

That Poor Little Thing: The Emotive Meanings of Diminutives in Polish and Russian
Translations of *Alice in Wonderland*

by

Dorothy Lockyer
BA, University of Victoria, 2010

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies

© Dorothy Lockyer, 2013
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

That Poor Little Thing: The Emotive Meanings of Diminutives in Polish and Russian
Translations of *Alice in Wonderland*

by

Dorothy Lockyer
BA, University of Victoria, 2010

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Julia Rochtchina, Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies
Co-Supervisor

Dr. Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Department of Linguistics
Co-Supervisor

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Julia Rochtchina, Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies

Co-Supervisor

Dr. Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Department of Linguistics

Co-Supervisor

The emotive connotations of diminutives in English are a source of controversy among scholars, while the Slavic languages of Polish and Russian are considered ‘diminutive-rich’ with diminutives that convey diverse nuances. Thus, the translation of diminutives between English and Slavic languages has either been portrayed as difficult or has been ignored altogether. However, an analysis of Carroll’s *Alice in Wonderland* and several of its translations into Polish and Russian shows that English has many diminutives, some of which are ‘untranslatable’, while many diminutives can be easily translated. Yet, the strong emphasis on diminutives in Polish and Russian produces diminutives in the translations that do not appear in the original text and are not typical of English. What becomes evident is that the obstacles in translating various diminutive constructions provoke the question: What are the semantic-pragmatic differences between English and Polish/Russian diminutives and how do these differences affect translation?

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgments.....	viii
 Introduction.....	 1
 Chapter 1: Entering Wonderland	 4
1.1 Diminutives in English	4
1.2 Examples of Diminutives in Children’s Literature.....	14
1.2.1 Names	16
1.2.2 Object Nouns	26
1.2.3 <i>Poor little X</i> constructions	32
1.3 Lewis Carroll and Diminutives in <i>Alice in Wonderland</i>	34
1.4 Summary	45
 Chapter 2: Introducing <i>Kasia</i> and <i>Katyusha</i>	 47
2.1 Creating Russian Diminutives: Introducing Vanya, Kolya and Sasha	48
2.1.1 Object Diminutives	53
2.1.2 Names and Formal Titles	59
2.2 Polish Diminutives: Creating Kasia, Wasia and Basia	62
2.2.1 Names and Terms of Endearment.....	64
2.2.2 Adjectives and Adverbs	66
2.2.3 Object Diminutives	67
2.2.4 <i>Biedactwo</i> constructions	72
2.3 Summary of Polish and Russian Diminutives	75
 Chapter 3: Theoretical and Methodological Framework for Translation	 78

3.1	Translation Studies.....	79
3.2	The Difficulties and Strategies of Translating Diminutives	81
3.3	The Loss and Addition of Diminutives in Translation	86
3.4	Description of the Translations & Translators.....	88
3.5.	The Database, Distribution and the Usage of Diminutives in the Source Text	91
3.6	The Case Studies.....	94
Chapter 4: The Case Study: Polish Translations.....		97
4.1	Names and Terms of Endearment.....	97
4.2	Object Nouns	104
4.2.1	<i>Very small X</i> and <i>tiny X</i> constructions	116
4.2.2	Diminutive Constructions with Preceding Adjectives.....	120
4.2.3	Added Diminutives	129
4.3	Event and Verbal Nouns	133
4.4	<i>Poor little X</i> constructions	139
Chapter 5: Case Study: Russian Translations		147
5.1	Names and Terms of Endearment.....	147
5.2	Object Nouns	155
5.2.1	<i>Very small</i> and <i>tiny X</i> constructions	163
5.2.2	<i>Little X</i> constructions.....	166
5.2.3	<i>Little X</i> constructions with Preceding Adjectives	169
5.2.4	<i>Such a tiny little thing</i> construction	174
5.2.5	Added Diminutives	175
5.3	Event and Verbal Nouns	177
5.4	<i>Poor little X</i> constructions	183
Conclusion		189
Bibliography		192

Appendix.....	200
Appendix A Diminutive affixes in Polish and Russian.	200
Appendix A1 Polish Diminutive Affixes.....	200
Appendix A2 Russian Diminutive Affixes.	201
Appendix B Translations of Diminutives	202
Appendix B1 Translations of all Diminutives without Context (POLISH).....	202
Appendix B2 Translations of all Diminutives without Context (RUSSIAN).....	206
Appendix C Added Diminutives.....	213

List of Tables

Table 1: Relationship between Polish and Russian	77
Table 2: Polish Translations of Names and Terms of Endearment	97
Table 3: Comparison of Polish Translations of <i>Little Passage</i> and <i>Small Passage</i>	114
Table 4: Russian Translations of Names and Terms of Endearment.....	147

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those involved in the completion of this thesis. Especially I would like to thank my co-supervisors, Dr. Julia Rochtchina and Dr. Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, for their insightful comments, guidance and encouragement in the preparation of this thesis. I consider myself to be very blessed for the opportunity to work with both of my co-supervisors for the past two years. In addition, I would like to thank my external examiner, Dr. John Dingley. Last, I would like to thank the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies, both faculty and fellow graduate students.

My overwhelming appreciation also goes to my parents, Katarzyna and Frank Lockyer, for their unwavering support, encouragement and patient ear. Finally, and most importantly, I would like to acknowledge and thank God for being my strength and guide in the writing of this thesis. This thesis certainly never would have come to completion without His grace and mercy.

Introduction

Diminutives are an important means of expressing attitudes and emotions in both Germanic and Slavic languages; yet, few studies have examined their use in literature and their translation from English into Polish and Russian. A definition of diminutives is given by the *OED*: “Expressing diminution; denoting something little: usually applied to derivatives or affixes expressing something small of the kind denoted by the primitive word” (“Diminutive”, def.1). In addition to the diminutive affixes that are preferred in Polish and Russian, diminutives can also be created by analytic diminutive constructions containing analytic markers like *small* or *little*, as is preferred in English.

The Polish and Russian languages belong to the Slavic group of languages, specifically East Slavic (Russian) and West Slavic (Polish), which are considered to be diminutive-rich languages and cultures. Thus, diminutives in these Slavic languages have received much scholarly attention as two of the languages more frequently studied by scholars such as Wierzbicka (Schneider 2003:25). In contrast to Polish and Russian, the Germanic language of English has been considered ‘diminutive-poor’ and diminutives have been considered to be nearly non-existent in English (Bratus 1969; Taylor 2003; Kryk-Kastovsky 2000; Wierzbicka 2003). According to Wierzbicka, this lack of diminutives in English indicates that Anglo-Saxon culture does not encourage “unrestrained” linguistic demonstrations of affection, endearment and other emotions through the diminutivization of nouns and adjectives (Wierzbicka 51, 55). Schneider (2003), however, claims that English has more diminutives than is commonly acknowledged, writing that in addition to the *-y/-ie* diminutive suffix, English is an analytic language that uses adjectives such as *little* to convey smallness and emotion.

This thesis aims to show that the relevant question is not which language has more diminutives or which culture can show more emotion, but rather is the question of how the languages' individual diminutive systems differ descriptively in context, culture and the conceptualization of diminutives. Thus, when translating between these languages, an efficient translator needs good knowledge of the semantic and grammatical systems of the source and target languages. That is, the translator has to be aware of the various diminutive forms, constructions and meanings in both source and target languages and also be aware of other layers, including wordplay that could affect the meaning of the diminutives. These are surveyed in the first and second chapters through a review of relevant literature and an examination of 'native' children's literature in each respective language.

The case studies in this thesis deal with the expressive meaning of diminutives in literary translation, specifically in the translation of Carroll's book, *Alice in Wonderland* (1865), into Polish and Russian. This text was chosen because the protagonist is a young girl who meets many outlandish creatures and encounters new surroundings. In Polish and Russian, stories concerning children typically involve many diminutive forms to express the emotion and tenderness adults feel towards children. Likewise, puns and wordplay abound in the text, which in several instances affects the meaning of certain diminutives. The chapter examines a total of four complete and published translations, specifically the Polish translations by Kaniewska (2010) and Dworak (2010), and the Russian translations by Shcherbakov (1977) and Demurova (1967). In order to analyze translation, the thesis uses Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), and also adapts a translation of puns methodology from Balci (2005) in order to discover strategies used to

translate diminutives. This is discussed in the theoretical and methodological framework in chapter three.

Given the background above, the major research questions of the thesis are the following:

1. What can translations and ‘native’ children’s literature reveal about parallels between the English and Polish/Russian languages that would make translation from English to Polish and Russian easier?
2. What are the main differences in semantic-pragmatic meaning between English diminutives and Polish and Russian diminutives and what is the main cause of these differences?
3. How do these differences and similarities affect translation strategies?

Each chapter (with the exception of chapter three) opens with specific research questions that pertain to that particular chapter, but draw back to the fundamental questions stated above.

The data used in this thesis were collected by searching the original texts (native English, Polish and Russian children’s literature, *Alice in Wonderland* and the four translations). The purpose of this thesis is to establish the many diminutives used and formed in English children’s/Young Adult literature and to describe the types of diminutives available in Polish and Russian in order to establish some parallels and differences between diminutive meanings and use in these languages. Establishing these grammatical and semantic-pragmatic meanings contributes to how diminutives are translated into Polish and Russian, and possibly shows some ways that diminutives can be translated based on how each language functions.

Chapter 1: Entering Wonderland

One foundational aspect of this thesis is to investigate diminutives in English.

Thus, chapter 1 of this thesis will be broken down into three sections. The first section (1.1) will address what a diminutive is; specifically, the functions of the diminutive, how it is formed and why the diminutive is a linguistic feature in English that needs to be studied. The second section (1.2) will show diminutive use and meanings within the broader genre of English children's/Young Adult (for readers from approximately age 8 to 14) fiction to establish the diminutive is a literary and linguistic feature that is used in many different contexts to portray diverse meanings. The last section (1.3) narrows to the focal text of this thesis, *Alice in Wonderland*, describing the semantic-pragmatic feature within the text and how diminutives contribute to the expressive attitudes conveyed towards and by the characters Alice, Bill, the baby-pig, the White Rabbit and others through a) the character's speech and b) the description of the character's environment. The objective of 1.3 is to establish the significance of diminutives in a specific literary text, thus proving the importance and functions of diminutives in a book of children's literature.

The research questions to be answered in this chapter are the following: What kinds of diminutives does English have and what are their functions? Second, what kinds of semantic-pragmatic meanings of diminutives occur in 'native' English children's literature and *Alice in Wonderland*?

1.1 Diminutives in English

In all languages, there are words that denote smallness of size and/or a specific attitude (also termed 'emotion' or 'evaluation') towards a subject. These words fall under

the term ‘diminutive’, which “is a term of traditional grammar and as such taken for granted, i.e. it is usually not clearly defined” (Schneider 2003:1). Diminutives are considered to be a morphological category, causing English diminutives that are formed with the use of *little* or another analytic marker to be ignored in scholarly research or regarded negatively when translating from Russian to English. For example, Borden (2005) writes that Russian diminutives are generally not “transferable to English without an unbecoming glut of modifiers such as ‘little,’ ‘small,’ and ‘dear’” (xxii). In this thesis, I use the term ‘diminutive’ to refer to both synthetic (formed through the addition of derivational affixes) and analytic (formed through the addition of an analytic marker preceding the noun) diminutive formations, which will be discussed in greater detail below. The diminutive is traditionally considered to convey smallness; however, this thesis follows Schneider’s claim that “diminutives seem to convey ‘littleness’ rather than ‘smallness’” (2). Likewise, Borrás and Christian (1971) write that “there are two functions of the diminutive noun: to indicate size and to indicate shades of emotion” (51). Waddington (1964) observes that “[a]ll diminutives may denote smallness, and most can also carry emotional overtones” (17-18). This thesis, however, will focus on the ‘emotional overtones’ or ‘littleness’ that convey diverse emotional meanings.

The range and variety of the emotional meanings of diminutives differ from language to language; however, the diminutive meanings specific to the English language have not yet been clearly established through empirical research. Diminutives, in general, are regarded as conveying meanings including positive/negative evaluation, unimportance, intimacy, “affection (or contempt)” (Waddington 18), ‘young’, metaphorical smallness, irony, reproach, pity (Schneider), and also ‘female’, ‘small type’

and ‘children’ in Jurafsky’s (1996) universal structural polysemy model. Thus, we have a rather broad range of diminutive notions when considering diminutives cross-linguistically.

Depending on the diminutive’s immediate context and the language under examination, the diminutive may convey various nuances and level of emotion, while also expressing size. In some cases, such as Polish *stoneczko* (sun-DIM-DIM), the double diminutive conveys merely emotion and does not comment on the physical size of the sun. If we try to translate *stoneczko* into English, we experience difficulty because neither analytic nor synthetic diminutives can express the concept of a ‘dear, dear little sun’ in English. English can, structurally, create diminutive constructions such as ‘dear little sun’, but some diminutive constructions, including the latter example, are not typically used in English.

A language is either predominantly synthetic or analytic. An analytic language (such as Modern English) “is one which either does not combine inflectional morphemes or does so sparingly; grammatical relations are indicated primarily by word order and function words” (Brinton and Arnovick 2006:91). When English creates diminutives, it preferentially does so analytically; that is, by compensating for diminutive suffixes lexically, which “is another means of expressing the same semantic category” (Naciscione 2010:136), by the addition of analytic markers such as *little*, *tiny* or *small* before the noun. Polish or Russian, which, on the other hand, are synthetic languages and preferentially form diminutives through attaching a vast array of diminutive affixes to the root (see chapter 2). In this way, the basic concept of diminution exists in all languages, even if some scholars (e.g. Wierzbicka 2003) argue that English does not have

diminutives that can convey the diverse range of diminutive meanings that are available in ‘diminutive-rich’ synthetic languages.

English diminutives are not as “unique in their extent and their variety” (Waddington 18) as Russian or Polish diminutives; however, English diminutives formed analytically convey diverse meanings. Synthetic diminutives are claimed to either hardly exist at all (according to Wierzbicka 2003) or are plentiful and productive (Schneider 2003); this thesis agrees with Schneider’s conclusion that the English language has plenty of diminutive suffixes that are used in spoken and written English. Thus, synthetic diminutives do exist in the English language. In his monograph on diminutives in a corpus of spoken English, Schneider discusses endings such as *-ie/-y* (in *doggie*), *-let* (as in *piglet* or *kinglet*), *-kin(s)* (as in the name *Lizziekins*), *-o* (as in the word *kiddo*) among many others. Wierzbicka, in contrast, only considers the *-ie/-y* ending as an English diminutive, but emphasizes that the suffix is used only with or by children.¹

Analytic diminutives are used comparatively more frequently in English than diminutive suffixes and can convey various expressive meanings. These analytic constructions use the analytic markers² *little*, *small*, *wee*, *diminutive*, *tiny* and other adjectives in the semantic field³ SMALL to convey emotion and smallness; in fact, Naciscone (2010) lists the following adjectives as analytic markers that create analytic diminutive constructions in English: *little*, *small*, *thin*, *petty*, *wee*, *slight*, *a bit (of)*, *by the skin of*, among others in her discussion of phraseological units in English. In addition,

1 The existence and productivity of synthetic diminutive suffixes in English is an enormous and controversial subject, which have been discussed in excellent detail in Schneider’s (2003) monograph.

2 These are referred to as ‘adjectival modifiers’, ‘adjectives’, ‘modifiers’, ‘diminutive markers’ and ‘analytic markers’. For consistency, I will use the term ‘analytic marker’ in this thesis.

3 Also referred to as ‘word field’ and ‘semantic domain’, which, Brinton and Arnovick (2006) define as “[a] structured part of the vocabulary in which words within a certain area of meaning are related, such as the domains of kinship terms, food terms, color terms” (502) or terms that create diminutives from the domain of SMALL.

adjectives such as *poky*, *pretty* or *unfortunate* before the analytic marker add additional emotional implications to the construction. For example, pity is conveyed in a construction such as *the poor little thing* or pejorative meaning is conveyed in *that miserable little monster* (when referring to a young, disobedient child). In this way, the base noun also affects the emotional meaning and stylistic effects of the diminutive construction, and also the choice of analytic diminutive and its position in the construction determines the level of emotional expressiveness conveyed through the construction.

To add further meaning to diminutive constructions, analytic and synthetic diminutives can co-occur, creating constructions such as *little doggie* or *teensy-weensy mousie*. However, some conceptualizations from other languages, such as our previous example of the Polish *stoneczko* (when referring to the physical object of the sun), are not expressed in English. Synthetically, **sunnie*, **sunlet* or **sunnette* are not used in English⁴. Neither does *little sun*, *small sun* or *wee sun* convey the concept. Rather, the closest English can come to *stoneczko* is through the now outdated construction *dear old sun* (as Waddington 1964 writes for the Russian version, *солнышко [solnyshko]*), where the adjective *old* is nearly equivalent to *little* (see Schneider). Although the English language has the means to form many types of diminutives that may convey diverse meanings, some unique diminutives that are used by speakers of other languages cannot be expressed in English. English has some diminutives with meanings that are not typical

⁴ Neither of these appear in the British National Corpus (BNC).

in other languages, including verbal nouns such as *little pattering of feet*⁵ (cf. chapter 4 and 5).

The diverse meanings of English diminutives can be difficult to pinpoint, but the two main analytic markers, *little* and *small* differ greatly from each other. According to Schneider, the analytic marker *small* only refers to ‘smallness’ while *little* is considered more ‘subjective’ than *small*, meaning that *little* can express more emotional meanings and is generally more flexible. This difference can be demonstrated by comparing the constructions *little dog* and *small dog* (Schneider 12). The latter impression is that of physical size because *small dog* does not convey a sense of ‘deariness’ or ‘littleness’. Yet, *small* can convey pejorative meaning, for example, if a speaker referred to a Great Dane as a ‘small dog’. Also, while appreciative qualifiers such as *cute* can be added to a *little X* construction such as *cute little dog*, it would be strange to say **cute small dog* because *cute* conveys positive emotion and endearment while *small* conveys either no emotion or pejorative meaning. On the other hand, it would be possible to say *ugly, small dog* in a disdainful manner, though *ugly little dog* would convey more emotion. Last, the adjective *small* inherently implies contrast because of its function in other parts of speech as *smaller* and *smallest* (in direct relation to *big*, *bigger* and *biggest* or *large*, *larger* and *largest*). The adjective *little* does not become **littler* or **littlest*, except in defamiliarizing situations. Therefore, the adjective *little* conveys a stronger emotive component than *small* because we can view *little* as a type of affix (e.g. the Polish synthetic diminutive *domek* ‘house-DIM’ could be translated as ‘house-little’), while *small* is more like a word that stands alone, as it does in synthetic languages (e.g. Polish *mały dom* ‘small house’).

⁵ Though interestingly, the construction *little pattering of X* is mostly found in *Alice in Wonderland*; it is not found in the British National Corpus (BNC) and appears to be nearly non-existent in other books.

The emotional difference between the analytic markers *little*, *small* and other analytic markers that create diminutives may differ in the so-called ‘non-standard’ varieties of English⁶. Diminutives used in these ‘non-standard’ English or Scottish-English dialects are said to have more emotion and a diverse set of ways to express diminution than the so-called ‘standard’ varieties of British English, North American English and so forth. Bryant (1889) writes that the poet Burns “taught us all to love the Scottish dialect – its graceful diminutives [...] its homely but intensely significant phrases of pathos and tenderness, which go straight to the heart” (320). Although Bryant writes this statement in the 1800s, when the English language was not as analytic as it has become in the twenty-first century, it does point to the slightly different use of English diminutives in dialects of English. Bratus (1969) writes that “English dialects are richer in diminutives than standard English” (2) and lists several diminutives that Scots typically use. These diminutives include *bairnie*, *hillie*, *housie*, *kitling*, *knifie*, *laddie*, *lassie*, *lambie*, *ninnie* and diminutives with double suffixes, such as *mitherikie*, *bittikey*, *housikie*, *lasseckie* or *wifiekie*. Within the English diminutive *manikin*, the Scottish variants include *mannie*, *mannikie*, *bit mannie*, *bit manikie*, *little wee bit mannie*, *little wee bit mannikie* (cf. Craik 1871:421) and so forth. From the list provided by Bratus and Craig, there is a preference for the common diminutive suffix *-ie* and the adjectives *little*, *bit* and *wee*. As in ‘standard’ English, the adjective *small* does not appear in these ‘non-standard’ varieties. While this thesis is not a sociolinguistic survey of diminutives in dialects of English, such a study could, arguably, discover that ‘non-standard’ English

⁶ ‘Non-standard’ here refers to dialects (also called varieties) that are not the ‘standard’; that is, they are not the prestige dialect that “is artificially maintained through class and education” (Brinton and Arnovick 2006). In the case of British English, the ‘standard’ dialect is called Received Pronunciation (RP), which is based on the language of the upper-class.

dialects have a more abundant system of diminutives than ‘standard’ English to express affection and other emotions more forcibly.

Diminutives are often used in contexts where women and children figure predominantly, and therefore diminutives are often associated with femaleness and children. This is certainly true of English, where the feminine portrayal and use of diminutives extends to objects, such as clothes tailored for women (e.g. *panties*, *nighties*, *hankies* or *jammies*). The feminine portrayal of objects additionally extends to children’s articles such as *nappies* (cf. Romaine 1999) because women and children are often grouped together in a separate category from men. Wood (2012) claims that “[d]iminutive suffixes designate women as reduced forms of the standard (male) form of the word: *suffragette*, *majorette*. Calling women *girls* (defined as a female who has not gone through puberty) defines them as children, not adults” (124). Furthermore, Mills (1995) suggests that endearment terms (diminutives) put women, children and animals into a separate, ‘cute’ and ‘little’ group apart from the men. Mills suggests that words such as *babe*, *baby*, *sweetie* or *ducky* “imply an equivalence between women and cute small animals” (89) even though these terms can be also used for men, while terms such *girlie* or *little darling* “label women as immature or juvenile” (Wood 2012:24). Romaine summarizes this link between the child and the woman by adding ‘contempt’, ‘ridicule’, ‘intimacy’, ‘marginality’ or ‘affection’ as additional diminutive meanings:

The metaphors that make it possible for diminutive markers to be extended from their original meanings of “child” and “small” are: Women are children. Women are small (things). Women are generally smaller than men and, like children, subordinate to men. That is why the wife is “the little woman.” (Romaine 145)

Although much more could be said about the connection between women and diminutives, gender issues are not a focus of this thesis. They are a significant aspect of diminution, since in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-American culture emotion is typically connected to femininity. These connotations of the diminutive that fall under the category of ‘women’ and ‘children’ are an important aspect that we will keep in mind in the next section (1.2) which deals with diminutives in children’s literature, where children and young adults are the main characters in the books.

