what was observed in Bulgarian and Russian.

In Slavic languages, especially in the paradigms that we examined, derivation and inflection intertwine diachronically (young animals constitute an inflection class) and synchronically (when native speakers have doubts about a derivational form, they tend to replace it with an inflectional one, e.g. in Slovak: *slôň-a* ‘baby elephant’, *leopard-a* ‘baby leopard’, etc. instead of *slon-íča*, *leopard-íča*).

Against any expectation, closely genealogically related languages took completely different paths in the development of their derivational paradigms for young animals and diminutives.

Derivational paradigms do exist but their nature seems to be more complex than that of inflectional paradigms. Depending on the task (i.e. in different situations), one and the same derivational paradigm in the same language seems to be processed differently by native speakers, which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been observed for paradigms in inflection.

References

- Иванова-Мирчева, Харалампиев 1999:** Иванова-Мирчева, Д., И. Харалампиев. *История на българския книжовен език*. Велико Търново: Фабер. (Ivanova-Mircheva, D., I. Haralampiev. *Istoria na balgarskia knizhoven ezik*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber.)
- Шведова 1980:** Шведова, Н. Ю. *Русская грамматика. Том 1. Фонетика, Фонология, Ударение, Интонация, Словообразование, Морфология*. Москва: Наука. (Shvedova, N. Ju. *Russkaja grammatika. Tom 1. Fonetika, Fonologija, Udarenie, Intonacija, Slovoobrazovanie, Morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.)
- Aronoff 1976:** Aronoff, M. *Word formation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Baerman et al., eds. 2010:** Baerman, M., G. G. Corbett, D. Brown (eds.) *Defective paradigms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bauer 1997:** Bauer, L. Derivational paradigms. – In: G. Booij, J. van Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of morphology 1996*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 243–256.
- Becker 1993:** Becker, T. Back-formation, cross-formation, and ‘bracketing paradoxes’ in paradigmatic morphology. – In: G. Booij, J. van Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of morphology 1993*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1–25.
- Blevins 2001:** Blevins, J. P. Paradigmatic derivation. – In: *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99(2), 211–222.
- Blevins 2016:** Blevins, J. P. *Word and paradigm morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonami, Strnadová 2018:** Bonami, O., Strnadová, J. Paradigm structure and predictability in derivational morphology. *Morphology* (2018) [30.11.2018] <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-018-9322-6>.
- Booij 1997:** Booij, G. Autonomous morphology and paradigmatic relations. – In: G. Booij, J. van Marle (eds.) *Yearbook of morphology 1996*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 35–53.
- Booij 2010:** Booij, G. *Construction morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boyé, Schalchli 2016:** Boyé, G., G. Schalchli. The status of paradigms. – In: A. Hippisley, G. Stump (eds.) *The Cambridge handbook of morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 206–234.
- Buffa 1973:** Buffa, F. Formy plurálu typu húsence/húsata v slovenčine. – In: *Slovenská reč* 38 (3–4), 151–153.
- Cotterell et al. 2017:** Cotterell, R., E. Vylomova, H. Khayrallah, C. Kirov, D. Yarowsky. Paradigm completion for derivational morphology. [30.11.2018] arXiv:170809151.
- Černá 2016:** Černá, A. Hroše, myše, fretče... aneb O mlád'atech. – In: *Živa* 2 (XXXIV).
- Fuková 1984:** Fuková, N. Jména mlád'at. – In: *Naše řeč* 67(3), 167–168.
- Gregová 2015:** Gregová, R. Slovak. – In: N. Grandi and L. Kortvelyessy (eds.) *Edinburgh Handbook of Evaluative Morphology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 296–305.
- de Jong et al. 2000:** de Jong N. H., R. Schreuder, R. H. Baayen. The morphological family size effect and morphology. – In: *Language and cognitive processes* 15(4–5), 329–365.
- Králik 2015:** Králik, Ľ. *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*. Bratislava: VEDA.
- Manova 2005:** Manova, S. Derivation versus inflection in three inflecting languages. – In: W. U. Dressler, D. Kastovsky, O. Pfeiffer, F. Rainer (eds.) *Morphology and its Demarcations. Selected Papers from the 11th International Morphology Meeting, Vienna, February 2004*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 233–252.
- Manova 2011:** Manova, S. *Understanding morphological rules*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- van Marle 1984:** van Marle, J. *On the paradigmatic dimension of morphological creativity*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Pavlovič 2012:** Pavlovič, J. *Lexikológia slovenského jazyka. Kompendium náuky o slovnej zásobe*. Trnava: Pedagogická fakulta Trnavskej university.
- Pirrelli, Federici 1994:** Pirrelli, V., S. Federici. Derivational paradigms in morphonology. – In: *Proceedings of the 15th conference on computational linguistics*, 234–240.
- Pirrelli, Yvon 1999:** Pirrelli, V., F. Yvon. The hidden dimension: a paradigmatic view of data-driven NLP. – In: *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence*, 11(3), 391–408.
- del Prado Martín et al. 2005:** del Prado Martín F. M., A. Deutsch, R. Frost, R. Schreuder, N. H. D. Jong, R. H. Baayen. Changing places: a cross-language perspective on frequency and family size in Dutch and Hebrew. – In: *Journal of Memory and Language* 53(4), 496–512.
- Rainer 2014:** Rainer, F. Blocking. – In: *Oxford Bibliographies in Linguistics*. [30.11.2018] <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199772810/obo-9780199772810-0185.xml#firstMatch>.
- Schreuder, Baayen 1997:** Schreuder, R., R. H. Baayen. How complex simple words can be. – In: *Journal of Memory and Language* 37, 118–139.
- Sims 2015:** Sims, A. *Inflectional defectiveness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spencer 2013:** Spencer, A. *Lexical relatedness: A paradigm-based model*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stump 2001:** Stump, G. T. *Inflectional morphology. A theory of paradigm structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stump 2018:** Stump, G. T. Some sources of apparent gaps in derivational paradigms. – In: *Morphology* (2018) [30.11.2018] <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-018-9329-z>.
- Štekauer 2014.** Štekauer, P. Derivational paradigms. – In: R. Lieber, P. Štekauer (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 354–369
- Vužňáková 2009:** Vužňáková, K. Slovtvorné kategórie a postupy v malom slovtvornom slovníku slovenčiny na pozadí detskej reči. – In: *Čeština - jazyk slovanský 3: sborník příspěvků z webové konference s mezinárodní účastí konané 15.2. - 30.4.2009*. Ostrava: Pedagogická fakulta Ostravské univerzity v Ostravě, 177–192.

Stela Manova
Middle European Interdisciplinary Master Program in Cognitive Science
Department of Philosophy
University of Vienna
Universitätsstraße 7
A-1010 Vienna
Austria
stela.manova@univie.ac.at

Renáta Gregová
Department of British and American Studies
Faculty of Arts
P. J. Šafárik University
Moyzesova 9
040 01 Košice
Slovakia
renata.gregova@upjs.sk