Diminutives formed with the adjective *little* and diminutive forms with suffixes do not derive diminutive forms of personal names nearly as much as they do in Russian or Polish, where many diminutive suffixes exist to express various nuances (see chapter 2). English diminutivized names do, however, have a role to play as terms of endearment. There is considerable confusion regarding the difference between English hypocoristics, pet names, diminutive forms, truncated forms and short forms and the level of emotion they each express. For example, the proper feminine name *Samantha* can be shortened to the hypocoristic/truncated form *Sam*, which in turn can receive a diminutive suffix to create *Sammie/Sammy* or even *Sammiekins*. A girl named *Samantha* could also be called *little Sam/little Sammy*. In this scenario, *Sam* is the standard shortened and truncated form, since the form has lost the last few sounds of the name, while the diminutive suffix *-ie* creates the diminutive form *Sammie*.

Returning to the connection between diminutive use and women, “girls’ names undergo shortening and diminution in one step” (Bonvillain 2003:82), suggesting that a girl or woman called *Christine* would skip *Chris* and be more likely to be called *Chrissy* or *Christy* while a man named *Christopher* would be called *Chris* (cf. Romaine).

Therefore, these scholars suggest that an adult named *Chris* is more likely to be a man (even though women use these shortened forms) and an adult named *Chrissie/Christy* is more likely to be a woman because women are “more likely to be addressed in adulthood with names marked with the diminutive suffix *-ie / -y* more so than men” (Romaine 141). However, girls in the children’s literature to be discussed in the following section are usually called by their truncated forms except in highly emotional speech (e.g. *Megan* is consistently referred to by the narrator and her friends as *Meg* in L’Engle’s *A Wrinkle in Time*). Compared to Polish and Russian, this particular derivation of names seems to be more apparent in English, since Russian men are commonly called by names such as *Alyosha* or *Sasha* that end with a diminutive suffix that would normally be part of the feminine grammatical category. Polish diminutive names, on the other hand, keep a clear difference between feminine and masculine diminutive names (with the exception of the diminutive form *Kuba* from *Jakub*). Despite the difference between children’s, women’s and men’s names in English, the affectionate meanings associated with diminutives do not play a vital role as one of the many emotional diminutive meanings conveyed by English diminutives. The *-ie* suffix tends to be attached to names of small children and sometimes to women’s names, while proper names and their shortened forms are used most often between adults/teenagers. This, however, is a generalization and the meanings and uses of names can only be discovered in context and empirically, as I will do in the following section.

Diminutives, thus, are a significant aspect of the English language. As I have discussed above, diminutives can create many diverse meanings and can be formed through synthetic or analytic constructions. Without diminutives, the English language

would lose a vital linguistic meanings of conveying emotion, attitude, evaluation, and also warmth. Diminutives provide a way to show affection towards people or things; they are expressive and contribute to emotional expression of language, whether in spoken discourse or in literary texts. Although formal occasions call for less expressive language, Anglo-Saxons conceptualize their surroundings and other people using affective diminutive constructions. These types of diminutive constructions are found in children's literature, which I discuss in the following section.

1.2 Examples of Diminutives in Children's Literature

In this section, I will discuss diminutive meanings in regard to personal names and terms of endearment; and also nouns and diminutive constructions containing a descriptive adjective such as *poor*. As a means to explore diminutives in the wider context of children's and YA literature, I turn to several classic novels aimed for children and youth from the 8 to 14 age range, which is approximately the reading level of *Alice in Wonderland*.⁷ Choosing the texts to take examples from proved a difficult task because *Alice in Wonderland* has widespread interest in all age groups, ranging from young children to adults. Specifically, I will use examples from Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables* series (1908, 1915, 1917, 1936) and *Pat of Silver Bush* (1933), White's *Charlotte's Web* (1952), Porter's *Pollyanna* (1913), DiTerlizzi and Black's *A Giant Problem* (2008), Tolkien's *The Hobbit* (1937), L'Engle's *A Wrinkle in Time* (1962), Rowling's *Harry Potter* series (1997-2003), Lewis' *The Chronicles of Narnia* series (1951, 1952, 1956), Keene's *The Nancy Drew Notebooks: The Carousel Mystery* (2003)

⁷ Although the character Alice in the story is seven years old, the 'real' Alice Liddell was ten years old when Carroll first told this story to her and her sisters (Lorina was thirteen years old and Edith was eight). The book could not have been written for a younger audience, as Carroll later published *The Nursery Alice*, which is aimed at very young children.

and Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876). I chose these particular books somewhat randomly, but for several reasons: a) they span the period from around the time when *Alice in Wonderland* was published (late Victorian) to the twenty-first century; and, b) they belong to various genres of children's literature, including mystery, fantasy and adventure. Thus, these books represent more than one literary period and genre of fiction, allowing for a broader survey of children's literature. Although these books are not the focus of this thesis, I use them to establish diminutives' various meanings and functions in children's and YA literature and provide a comprehensive foundation from which to examine *Alice in Wonderland* and its translation into Polish and Russian in chapter 3. In this way I explore diminutive formation and use in the English language, and specifically in children's literature.

As I discussed previously, diminutives in English are a comparably under-researched aspect of the English language, especially diminutives in English literature. In scholarly literature, English diminutives are mentioned rarely; and, if they are discussed at all, English diminutives are examined in comparison to those found in diminutive-rich synthetic languages such as Spanish, Greek or Russian. As Schneider says, this leads scholars to claim that English has no diminutives. Schneider's monograph, which I rely heavily upon for this chapter, provides the background literature for my analysis. Schneider's conclusions that diminutives do exist in English led me to investigate whether Schneider's claims held true in children's and young adult literature. Despite Wierzbicka's (2003) and Taylor's (2003) claims that English has little or no diminutives, I found frequent use of diminutives in the aforementioned books. Synthetic diminutives were scarce (except in personal names), but analytic diminutives with diverse meanings

were easy to find in the texts. For example, the construction *little X* appeared often, though the frequency seemed to rest on the author's personal style and preference. I will not speculate on the frequency and intensity of diminutives because it is not the frequency of diminutive use that I will discuss below; rather, I will show how diminutives are created and used in names, object/event nouns and constructions such as *poor little X* or *little X*.

Without comparing English with any synthetic languages and thus only examining 'native' English diminutives, my short study of English children's literature confirms Schneider's conclusions in his analysis of diminutives in spoken discourse, specifically that:

1. Diminutives exist in English.
2. Diminutive suffixes are used in English, though analytic constructions remain more typical of English.
3. Both analytic constructions and synthetic diminutives express diverse emotional meanings and can co-occur.
- 3b. Analytic diminutives are not 'objective'; rather, they have the ability to form various meanings by the choice of analytic marker and preceding adjective(s).
4. Diminutives have an important role in expressing affection and other emotions in English.

1.2.1 Names

Diminutive forms of children's first names in English children's fiction shows various kinds of diminutive meaning when analyzed in their immediate context. That is, I argue that outside of broad generalizations of each diminutive suffix, we can only

discover specific nuances of diminutive personal names when viewed in context. For example, we cannot come to a firm conclusion about the nuances of the diminutive names *Siddy* or *Ronniekins* without discussing, at the very least, their immediate context, as I will do below. The use of diminutive names in English children's literature can also be viewed in a similar way, though we can claim that diminutive forms, not hypocoristics or pet names, are used sparingly and in instances of heightened emotion.

The emotions expressed by the diminutive names can be teasing, pejorative, affectionate, endearing and even insulting. For example, in Montgomery's *Pat of Silver Bush*, the main character, Pat, uses her friend Sidney's name in an endearing diminutive form to emphasize her request: "But you won't like [the new baby] better than me, will you...oh, *please Siddy?*" (45). In Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, however, the *-ie* suffix is used childishly and teasingly when Ron's older brothers say, "[a]ah, has ickle Ronnie got somefink on his nosie?" (72), which is one of the only two times that Ron's name receives a diminutive suffix in the book. Thus, although diminutive personal names may not, by themselves, possess diverse nuances and meanings on first glance, they gain various emotional meanings when viewed in context.

The diverse diminutive names' meanings that can be found in children's literature sometimes depend on the character who speaks them and the narrator's own preferences. For example, in L'Engle's *A Wrinkle in Time*, the character Mrs. Who remains the sole character throughout the whole book who diminutivizes the main children's names through the suffix *-sie*, specifically in *Charlsie* (for *Charles Wallace*) and *little Megsie* (for *Meg*). This happens solely because of Mrs. Who's dramatic and expressive personality, as demonstrated through the diminutives' immediate contexts:

(1a) The plump little woman beamed at him. “Why, Charlsie, my pet!” (34)

(1b) “And he’s a very good man, Charlsie, darling, but right now he needs our help.”

(35)

(2) “And little Megsie! Lovely to meet you, sweetheart.” (35)

In the above examples, the meaning of the diminutives is that of endearment and affection as to a young child. These positive evaluations are aided by the use of other endearing terms that usually accompany diminutives. These are necessary because the diminutive names could easily convey contempt if used by a bully, for example. In (1a), the diminutive name is preceded by a positive description of the speaker as a ‘plump little woman’, where the diminutive construction serves to evoke a positive attitude towards her. In (1b) Mrs. Who adds a term of endearment, specifically *darling*, which shows her affectionate feelings towards the young boy. Thus, both the narrator’s description and the character’s utterance evoke the positive diminutive meanings of *Charlsie*. The second example follows similarly in form, but rather than only using a diminutive suffix, the analytic construction co-occurs with the synthetic diminutive suffix, creating *little Megsie*. Interestingly, the choice of *little Megsie* implies that Meg is younger than Charles Wallace, while in reality Meg is several years older than Charles Wallace, though Meg is not as important or ‘special’ as Charles Wallace in the context of the story. Putting aside the gender dynamics, *little Megsie* evokes affection and endearment, despite being structured slightly differently than the synthetic form *Charlsie* while showing the

effect of one character's tendency to use diminutive forms of names when speaking to other characters.

The above examples from *A Wrinkle in Time* also show that a distinction does not exist between diminutive suffixes for girls and suffixes for boys; rather, English diminutive suffixes on personal names can broadly be considered 'unisex', since both Meg and Charles Wallace received the suffix *-sie*. Diminutive suffixes produce very similar names for both girls and boys in the children's literature under analysis. Feminine names include *Patsy* (from *Pat*, from *Patricia*) and *Bets* (from *Elizabeth*) in Montgomery's *Pat of Silver Bush*; and *Gracie* (from *Grace*), *Becky* (from *Rebecca*) and *Susy* (from *Susan*) in Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. Masculine names include *Siddy* (from *Sid*, from *Sidney*) in *Pat of Silver Bush*; *Hucky* (from *Huck*, from *Huckleberry Finn*) in Twain's *Adventures of Tom Sawyer*; and *Ronnie* (from *Ron*, from *Ronald*) in Rowling's *Harry Potter* series. As the above examples show, occasionally a diminutive suffix is added to the shortened form of a name, provided that the form ends with a consonant. In addition, the *-ie/-y* suffixes are used for both feminine and masculine names. The only exception occurs in *Bets*, which has a *-s* diminutive suffix attached to the truncated form *Bet* (< *Elizabeth*).

Despite the fact that the same suffixes exist for both feminine and masculine names, some feminine names are used in stories to reveal a character's imagination and important points about her character. For example, in Montgomery's *Anne of Windy Poplars*, Anne befriends a little girl named Elizabeth. The name *Elizabeth* gives the imaginative and love-starved child an escape from her dull and dreary life with her strict grandmother. She uses a different form of her name depending on the mood she is in at

the time. In one instance she tells Anne, “[t]his is my night for being Betty because I love everything in the world tonight” (30). Anne writes in a letter to Gilbert that “[w]hen she is Betty she makes faces at her grandmother and the Woman behind their backs; but when she turns into Elsie she is sorry for it and thinks she ought to confess, but is scared to” (36). Thus, because of the many diminutive forms (and hypocoristics) that can be created from *Elizabeth*, the author can characterize the girl as a dreamy and imaginative type that would not have been possible with another name, such as *Irene* or *Ann*. In addition, the girl shows how malleable some English names are, for, as Elizabeth aptly states, “I can make so many names out of [Elizabeth]” (31).

In Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*, the teasing and childish/affectionate meaning of diminutive names become exemplified when Ronald Weasley’s two older brothers teasingly refer to him with the diminutive suffixes *-ie*, *-kin* and *-s*. While the brothers first use the diminutive suffix *-ie* in *Ronnie*, the example in (3) below builds on the first suffix, then adds the suffixes *-kin* and *-s*, which adds further emotional meanings to their name. Although the two diminutive names are used closely together in the text, the first conveys a more teasing meaning that is directed at Ron, the double diminutive suffix *-kins* conveys quainter affectionate feelings when Ron’s older brothers reassure their mother by saying, “[d]on’t worry, ickle Ronniekins is safe with us” (73). Bertills (2002) writes that “the particle *-kin*, which is very common in English children’s stories [...] does not convey suggestions of age, let alone derogatory ones. On the contrary, *-kin* usually suggests diminutive size and immature years, and in a way that is unreservedly pleasant, and even rather quaint and sentimental” (78). The author’s statement about the suffix’s meaning reflects part of the nature of *Ronniekins*, as Ron is

physically smaller, younger and about to make his first trip to Hogwarts (thus ‘immature years’).

Romaine claims that “[n]ames given to household pets are also often diminutive forms” (141) and Schneider asserts that “diminutives are employed as (endearing) names for toy pets [...] as well as for animals in children’s stories” (90). However, this is often not the case in the children’s literature examined here, such as in Montgomery’s *Anne of the Island* or Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*. In the former, the protagonist and her group of friends own three cats whose names are *Joseph*, *Rusty* (first called *Rusty Coat* from his appearance) and *Sarah-cat*; in the latter book, Harry owns an owl named *Hedwig*, Ron owns a rat named *Scabbers*, and another character owns a toad named *Trevor*. Other pets in *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone* include cats named *Snowy*, *Mr Paws*, *Tufty* and *Tibbles* and a dog named *Fang*. In Carroll’s *Alice in Wonderland*, Alice’s cat is named *Dinah*. The names of other pets in the children’s stories include a cat named *Gentleman Tom*, a cat named *Dusty Miller*, a dog named *Carlo*, a pig named *Wilbur* and a puppy named *Chocolate Chip*. Although these examples do not disprove Romaine’s claim that pet names are often diminutives, it shows that these children’s books generally prefer full names rather than diminutive forms for pets. The diminutive forms *Carlo* (with an *-o* diminutive suffix), *Scabbers* (with a *-ers* suffix), *Tibbles* (with a *-s* suffix) and *Tufty* can be considered the diminutive exceptions in the books above. However, with the exception of *Tufty*, and, perhaps, *Carlo*, these diminutive names are not commonly considered to convey affection.

Schneider writes that “youngness correlates with smallness [and] smallness caused by youngness evokes positive attitudes” (14). The positive attitudes Schneider

speaks of can come not only from diminutive suffixes attached to personal names of humans and animals, as I have discussed above, but from analytic constructions that use the adjective *little* combined with the personal name, such as ‘little Elizabeth’. The analytical structure evokes positive attitudes towards younger children, especially in Montgomery’s novels. For example, in *Anne of Windy Poplars*, Anne constantly refers to Elizabeth (the character that uses different forms of her name depending on her mood) as ‘little Elizabeth’ because “she was so tiny, so golden, so elf-like, that they couldn’t think of her as anything but little Elizabeth” (192). Returning to Schneider’s statement, the above passage describes the young girl as *tiny*, thus correlating her youth with smallness, causing Elizabeth to be called ‘little Elizabeth.’ From a conceptual viewpoint, the passage is important because the narrator writes that the residents always *thought of* Elizabeth as ‘little Elizabeth’ because of several input characteristics that refer to Elizabeth’s physical appearance, as *tiny*, *golden* and *elf-like*. These adjectives help conceptualize Elizabeth as a magical sort of girl; that is, a girl that evokes ‘littleness’ every time her (older) friends think about her.

Although Elizabeth is thought of as ‘little Elizabeth’, the analytic marker *little* does not become “a permanent constituent of the name” (Schneider 131) because *little* is not capitalized. Rather, the emphasis remains with the name Elizabeth and the various forms and meanings Elizabeth dreams up for each variant. In some analytic diminutive constructions, the *little* is capitalized, thus becoming bound like a title to the name, such as in *Little Red Riding Hood* or titles of nursery rhymes such as *Little Miss Muffet* or *Little Boy Blue*. In *Anne of Windy Poplars*, Anne meets an eight-year-old boy whose full name is Teddy Armstrong, but who is called ‘Little Fellow’ by his father; likewise, in

Anne's House of Dreams, Anne constantly refers to her young first-born son as 'Little Jem' (from the name *James*). In this way, the correlation between youngness and the positive attitude evoked by the adjective *little* remains an important part of the diminutive construction's meaning. Whether or not *little* is capitalized, the endearing and affectionate emotion linked with *little* cause use to think positively and affectionately about the child referent.

The analytical construction *small X* does not convey similar affectionate meaning; rather, *small* refers to size. For example, *Small Red Riding Hood* or *Small Miss Muffet* seems to compare the referent (Miss Muffet or Red Riding Hood) to something larger and focuses on physical dimensions only. Schneider agrees, writing that "*little* cannot be replaced by *small* because *small* lacks affective connotations" (135), as I have demonstrated in the examples above. Despite this, I would argue that some names in literature that begin with *small* can evoke positive meanings, though not necessarily because of the analytic marker *small*. In *Anne's House of Dreams*, Anne's best friend, Diana, names her baby after Anne, as is stated at the beginning of the book: "she held a small, sleeping, black-curled creature, who for two happy years had been known to the world of Avonlea as 'Small Anne Cordelia'"(1). Yet, to readers of the *Anne of Green Gables* series, the connotations would be pleasant ones because they would recall how Anne, in the first book in the series, begged to be called 'Cordelia' rather than 'Anne'. By naming her child after her best friend, Diana fulfils her friend's childhood fantasies of being called 'Cordelia' in the baby's middle name; thus, Diana makes Anne's childhood dream come true in the form of another person. In this kind act, the affective nature of the name resonates with readers. The capitalized 'Small' receives some of that positive

meaning, although by itself, it seems to indicate that the two-year-old is, indeed, small in size, compared to her namesake, Anne Shirley.

In conclusion to this discussion of the meanings and forms of personal names, I re-state that diminutive names are more often than not used to express a sudden emotional outburst or heightened feelings. Diminutive forms indicate that the particular moment (and in many cases, the particular scene) has strong emotional undercurrents that cause the speaker to use a diminutive form. In the narrative, diminutive forms generally do not appear; rather, they seem limited to direct speech. Unlike synthetic forms which display sudden outbursts of emotion, analytic constructions have more subdued emotional meanings. Their use does not come out of sudden outbursts of feeling (except when combined with a synthetic diminutive form in ‘little Megsie’), but demonstrate a permanent affectionate or endearing quality, such as ‘little Elizabeth’. The analytic diminutive construction, I suggest, reflects the conceptualization of a young child which evokes affection, while a synthetic diminutive reflects more of a burst of emotion in response to a certain situation. Occasionally, a character such as Mrs. Who uses diminutive suffixes and endearing forms with everyone she meets, which is a characterization choice on the author’s part.

In a similar manner to Mrs. Who’s regular use of diminutive names in *A Wrinkle in Time*, Miss Cornelia in *Anne’s House of Dreams* refers to other women with the pet diminutive *dearie* (from *dear*). Miss Cornelia constantly refers to Anne as *dearie*. In their first conversation, Miss Cornelia says, “I’ve brought my work, Mrs. Blythe, dearie” (43) and the chapter ends with Miss Cornelia remarking, “I’ve finished my little dress, dearie, and the eighth baby can come as soon as it pleases” (51). Although *dear* denotes “a

quality, while the resulting diminutive [denotes the human] of who this quality is (considered) a characteristic feature” (Schneider 90), when a character constantly uses the diminutive, whether ‘dearie’ or ‘darling’, the diminutive meaning loses its emotional impact because the diminutive is uttered as a force of habit. Rather than showing Anne in a positive light, Miss Cornelia more likely addresses all younger women that she deems acceptable as *dearie* and therefore *dearie* is a typical marker in her speech and not a direct comment on a quality of Anne’s.

Characters who speak a ‘non-standard’ English variety use diminutives more often and to a greater degree than upper-class characters who speak ‘standard’ English. As I briefly mentioned in the previous section, ‘non-standard’ varieties, especially Scottish English, not only use diminutives more often than ‘standard’ English, but also have more diminutives that speakers can choose from. This is exemplified in the character Judy from *Pat of Silver Bush*, who originally came from Scotland; and also the poltergeist named Peeves in *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*. Judy’s speech is filled with diminutives that contrast sharply with the other characters’ diminutive use in the book. For example, Judy uses the analytic markers *tiny* and *wee* often, such as when Judy asks Pat, “What wud ye be after thinking if I told ye I’d find a tiny wee new baby there?” (29), and also synthetic diminutives in other parts of the book, including *girleen* (with an *-een* diminutive suffix). In *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone*, the poltergeist uses synthetic diminutives with an *-ie* suffix (e.g. *beastie*) and, like Judy, uses the analytic marker *wee* in his utterances: “Are you ghoulie or ghostie or wee student beastie?” (199). He also adds, “[f]orgive old Peevsie his little joke, sir” (199), which includes a synthetic diminutive in *Peevsie* and an analytic construction in ‘little joke’.

Thus, a speaker who uses diminutives extensively is often considered a ‘non-standard speaker’ and thus not part of the upper, educated class, which can be evidenced by the low social status of Judy and Peeves.

Other diminutives that refer to people provide evidence as to the variety of emotional meanings that diminutives evoke within a story, especially in direct discourse. Diminutive terms of address also can be both pejorative and positive to the extent that it becomes difficult to establish where the diminutive term falls on the continuum. For example, in *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*, Professor Moody says to Harry, “I wasn’t accusing you, laddie” (301), which does not appear pejorative, but neither does it evoke strong affection. In a similar way, in Lewis’ *The Last Battle*, a dwarf asks a protagonist character, “[a]nd who might you be, Missie?” (81), which can evoke affection and positive meaning, but also a pejorative meaning if the speaker is referring to a child who is obnoxious or pushy. A more affectionate diminutive form of address can be found in *Auntie* when Tom refers to his Aunt Polly as ‘Auntie’ in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. Although Polish and Russian may have yet additional ways to express precise diminutive meanings in terms of address, the previous examples show the versatility of the English language to express meanings ranging from positive to negative, and sometimes these opposing meanings can be found in a single diminutive.

1.2.2 Object Nouns

Diminutives that do not refer to people, but to object nouns that “refer prototypically to man-made objects...such as *book*, *door* and *house*” (Schneider 132) can evoke strong emotional (both positive and negative) attitudes. Schneider writes that “[a]nalytic diminutives derived from such nouns express smallness relative to the

relevant class norm as well as an attitude towards the referent” (132). These types of diminutives in analytic constructions are especially frequent as descriptors of Alice’s surroundings in Wonderland; likewise, Montgomery very frequently uses analytic constructions to evoke positive feelings about a character’s surroundings.

In her *Anne of Green Gables* series, Montgomery makes use of many analytic diminutive constructions where the noun is an object that describes Anne’s surroundings or “denote[s] everyday objects, but display[s] a complex structure” (Schneider 90).

Montgomery makes special use of these diminutive constructions to evoke a positive evaluation of objects for which Anne and other characters feel love and delight.

Katherine, a character in *Anne of Windy Poplars*, seems to sum up Montgomery’s perspective on diminutives’ place in her books with one poignant sentence to Anne: “you seem to live in a little enchanted circle of beauty and romance” (149). Katherine connects the analytic marker *little* with words such as *enchanted*, *beauty* and *romance*, all of which evoke positive and affectionate feelings, thus suggesting that diminutive constructions in Montgomery’s books express concepts of enchantment, beauty and love. For example, in *Anne of Windy Poplars*, Anne first describes objects in her new residence at Windy Poplars with many analytic constructions that are often reinforced by appreciative adjectives, such as “a funny little movable set of steps” (11), “dear little corner cupboard” (11), and “the dear little sailboats I love” (12). The base nouns that the adjective *little* modifies are common, everyday objects. The addition of *little* and the preceding adjectives that Schneider calls ‘appreciative qualifiers’ such as *funny* or *dear* cause the diminutive construction to convey as much emotion as several suffixes. During the narrative, Montgomery takes nearly every opportunity to describe something small and

positive with an analytic construction: “a little bronze chessy cat” (155) or “a dear little brown-eyed puppy” (155). Likewise, in *Pat of Silver Bush*, everyday objects are described with analytic constructions: “the little round window” (20), “two dear little spruces” (21) and “the poor, bleak, little stony field [that Pat loves]” (21). Other nouns, such as in the diminutive construction “dear little screech owls” (20) are just as abundant on Montgomery’s books and demonstrate the character’s love for her surroundings.

Children’s bodies are diminutivized in English literature, but not as often, and consistently, as they are in Polish and Russian (cf. 2.1). As Kelly (2007) writes, “[t]he affectionate, wheedling nature of the address to the child is easy to capture in English at some points [but] diminutive in the Russian express this tone much more consistently. Given that such diminutives are routinely used about parts of the child’s body [...] an association between cuteness and smallness is established” (358). However, the children’s stories under examination that deal with very young children more often contain diminutive constructions that are mostly used by the narrator and are preceded by adjectives including *strong*, *sturdy*, *thin* and *darling*. For example, in Porter’s (1912) *Pollyanna*, the narrator refers to Pollyanna, “swinging from her strong little arms” (35-36), which positively evaluates her arms, implying that even though they were small (belonging to a little girl), they were strong enough to enable Pollyanna to climb a tree. Likewise, a little boy “[w]ith two strides of his sturdy little legs [...] confronted Miss Polly fearlessly” (112). At another point in the story, the face of a little boy is diminutivized later in the story to arouse a feeling of empathy, as in the one-sentence paragraph, “Jimmy Bean’s thin little face brightened” (109). Despite the fact that the narrator uses diminutive constructions to describe Pollyanna’s face and Jimmy’s face and

legs, diminutive constructions that refer to a character's face or arms generally reflect the narrator's voice and are voiced by Pollyanna once when speaking to her Aunt Polly, specifically in "those darling little black curls. Oh, Aunt Polly, they're so pretty!" (156) and by an adult to Pollyanna, specifically "[d]on't let other people's troubles worry your little head" (219). Likewise, the new school superintendent gives a speech to the children, including Tom in Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, that includes the diminutive construction *bright, clean little faces* in "I want to tell you how good it makes me feel to see so many bright, clean little faces assembled in a place like this, learning to do right and be good" (44). In the latter two examples, however, the subjects are not the focal point; in other words, the phrases are expressions that have a similar meaning to 'you', as for example 'don't let other people's troubles worry *you*' or 'how good it makes me to feel to see so many of *you*' (my emphasis). Thus, the feelings derived from diminutives towards children's bodies exist in English, but are usually reserved for subjects with preceding adjectives, including *head, curls, legs* and *faces* and are, in speech, often part of expressions that no longer convey much, if any, diminutive meaning.

Diminutive objects can also be formed synthetically, although many have become lexicalized. That is, they have taken on meanings of their own and no longer convey diminution or any type of emotional meaning. Examples include words such as *coronet*, which has an *-et* suffix and appears in *Anne's House of Dreams*, where Anne sees a girl whose heavy braids "were twisted about her head like a coronet" (24). Other diminutives include certain luxuries such as *drinkies*. In *The Last Battle*, a Dwarf uses the diminutive *baccy* for *tobacco*: "Anyone who knows the smell of baccy could tell that [I have a pipe in my mouth]" (165). These types of object nouns identified by Schneider are usually a

type of sweet food, alcoholic beverage or tobacco. The emotional meanings of such object diminutives are rather vague and are usually “stylistically marked as slang” (110-111). Another example in *The Last Battle* occurs when Edmund uses the lexicalized diminutive *rugger* (from *rugby*), which uses an *-er* suffix. The last use of synthetic diminutive objects is used “when the objects belong to children” (Schneider 90), such as Elizabeth’s *hankies* (from *handkerchiefs*) in *Anne of Windy Poplars*.

While synthetic object diminutives exist in English and appear in children’s literature, the analytic constructions provide more emotional variation and meanings. Additionally, analytic constructions appear more frequently than synthetic diminutives and often are preceded by adjectives such as those that evoke positive emotions, including *dear*, *nice*, *funny*, *sweet* or *delightful*; or, conversely, adjectives such as *poor*, *pitiful*, *miserable* and *poky* evoke negative emotions. In the discussion above, I have chiefly mentioned adjectives that evoke positive emotions, specifically those used by Montgomery. Adjectives that evoke negative emotions such as pity or contempt also appear in the children’s literature examined by this thesis section. I would like to begin with the meanings of pity evoked by diminutive constructions preceded by an adjective such as *miserable* before moving on to *poor little X* constructions, which strongly evoke pity, empathy or commiseration.

The use of adjectives such as *miserable* or *narrow* that precede a *little X* diminutive construction evokes pity, negative evaluation, contempt or similar meanings, although the use of *little* softens the full impact that the construction would have had without the diminutive marker *little*. (Compare *the miserable little shack* and *the miserable shack*.) In the children’s books under study, *little X* is usually preceded by a

positive adjective or *poor*; however, negative adjectives also appear to bring negative meanings. For example, in *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, the narrator describes the environment, writing that “[p]erched on top of the rock was the most miserable little shack you could imagine” (37). The diminutive construction, *miserable little shack*, evokes feelings of pity towards the shack. Subsequently, the shack is described without a diminutive, specifically as a “broken-down house” (37). In *Anne of Green Gables*, the narrator describes Anne’s negative reaction upon arriving at her residence: “She looked dismally about her narrow little room, with its dull-papered, pictureless walls” (268); likewise, in Porter’s *Pollyanna*, Nancy growls protectively of Pollyanna, “[y]es, or when you’re put in a snippy little room ‘way at the top of the house with nothin’ in it” (43). In these contexts the diminutive construction does not evoke pity *per se*, but conveys a negative evaluation that makes us feel sorry for Anne (and Pollyanna), who looks ‘dismal’ because of her negative evaluation of the room through the adjectives *narrow* and *snippy*. In the case of Pollyanna’s little room, the room is always portrayed negatively, with adjectives including *hot*, *cold* and *bare*. Thus, the adjective preceding *little* strongly guides our emotions along the positive/negative continuum and its subtle ‘flavours’ of meaning.

Two strong negative diminutive constructions also appear in *The Last Battle*, after a group of Dwarves shoot and kill all of the remaining Talking Horses of Narnia. Eustace’s reaction to the traitorous Dwarves produces two differing constructions. The first emphasizes the noun (swine), while three descriptive adjectives precede *little* in the second construction. Thus, the diminutive meanings of negative evaluation and (metaphorical) smallness occur through the blending of ‘little swine’ and ‘dirty, filthy,

treacherous little brutes’: “‘Little *Swine*,’ shrieked Eustace, dancing in his rage. ‘Dirty, filthy, treacherous little brutes’” (138). Here, the first utterance, ‘little Swine’ is intended as an insult and thus conveys pejorative meaning. In this case, *little* is not very strong; rather, the analytic marker “enhances the negative evaluation expressed by the animal term” (Schneider 134) of *swine*. The second utterance, which is an extension of the first utterance, uses three descriptive adjectives, specifically *dirty*, *filthy* and *treacherous* before ‘little brutes’ to express “more emphatic criticism [...] or even blunt abuse” (134). Eustace’s exclamation, unlike the ‘miserable little shack’ diminutive construction, does not even hint at pity or empathy. Therefore, the use of negative adjectives in diminutive constructions evoke various negative attitudes based on the situation and preceding adjective. A combination of a negative adjective with a synthetic diminutive, however, would only detract from the insult and negative evaluation expressed in the examples above. We could not take Eustace seriously, for example, if he had shouted a construction such as *dirty, filthy, treacherous bruties*; rather, the entire construction would seem teasingly affectionate or a joke.

1.2.3 **Poor little X constructions**

The emotions of pity or empathy are possibly the strongest and most frequently used emotions associated with the English diminutive, especially in the diminutive construction *poor little X*. A person referred to as *poor* is often perceived as inherently weak or young, which “may infuse the emphatic observer with feelings of pity and sorrow and, as a result, the pejorative implications are sometimes overridden by slightly affectionate overtones” (Santibanez Saenz 176). *Poor* additionally expresses commiseration when preceding *little* in analytic constructions (Schneider 134).

The children's literature under study makes frequent use of the emotional feelings of pity through the *poor little X* construction when referring to human beings (or their equivalents in fantasy worlds). For example, in Tolkien's *The Hobbit*, the narrator comments that "[p]oor little Bilbo was very nearly left behind again! He just managed to catch hold of Dori's legs" (101). Likewise, in Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, the character Hagrid bids an emotional goodbye to the infant Harry and apologizes in (6), referring to Harry as 'poor little Harry':

- (3) S-s-sorry,' sobbed Hagrid, taking out a large spotted handkerchief and burying his face in it. 'But I c-c-can't stand it – Lily an' James dead – an' poor little Harry off ter live with Muggles-' (17)

In both examples, the referent is perceived as either weak (because of small physical size, as with Bilbo) or, in the case of Harry Potter, very young and thus very small. Both examples occur in emotional circumstances: first, when Bilbo is nearly left behind because the Eagles who come to rescue Bilbo's group from the Wolves are unable to see Bilbo; and, second, when Hagrid considers Harry's tragic circumstances, namely the death of Harry's parents. Bilbo and Harry both evoke feelings of pity because both characters are quite helpless and, especially in Harry's case, are unable to change the fate that looms ahead for them. As I will show in the following section, this use of *poor little X* is especially relevant to certain characters in *Alice in Wonderland*.

In conclusion, English diminutives exist in various forms and can be formed in numerous ways to evoke certain meanings. The broad area of children's fiction has

demonstrated that English diminutives, especially in children's fiction, do express various semantic functions besides the prototypical meaning of 'small'. Some authors, such as Montgomery, use diminutives to greater positive emotional extents than other authors. Therefore, in this section, I have attempted to establish the uses of English diminutives in a selection of English children's books for children/YA aged from about eight to fourteen and to demonstrate how the diminutives are incorporated into the narratives to evoke affective qualities of pity, affection, endearment, disgust and many others. In the following section, I will narrow the focus to one children's book, *Alice in Wonderland*, and discuss the various diminutives formed with analytic diminutives in noun phrases and their various meanings, which are not quite as diverse as I described by the use of examples in children's literature. The section should provide a background of diminutives in *Alice in Wonderland* as preparation for the section that discusses the translation of diminutives from *Alice in Wonderland* into Polish and Russian.

1.3 Lewis Carroll and Diminutives in *Alice in Wonderland*

Alice in Wonderland was published in the late Victorian era by Lewis Carroll, the pseudonym of Charles Lutwidge Dodgson. Dodgson taught mathematics at Christ Church, Oxford and invented logic and word puzzles with which he entertained young girls. One of his stronger friendships with little girls was with Alice Liddell, the Christ Church dean's young daughter. One summer's day in 1862, Dodgson and a company that included Alice Liddell went on "a rowing expedition up the Thames" (Gardner 2000:7), where this story is said to have been first told to Alice. At Alice's insistence, Dodgson wrote the story, first called 'Alice's Adventures Under Ground' and gave it to her as a Christmas present; later, he revised his first version by adding several chapters and

publishing it as *Alice in Wonderland*. It is the culmination of puns, logic puzzles, wordplay and ‘verbal art’ that Dodgson enjoyed inventing during his spare time. Since *Alice in Wonderland* is the most-widely read book of Carroll’s (alongside its sequel, *Through the Looking-Glass*), the book has been translated into numerous languages and scholars have written about the translation of puns and wordplay for the past century. Due to the vast amount of puns in the book, Balci (2005) writes that “Carroll included hundreds of puns, many of which may never be discovered [and] figuring out exactly how many puns he included in *Alice* [may be] an impossibility” (43). However, to date, scholars have not typically looked past the book’s exterior of puns, jokes and wordplay to consider the expressive meanings that are conveyed by diminutives, even though a pun on little/Liddell could potentially dramatically affect the emotional colouring of the text and pose an additional challenge for translators.

Before continuing, I would like to point out the two known puns on little/Liddell. According to Gardner, the ‘three little sisters’ was the second instance where Carroll punned on the sound similarity between *Liddell* (which rhymed with ‘fiddle’⁸) and *little*, while the first instance occurs in the poem that opens the story. *Little*, interestingly, is the preferred and most frequently used diminutive marker in the book. This could cause some difficulty in analyzing diminutives, since many diminutive constructions with the analytic marker *little* could be replaced with *Liddell*; for instance, ‘little girl’ could be ‘Liddell girl’ or ‘a little door’ could be ‘a Liddell door’. In fact, I suggest that nearly all of the *little X* constructions could be substituted by *Liddell X*. For the purposes of this thesis, I consider any use of *little* (unless stated to stand for *Liddell*, such as the ‘three little

⁸ According to Gardner (2000), we know that ‘Liddell’ rhymed with ‘fiddle’ (with the stress on the first syllable) because “in Carroll’s day the students at Oxford composed the following couplet: *I am the Dean and this is Mrs. Liddell. / She plays the first, and I the second fiddle*” (75).

sisters’) to be an analytic diminutive marker. I leave a study on which instances of ‘little’ are puns for future scholarship because such a study remains outside the scope of this thesis. Thus, because Carroll was an expert with wordplay in the English language, future investigations into diminutives and puns in *Alice in Wonderland* could benefit from a more in-depth study of the *Liddell/little* language issue.

Carroll uses analytic diminutive constructions to provide ‘emotional shading’ in *Alice in Wonderland*. Many characters are described using analytic diminutive constructions in ways similar to those demonstrated in the various children’s books used in the previous section to establish diminutive use as important on a number of levels. Specifically, the most common semantic-pragmatic meanings in *Alice in Wonderland* convey positive/negative evaluation (e.g. *poky little house* or *tidy little room*); pity/empathy (e.g. *the unfortunate little Bill* or *the poor little thing*); irony (e.g. *nice little stories*); small type (e.g. *a little girl*). In order to convey these meanings, the narrator creates diminutive constructions using the adjectives *little*, *tiny* and *small* and also many preceding adjectives such as *dear*, *poky*, *nice*, *unfortunate*, *poor* and *tidy*. In this way, the diminutive constructions provide many ways for the narrator or a character to express an attitude or emotion towards a subject. (These meanings are dealt with in greater depth in chapter 4.)

The fact that various characters do not have diminutives connected to them at all is also significant because it contrasts those characters sharply with the characters that are strongly described by diminutives. A few characters are not the subject of a diminutive construction or do not use diminutives in their speech. Since diminutives usually are used in the contexts of women and children, it is not surprising that most of these ‘non-

diminutive' characters are male, adults and implied as 'mad' to varying degrees. The characters include the Mad Hatter, March Hare, Cheshire Cat, Pat and Gryphon (compared with Alice, the baby-pig, Bill, the Duchess, the Mouse and the White Rabbit, all of whom are described with a diminutive construction at least once in the story). The lack of diminutives used to describe objects around these characters like the Mad Hatter implies that they were not intended to inspire emotion through the meaning of 'littleness'; that is, their characters are not 'emotionally shaded' through diminutives. This lack of specified 'emotional shading' for such characters in the original allows for significant emotional changes to these characters and their environment in the Polish and Russian translations as I show in chapters 4 and 5.

To show how a diminutive construction can affect the perception of a character, I will turn to the White Rabbit as an example. The diminutive construction that describes the White Rabbit's voice, *shrill little voice*, suggests that the White Rabbit is not a powerful, authoritative personality, but *shrill* (that is, 'piercing', 'high-pitched' or 'sharp', which negatively evaluates the voice) and *little* in the following immediate context: "Imagine [Alice's] surprise, when the White Rabbit read out, at the top of his shrill little voice, the name "Alice!" (117). The diminutive construction that describes the White Rabbit's voice comes somewhat as a surprise, for when Alice first sees the White Rabbit, he appears quite distinguished (although rushed), wearing a waist-coat, kid-gloves and fan. In a subsequent chapter, the narrator describes the White Rabbit's house positively, using the diminutive constructions *neat little house* and *tidy little room*. Later, the White Rabbit frightens Alice by shouting at her in an angry tone, orders his servants about angrily and insults one of his workers. However, several chapters later, he re-

appears with a different attitude to the company around him. Instead of being angry, he is timid, anxious and afraid of the Queen of Hearts. Later, he appears as the herald in the trial scene, where he loses both of his previous demeanours. He becomes self-assured and interrupts the King of Hearts. Thus, the diminutive construction *shrill little voice* in the court scene shows the different sides of the White Rabbit. Rather than being a strong, self-assured character, the White Rabbit suddenly becomes a nervous rabbit who tries to adopt an air of authority that only frightens some people (such as Alice or his workers) initially. This sudden change in character does not evoke feelings of pity, which is reflected in the above diminutive construction, where the descriptive adjective *shrill* evokes an unlikeable, pejorative quality and the diminutive marker *little* adds to the emotional component of the analytic construction.

Turning to the diminutive meaning of ‘pity’ or ‘commiseration’, several characters seem to be associated with the *poor little X* construction, specifically the worker Bill, the baby that turns into a pig, and also Alice. All three characters appear helpless, young and find themselves in difficult circumstances. For example, Bill is a worker that the White Rabbit sends into the chimney after Alice and who is subsequently kicked out and knocked unconscious. Later on in the story, he appears as a juror who has a squeaking pencil that Alice steals away; when Alice stands up to give evidence, she knocks Bill out of his seat and puts him back in up-side down; and last, when the Queen of Hearts becomes upset, she throws an inkstand at Bill. During this time, Bill is referred to not only with the *poor little X* constructions *the poor little thing*, *the poor little Lizard* and *the poor little juror*, but also as *the unfortunate little Bill* and *a little animal*, and is also described as speaking with *a little feeble, squeaking voice*. The narrator sets Bill up

as a character who is supposed to be thought of with feelings of pity, especially since the narrator implies that Bill is a feeble, delicate and perhaps physically small character. The chapter title of ‘The Rabbit Sends in a Little Bill’ additionally seems to put the joke rather ruthlessly on ‘(poor) little Bill’. In a similar way, the baby-pig receives several diminutive constructions with *poor* in the short time from when the Duchess violently throws it in the air, throws it to Alice, where it eventually turns into a pig in Alice’s arms. The diminutive constructions include *poor little thing*, *queer-shaped little creature* and *little creature*, all of which (like Bill) imply that the baby-pig is somehow different from the other characters, deserving pity, and also being feeble (which, in this case, is because of the baby-pig’s age and thus evokes a similar diminutive meaning as *poor little Harry* in the previous section). Carroll thus adds strong emotional shading to the text through the portrayal and description of these characters using various diminutive constructions.

Alice plays a much larger role in the emotional shading of the book compared with Bill and the baby-pig; in fact, many emotions evoked by diminutive constructions (especially those of pity or empathy) are connected to Alice because she is the protagonist of the story. During the course of the book, Alice uses the *poor little X* construction to refer to a body part in “Oh, my poor little feet” (20); the narrator refers to Alice as “the poor little thing” (18); and, Alice refers to a puppy as “poor little thing!” (45). Alice’s emotional outbursts evoke pity (along with affection), which are made stronger in context. Other diminutive constructions do not use the *poor little X* construction, yet still evoke strong, often positive, emotional connotations. Some describe Alice’s surroundings so that Alice feels more at ease, such as the “dear little puppy” (46) that nearly crushes her because of its enormous size (compared with Alice); the pebbles

that turn into “little cakes” (44) that enable Alice to shrink and escape the White Rabbit’s house; the ‘little door’ that leads into Wonderland or the ‘little golden key’ that fits the lock; the “nice little dog” (27) that Alice eagerly describes to the offended Mouse; the “tidy little room” in the White Rabbit’s “neat little house” (38), and so forth. For the most part, these diminutives express positive emotions that often overshadow the dangerous or negative situation that Alice finds herself in.

Alice’s adoration for animals also helps her cope with her environment and her feelings. Alice’s attitude is apparent throughout the course of the book, as the animals (especially cats and dogs) that Alice meets in Wonderland or talks about receive a great deal of emotion, and sometimes this emotion is expressed through a diminutive construction. Outside of the Mouse, who appears to “wink with one of its little eyes” (26) at Alice, thus suggesting a positive evaluation that misrepresents the Mouse’s character, several animals receive positive and affectionate meanings through Alice’s conceptualization of them. For example, Alice tells the Mouse about “a nice little dog [...] a little bright-eyed terrier, you know, with oh, such long curly brown hair!” (27); later, Alice meets an enormous puppy that she escapes from without being trampled under its feet, but which she refers to as “a dear little puppy” (46) and “poor little thing!” (45). The other animals that Alice cares for, such as Dinah or the Cheshire Cat do not receive diminutives; rather, Alice refers to them with just ‘dear’ or ‘puss’. As I mentioned earlier, Alice’s expression of affection for these animals without using diminutives to express that affection leads to most translations adding diminutive suffixes to the animals’ names. Translations of *Dinah* and *the Cheshire Cat* often add diminutives to convey Alice’s affectionate feelings, which show the significance of what Wierzbicka

refers to as ‘true’ diminutives in Polish and Russian culture (see the following chapters for further discussion), although it cannot be denied that *Alice in Wonderland* does use diminutives for various semantic-pragmatic functions.

Although the positive nature and the meaning of ‘pity’ play significant roles in *Alice in Wonderland*, pejorative meanings without the meaning of ‘pity’ do occasionally occur, especially when Alice is reminded of her frightening situation. For example, when Alice sits in the dark hall after shrinking and growing several times, she finds that she cannot recite the multiplication table or a poem properly. Her sudden realization that she is all alone and confused make her wonder who she really is. At one point, she wonders whether she actually is Mabel, who lives in a “poky little house” (23). This thought causes her to, once again, burst into tears. Alice’s addition of the adjective ‘poky’ expresses her negative evaluation of Mabel’s house; however, the negative evaluation does not comment on Alice’s immediate surroundings, but of ‘real life’ outside of Wonderland. The other negative evaluation that Alice makes through a diminutive construction pejoratively evaluates characters rather than objects: the first conveys the Duchess as having a ‘sharp little chin’ that she digs into Alice’s shoulder while speaking of morals; the second occurs when Alice talks to herself while falling down the rabbit-hole, saying “what an ignorant little girl she’ll think me for asking!” (14). Alice also comments, before drinking from a bottle that leaves her trapped in the White Rabbit’s house, that she is “tired of being such a tiny little thing!” (38). The comment is not pejorative because it lacks a preceding adjective such as ‘poky’ to evoke a specific evaluation; yet, the use of *tiny* and the immediate context suggest that the diminutive construction cannot be considered positive or affectionate. Neither can it be neutral

because of the intensifier *such* and the exclamation mark that evoke a strong emotional reaction; indeed, in this context, the diminutive construction suggests a pejorative meaning. Although diminutive constructions in *Alice in Wonderland* are, on the whole, positive or evoking pity in nature, a few choice diminutive constructions evaluate objects (namely a house and a chin), and a person (Alice) with a negative evaluation.

Alice typically refers to herself as a ‘little girl’, which evokes both emotion and the prototypical meaning of ‘small’; however, we receive an affectionate and endearing perspective through the diminutive constructions Alice’s sister uses to refer to Alice at the end of the book. Alice’s sister thinks of Alice as ‘little Alice’ with “tiny hands clasped upon her knee” (126) and the “queer little toss of her head” (126). Alice’s sister quickly falls into a reverie which becomes “alive with the strange creatures of her little sister’s dream” (126). This leads to the last paragraph of the book, where Alice’s sister pictures “to herself how this same little sister of hers would, in the after-time, be herself a grown woman [...] and how she would gather about her other little children, and make *their* eyes bright and eager with many a strange tale” (127, original emphasis). These last paragraphs of the book evoke strong positive evaluations of Alice that express the sister’s affection and love for ‘little Alice’. Except for the one construction that uses *tiny* in an affectionate way to describe Alice’s clasped hands, the other diminutive constructions use the analytic diminutive *little* to convey positive attitudes towards Alice while also adding the meaning of ‘young of its kind’ and ‘small size’ because the narrator contrasts ‘little Alice’ with the future, grown-up Alice who the narrator comments, would “gather about her other little children [...] remembering her own child-life, and the happy summer days” (127). Unlike *Wonderland*, with its diminutives that convey pity and sporadic

negative evaluations, the ‘real world’ at the end conveys only deep-rooted affectionate meanings for ‘little Alice’.

Alice’s name appears in the wordplay in the Dormouse’s tale about the ‘three little sisters’ who live in a well. These names represent the only diminutive forms of names that Carroll uses in the book. However, these diminutive names also are used as wordplay, since the three names, *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie*, are the names of the ‘three little sisters’ of the Dormouse’s story and are anagrams for the three Liddell sisters besides being diminutives in their own right. As Gardner (2000) writes, “Elsie is L.C. (Lorina Charlotte), Tillie refers to Edith’s family nickname Matilda, and Lacie is an anagram of Alice” (75). In addition, the name *Elsie* is a Scottish diminutive for *Elizabeth/Elspeth* (as we saw in the previous section about the little girl named Elizabeth) or *Alice*; the second name, *Lacie*, is a diminutive/familiar form of *Larissa* but also comes from the well-known medieval last name *Lassy*; and, the third name, *Tillie*, is a diminutive of *Matilda*. Although one of Carroll’s intentions was to pun Alice’s and her sisters’ names, the end result are three names with the common diminutive ending *-ie* that are not formal personal names. In this way, Carroll uses diminutives stylistically for a subtle interplay of emotional shading and humour.

To offset the emotional meanings of diminutive constructions that use *little*, the analytic marker *small* appears in the book infrequently and to convey the meaning of ‘small’ in the same ways as in my discussion of *small* in the previous section. The use of *small* is very limited and generally involves a contrast with something large or little. For example, “it led into a small passage, not much larger than a rat-hole” (15) describes the physical size first by comparing the passage to a rat-hole. Later in the story, the passage

becomes the ‘little passage’ that Alice is able to pass through to enter the beautiful gardens of Wonderland. In another instance, Alice eats “a very small cake” that she finds in “a little glass box” (18), which causes her to grow much larger in size. In another instance, Alice hands out comfits to the party of animals, which “caused some noise and confusion, as the large birds complained that they could not taste theirs, and the small ones choked” (33), which directly contrasts the physically large birds with the physically small birds. In addition, when Alice carries the ‘little golden key’ to all the doors in the great hall, the narrator comments that “either the locks were too large, or the key was too small” (15), which functions the same way as with the birds in the previous example. Thus, as I discussed in the previous section, the analytic marker *small* does not evoke emotion; rather, it describes the physical size of the subject.

In a similar way to *small*, the analytic marker *tiny* also tends to convey physical size rather than emotional qualities, such as when Alice first comes across the “tiny golden key” (15) that, afterwards, is usually referred to as the ‘little golden key’, thus suggesting that *little* has more emotional implications than *tiny*. Later, when Alice refers to herself as a ‘tiny little thing’, as I discussed earlier, the *tiny* also seems to suggest physical small size, but since *tiny* immediately precedes *little*, some of the emotional connotations of *little* could be attributed to it in the same manner of diminutive constructions that contain adjectives such as ‘poky’ or ‘sharp’. However, when Alice’s sister refers to Alice’s ‘tiny hands’, the context and the fact that the diminutive construction refers to a body part of a little girl serves the emotional feelings being evoked in those concluding paragraphs of the book. As Schneider comments, *tiny* requires an in-depth investigation into its semantic-pragmatic functions in order to

establish possible levels of emotional meaning and other possible meanings that the analytic marker could convey in various contexts.

Although this brief introduction to diminutives' meanings in *Alice in Wonderland* and their uses in portraying various characters has not covered every diminutive in the book, my aim in this section was to present some of the variety of diminutives that Carroll used in the book. (A full chapter-by-chapter list of all diminutives can be found in Appendix B). In chapter 4 and 5, I will go into more detail concerning the diminutives linked with each character's description, surroundings and name, which will uncover the main focus of this thesis, specifically the translation of these analytic diminutives into synthetic languages which have unique and diverse diminutives to express many emotional nuances. In the following chapter, I will provide a brief background to diminutives in the Polish and Russian cultures and languages respectively.

1.4 Summary

The English language does have, and uses, many different diminutives for various purposes and semantic functions besides the meaning of 'small'. Although Wierzbicka claims that diminutives hardly exist at all in English, diminutives (both synthetic and analytic) are actively used to portray various meanings. These include pity or empathy in *poor little X* constructions, which can be found in children's literature and often in *Alice in Wonderland*; affection and endearment in constructions with adjectives such as *dear* or *nice*, which are used very often by Montgomery and also in *Alice in Wonderland* to make Alice's surroundings appear less frightening; negative evaluation in constructions that use adjectives such as *treacherous* or *poky* or in synthetic diminutives; and, in names,

diminutive suffixes such as *-sie*, *-ie/-y* or *-kins* can evoke different emotional nuances and also co-occur with the analytic diminutive *little* for a stronger emotional effect.

When we consider the synthetic and analytic diminutives in Polish and Russian in the next chapter, we see parallels between English diminutives and Slavic diminutives emerging, although many of the various suffixes that denote emotional nuances are often unique to Polish or Russian. I have shown above that linguistically, various analytic and synthetic diminutives can be constructed in English . However, as I will show in the following chapters, the translation of English diminutives into Polish and Russian does not depend as much on whether or not the diminutive can be constructed, but whether speakers of the language conceptualize the subject as one that can receive diminutive meaning. Thus, diminutives are added in the Polish and Russian translations, while several English diminutives are not translated as diminutives but become lost in translation; diminutives are a linguistic device that affects translation and creates problems for translators, as we will see in subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2: Introducing *Kasia* and *Katyusha*

A second foundational aspect of this thesis is to investigate Slavic diminutives in relation to Slavic language and how it reflects on culture (namely Polish, a West Slavic language, and Russian, an East Slavic language). Unlike diminutives in English, Slavic diminutives and their diverse range of expressive meanings and various nuances do not cause controversy among scholars; rather, Slavic diminutives have long been established as a significant and a unique part of Slavic language and culture. For example, Bratus writes that “[l]anguages rich in diminutives are the Slavonic group (especially East Slavonic – Russian, Ukrainian and White Russian)” (1). Likewise, Długosz (2009) writes that “[a]ll Slavic languages feature a large wealth of diminutive formations” (14, my translation).

An objective of this chapter is to illustrate the unique meanings of Slavic diminutives and to show that ‘affection’ is a significant meaning of Polish and Russian diminutives. Like English diminutives, Slavic diminutives also convey non-affectionate meanings, including irony, contempt, pity and negative evaluation. In addition, I argue that “some parallels can be drawn” (Waddington 18), if not several, between Polish/Russian diminutives and English diminutives; that is, I argue that Slavic diminutives in many instances can parallel English diminutives structurally (either with affixes or analytic markers and adjectives) and also can parallel English diminutives through diminutive meaning. Although some Russian and Polish diminutives cannot be expressed in English (e.g. many of the diverse diminutive forms of names), Russian and Polish use analytic constructions equivalent to ‘little X’ or ‘small X’. These parallels aid in the translation of diminutives (cf. chapter 3 and 4). I draw from diminutives in

children's literature (a genre where diminutives generally convey positive evaluation and affection, but can also convey negative evaluation) and the observations of other scholars in order to show the parallels and differences between Slavic and English diminutives in a context in a way that can serve as a background for the case study in chapter 4. Thus, the focus of this chapter is to provide background on Polish and Russian diminutives and show the diminutive meanings that easily parallel English diminutives. The parallels demonstrate that many English diminutives can, indeed, be translated into Russian or Polish, though cultural differences cause several obstacles between the use of diminutives between these languages.

Chapter 2 is broken down into two main sections. The first section will discuss the morphology and meanings of Russian diminutives with reference to 'native' Russian children's literature, while the second section will provide an overview of Polish diminutives, also with reference to 'native' Polish children's literature.

2.1 Creating Russian Diminutives: Introducing Vanya, Kolya and Sasha

As Waddington (1965) writes, Russian diminutives are "an enormous subject, and there would be no point in treating it exhaustively here" (17). Following Waddington's approach, I will present evidence of Waddington's claim that "although Russian diminutives are unique in their extent and their variety, some parallels can be drawn" (18) between Russian and English with use of examples from Russian children's literature.⁹ The aim for this section is two-fold: a) to present a broad overview of Russian diminutive formation, especially the formations that have some parallels to English and b) to expound upon expressive diminutive meaning in children's literature, a genre where

⁹ For a more detailed analysis of Russian diminutives, see Bratus (1969).

diminutives occur frequently. The children's books under examination are: *Алые Паруса* [*Alye Parusa*] 'Red Sails' (1922) by Грин [Grin], *Прошу к нашему шалашу* [*Proshu k Nashemu Shalashu*] 'Invite to our Hut' (1970) by Савин [Savin], *Девочка в бурном море* [*Devochka v Burnom More*] 'Girl in Rough Seas' (1969) by Воскресенская [Voskresenskaja], *Только вперед* [*Tol'ko vperjod*] 'Only Forward' (1952) by Раевский [Raevskij], *Малахитовая шкатулка* [*Malahitovaja shkatulka*] 'Malachite Casket' (1985) by Бажов [Bazhov] and *Белый Пудель* [*Belyj Pudel'*] 'The White Poodle' (1904) by Куприн [Kuprin]. These books have been chosen randomly to give a broad range of diminutive use by different authors during the past century. In order to provide evidence for my arguments regarding the multi-faceted semantic-pragmatic features of Russian diminutives and their parallels to English, I couple a corpus analysis with close reading of several books, specifically *Белый Пудель* [*Belyj Pudel'*] and *Алые Паруса* [*Alye Parusa*].

Since Russian diminutives have been studied extensively by scholars during the past century, I will provide a brief review of previous literature on Russian diminutives. The observations scholars have made has established Russian diminutives as significant ways to express emotion in the Russian language. For example, Bratus concludes that “[d]iminutivization is one of the most important expressive resources in Russian. With the aid of diminutives Russian can render various shades of expressiveness and subjective colouring: tenderness, affection, delight, friendly attitude, irony, scorn, contempt, flattery, condescension and familiarity. [...] Russian is rich in suffixes for creating diminutives” (55-56). The Russian language is a language well-known for its “rich morphology and an elaborated diminutive system” (Protassova and Voeikova 2007:43) through a range of

simplex and complex diminutive suffixes that can express various shades of meaning (cf. Waddington 1964:18). Waddington expresses the vastness of Russian diminution and the diverse meanings of Russian diminutives in one poignant sentence: “No dictionary can possibly do justice to the immense wealth of Russian diminutives” (18).¹⁰ Thus, as a synthetic language, Russian (as Polish) expresses diminution and other meanings through the use of extensive affixes that evoke numerous meanings.

A reason that Russian diminutives cannot have justice done to them by dictionaries lies in the fact that the suffixes produce diminutives that can have various shades of meaning or emotion, some of which are unique to the Russian language. Furthermore, diminutive creation is very productive and not entirely systematic because it is situation-specific. Thus, in some cases, “diminutives may simply denote smallness; or they may only convey affection (or contempt); or they can be both concrete and emotional at the same time. Unfortunately, exactly the same word can fulfil each of these three functions in turn, depending on the mood of the speaker, the audience, the context, and the reference” (Waddington 18). In other words, the same word can receive different diminutive suffixes to express a different shade of emotion or meaning depending on the four major factors identified by Waddington above. For example, the diminutive form of the noun *сын* [*syn*] ‘son’ can be *сынoк* [*synok*], *сынoчек* [*synochek*], *сынyля* [*synulja*] or even *сынa* [*syna*] or, in colloquial Russian, *сынoчка* [*synochka*]; or, the noun *кoт* [*kot*] ‘cat’ can become the diminutive forms *кoтик* [*kotik*], *кoтoк* [*kotok*] or *кoтёнок* [*kotjonok*] (cf. Protassova and Voeikova 44). As Waddington writes, each form expresses a different meaning, depending on the speaker, mood, audience and reference.

¹⁰ See Appendix A2 for a complete list of all Russian diminutive suffixes.

Thus, the many suffixes can appear to cause significant difficulty in translating Russian diminutives into other languages, especially Germanic languages, which tend to create diminutives through an analytic construction that contains one or more analytic markers that diminutivize the noun (cf. 1.1). Despite the fact that this diverse set of diminutives can cause potential difficulty in translation, the Russian translators under study in chapter 4 use the common diminutive forms for many of their translations, including their translations of *Cheshire-Puss* (refer to chapter 4). In this way, a parallel to English can be drawn, as in the case of ‘cat’ or ‘puss’; English has the diminutive ‘kitty’ and the ability to add various emotions through analytic constructions, including: ‘little kitty’, ‘dear kitty’, ‘dear little kitty’. Speakers can also create new synthetic diminutives by adding various diminutives to a base noun, creating ‘catling’ or ‘kittykins’. Returning to analytic constructions, Russian can also create constructions where synthetic diminutives co-occur (e.g. *маленький котик* [*malen'kij kotik*]) ‘little cat-DIM’. Thus, Russian and English can draw parallels in how each language constructs diminutives, though the resulting diminutives might not be typically used in the particular language.

Before I proceed further, I would like to mention that the semantic meaning of diminutives “is influenced by the character of the base stem to which they adhere (lexical factor), the broader linguistic context in which they appear (textual factor) and their relationship to the units of the discourse situation (pragmatic factor)” (Volek 1987:56). In fact, as Volek aptly states, “[i]t is impossible to establish the meaning of the diminutive suffixes in isolation” (56), even though Bratus attempts to establish the meanings of Russian suffixes in relative isolation (e.g. *-ушко* [*-ishko*] to “convey disparagement or a condescending irony” (33), which is not necessarily true, as I will show in the following

sub-section). However, some diminutives (especially object diminutives) are largely lexicalized and convey little emotional meaning; as Volek writes, these diminutives “are characterized by the fact that the actual context is relatively unimportant; these are diminutives the emotive character of which is either not present at all or is very weak” (104). Some of these diminutives include “*stolik* ‘table’, *domik* ‘house’, *korobočka* ‘box’, *kabinka* ‘cabin’, *gorodok* ‘town’” (104). Thus, in some cases we cannot establish one specific meaning for a Russian (or Polish) diminutive suffix because the meaning may vary depending on the specific context, stylistic use and the base noun affected. In the following chapters, I will analyze diminutives in children’s literature in their immediate context, as will be done in the case study in chapter 4.

The various shades of meanings in Russian (and also Polish) can be expressed through diminutives formed from nouns, interjections, particles (e.g. *аюшкы* [*ajushki*] ‘ah-DIM’ from *a* ‘what’), adjectives and adverbs (e.g. *туточки* [*tutochki*] ‘here-DIM’ from *тут* [*tut*] ‘here’), and, in few cases, verbs including *кушенькаты* [*kushen’kat’*] ‘to eat-DIM’ from *кушать* [*kushat’*] ‘to eat’ (Protassova and Voieikova 2007:45).

Diminutives from particles and verbs are not as frequent as diminutives formed from nouns and adjectives (Waddington 18). As I have discussed in the previous chapter, diminutives in English are restricted to nouns and possibly adjectives (e.g. *bluish*). Since Russian has many diverse nuances and shades of meaning depending on context, I mention the five main meanings listed by Bratus (2-3): ‘diminutiveness’ (smallness of quantity or size, etc.) such as *городок* [*gorodok*] ‘small town’ or *ножка* [*nozhenka*] ‘small foot’; ‘tenderness’ such as *миленький* [*milen’kij*] ‘nice and dear’ or *хлебушко* [*hlebushko*] ‘a loaf, a nice little loaf’; ‘disparagement’ such as *городушка* [*gorodishka*]

‘a miserable little town’ or *женишок* [*zhenishok*] ‘a sorry-looking bridegroom’; ‘irony’ such as *идейка* [*ideyka*] ‘a sort of idea’; and, also, ‘condescension and familiarity’ such as *комнатушечка* [*komnatushechka*] ‘an insignificant little room’.

2.1.1 Object Diminutives

Of the main meanings, the first (‘diminutiveness’) generally conveys a positive emotion such as positive evaluation besides just ‘small size’. (This is especially true of English analytic diminutives; *see* 1.2.) Generally, the more simplex diminutives derived from this category can be easily paralleled with English diminutives. For example, in *Прошу к Нашему Шалашу* [*Proshu k Nashemu Shalashu*] *а ветерок* [*veterok*] ‘little wind’ blows, as shown in the following context: “Дунет ветерок - и зазвенит” [*Dunet veterok - i zazvenit*] ‘The little wind blows- and tingles’ (n.pag.). Here, ‘little wind’ could be replaced with ‘breeze’, which shows the difference between English and Russian in conceptualizing certain nouns with emotional connotations. The diminutive does not convey affection *per se*, but the immediate context conveys a positive evaluation of the ‘little wind’ because ‘tingle’ is generally regarded as a positive sensation on the skin. A more endearing type of diminutive appears when adults address children. When the character Trilli has an accident in *Белый Пудель* [*Belyj Pudel'*], an adult uses diminutives when referring to Trilli in the following context: “прими лекарство; увидишь, тебе сразу-сразу станет легче: и животик пройдет и головка” [*primi lekarstvo; uvidish', tebe srazu-srazu stanet lehche: i zivotik projdet i golovka*] ‘Take this medicine: you’ll see, you’ll immediately-immediately be better: and your stomach-DIM and your head-DIM’ (22). In the passage, the diminutives *животик* [*zhivotik*] ‘stomach-DIM’ which Bratus says comes “with [a] nuance of tenderness” (7) and *головка*

[*golovka*] ‘head-DIM’ express a smaller size (a child’s stomach and head) but also affection, as one would feel towards a hurt child. Thus, although a main part of the Russian diminutive meaning remains ‘diminutiveness’, affection or positive evaluation also is often evoked because the subject is small in size, causing the speaker to feel a degree of tenderness towards the referent.

Before continuing, I would like to briefly discuss the cultural dissimilarity in the latter example. Although English can construct a similar structure that expresses emotion by using ‘little head’ and ‘little stomach’, the English diminutives would not typically be used in English. Arguably, then, the problem that underlies back-translation is mainly language-specific and cultural. In Russian (and Polish), diminutives are used when speaking of a child’s body, but in that context, diminutives are not often used in English; if diminutives are used in English, they are typically preceded by an adjective, as I discussed in 1.2. Borrás and Christian (1971) provide the example of “a doctor addressing a child: *pokazhi jazychok*” (51), which literally translates as ‘let me see your little tongue’. Because in Anglo-Saxon culture a doctor would not ask a child to stick out her ‘little tongue’ or talk about a child patient’s ‘little feet’, Borrás and Christian translate the Russian request as ‘let me see your tongue’. Kelly (2007) calls this ‘baby-talk’, which she writes is “abundantly employed [by] the rich range of diminutives in the language, giving an emotional coloration to everyday processes, such as dressing, eating, or dealing with parts of the body” (358). Kelly’s examples of ‘dressing’, ‘eating’ and ‘dealing with parts of the body’, all deal with children’s bodies. Thus, it is not that Russian has a unique diminutive that cannot be translated into English or that positive feeling towards a child’s body is confined to Russians, but that Russian culture encourages speakers to

express their feelings towards cute, small children by speaking to them not as if they were adults, but as little children. Thus, this phenomenon greatly influences whether diminutives are used, and also affects the translation of children's literature, as I will show in the following paragraphs.

The meaning of 'tenderness' is most often expressed through the *-еньк-* [-en 'k-] affix in adjectives and adverbs (similar to the Polish affix *-iutk-*), and also through third-degree diminutives, which are "formed with the aid of double and sometimes even triple diminutive suffixes" (9). In children's literature, the *-еньк-* [-en 'k-] diminutive affix appears frequently in adjectives to express affection and endearment. For example, in *Белый Пудель [Belyj Pudel']*, the boy, Sergei, takes off his old coat and remains in his "стареньком нитяном трико" [*staren'kom nitjanom triko*] 'old-DIM thready gymnastic costume' (28) that shows his thin but strong figure. Here, the diminutive affix appears in *стареньком [staren'kom]* 'old-DIM:Prep' and refers to his outfit in an affectionate way, which could be glossed as his 'dear little old'. In this case, the diminutive contributes to the positive, affectionate feelings towards the character during the entire paragraph. The similar diminutive suffix *-енька [-en 'ka]* attaches itself to a noun to create a diminutive-hypocoristic form, for example when Sergei's grandfather says, "[п]оди сюда, Арто, поди, моя собаченька" [*podj sjud, Arto, podj, moja sobachen 'ka*] (38) which back-translates as 'come here, Arto, come, my dear little doggie'. In this example, the second-degree diminutive *собаченька [sobachen 'ka]* 'dog-DIM-DIM' (< *собачка [sobachka]* < *собака [sobaka]*) expresses the grandfather's strong affection and tenderness towards the dog. Bratus explains that this "doubling of the diminutive suffix expresses a greater degree of tenderness, a kindly, loving attitude [...] compared with the ordinary

diminutives” (8). Thus, usually any diminutive suffix of the second or third degree conveys very strong emotional attitudes, and third-degree diminutives are “devoid of negative emotional nuances” (35). In English, however, third-degree diminutives are rare, such as in the diminutive name *Ronniekins* that I discussed in the previous chapter; thus, translating third-degree Russian diminutives into English requires the use of several analytic markers and also adjectives, such as the *dear* in ‘dear little X’. These Russian diminutives convey positive emotional nuances, a fact which is true of Polish diminutives as well (see section 2.2 below).

Diminutives typically convey positive emotional nuances, but several diminutive suffixes create diminutives that convey negative evaluation, scorn, disparagement and other pejorative nuances. A diminutive that usually has a pejorative meaning can appear in children’s literature, usually with the suffix *-ушко* [*-ishko*] or *-онка/-ёнка* [*-onka/-jonka*], but in children’s literature the pejorative meaning rarely takes effect or appears in the text. Rather, the diminutive can often be used for stylistic purposes. For example, in *Белый Пудель* [*Belyj Pudel'*], the grandfather remarks, “[з]ачем ему брать? Человек солидный, непьющий... домишко у него в Севастополе” [*zachem emu brat'? Chelovek solidniy, nep'jushhiy... domishko u nego v Sevastopole*] (9), which translates as ‘what to bring it to him for? The person is solid, not a drinker...he has a little house in Sevastopol’. Although the diminutive *домишко* [*domishko*] ‘house-DIM-DIM’ typically is glossed as a ‘miserable little house’ or even ‘small wretched house; hovel’ because, as Bratus claims, diminutives with an *-ушко* [*-ishko*] suffix “convey disparagement or a condescending irony” (33), the diminutive *домишко* [*domishko*] ‘house-DIM-DIM’ in the above passage serves only as a marker of the speaker’s language. The diminutive

does not convey any negative nuances above. (In the translations of *Alice in Wonderland* in 4.2.2, however, the diminutive conveys disparagement and negative evaluation.)

Rather, it emphasizes the diminutives that the grandfather typically uses in his speech. In a similar way, the use of a diminutive for stylistic and pragmatic purposes also appears in Miss Cornelia's frequent use of the diminutive *dearie* in Montgomery's *Anne's House of Dreams*, as I discussed in the previous chapter.

Russian is a synthetic language; yet, *small* and, more often, *little* are sometimes constructed through an analytic construction, including the construction *маленький X* [*malen'kij X*] 'little X', which typically conveys affection or positive diminutive meaning. In some cases, these analytic constructions can also be translated as *small*. For example, Грин [Grin's] *Алые Паруса* [*Alye Parusa*] contains several analytic constructions, including “маленькие модели лодок” [*malen'kie modeli lodok*] (11), or “маленьком доме Лонгена” [*malen'kom dome Longena*] (9) which can be translated as ‘little model boats’ and ‘Longen’s small house’ respectively. Or, to show the construction in its immediate context: “Но эти дни норда выманивали Лонгена из его маленького теплого дома” [*No eti dni norda vymanivali Longena iz ego malen'kogo teplogo doma*] (12), where the phrase can be back-translated as ‘But these days of the north wind lured Longen from his little warm house’. Additionally, another parallel can be drawn to English with the addition of adjectives and other parts of speech that convey positive emotion. For example, in *Белый Пудель* [*Belyj Pudel'*], poor Zembo's (an elephant) eyes are referred to through an analytic construction that is surrounded in its immediate context by words including ‘joy’ and ‘tenderly’ in (4) below:

- (4) С искренней радостью он поворачивался то левым, то правым боком, и его маленькие глаза ласково щурились

S iskrennej radost'ju on povorachivalsja to levym, to pravym bokom, i evo malen'kie glaza laskovo shhurilis'

With sincere joy he turned to the left, then to the right side, and his little eyes squinted tenderly (89)

Or, in Воскресенская's [*Voskresenskaya's*] *Девочка в Бурном Море* [*Devochka v Burnom More*] in (5) below:

- (5) перед ним, как два маленьких светлых зеркала, светились глаза Антошки

pered nim, kak dva malen'kih svetlyh zerkala, svetilis' glaza Antoshki

in front of him, like two little light mirrors, shone Antoshka's eyes (n.pag.)

Here, Antoshka's eyes are described as being like 'two little light mirrors'. In addition, the co-occurrence of synthetic and analytic diminutives also appears, thus drawing another parallel to English. An example occurs in Савин's [*Savin's*] *Прошу к нашему шалашу* [*Proshu k nashemu shalashu*]: "Но вот в черной дыре показались короткие маленькие ушки" [*No vot v chernoy dyre pokazalis' korotkie malen'kie ushki*], where the construction *маленькие ушки* [*malen'kie ushki*] 'little ears-DIM' contains an analytic marker (*маленькие* [*malen'kie*]:Pl) and a synthetic diminutive (*ушки* [*ushki*]). The different uses and frequency of analytic constructions in the children's books under study suggest that analytic constructions may also express some types of emotion, although

rather weak because the analytic marker is not the direct equivalent of *little*, although if the analytic marker precedes a synthetic diminutive, the meaning is more equivalent to ‘little’. The diminutive suffixes are commonly understood by scholars to convey various emotive meanings; yet, analytic constructions are rarely discussed in translation criticism, even though these three types of constructions parallel English and suggest a simpler translation from and into English.

2.1.2 Names and Formal Titles

Although some parallels do exist between Russian and English diminutive constructions, the diminutive meanings expressed by diminutivized personal first names are mostly unique to Russian (and also to Polish). Names in Russian pose a problem for translators because of “the many diminutive forms of Russian first names...[which] may be used of anyone, irrespective of his age, and they express various shades of familiarity or endearment. Most of these shades of meaning are impossible to convey in English” (Waddington 22) through equivalent synthetic diminutives. For example, the name *Vera* can become *Веронька* [*Veron’ka*], *Веруся* [*Verusya*], *Верочка* [*Verochka*] and *Верка* [*Verka*]. While the former diminutive names generally convey positive meaning, the last of the diminutive forms with the *-ka* suffix is usually considered pejorative and can be rendered in English as “that Vera” (Waddington 23). (It is interesting to note that in Polish, the *-ka* suffix in *Dorotka* or *Dorka* ‘Dorota-DIM’ is not considered depreciative or less ‘tender’ than another simple diminutive form, *Dosia*, which does not have a *-ka* diminutive suffix.)

Russian children’s literature also uses diminutive forms of names, but every possible form of a character’s name is not used for a particular character. Rather,

characters seem to have certain diminutive forms that are used by most other characters in a story, including a character's close friends and family. In examining the children's literature under study, I found that the names used can usually be expressed in English because the more complex forms are used in more emotional statements (such as *little Megsie* by Mrs Who, which I discussed in chapter 1.2). For example, in *Белый Пудель* [*Belyj Pudel'*], several names appear in their diminutive forms for the dog named *Арто* [*Arto*] and the young boy named *Сергей* [*Sergei*], but these appear at certain times during the book. When Sergei's grandfather loses his dog, he calls for it, saying “Арто! Ар-то-шень-ка !” [*Arto! Ar-to-shen'-ka!*] (56), where the latter diminutivized version of the name uses a strongly affectionate diminutive form. Also, the main character's name, *Сергей* [*Sergei*], derives two tender forms in the book, specifically the first-degree form *Серёжа* [*Serjozha*] ‘Sergei-DIM’ and the second-degree diminutive form *Серёженька* [*Serjozhen'ka*] ‘Sergei-DIM-DIM’, which is “used mainly to children [which often] distinguish between parents and adults with the same name” (Cubberley 2002:356). Both of the examples are used frequently to refer to Sergei by his grandfather. Predictably, the diminutive form *Серёжка* [*Sejzhka*] is not used by the grandfather because the form is “usually pejorative or indicative of annoyance” (Cubberley 356). Likewise, the other possible diminutive forms that could be created from Sergei's name are not used by any character, thus showing that Sergei is addressed by certain diminutive forms of his name and not others. Thus, when drawing parallels with English, it is evident that some concerns would be brought up regarding the nuances conveyed by each diminutive form. But despite the unique nature of Russian diminutivized names, characters usually have one or two forms that are generally used for the character, and these forms can sometimes

have parallels to English (e.g. *Katherine* > *Kathy, Kate, Katie, Kitty*), and therefore are able to be translated to and from Russian.

Before I conclude this section, I would like to briefly comment on the бедняжка (*bednjazhka*) ‘poor little thing’ diminutives. The equivalent of ‘poor little thing’ in Russian is expressed either synthetically through a diminutive such as бедняжка [*bjednjazhka*] or, less frequently, through an analytic construction (e.g. бедный маленький человек [*bedny malen'kij chelovek*] ‘poor little person’). For example, in Раевский’s [*Raevskij’s*] *Только вперед* [*Tol’ko vperjod*], a character says, “сестре за меня так попало!..Даже заплакала, бедняжка!” [*sestre za menja tak popalo!..Dazhe zaplakala, bednjazhka!*] ‘sister got in trouble for me so horribly! ..She even cried, poor little thing!’ (n.pag.). Here, the sister is conceptualized as a бедняжка [*bednjazhka*] ‘poor little thing’, which is emphasized by the sister’s crying. Despite the existence of the *poor little X* diminutive construction in Russian through either a synthetic diminutive or analytic construction, these appeared rarely in the Russian children’s stories under study. As in the English children’s literature, the Russian equivalents of *poor X* constructions were preferred because the subject does not have to be conceptualized as a ‘small type’.

In this section on Russian diminutives in native Russian children’s literature, I suggest that although Russian diminutives generally convey positive emotional nuances, they can also convey negative nuances. In addition, many analytic constructions with the equivalent of English ‘little’ appear in the children’s literature (e.g. *маленькие руки* [*malen'kie ruki*] ‘little hands’).

Despite the types of diminutives available for Russian language speakers to show affection and various other meanings, I have provided evidence of Waddington’s claim

that “although Russian diminutives are unique in their extent and their variety, some parallels can be drawn” (18) between Russian and English. The Russian language has diminutive forms of names (i.e. *Серёженка [Serezhenka]* < *Сергей [Sergei]*) that would not translate well into English or any other analytic language, if it can translate at all; and yet, the Russian language uses analytic constructions equivalent to ‘little X’ and also constructions where synthetic and analytic forms co-occur, thereby drawing some parallels to English. Thus, a similar structure of diminutive formation also seems to exist, which can help in the translation of diminutives that will be discussed in chapter 4.

2.2 Polish Diminutives: Creating Kasia, Wasia and Basia

In Polish, “the inventory of diminutive forms [...] is very rich” (Długosz 2009: 274, my translation).¹¹ In the same way as in Russian diminutives, Polish diminutives express various meanings through mainly synthetic diminutives. Reid and Marslen-Wilson (2003) write that “Diminutive suffixes are one of the most productive derivational suffixes in Polish. Diminutive forms can be created for almost every noun [...] and can convey two meanings, a small size or affectionate feelings towards a given object” (294). The authors give the synthetic diminutive *kocyk* as an example, writing that it “might be a little blanket or a beloved blanket, or indeed both” (294). Likewise, Bielec (1998) supports this claim, writing that “[d]iminutive forms of nouns (less often of other words) are a particular, very frequent feature of Polish. They denote the *smallness of*, or *fondness towards*, a person or object” (98, original emphasis). Szczepańska (2009) writes that Polish diminutives are emotionally “more often positive than negative” (250, my translation). The many diminutives that convey positive meanings more often than

¹¹ See Appendix A1 for a complete list of all Polish diminutive suffixes.

negative meanings could be the reason that Wierzbicka calls Slavic diminutives the ‘heart’ of the Polish language and culture.

The wide range of diminutives strongly suggests that diminutives make up a large part of the Polish language. It might be assumed, therefore, that diminutives are used very often in Polish children’s literature. However, outside of names, diminutives are used sparingly in children’s books, such as *Król Maciuś Pierwszy* [*King Matty the First*] (1923) and *Kajtuś Czarodziej* [*Kaytek the Wizard*] (1935) by Janusz Korczak (note that the name of the main characters, *Maciuś* and *Kajtuś*, are diminutive forms that are translated into English as *Matt/Matty* and *Kaytek* respectively); *Puc, Bursztyn i Goście* [*Puc, Bursztyn and Company*] (1946) by Jan Grabowski; *Tomek Wśród Łowców Głów* [*Tommy Amongst the Head-hunters*] (1965) by Alfred Szklarski; *Porwania Profesora Gąbki* [*The Abduction of Professor Gabek*] by Stanisław Pagaczewski; *Imieniny* [*Name Day*] (1998) by Małgorzata Musierowicz; *Piosenka Koguta* [*The Song of the Rooster*] (1998) by Krystyna Siesicka; and *W Pustyni i w Puszczy* [*In Desert and in Wilderness*] (1911) by Henryk Sienkiewicz. Thus, in this section I show how Polish diminutives are treated in Polish children’s literature aimed at children from ages 8-14. As in the previous section, I will specifically argue that Polish diminutives have a) parallels with English and b) diverse and unique meanings, some of which are pejorative when used in a negative context. My selection of children’s books has been randomly chosen from Polish literature in order to show books from throughout the past century by different authors. In this way, a broader range of diminutive use and functions can be shown, since the Polish language and its expressive functions have shifted during the past century, and

each uses diminutives in a slightly different way (as is the case with both Russian children's literature in 2.1 and English children's literature in 1.2).

2.2.1 Names and Terms of Endearment

I would like to begin with Polish diminutive names, which Wierzbicka addresses as a vital aspect of the Polish language. As Wierzbicka aptly states, as many as ten different forms can be created from a single name such as *Anna* or *Maria*. Despite the numerous forms that can be derived from those names, some names (e.g. *Ewa*) may not have quite as extensive an array of diminutive forms as the former examples. However, the diminutive names are frequently used to show positive emotional meaning, as Miodunka (2002) writes, saying that "Polish names always have their official form stated on documents, and the unofficial form used in the family circle, among friends, etc. The semantic characteristic feature of diminutives is that they express intimacy and a friendly attitude on the part of the speaker" (46). However, these 'unofficial forms' are not limited to the family circle or friends in children's literature; rather, many of the children in these stories usually are called by their diminutive forms by the narrator and also in written discourse. Thus, in Sienkiewicz's *W Pustyni i w Puszczy*, the character *Stanisław* is always called *Staś*; in Korczak's *Król Maciuś Pierwszy*, the boy-king is always called *Maciuś* (from *Maciej*) and other children are referred to by their diminutive forms (*Tomek*, *Felek*, *Irenka*); in *Tomek Wśród Łowców Głównych*, the main character *Tomek* is called by the diminutive form *Tomek*; in *Puc, Bursztyń i Goście*, *Krystyna* is often called *Krysia*, a typical diminutive form for *Krystyna* and the dog *Puc* is called *Pucek* or *Pucunio*. In *Imieniny*, the girls are usually referred to by their formal names, though on occasion diminutives appear, such as when the mother uses the diminutive form

Robrojeczku (< *Robert*) in an emotionally charged question, as put in context in (6) below:

- (6) -*Robrojeczku*, a kiedy znów przyjedziesz? – spytała bezradnie mama. (30)
 “Robert-DIM-DIM, but when will you return again?” asked mama helplessly.

Parallels can be drawn between Polish and English names. In similar ways, diminutive suffixes can be added to names in circumstances where the speaker feels especially emotional or affectionate (compare *Megsie* and *Ronniekins* in 1.2). Although most English names do not have ten different variations that are commonly used, if a speaker wants to add a diminutive suffix or shorten the name for a certain emotional nuance, it is possible to alter the English name in some way. For example, the typical diminutive form *Kasia* (< *Katarzyna*) easily can translate into the typical diminutive form of *Kathy*. The double diminutive form *Kasieńka* could translate into the diminutive form *Katie*, which has stronger diminutive meaning than *Kathy*. In this way, parallels can be drawn between Polish and English; however, differentiating between forms such as *Kasieńka*, *Kaśka* and other possible derivatives is difficult when translating into English because there are fewer English derivatives to choose from.

Another parallel between English and Polish can be found in terms of endearment for human beings. These terms of endearment are often expressed by diminutive animal terms in Polish and in English. Dziwirek and Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2010) write that “Polish employs more animal names, often as diminutives, as terms of endearment” (34), listing animal terms such as *kociak/kocię/kociątko* ‘kitten’ or *ptaszek/ptaszeczek*

‘little bird, birdie’. In the children’s literature that I examined for this study, I found many additional animal terms used as terms of endearment that usually were directed towards a girl. For example, in *Imieniny*, several terms of endearment appear to express the speaker’s affection towards the referent, including *golqbeczko* ‘dear little pigeon’ or “moja uparta kózko” (127) ‘my stubborn little goat’. Wierzbicka (2003) agrees that Polish often expresses affection through terms of endearment, writing that Polish has “a rich set of terms of endearment” (122), which Wierzbicka claims is evidenced through the terms that are “widely used in everyday speech, particularly in speech directed at children” (122). Nevertheless, children do not usually direct diminutive terms of endearment towards other children. Instead, adults direct terms of endearment towards the children.

2.2.2 Adjectives and Adverbs

Despite the parallels between the construction and meanings of Polish and English names, adjectives and adverbs cause more problems for translation between these two languages because English does not create adjectives with *littleness* or emotional meanings in the same way as Polish (or Russian) diminutives. Bielec writes that diminutive adjectives and adverbs “intensify the meaning to ‘very’ or ‘completely’” (100); indeed, Bielec suggests that a word such as *prędziutko* (< *prędko*) means ‘very quickly’ or ‘completely quickly’. Other research suggests that adjective diminutives convey an attitude towards the subject; that is, if a speaker refers to another person as *zdrowiutki* ‘healthy-DIM’, the diminutive adjective conveys a positive attitude, usually of affection, towards the referent. As Bielec suggests, the diminutive does intensify the effect of the original adjective. If *zdrowy* means ‘healthy’, then *zdrowiutki* would suggest

something similar to ‘entirely dearly healthy’; likewise, if *cały* means ‘entire’, then *calutki* would suggest ‘entirely dearly and little entire’. The former example, which occurs in a translation of *Alice in Wonderland*, poses special difficulty for the translator, since the English language does not normally connect ‘littleness’ with ‘entirety’.

The Polish children’s literature under study often uses these diminutives formed from adjectives to evoke positive meanings. For example, the adjectives and adverbs *leciutki* ‘lightly-DIM’, *cichutko* ‘quietly-DIM’ or *nowiutki* ‘new-DIM’ in *Imieniny* are used to modify small acts, such as turning one’s head, suppressing a hiccup, breathing or tears running down one’s cheeks. Likewise, in *Piosenka Koguta*, diminutive adjectives and adverbs modify nouns such as a doll’s dress, moving one’s head or a smile. For example, the diminutive adverb *równiutko* ‘straight-DIM’ is used to modify the doll’s white dress in “[w]ygładziła starannie białą sukienkę mojej lalki Coletki, złożyła ją równiutko” ‘[c]arefully smoothed the white dress of my doll Coletki’s, folded it neatly-DIM’ (57). Because of the inherent lightness and smallness associated with adjective and adverb diminutives, the affix *-(i)utk-* is only added to certain adjectives and diminutives; for example, the affix cannot be added to *głośno* ‘loud’ to create **głośniutko*. Thus, the adjectives and adverbs that create diminutives are limited, but the limitation does not make them less significant in Polish and children’s literature.

2.2.3 Object Diminutives

Polish diminutives formed from nouns convey various meanings and can be formed from various nouns that are based on culture. Following Hejwowski (2004), we can assume that these meanings “can fulfil many different communicative functions; for example, the expression of positive feelings” (119, my translation). These feelings

include emotion/feeling (such as *mateczka* ‘mother-DIM’); happiness/joy (such as *słoneczko* ‘sun(shine)-DIM’); pity/empathy (such as *biedaczek* ‘poor thing-DIM’); hospitality (such as *zupka* ‘soup-DIM’); negative emotions such as disrespect or contempt (*idejka* ‘idea-DIM’); or, irony, such as using *nóżka* ‘little foot’ when referring to a dinosaur’s foot (119). Thus, diminutives in Polish can express a variety of meanings, which express positive attitudes more often than negative ones. In the children’s literature under investigation, diminutives derived from nouns refer to a variety of subjects, including the bodies of children, women or pet animals. This differs from English, where children’s (except for very young children, such as infants and toddlers) and pet animals’ bodies are not considered *little*; as I have shown in chapter 1.2, such diminutives are not used except in pity (e.g. ‘my poor little feet’). In addition, it might sound strange for a doctor to ask a child to stick out her ‘little tongue’ or for a child to refer to a friend’s broken ankle as ‘little ankle’. Thus, although the diminutive can be created, culture is a significant factor as to which subjects are diminutivized and what meanings are attached to them.

In my discussion of various usages of diminutives formed by adding a diminutive affix to the root of a noun, I would like to begin with pet animals, whose bodies are often given diminutive affixes because people generally feel very affectionate towards their pets, including their paws, ears or nose. In *Piosenka Koguta*, a cat’s stomach is referred to as *brzuszek* ‘little stomach’ (< *brzuch*). Likewise, in *Puc, Bursztyn i Goście*, where animals are the main characters, the dogs are referred to as *pieski* ‘little dogs’ (< *psy*), and one woman refers to her small, delicate dog in an emotionally charged utterance in (7), where the diminutive *serduszko* ‘little heart’ (< *serdce*):

(7) Mój Tiuzdejek jest taki nerwowy! O, jak mu serduszko bije! (38)

My Tiuzdejek is so nervous! Oh, how his little heart beats!

While diminutives formed from the bodies of animals are very common, diminutives formed from the bodies of humans also convey intense emotion, affection and/or endearment. The hands, face, eyes and feet most often undergo diminution. Whether or not the body receives a diminutive suffix or analytic marker, however, rests on the context and speaker's attitude towards the body (as in the case of the dog's heart in (2) above). For example, a strong emotional use for a young girl's face occurs near the end of *W Pustyni i w Puszczy*, where the main characters, Staś and Nel, have escaped from their captors by travelling through Africa and have survived three days without any water, leaving them with little hope for survival or rescue. Because of these events, Staś dreams that he sees Nel's pale and very dear *twarzyczka* 'little face': "A w końcu widział już tylko bladą, bardzo kochaną twarzyczkę" (243), which translates as 'At the end he saw only the pale, very loved little face'. Since diminutives appear rarely throughout the book, the diminutive suggests heightened emotion. Thus, the use of the simple synthetic diminutive *twarzyczka* evokes the tenderness that we are supposed to feel for Nel.

Before continuing, I would like to mention that although Polish remains a highly inflectional synthetic language, analytic diminutive constructions (as in Russian and English) appear frequently throughout the books that I examine; in fact, many synthetic diminutives co-occur with analytic constructions. Thus, parallels can be made to English regarding analytic constructions and constructions where analytic and synthetic

diminutives co-occur. In the latter example in the preceding paragraph, the girl's 'dear little face' is expressed by the co-occurrence of a synthetic and analytic diminutive, specifically *małe rączki* 'small, dear little hands'. The girl, Nel, is also usually referred to as 'mała Nel' (small/little Nel), which refers to her age and size, but also evokes diminutive meaning. Thus, her body undergoes diminution as well in order to fit the narrator's attitude and conceptualization of Nel as a small, angelic-type character. During the children's journey, the narrator comments that Nel always wanted to show that she "nie jest małym dzieckiem" 'is not a small child' (212). Several constructions in *Imieniny* take the co-occurrence of analytic constructions with synthetic forms a step further by making the analytic marker *mały* 'small' receive diminutive suffixes as well as the following noun, such as in *maleńki braciszek* 'small-DIM little brother', where *braciszek* 'brother-DIM' comes from the base noun *brat*. The construction, thus, emphasizes the 'deariness' or tenderness felt towards the brother, but also highlights the smallness/littleness of the brother, who in the context of the diminutive construction, is being searched for by his family after getting lost in a crowd of people. When translating into English, this requires a long construction of modifiers, such as 'dear, tiny little brother', which sounds odd in English, thus suggesting that this level of emotion is not typically expressed in English. Despite the foundational parallelisms between Polish and English analytic constructions, the addition of multiple Polish diminutive suffixes causes the fundamental parallelism to disappear.

Affection or positive evaluation is also expressed for objects, such as houses, by the addition of simple diminutive suffixes to the root of the noun. In *Kajtuś Czarodziej*, Kajtuś talks to his grandmother, who describes her house, saying that "stary był nasz

domek, ale czysty” ‘our little house was old, but clean’ (n.pag.) using *domek* ‘little house’ to convey her positive evaluation and emotional connection to the house. Later on in the story, Kajtuś looks through an *okienko* ‘little window’ at the stars. Likewise, in *Porwania Profesora Gąbki*, the character Don Pedro uses three diminutive forms to express positive evaluation. Specifically, he refers to a little island (*wysepka* < *wyspa*), a little house (*domek* < *dom*) and a little garden (*ogródek* < *ogród*) in the following immediate context: “na Morzu Wielorybim znajduje się urocza wysepka Relaksja. Mam tam wygodny domek z ogródkiem” (70)¹². In *Puc, Bursztyn i Goście*, the book’s third paragraph begins with the diminutive *korytarzyk* ‘little corridor’ in the following sentence: “Z korytarzyka przy kuchni buchała na podwórze para i zapach mydlin” ‘From the little corridor near the kitchen gushed steam and the smell of suds into the yard’ (3). Thus, object diminutives (which usually receive a simple diminutive suffix such as *-ek/-yk*) also denote the speaker’s (or narrator’s) positive evaluation and attitude towards the object, while at the same time, also denoting the object’s smaller size. Or, as in the third example of the *korytarzyk*, the immediate context denotes a smaller size that we feel positive towards because we generally feel affectionate towards things that are physically smaller than their ‘regular’ versions.

Diminutives in children’s literature can also express negative meanings through suffixes including *-ik* and *-ek*, which, as I have shown in the preceding paragraph, create diminutives that denote positive connotations. Thus, diminutives with negative meanings often depend on the context to express contempt, negative evaluation and insulting meanings because outside of the specific context, the diminutive forms generally express

¹² ‘on the Whale Sea there is the charming little island Relaxation. I have there a comfortable little house with a little garden.’

positive attitudes. At the end of *Król Maciuś Pierwszy*, several hooligans shout at Maciuś when he believes that he walks to his execution, using diminutives such as *nosek* in a contemptuous way in (8) below:

- (8) — Ooo, król idzie, królik! O, jaki malutki! Płaczesz, króliku Maciusiu? Chodź, nosek ci utrzymy.¹³

In the utterance above, the hooligans use diminutives such as *malutki* ‘small-DIM’ and *nosek* ‘little nose’ disrespectfully in reference to Maciuś, and also add a diminutive suffix to *król*, creating the diminutive *królik* ‘little king/kinglet’ (although the word *królik* typically means ‘rabbit’) in order to further insult Maciuś. Likewise, in Pagaczewski’s *Porwania Profesora Gąbki*, the Smok refers to the professor as *profesorek* ‘little professor’, in context expressing a negative and perhaps contemptuous attitude towards the professor, as if the professor failed to meet the Smok’s standards of a professor. These examples show that negative meanings are expressed (although not frequently) through the use of diminutive suffixes that often create affectionate diminutives.

2.2.4 *Biedactwo* constructions

The Polish language does not typically convey the diminutive meaning of the *poor little X* construction through an ‘equivalent’ or similarly-structured analytic diminutive construction. Instead, Polish uses words that convey the same meaning through a synthetic diminutive, including *biedactwo* (or *bidulka*, as is used in a

¹³ “Ooo, the king comes, the little king! Oh, how little he is! Are you crying, little king Matty? Come here, we’ll wipe your little nose.” Interestingly, Laurie’s (1986) translation eliminates the diminutive *nosek*: “‘Oooo,’ they shouted. ‘There goes the king, the little king. He’s so little, little King Matt, you’re crying. Come here and we’ll wipe your nose’” (332).

translation in chapter 4.1). Furthermore, Polish also uses *biedny X* ‘poor X’ constructions or words such as *biedak* ‘poor thing’ to convey empathy or pity for the subject, though these do not convey the meaning of ‘smallness’. As I discussed in the previous chapter, subjects that receive *poor little X* constructions in English are small in size and sometimes younger, specifically like the infant Harry Potter in Rowling’s *Harry Potter and the Philosopher’s Stone* or the hobbit Bilbo Baggins in Tolkien’s *The Hobbit* (see 1.2). Thus, as in English children’s literature, the use of constructions that convey pity/empathy and also a corresponding ‘smallness’ in native Polish children’s literature also refer to subjects that are young and small, if used at all.

In the small corpus of native Polish children’s literature under study, the synthetic diminutive that conveys a smallness of size is absent. A large majority of the authors under examination prefer *biedny X* ‘poor X’ constructions or the word *biedak* ‘poor thing’, which suggests that either these examples of Polish children’s literature prefer not to convey a sense of ‘smallness’ or that the diminutive is not typically used in the written genre for children. However, the use of *biedny X* conveys the sense of pity and empathy found in English *poor X* and *poor little X* constructions. For example, Professor Gąbka in *Porwanie Profesora Gąbki* says, “[b]iedny Salamandrusie, cierpisz teraz przeze mnie” ‘Poor Salamandrus, you suffer now because of me’ (n.pag.); likewise, later in the story, the author writes, “[b]iedny osioł pomyślał, że jeżeli jego pan będzie przemawiał jeszcze godzinę” ‘the poor donkey thought that if his master will be talking another hour’ (n.pag.). Despite the fact that the adjective *biedny* ‘poor’ is used in the previous constructions, the diminutive forms with an analytic marker do not appear in the book.

At times, an analytic or co-occurring analytic and synthetic construction with the analytic marker *mały* is used. For example, Sienkiewicz, in *W Pustyni i w Puszczy*, has the character use a *poor little X* construction in English (to the English character Nel) in the following immediate context: “i odszedł powtarzając po angielsku: „*Poor little bird!*” (biedny mały ptaszek)” ‘and he left saying in English, “Poor little bird!” (poor small bird-DIM)’ (85). In Sienkiewicz’s translation, it is interesting to find that he keeps the analytic construction intact, appearing to translate word-for-word, but also adds a diminutive suffix to the noun that conveys a sense of endearment and thus makes the Polish construction’s meaning equivalent to *poor little bird*. Despite this assertion that these co-occurring analytic and synthetic constructions exist to convey *poor little X*, the books under study do not use them often; rather, *biedny X* ‘poor X’ as described in the paragraph is preferred. Likewise, although *biedactwo* or a similar synthetic diminutive is given by dictionaries as a translation of *poor little X*, the diminutive is limited to one instance of *biedactwo* in the same book, specifically when the character Grek advises Staś, “[g]dybyś postąpił inaczej, naraziłbyś siebie, to małe biedactwo, a nawet i mnie, który chce waszego dobra.” ‘If you had acted differently, you would have exposed yourself, this small poor little thing, and even me, who wants your good’ (90). Here, the *małe biedactwo* construction refers to Nel, who, as I established earlier, is a vulnerable young British girl who is friends with Staś; thus, the character Grek is indicating Nel’s physical smallness as a young girl who suffers much from being taken captive.

In this section, I have presented a short overview of Polish diminutive formation, function and use in children’s literature. I have established that a) Polish often uses diminutive names, although usually the same one to refer to a certain character, b) terms

of endearment are usually expressed as diminutives (for example, *kózka*), c) diminutives derived from adjectives are very common and are used to modify metaphorically smaller actions (such as a hiccup), d) analytic diminutive constructions occur in parallel ways with English analytic constructions and can include a synthetic diminutive to highlight ‘smallness’ and emotional attitudes towards the referent; and, e) that although diminutives prototypically express positive attitudes, they can be put into a context that expresses negative attitudes. Thus, many parallels can be drawn between English and Polish diminutives.

2.3 Summary of Polish and Russian Diminutives

Although diminutives in Russian and Polish seem remarkably similar to each other in diminutive meaning and emotion (e.g. Polish *domek* and Russian *домик* [*domik*] ‘house-DIM’), there is a significant difference in several aspects, and especially in the analytic markers from the two languages. In addition to the analytic markers (discussed below) and formal names, the possible differences could benefit from further study, including variations of diminutive names, the particular nuances and frequency of different diminutive suffixes in literature and the relationship between lexicalized and semi-lexicalized synthetic diminutives (e.g. Polish *książka* ‘book’ and Russian *книжка* [*knizhka*] ‘book-DIM/booklet’ < *книга* [*kniga*] ‘book’).

The analytic markers *маленький* [*malen’kij*] and *mały* ‘small/little’ appear to have the same diminutive meaning because they are the standard form for ‘small/little’; however, the Russian analytic marker conveys a stronger sense of ‘littleness’ than the Polish analytic marker, which typically conveys the meaning of ‘smallness’ rather than emotive meaning. Although both analytic markers come from the same proto-Slavic word

**malъ* meaning “having a small size, small/little” (Malmor 2009:256, my translation), the diminutive meaning has changed differently in each language (see table 1 below). The Polish language has kept the original word through its variant *mały*, which can create many diminutive forms, including *maleńki*, *malutki*, *malusi* ‘small-DIM’ and double diminutive forms including *malusieńki* ‘small-DIM-DIM’. The Russian language, on the other hand, has lexicalized the diminutive *маленький* [*malen’kij*] to be the ‘standard’ analytic marker, causing the original analytic marker *малый* [*malij*] to obtain the meaning of ‘(too) small’. Because of the lexicalization of the diminutive form, it followed that the Russian diminutive forms are limited to *малюсенький* [*maljusen’kij*] ‘small/little-DIM’. Because of this difference, we cannot say that *маленький* [*malen’kij*] and *mały* ‘small/little’ have the same diminutive meaning or correspond with each other (in the same way that Polish *mały* and Czech *malý* correspond with each other semantically). The difference between Polish and Russian is further demonstrated in the PWN’s Polish-Russian dictionary (2006), where the given translation of *маленький* [*malen’kij*] is *mały* / *malutki*; likewise, the given translation of *малый* [*malij*] is *mały*. In the translation from Polish to Russian, the given translation for *mały* is such: 1. *маленький* [*malen’kij*] 2. (*small; not the physical dimensions, mainly about abstract meanings*) *малый* [*malij*] 3. (*short in duration*) *небольшой* [*nebol’shoj*]. Likewise, the given translation for the Polish diminutive *malutki* ‘small-DIM’ is the ‘standard’ Russian *маленький* [*malen’kij*]. This evidence suggests that the ‘standard’ Polish analytic marker conveys a greater meaning of smallness and less of diminutive meaning than the ‘standard’ Russian analytic marker. In chapter 4, this will be especially relevant, for Polish translations of English analytic constructions prefer to use *mały* and its diminutive

more often than Russian translations, which tend to use *маленький* [*malen'kij*] and not its diminutive forms. Thus, I will (unless context conveys a different meaning) back-translate the Polish analytic marker as 'small' in order to differentiate it from a synthetic diminutive which back-translates as 'little'; I will back-translate the Russian analytic marker *маленький* [*malen'kij*] as 'little' because its diminutive meaning differs, if at all, only slightly from a synthetic diminutive.

Table 1: Relationship between Polish and Russian

proto-slavic * <i>malъ</i>	
Russian	Polish
<i>малый</i> [<i>malij</i>]	<i>mały</i> – standard
<i>маленький</i> [<i>malen'kij</i>] - standard	<i>malutki, maleńki, malusi</i>
<i>малюсенький</i> [<i>maljusen'kij</i>]	<i>malusieńki</i>

Chapter 3: Theoretical and Methodological Framework for Translation

The translated text remains a paradoxical item; on the one hand, it is a substitute for an existing text written in another language and arising from a different culture; on the other hand, it is a published text in its own right (cf. Hewson 2011). It is supposed to be the same text as the original, but is often viewed as being quite different from the original. Often we can find many diverse translations of the same text that are similar to each other, but in many cases, the translations of a certain text contain differences that cause the translations to be very different from each other. Thus, ‘translated’ texts differ from ‘native’ texts in the same language. For example, ‘translated’ English differs from ‘native’ English in several stylistic, grammatical and lexical aspects. The translated language is often somewhat unnatural because the translation attempts to retain the meaning from the source text. I would argue that the previous claim about the translated text applies to the translated diminutive as well. That is, the translated diminutive, studied within its immediate translation context, is a diminutive in its own right, but also acts as a substitute for an existing diminutive in the existing untranslated source text that it comes from. Because of the semantic-pragmatic meanings associated with the diminutive, the translated diminutive’s expressive meanings are paradoxical, belonging not only to the existing text’s language and culture, but also expressing emotions within the translated text.

In the following section, I will provide a framework and methodology for a discussion and analysis of how the translated text and its diminutives can be translated from English to Polish and Russian specifically. The section will serve as a background and introduction to the case study of *Alice in Wonderland* in the following chapter. Thus I

will briefly describe various approaches to studying the translated text; provide an overview of the role of translating diminutives in Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS); address the difficulties in translating diminutives based on evidence gained from the preceding two chapters; outline strategies undertaken by the translators to translate diminutives; and, briefly mention the issues that cause an addition or omission of certain diminutives in the translated text.

3.1 Translation Studies

Translation Studies is a large field that includes many theoretical frameworks and methodologies that are often cross-disciplinary, thus drawing from disciplines such as linguistics, philosophy, anthropology and literary criticism. The approaches that have arisen from this field include cultural translation, including Bhabha's anthropological concept of the 'Third Space' that exists between the original text and its translation (1994); cognitive approaches to translation which are formed on the basis that translation is metaphor that involves conceptual blending (Kozak 2009; Boase-Beier 2006, 2011); dynamic and formal equivalence (Nida 1975); skopos theory (from German *Skopostheorie*), which claims that the function of both source and target text should be primarily considered (Hans Vermeer 1990); linguistic aspects of translation, which focus on interpreting verbal signs (Jacobson 1959); and, Descriptive Translation Studies, which I will discuss in greater detail below. The wealth of differing translation movements within the field provide various approaches to the study of translation, affording researchers various methods and aspects of translation to focus on in individual case studies.

As Xiao and Yue (2009) aptly state, “Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) is characterized by its emphasis on the study of translation *per se*” (244). Furthermore, DTS is a descriptive branch of Translation Studies which is broken down “in terms of three different foci of research – *Function-*, *Process-*, and *Product-oriented*” (Toury 1995:10), where function-oriented DTS “describes the function or impact that a translation or a collection of translations may have in the socio-cultural context of the target language” (Xiao and Yue 247), process-oriented DTS “aims at revealing the thought processes that take place in the mind of the translator while she or he is translating” (246) that is usually examined through multiple drafts of a translation, and product-oriented DTS involves “describing translation as a product” (244); that is, product-oriented DTS describes the end-result of a translation process. This thesis examines the translations of *Alice in Wonderland* primarily through product-oriented DTS in order to descriptively show how diminutives were translated, without judging the translations (or ‘target texts’ (TT)) as ‘good’ or ‘bad’; rather, DTS aims to show how a book is translated and provide a suggestion how the source text (ST) could be translated into the target language (TL), rather than how the original should be translated. As Munday (2008) puts it, “[p]roduct-oriented DTS examines existing translations [and] can involve the description or analysis of a single ST-TT pair or a comparative analysis of several TTs of the same ST (into one or more TLs)” (10). I will also use the information from the previous two chapters on diminutives in the languages under discussion to mention whether the diminutives under study can, indeed, be translated with an ‘equivalent’ diminutive.

As I have shown in the preceding two chapters, diminutives influence the ‘emotional colouring’ of a book and hold a significant linguistic function in English and

the Slavic languages of Polish and Russian. Thus, studying the role of diminutives through Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) is important, although English diminutives remain relatively under-researched and, in many cases, simply ignored because of the traditional view of English diminutives' productivity, existence and function in a language. As language is at the core of DTS and thus also the translated text, the role of diminutives is significant because the equivalent chosen for the ST diminutive affects the overall emotional impact and colouring of the translated text and can either cause more emotion in the translated text, shift the meanings to different characters or parts of the book, or decrease the intensity of the emotion conveyed in the ST.

3.2. The Difficulties and Strategies of Translating Diminutives

Diminutives pose a unique challenge for translators who translate a text from an analytic language such as English into synthetic languages such as Polish or Russian. English, as I have shown in chapter 1, presents a particular difficulty for translators because a small amount of literature exists on the emotional connotations of analytic markers and diminutive suffixes. In addition, English has two neutral analytic markers, *small* and *little*, which are not interchangeable in most contexts and do not exist in Polish or Russian. Thus, there are many difficulties in translating diminutives and their emotional meanings between languages that translators must face when choosing a target diminutive for the diminutive in the ST.

The first task for a translator is to be aware of the difficulties of translating diminutives, the differences between diminutives in the source language (SL) and target language (TL), and also the strategies for the translation of diminutives. As Levý (1983)

points out, “routine Czech translations from English make insufficient use of diminutives and other means of expressing affection due to the typological differences” (qtd. in Kubáčková 2009:39), which applies to other Slavic languages as well. However, comparatively few studies have focused on the strategies of translating diminutives from English to Russian or Polish – or, indeed, into any Slavic language. Instead, brief mentions are often given to translating Slavic diminutives into English. For example, Waddington (1964) writes about translation from Russian to English, saying that “[w]hen confronted with a diminutive, one should see first whether it has lost its diminutive sense; this can be told by looking it up in a dictionary. If it seems to have a definite diminutive content, however, one should then try attaching the ending *-let* to its possible English renderings, or adding words “little” and “tiny”, “toy” and “baby”; one may also try words which denote a smaller variety of the object concerned” (19). In some cases “the diminutive must be ignored” (19). Likewise, Hejwowski (2004) writes that “[i]n connection with such a limited use of diminutives in the English language, finding ready and satisfactory Polish diminutives in this language is actually impossible” (119, my translation). Hejwowski goes on to say that translators have a few techniques at their disposal, such as adding “little” or “small”; using English words that denote a smaller object than the base of the diminutive, such as translating the Polish word *dróżka* ‘road-DIM’ (from *droga*) not as “small road” but as “path”; using words that have positive/negative meaning; or, an additional form of compensation (119, my translation). Some scholars, such as Borden (2005), picture translation of diminutives into English negatively, writing that Russian diminutives are “not always transferable to English without an unbecoming glut of modifiers such as “little”, “small” and “dear”” (xxii).

Thus, translators hold slightly different approaches and attitudes to translating diminutives, which result in quite different translations of the same book.

Before continuing, I would like to briefly discuss the translation (and back-translation) of the Russian and Polish analytic markers into English, specifically *маленький* [*malen'kij*] and *mały* respectively. As I mentioned in 2.3, there is a difference in diminutive and emotive meaning between the two markers. Although translating between Polish and Russian is somewhat difficult, translating the Polish and Russian analytic markers into English provides an even more difficult obstacle to overcome. As discussed in chapter 1, the two neutral analytic markers in English, specifically *little* and *small*, are not interchangeable in most, if not all, contexts. That is, a semantic-pragmatic difference exists between these constructions, as the following illustrate: *small road* and *little road*; *small shriek* and *little shriek*; *small child* and *little child*; and, *small voice* and *little voice*. In the preceding paragraph, I quoted Hejwowski, who says that synthetic diminutives should be translated using *little* or *small*. In fact, Hejwowski goes further to give examples: “drzewko – a little palm, uliczki – little streets, wioseczka – small village, mostek – small bridge” (119) and so on, but without specifying why he translates some synthetic diminutives using the analytic marker *small* and others with the analytic marker *little*. Thus, it appears that the differences between the two English analytic markers are an obstacle as well, which causes a two-fold problem regarding whether *маленький* [*malen'kij*] and *mały* mean ‘small’ or ‘little’ and vice-versa. Based on the evidence given in 2.3, I consider *маленький* [*malen'kij*] to typically convey ‘littleness’ and *mały* to typically convey ‘smallness’ (unless a specific context indicates otherwise). Therefore, I

argue that the analytic markers (both Polish, Russian and English) require an in-depth investigation.

The above scholars give recommendations for translating from the diminutive-rich Slavic languages into English. Despite the literature on translating diminutives, I have been unable to find any research that deals with translating into Russian and/or Polish. Perhaps scholars view the translation of the “few” English diminutives into diminutive-rich synthetic languages as too easy: first, many scholars believe that English has few (if any) diminutives, thus perhaps making such a study unnecessary; or, scholars may consider that the English analytic diminutives can be simply and easily reproduced in the target language.

Since diminutives and their translation into languages other than English have been largely ignored, there does not exist an established methodology to analyze the translation of diminutives from an analytic language to synthetic languages. To compensate for the lack of pre-established strategies, this thesis incorporates a methodology used for examining pun translation used by Delabastita (1996) and Lefevere (1992) (qtd. in Balci 2005). I will adapt these terms and strategies for diminutives because the terms can be applied to diminutives. However, since pun translation and diminutive translation differ in many ways, I modify the pun translation methodology based on the strategies found to be used by translators in their translations of *Alice in Wonderland*. Since each translator has a general strategy to translate diminutives based on personal experience in translating literary texts, specific strategies can be determined for diminutive translation. Below I have identified the main strategies used by translators

of *Alice in Wonderland* to help them choose the best possibility when translating diminutives from English to Polish and Russian:

1. Diminutive-to-diminutive translation, which can be further divided into synthetic and analytic translations, specifically $A \rightarrow S$ ¹⁴ (e.g. *little house* \rightarrow Polish *domek* or Russian *домик* [*domik*]), $A \rightarrow A$ (e.g. *little house* \rightarrow Polish *mały dom* or Russian *маленький дом* [*malen'kij dom*]), $A \rightarrow A \& S$ (e.g. *little house* \rightarrow Polish *malutki domek* or Russian *маленький домик* [*malen'kij domik*]).
2. Manipulative translation. This strategy involves modifying, or manipulating, the translated diminutive, usually by changing the base noun (e.g. *little house* \rightarrow Polish *chatka* ‘hut-DIM’ rather than *domek* ‘house-DIM’) or by adding diminutive suffixes (e.g. *little arms* \rightarrow Russian *маленькие ручки* [*malen'kie ruchonki*] ‘little arms-DIM-DIM). This strategy can overlap with diminutive-to-diminutive translation.
3. Non-translation/Transliteration. This strategy involves not translating a diminutive form from the original text but leaving the diminutive in its source language, particularly diminutive forms of personal names, but transliterating the form (e.g. *Tillie* \rightarrow Russian *Тилли* [*Tilli*] or Polish *Tillie*).
4. Diminutive-to-zero. This strategy involves removing the emotional meaning from the source text entirely by not translating the diminutive as a diminutive, but rather translating it as the base form (e.g. *little house* \rightarrow Polish *dom* or Russian *дом* [*dom*]).

¹⁴ Here, A stands for analytic diminutive constructions and S stands for synthetic diminutives.

5. Omission. This strategy involves omitting the diminutive and the base noun altogether from the TT (e.g. *poor little thing* → Russian *ezo [jevo]* ‘his’ or ☉).

3.3 The Loss and Addition of Diminutives in Translation

Loss in translation is generally unavoidable; in fact, loss can be expected. In translating diminutives from English to Polish and Russian, addition of diminutives can also be expected because of the importance of diminutives in the children’s literature of these two languages, as shown in the previous chapter. In the case of pun translation, three reasons can be given for loss of puns, which can be applied to diminutive loss as well. Specifically, Gottlieb (1997) lists these reasons as a) ‘language-specific’; b) genre of literature; and, c) the translator’s competence.

I will first discuss the ‘language-specific’ reason for diminutive loss, which is perhaps the most common reason for diminutive loss in translation from English to Polish/Russian. By ‘language-specific’, we refer to “constraints that indicate the presence of ‘untranslatable’ elements in the original, which fail to have linguistic counterparts in the target language” (Balci 27). An example in *Alice in Wonderland* would be the wordplay that interplays with diminutives in the case such as those of the three ‘little sisters’ and the diminutive names *Elsie*, *Lacie* and in the Dormouse’s story. Besides the diminutives that have been discovered to be intertwined with wordplay, the other common language-specific examples are few, yet include cases like the Duchess’ *sharp little chin*, where the Russian word *подбородок [podborodok]* ‘chin’ in reference to an adult’s chin cannot receive a diminutive suffix without sounding silly and humorous. Thus, translators cannot render an equivalent diminutive without changing the base noun and thus the original meaning; the diminutive and its emotional connotations are lost.

Second, the genre of the book in question also affects diminutive loss. *Alice in Wonderland* was originally written for children, specifically for ten-year-old Alice Liddell on a summer's afternoon in 1862. Because of scholarly interest in the book, translators usually keep both adult readers and children in mind when translating, unless they are specifically translating for children, in the case of Kaniewska's (2010) Polish translation for young girls. Thus, the translator has to keep a balance between adding more diminutives and thus including affection and other emotional connotations for a child with reducing the number of diminutives that is typical for a 'native' children's book in the TL and level of emotion for adult readers. Without emotion, a child's interest may not be kept for long, but with too much emotion through diminutives, the book may be considered too colloquial or 'childish' for adults. In translating into Polish and Russian from English, the issue of adding too many diminutives because of the significance of diminutives in the TL culture appears more often than diminutive loss, though there is a clear difference between Kaniewska's (2010) translation under study in the following chapter and the translation by Słomczyński (1977) that is translated for adults and thus uses fewer diminutives – though still more than in the ST – than Kaniewska does. Likewise, Iahknin's (1990) Russian translation also uses more diminutives, and, paired with the colourful and child-appealing illustrations, creates a translation more suited for children than adults, as compared with Demurova's (1967) translation, for example.

The third constraint comes from human competence which comes from the translator's skill, knowledge, creativity, understanding and conceptualization of the SL, TL and literary translation. To quote Balci, "[t]here are limits to the performance of the translator" (27) that can cause misinterpretation and thus lead to errors that are almost

entirely man-made. Even the most competent translator with a native knowledge of both languages and a thorough understanding of the text may make a mistake or conceptualize the diminutive in a slightly different way than another translator or what the author originally intended. In this way, diminutives may be mistakenly added, lost, or manipulated and thus alter the emotional meaning between ST and TT.

The constraint that will not be discussed in this thesis arises from temporal dislocation in language; that is, the diminutive construction may have conveyed a slightly different diminutive meaning at the time of writing than when the ST was translated; furthermore, the understanding of the diminutive construction's meaning may have shifted again at the writing of this thesis. Thus, the shifts in diminutive meanings and use during the past literary eras is a topic that could be further investigated in order to gain insight into the diachronic changes in diminutive constructions, in the analytic English language but also in the synthetic Polish and Russian languages.

3.4 Description of the Translations & Translators

As of 2011, *Alice in Wonderland* has been translated into Polish nine times, and into Russian approximately eighteen times, though the precise number of translations into Russian is difficult to trace because Russian translations were quick to appear after the publication of *Alice in Wonderland* in 1865, and also because several online-only translations exist. Clearly, *Alice in Wonderland* in both countries has been well-received, with many adaptations coming out in print and old translations being yearly reprinted. In Poland, it is still easy to find a recent reprint of Maria Morawska's (1927) translation or the eleventh edition of Antoni Marianowicz's original 1955 translation. In Russia, the prominent author and translator, Vladimir Nabokov, created a thoroughly 'Russified'

translation of *Alice in Wonderland* in 1923. In fact, Russia produced nine translations and adaptations before 1960, showing the popularity of the book in Russia (Weaver 1964).

I chose *Alice in Wonderland* for the case study of the translation of diminutives specifically because the overarching focus of the book rests on wordplay, including puns and other instances of humour. I could assume therefore that the translators' key focus would not be on translating diminutives (as they would in children's books such as for example by L.M. Montgomery, as discussed in chapter 1 of this thesis); but, rather, that the translators' main priority would be the translation of wordplay, which is often considered 'untranslatable'. Thus, in *Alice in Wonderland*, I could be sure that the diminutives and their emotional meanings would not be the translators' priority and thus the translators would be, perhaps, more lax in conveying 'equivalent' diminutiveness compared with wordplay. Thus, I ask the following questions: how do the translators approach translating diminutives? What strategies do the translators adopt and what do the translators emphasize to produce an 'equivalent' diminutive meaning with its various nuances?

I turn to the diminutives found in translations of *Alice in Wonderland*. I examine four translations in total; that is, two translations into Russian by Nina Demurova (1967), a prolific Russian translator and translation critic, and the other by Alexander Shcherbakov (1977), a Soviet author. Both of these translations were published during the Soviet era and within ten years of each other. Thus, both novels may have a Soviet influence and be slightly more old-fashioned in style; however, this will not be analyzed in the case study, though might be kept in mind when comparing with the newer Polish translations. I examine two translations into Polish, specifically one by Bogumiła

Kaniewska (2010), a professor in the English Studies department at the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, and one by Krzysztof Dworak (2010), of whom little is known. Unlike the two Russian translations by Demurova and Shcherbakov, these Polish translations were published after the fall of Communism and were published in the same year. Yet, both translators' styles are quite different, as will be shown in the following chapter.

I chose these four translations because they are the most recently-published print book translations that can be found in bookstores in Poland and Russia. Thus, when I chose the translations, I omitted the online Russian translations that have not been published in print; the Polish translation by Iwona Libucha (2000) which has disappeared from bookstores and libraries; the 1988 Russian translation by Vladimir Orel because it is no longer being reproduced; the Russian translation by Leonid Iakhnin (1990) that is more of an adaptation than a true translation; and, the Russian translation by Boris Zakhoder (1971), which I also consider to be more of an adaptation than a translation. I excluded all translations that read like adaptations because my study aims to focus on what I refer to as 'pure' translations, where the text has not been altered so that the loss or addition of diminutives is not based on the translator's creative and original adaptation of the story but rather based on a language or cultural issue that would prevent the original diminutive from being directly translated¹⁵. Thus, the translations are, indeed, the translations of *Alice in Wonderland* that are closest to the original text.

¹⁵ However, I will refer to other translations when one of the translations has an ideal 'equivalent' of a diminutive, specifically those of the translators Vladimir Nabokov (1923) and Jolanta Kozak (1999).

3.5. The Database, Distribution and the Usage of Diminutives in the Source Text

Many diminutives appear in the translations and are created through the analytic markers *little*, *small* and *tiny*. For example, the ST includes constructions including *such a tiny little thing*, *a small passage*, *a little house*, *a tidy little room*, *a tiny golden key* and *a little key*.¹⁶ The analytic marker *little* is used most often in the ST (used over 50 times), followed by the markers *small* (3 times) and *tiny* (4 times). Thus, analytic constructions are prevalent within the ST with an overwhelming use of the analytic marker *little* in comparison with *small* and *tiny*. The synthetic diminutives are lexicalized with the exception of the personal diminutive forms/wordplay *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie* (see 1.3). However, all the other synthetic diminutives are entirely lexicalized (e.g. *ringlets*) and will be omitted in the following analysis of translations.

These analytic constructions are distributed unevenly throughout the text; as we have seen in chapters 1 and 2, the constructions tend to appear in groups around an emotionally charged situation, although they can appear sporadically when Alice positively evaluates new parts of her environment. Overall, the first two chapters contain the most diminutives as Alice becomes used to her new surroundings and grows and shrinks; after the initial chapters, the use of diminutives occurs around specific characters, notably the lizard Bill and the baby-pig, who are pitied through use of *poor little X* constructions. Thus, diminutive constructions in the ST are used similarly to

¹⁶ The word *little* also appears in other constructions within the ST that will not be discussed in this thesis, specifically in phrases with the meaning of approximation, such as *a little larger*. In these cases, *little* does not modify a noun and arguably does not convey emotional meanings; however, this use of *little* has been comparatively under-researched and could use further empirical investigation in literature and could be compared with constructions using other markers, such as a comparison of the constructions including *a mite larger*, *a bit larger* and *a little larger*. Furthermore, translations of this type of phrase receive diminutive suffixes, such as *trochęczkę* ‘a little-DIM’ in Polish and convey some emotion.

diminutives in Polish and Russian children's literature and speech, where diminutives are used to create the feeling of a safe and comfortable environment for children (Protassova and Voeikova 2007). Thus, near the middle of the ST, diminutives disappear and rarely appear, yet reappear forcefully to describe Alice after she awakes and tells of her dream to her elder sister. In this way, the analytic markers create constructions that soften the 'impact' of Wonderland, which, without diminutives, arguably would become more frightening for not only Alice, but the child reading *Alice in Wonderland*.

The analytic marker *little* appears most often throughout the ST. In some cases, it is semi-lexicalized, such as in *little girl*, which Alice always uses to refer to herself. In other situations, it creates a diminutive construction that conveys irony (e.g. *nice little stories* which are rather awful), positive evaluation (e.g. *tidy little room*), negative evaluation/affection (e.g. *poky little house* and *sharp little chin*) and commiseration/pity (e.g. *the unfortunate little Bill*). As the examples above show, the diminutive construction *little X* is frequently preceded by an adjective that directs the emotion of the construction (cf. 1.2), specifically *nice*, *shrill*, *tidy*, *poky*, *unfortunate*, *sharp*, *poor* and *neat*. Some constructions convey positive evaluation without the adjective, such as *little house*, *little golden key*, *little door*, *little animal* and *little table*. In most cases, the diminutive construction with *little* should be easily translatable into Polish and Russian with the use of a simple diminutive suffix (e.g. *little house* → Polish *domek*/ Russian *домик* [*domik*]). Yet in many instances, the translators under study make the translations more complex than expected, adding analytic markers and various degrees of suffixes to the base noun.

Likewise, the three instances of the analytic marker *small* should be easy to translate, as the marker "cannot be used interchangeably [with *little*] in most contexts"

(Schneider 2003:126) and is described in more detail in chapter 1 of this thesis. In the ST, the constructions with *small* only convey smallness with no emotional connotations, such as in *small passage*, *very small cake*, *the small ones*, and also in constructions that will not be analyzed in this thesis, specifically *the smallest idea*, *not the smallest notice*, *too small*, *getting extremely small* and other constructions that do not follow the *small X* construction. Thus, the three constructions that use the analytic marker *small* should parallel Polish and Russian easily (c.f. 2.1 and 2.2) in *very small cake* → *bardzo mały tort* ‘very small cake’ in Polish. Yet the translators typically complicate the translation by adding a diminutive suffix, which introduces an emotional connotation not conveyed by the original construction.

The third analytic marker, *tiny*, appears four times in the ST to show the extreme smallness of an object. The marker occurs in the following constructions: *such a tiny little thing*, *a tiny golden key*, *tiny white kid gloves* and *the tiny hands*. In the first construction, the analytic marker precedes *little*, which conveys an emotional meaning while expressing the physical smallness of the subject’s size. Little empirical research has been conducted on the possible emotional connotations of *tiny*; thus, for this thesis, I consider it to primarily express extreme smallness of size because the four constructions above that appear in *Alice in Wonderland* suggest mainly a meaning of ‘smallness’. Likewise, like *small*, the *tiny X* constructions are not preceded by appreciative qualifiers such as *nice* or *dear*, suggesting that *tiny X* constructions’ functions are closer to *small* than *little* in *Alice in Wonderland*. However, Polish-English dictionaries give a translation of *tiny* as *drobny* ‘tiny’ and *maleńki* ‘little-DIM’ and Russian-English dictionaries likewise give a translation of *tiny* as *крошечный* [*kroshechniy*] ‘tiny’, *крохотный*

[*krohotniy*] ‘tiny’ and *малюсенький* [*maljiusen’kij*] ‘little-DIM’, suggesting that we can expect translators to translate *tiny* with diminutive suffixes and analytic markers and that a simple parallel does not exist between English and Polish or Russian.

In conclusion, the ST contains many ‘simple’ analytic diminutives from a translation perspective, but several constructions, specifically those with preceding adjectives, and also the diminutive forms of names, can be expected to create difficulty for the translators, leading to a creative alternative solution that differs somewhat from the emotional connotations conveyed by the original.

3.6 The Case Studies

The case studies presented in the following chapters arrive at several conclusions pertinent to translation. Namely, out of the five strategies listed in chapter 3, the diminutive-to-diminutive, manipulation and diminutive-to-zero strategies are most commonly used in the translations under examination in the case study below. These generally shift the emotional connotations of the source constructions the least, compared to omission and transliteration, which were used rarely (notably with translating *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie*). This shows that the translators were unwilling to completely remove a diminutive and its base noun even if it was difficult to translate. Instead of completely removing the base noun as if it never existed in the ST, the translators either modify the original construction by adding additional suffixes or analytic markers in a ‘non-equivalent’ diminutive-to-diminutive translation strategy or removed the diminutive by just using a base noun so that the word would still be found in the translated text. Therefore, in both the Polish and Russian translations under study, Alice *screamed* and *shrieked* rather than let out a *little scream* or a *little shriek*; the Mock Turtle sits on a

ledge of rock rather than *a little ledge of rock*; and, the Duchess has a (*sharp*) *chin*, rather than a *sharp little chin*. Through manipulation, which usually overlapped the diminutive-to-zero strategy, the Mock Turtle sits on a ‘splinter of rock’ or ‘a rock shelf’ and the *little passage* becomes a hole that Alice walks through. Thus, the TTs, through the use or loss of diminutives because of typical diminutive use in the TLs, all shifted away from the ST. This suggests that there are several diminutives in English that are not translatable into Polish and Russian; that is, the diminutives can be translated structurally the same as the ST diminutives, but these translated diminutives would not convey typical use and therefore are exchanged for a word without a diminutive affix or analytic marker.

The following chapters examine the translations of diminutives in *Alice in Wonderland* into an East Slavic (Russian) and West Slavic (Polish) language, specifically focusing on diminutives in noun phrases. The case studies suggest that although scholars say that English has few diminutives, there are many diminutives in analytic constructions that are unique to English and are untranslatable into Polish and Russian; likewise, both Polish and Russian use diminutives in a different way than English, which is evidenced by the addition of diminutives for the bodies of animals and children, to name the most commonly added diminutives.

The evidence shows that the translators under study preferred keeping wordplay over diminutives when faced with choosing between the two (e.g. *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie*). When wanting to emphasize the emotional connotations of the ST, the translators added diminutive affixes in a diminutive-to-diminutive strategy or through the addition of diminutive affixes to either preceding adjectives (e.g. *milen'kii* [*milen'kii*] ‘dear’ in Russian), analytic markers (e.g. *malutki* ‘small-DIM’ in Polish) or the base noun itself

(e.g. *ручонки* [*ruchonki*] ‘hands-DIM-DIM’ in Russian), in a similar way as in ‘native’ Polish or Russian children’s literature examined in chapter 2 of this thesis. Thus, to modify a statement at the beginning of this chapter, a translated diminutive construction is paradoxical; in one way, the translated diminutive functions as an original diminutive and part of the target language in its own right because it follows the rules of the target language in the structural formation of diminutives. On the other hand, the translated diminutive also functions as a substitute for an existing text and thus remains slightly dissimilar from both source and ‘native’ target diminutive constructions, suggesting that it exists in a separate ‘third world’ that is connected to both source and target languages and cultures but is, in essence, an item of its own.

In the following chapters, I will analyze the strategies undertaken by Polish translations, followed by Russian translations in chapter 5. I will begin with a discussion of names, followed by object nouns, event and verbal nouns and ending with poor little X constructions.

Chapter 4: The Case Study: Polish Translations

The first case study will begin with the translations into Polish. In the sections below, I will show the different strategies used by translators in various types of constructions, including names (e.g. *Tillie* → *Tillie*), added diminutives (e.g. *obiadek* ‘little lunch’), object nouns (e.g. *little table* → *stolik* ‘table-DIM’ / (bedside) table), event nouns (e.g. *little shriek* → *pisk* ‘shriek’), the gerund *pattering* (e.g. *little pattering of feet* → *tupot małych nóg* ‘pattering of small feet’), and the *poor little X* constructions (e.g. *poor little thing* → *biedactwo* ‘poor little thing’).

4.1 Names and Terms of Endearment

The two Polish translators under investigation, Kaniewska and Dworak, translate names and terms of endearment using three major strategies, specifically diminutive-to-zero, non-translation/transliteration and addition. The analysis shows that *Alice in Wonderland* presents translators with a special and difficult case when translating diminutive forms of names because, as we can expect from Lewis Carroll, a hint of wordplay and punning remains in the background, which the translators focus on at the expense of emotional colouring.

Table 2: Polish Translations of Names and Terms of Endearment

English	Kaniewska	Dworak
Elsie	Ela	Ela
Lacie	Lala	Hela
Tillie	Tilla	Matylda
Bill	Bill	Jasiek
Cheshire-Puss	Koteczek z Cheshire	Kotek z Cheshire
little Alice (1)	Alicja	mała siostrzyczka
little Alice (2)	mała Alicja	mała Alicja

I would like to begin with the three diminutive names in the ST, specifically *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie*. Table 2 above shows the translation of diminutive names and terms of endearment in the two translations under study. *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie* are described in the Dormouse's story as 'three little sisters' (referring to the three real-life Liddell sisters that Carroll was particularly fond of, as discussed in 1.3), but also involve anagrams and wordplay. Both translators adopt the first strategy of diminutive-to-zero in order to bring wordplay to the forefront; that is, the translated names do not contain diminutive suffixes that indicate emotional meaning or that suggest the sisters are young girls rather than adults. Rather, the translators keep a sense of wordplay in the translated names, and also a sense of familiarity through several shortened forms. Kaniewska translates the three names as *Ela*, *Lala* and *Tilla* and Dworak follows with *Ela*, *Hela* and *Matylda*. Both translators, interestingly, use the name *Ela* for *Elsie*. The name *Ela* can come from the full name *Elżbieta*, but even if the name *Ela* is shortened, the name does not contain a diminutive suffix to create a diminutive form, such as *Elka* or *Elusia*. Likewise, other translated names can be shortened forms, including *Hela* (<*Helena*) and *Tilla* (<*Elizabeta*), all of which can receive a diminutive suffix in the Polish language.¹⁷

However, the translators seem to emphasize wordplay rather than emotional connotations, as shown in Dworak's translation, which emphasizes Alice's sister "Edith's family nickname Matilda" (Gardner 75) by rendering *Tillie* as *Matylda*.

The name *Bill* also receives similar consideration regarding wordplay and familiarity by Kaniewska and Dworak. However, unlike the diminutive forms of the names of the three little sisters above, *Bill* is typically considered a name on its own,

¹⁷ In fact, Jolanta Kozak, in her translation, chooses the names *Wacia*, *Lucia* and *Tycia*, all of which are common diminutive forms of personal names that keep the intertextuality of the original while also keeping the diminutive meaning. Thus, Kozak focuses on the diminutive meaning instead of the wordplay.

though historically it is a shortened form of the name *William*. In *Alice in Wonderland*, the name *Bill* is also a pun for a bill of money, as demonstrated in the chapter title, ‘The Rabbit Sends in a Little Bill’. Furthermore, Bill is referred to with several *poor little X* constructions and also the diminutive construction *the unfortunate little Bill*, which suggests that Bill, a lizard, is a rather feeble character (cf. 1.3). On the translation of Bill’s name Kaniewska and Dworak completely diverge: Kaniewska uses transliteration/non-translation, while Dworak adds a completely different name with a double diminutive suffix and a pun. The difference between the two translated names creates an interesting discussion. Unlike Dworak, Kaniewska leaves the name *Bill* as *Bill*; she does not attempt to find a Polish equivalent, nor does she manipulate the name to further emphasize the pun. Rather, she alienates the Polish reader by leaving a name that has no distinctive meaning for a Polish reader as either a familiar name or a pun. For example, the chapter title in Kaniewska’s translation is “Bill na Posylki” ‘Bill for Errands’, which emphasizes the fact that Bill is made to climb down the chimney (which differs from Dworak’s chapter title, “Przeznaczenie Małego Jaśka” ‘The Destiny of Small Jasiek/Pillow’). Dworak, by comparison, uses a different name, specifically *Jasiek*, a diminutive name that comes from *Jan* and contains two suffixes: *-ek* and *-ś*. Unlike the original name *Bill* or Kaniewska’s translation, the diminutive *Jasiek* conveys strong emotional connotations and affectionate meanings, such as towards a young boy; at the same time, the word serves as a pun (as in the ST), since the word *jasiek* also means ‘small pillow’ in Polish and sounds similar to *jaszczurka*, the Polish word for ‘lizard’. Thus, for the Polish reader, Kaniewska’s translation evokes neither emotional meaning

nor wordplay, while Dworak's translation strongly conveys affection through diminutive suffixes and also similar wordplay for the Bill/bill pun.

Both translators use the strategy of addition (or zero-to-diminutive) when Alice uses a non-diminutive term of respect when addressing the Cheshire Cat, specifically *Cheshire-Puss* in the following immediate context:

The Cat only grinned when it saw Alice. It looked good-natured, she thought: still it had *very* long claws [...] so she felt that it ought to be treated with respect. 'Cheshire-Puss,' she began, rather timidly, as she did not at all know whether it would like the name (64-65).

Through the strategy of addition, the Cat's term of respect, as used by Alice above, becomes a term of endearment and affection more than one of respect. In fact, in both translations under study the term receives diminutive suffixes and thus expresses two different levels of affection. In English, the word *puss* does not convey an emotive component such as for example *kitty*. Although the word *puss* does not convey diminutive meaning, Alice does feel affection (and respect) towards the Cat, which is demonstrated later when she expresses pleasure in seeing the Cat again and introduces the Cat as "a friend of mine" (86) to the King of Hearts. Based on Alice's feelings towards the Cat, both Kaniewska and Dworak provide an equivalent of the diminutive *kitty* rather than *puss* in *koteczek* and *kotek* respectively in order to show Alice's affection towards the Cat. Dworak creates a diminutive that can be translated into English as *kitty* or *little cat*, which conveys affection and is commonly used in both Polish and English

when wanting to show positive emotions towards a cat. Kaniewska implies a stronger emotional connection between Alice and the Cat than Dworak through rendering *Cheshire-Puss* as the synthetic diminutive *koteczek* that could be construed in English by the construction ‘dear little kitty’, as can be seen in the two corresponding immediate contexts in (9a) and (9b) below.

(9a) Kot uśmiechnął się szeroko na widok Alicji. Wydawał się pokojowo do niej nastawiony [...] więc dziewczynka czuła, że należy traktować go z należytych szacunkiem.

-Kotku z Cheshire – powiedziała dość nieśmiało, nie wiedziała bowiem, czy lubi być tak nazywany; ten jednak tylko uśmiechnął się szerzej.

‘The cat smiled widely at the sight of Alice. He appeared to view her peacefully [...] therefore the little girl felt the need to treat it with due respect.

“Kitty from Cheshire,” she said rather sheepishly, because she didn’t know whether it likes to be called that; it, however, just smiled wider.’

(Dworak 88)

(9b) Uśmiechnął się na jej widok. „Wygląda na dobrodusznego [...] Powinna więc traktować go z szacunkiem”...

-Koteczku z Cheshire – zaczęła dość nieśmiało, bo nawet nie wiedziała, czy spodoba mu się ten zwrot, ale on uśmiechnął się jeszcze szerzej.

‘He smiled at the sight of her. “It looks good-natured [...] It should, therefore, be treated with respect.

‘Dear kitty from Cheshire,’ she began rather timidly, because she didn’t even know if it would like the phrase, but he smiled even wider.’ (Kaniewska 88-89)

The changing or addition of the diminutive in the translation of *Cheshire-Puss* is not surprising because pets and bodies of animals typically receive diminutive suffixes in the Polish language (cf. 2.3), especially in direct discourse. However, it is interesting why, for example, Alice’s beloved cat Dinah does not receive diminutive suffixes when Alice conveys a significant amount of affection towards Dinah, calling it “my dear” (14) and at one point exclaims dejectedly, “Oh, my dear Dinah! I wonder if I shall ever see you any more!” (36). Despite this emphasis of Alice’s affection for Dinah, the name *Dinah* is translated as *Dina* by both translators as is shown, for example, by Kaniewska’s translation of the latter passage: “Och, moja kochana Dina! Zastanawiam się, czy jeszcze kiedyś ją zobaczę!” ‘Oh, my dear Dinah! I wonder if I will see her once again!’ (48), which is nearly identical in Dworak’s translation. Interestingly, then, when Alice stops missing Dinah but feels affection towards the Cheshire-Cat, the Cheshire-Cat receives a diminutive suffix or two, but the translators do not add diminutives (to form the diminutive name *Dinka*) when Dinah is the subject.

At the end of the book, when Alice awakes and her elder sister thinks “of little Alice and all her wonderful Adventures” (123), the translators use different strategies to translate the two instances of the *little Alice* diminutive construction. Kaniewska uses diminutive-to-diminutive and diminutive-to-zero strategies while Dworak uses manipulation and diminutive-to-diminutive strategies. For example, in the first instance,

Dworak translates *little Alice* as *mała siostrzyczka* ‘small sister-DIM’, which renders *Alice* as ‘little sister’ and thus conveys affection; Kaniewska, on the other hand, renders *little Alice* as *Alicja* in the following immediate context: “Opierając głowę na dłoni, obserwowała zachodzące słońce i myślała o Alicja i jej cudownych Przygodach” ‘Leaning her head on her arm, she observed the setting sun and thought about Alice and her wonderful Adventures’ (170). It is odd that Kaniewska would decide to remove all affection that was conveyed in the ST *little Alice*, especially because it is unusual for a name not to receive a diminutive suffix or an analytic marker when the narrator attempts to demonstrate a sister’s strong affection for her younger sister (cf. 2.2). However, both translators render the second instance of *little Alice* as the analytic construction *mała Alicja*, as in Dworak’s translation: “Najpierw śniła jej się sama mała Alicja” ‘first she dreamed about the same small/little Alice’ (184). Here, Dworak keeps the original diminutive meaning and thus shows Alice’s smaller physical size than her elder sister, but not, perhaps, the same degree of affection that the elder sister feels towards Alice. This choice on Dworak’s part suggests that Dworak felt that either the affection had been established in the first use of the construction and need not be repeated again for the second use, or Dworak decided not to emphasize the diminutive connotations again for stylistic or conceptual reasons. To provide another example, the diminutive construction *wise little Alice* from the context of “[i]t was all very well to say ‘Drink me,’ but the wise little Alice was not going to do *that* in a hurry” (17) becomes *mądra mała Alicja* in Dworak’s translation and *nasza mała Alicja* in the immediate context “łatwo powiedzieć „wypij mnie”, ale nasza mała Alicja była zbyt mądra, by zrobić TO od razu” ‘it was easy to say, “drink me”, but our small Alice was a bit too wise to do THAT immediately’ (19)

in Kaniewska's translation. Yet, despite the affection often de-emphasized in the diminutive constructions above, it is strange for Alice to be described as small and endearing without her name being altered from its formal form *Alicja* to a diminutive form including *Alusia*. This lack of diminutivization of the name suggests that neither translator attempted to make the translation more 'Polish'.

4.2 Object Nouns

Object nouns abound in *Alice in Wonderland* and more object diminutives are found in each of the translations under study compared with the original, which suggests the significant role and linguistic function of diminutives in both the Polish and English languages (cf. 1.2 and 2.2). In this sub-section, I will begin with direct translations of object nouns, beginning with the items and body parts of animals and Alice, including a key, house, table, ledge of rock, bottle, eyes and door that appear in simple *little X* analytic constructions with no preceding adjectives. Next, I discuss simple *small X* and *tiny X* analytic constructions (e.g. *tiny hands*, *small passage*). The analysis will be followed by a discussion of analytic constructions with preceding adjectives in constructions that convey positive meanings (e.g. *tidy little room*) and will end with a discussion of the constructions that convey negative meanings (e.g. *poky little house*) before moving to the most complex construction, specifically *such a tiny little thing*. The sub-section will finish with a discussion of types of added object diminutives in the translations under study.

This section shows several things about the translation of nouns: first, that there is no clear strategic difference between the two translators under study, thus creating an interesting interplay between the two translations; second, that the analytic marker *maly*

‘small’, which typically denotes a smallness of size, is the preferred translation of *little* rather than a synthetic diminutive, thus putting an emphasis on the size of the object rather than creating equivalent feelings of positive evaluation or affection, depending on context. Thus, the diminutives are more than frequently analytic or co-occurring analytic and synthetic constructions rather than synthetic diminutives with a simple diminutive suffix. Since language is constantly in a state of flux, it is possible that these translations suggest that the Polish language is adopting analytic constructions more often, since they also featured prominently in ‘native’ Polish children’s literature; or, the translations show that both translators conceptualized the source English constructions as emphasizing smallness rather than attitude. Either way, the emotional aspect of diminutives was often significantly de-emphasized in the Polish translations when contrasted with the emphasis on the object’s physical size.

I would like to begin with the simple *little X* diminutive constructions that are used when Alice enters Wonderland; specifically when Alice enters a dark hall with many doors and “a little three-legged table, all made of solid glass” (15), which leads her to examine the doors, where she finds “a low curtain she had not noticed before, and behind it was a little door about fifteen inches high: she tried the little golden key in the lock, and to her great delight it fitted!” (15). Later, she comes back to the table and finds “a little bottle on it” (16). Although these objects are diminutivized in the instances above, in the entire text generally, the analytic marker appears to be used and dropped randomly. For example, the narrator later writes of the little table, “[t]here seemed to be no use in waiting by the little door, so she went back to the table” (16), which is not described as *little* in the latter use. (Refer to chapter 1.3 for a more detailed discussion.)

In the translations, the object diminutives also appear to be randomly placed and not necessarily in the same places that originally contain a diminutive in the ST; I will discuss this below. Furthermore, the type of diminutive suffix used by both translators under study also alters the diminutive meaning of the original diminutive construction.

Although the location of the diminutive in the TT may differ from the ST and thus alters the ‘emotional colouring’ of the text, Kaniewska and Dworak render the source diminutive as either equivalent synthetic diminutives which have a single diminutive suffix (e.g. *drzwiczki* ‘doors-DIM’) or use a construction where synthetic and analytic diminutives co-occur to produce an emotional meaning similar to the *little X* construction (e.g. *male drzwi* ‘small doors-DIM’). Or, in several instances, Kaniewska and Dworak add diminutive affixes to the base word or analytic markers to a diminutive construction (e.g. *malutkie drzwiczki* ‘small-DIM doors-DIM’) in order to convey a more forceful diminutive, and thus emotive, meaning. The strategies they use vary from diminutive-to-zero, diminutive-to-diminutive and some manipulation of diminutive suffixes. For example, the first instance of *little table* is rendered as *stoliczek* ‘table-DIM-DIM’ by Kaniewska; Dworak, on the other hand, uses *stolik* ‘table-DIM’ / ‘(bedside) table’ to emphasize the small physical size of the table and to suggest the positive emotional connotations that are generally felt in relation to a smaller version of a physical object. Furthermore, the first instance of the *little golden key* is translated directly as diminutive-to-diminutive as *złoty kluczik* ‘golden key-DIM’ in both Kaniewska’s and Dworak’s translations. Thus, the above evidence suggests that Dworak emphasizes smallness of size rather than emotion; Kaniewska, if choosing to use a diminutive, chooses diminutive suffixes that convey a strong level of emotional connotation from diminutive suffixes.

The following translations of object nouns further demonstrate these individual strategies by Kaniewska and Dworak, though the translators seem to shift from strategy to strategy for the same source diminutive construction, perhaps to control the level of emotion directed towards the doors. In the following examples, the ST uses *little door* in the first instance (“behind it was a little door about fifteen inches high” (15)), *door* in the second (“Alice opened the door” (15)), and *little door* again in the third instance (“[t]here seemed to be no used in waiting by the little door” (16)). For example, Dworak used the analytic construction *niewielkie drzwi* in the first instance of *little door*. In the second use of *little door*, the diminutive is rendered as a synthetic diminutive: “Alicja otworzyła drzwiczki” (Dworak 16), where *drzwiczki* ‘doors-DIM’ adds a simple diminutive suffix to the base noun *drzwi* ‘doors’ and thus describes the doors also as physically smaller than what one would conceptualize as a ‘regular-sized’ door. In the next translation of the *little door*, Dworak uses the same diminutive-to-diminutive strategy by choosing *drzwiczki*. Yet, the shift in diminutiveness is again shown in the context of the following two instances: “I pobiegła jak najszybciej do małych drzwi. Niestety! – drzwiczki znów były zamknięte” ‘And she ran back as fast as she could to the small doors. Alas! the little doors were once again locked’ (28). In the previous example, the same source diminutive, *little door*, is rendered by Dworak as an analytic construction that conveys only smallness of size *małe drzwi* ‘small doors’, but is quickly followed by the synthetic construction *drzwiczki* that implies more emotional meaning than smallness of size. Thus, Dworak does not follow the same pattern of diminution as the ST and alters the ‘emotional atmosphere’ from the *little door* diminutive constructions.

Kaniewska's translation of the instances of *little door* suggests a more dynamic use of the diminutive than Dworak's translation by using all three types of constructions, specifically purely analytic, purely synthetic and co-occurring synthetic and analytic.

Kaniewska uses a diminutive-to-zero strategy in the translation of the first instance of *little door*, simply inserting the base noun: "za zasłoną ukryte były jeszcze jedne drzwi, wysokie na niecałe piętnaście cali" 'behind the curtain was hidden one more door, almost fifteen inches in height' (18), thus using *drzwi* 'doors' instead of *drzwiczki* 'little doors'.

In subsequent instances of *little door*, Kaniewska uses various diminutive-to-diminutive strategies, including *małe drzwi* 'small doors', *malutkie drzwi* 'small-DIM doors' and, in the last two instances in the chapter, *maleńkie drzwiczki* 'small-DIM doors-DIM-DIM' and *drzwiczki* 'little doors' in the following example: "Pobiegła najszybciej, jak umiała, w stronę maleńkich drzwiczek. Niestety, drzwi były wciąż zamknięte" 'She ran as quickly as she could in the direction of the dear small-DIM little doors. Unfortunately, the doors were again locked' (32). Kaniewska's apparently erratic strategy of translating diminutive objects in the first two chapters also affects other diminutive objects, including *małe szklane pudełeczko* 'small glass box-DIM' for *little glass box*, *malutki kluczyk* 'small-DIM key' or *kluczyk* 'key-DIM' for the little key, *stolik/stoliczek* for the little table and the lexicalized *butelka* 'bottle' and *niewielka butelka* 'small bottle' for the little bottle. However, the translation of the little door undergoes the most variation in Kaniewska's translation of diminutives in the first two chapters. The reason for this shift in diminutive constructions could be speculated upon in greater detail and in regard to prosody and rhythmic constraints, but, at the fundamental semantic-pragmatic level focused on in this thesis, Kaniewska's translation demonstrates that she is aware of the

emotional differences between the different constructions and is willing to exploit them in order to create a more emotionally dynamic translation that differs strongly from the ST, although she does not go as far as adding a preceding adjective or different base noun. Thus, she operates on the emotional levels within the available diminutive constructions in the Polish language.

Later in the book, several other *little X* constructions appear. I will not examine the translation of every construction closely (a list of the translations of all diminutives and their Polish and Russian translations can be found in Appendix B). However, I would like to discuss several additional examples that suggest that the *little X* constructions do not easily parallel Polish with a simple synthetic diminutive, that the translators under investigation prefer to complicate the diminutives in order to convey a certain style or emotional level, or that these translators consider analytic constructions in English to convey primarily smallness rather than an attitude. For example, the following *little X* constructions that I will discuss below differ from the ST and each other, including *little pebbles*, *little cakes*, *little white kid-gloves*. In addition, *little X* constructions also refer to animate beings, including *little Alice*, *little sister*, *little bird* and *little animal*.

In the former examples in the preceding paragraphs, the translators showed their own conceptualizations of the little door, key and table, thus changing the types of diminutives and diminutive meaning. The same applies to several other object diminutives, specifically *little pebbles*, *little cakes* and *little white kid-gloves*, where the diminutive-to-diminutive strategy used by Kaniewska and Dworak suggests that they consider the analytic marker *little* to convey smallness, though Kaniewska takes a greater step to emphasize the emotive connotations when possible. For example, although *little*

pebbles are translated as the semi-lexicalized *kamyczki* ‘pebbles-DIM’ by Dworak, such as in “a niektóre kamyczki uderzyły ją w twarz” ‘and some pebbles hit her in the face’ (57), Kaniewska creates a co-occurring analytic and synthetic diminutive construction in “w tym samym momencie posypał się do środka deszcz małych kamyczków” ‘in that same moment a downpour of small pebbles poured inside’ (59) for the ST “a shower of little pebbles came rattling in at the window, and some of them hit her in the face” (44). The construction *małe kamyczki* emphasizes the smallness of the pebbles along with the immediate context of “a shower of little pebbles”, which seems to conceptualize the little pebbles as the size of raindrops connected with rain or a shower. In the same way, Kaniewska (and Dworak also) translates *little cakes* as *małe ciasteczka* ‘small cakes-DIM’, so that the analytic diminutive construction in the English original conveys a stronger emotive component than would be conveyed through a solely analytic construction, specifically *małe ciastka* and also a stronger ‘smallness of size’ connotation than would be conveyed through only *ciasteczka*. Returning to the *little pebbles*, however, Dworak again translates similarly to Kaniewska, though he uses the synthetic diminutive *kamyczki* for *little pebbles* instead of a co-occurring synthetic and analytic diminutive construction. Like the objects mentioned above, *little white kid gloves* also are translated as the lexicalized *rękawiczki* ‘gloves’ by Dworak in the following context: “Bardzo się zdziwiła, widząc, że mimowolnie założyła jedną z króliczych rękawiczek” ‘She was very surprised to see that she had involuntarily put on one of the rabbit’s gloves’ (Dworak 27) when the ST reads as follows: “and was surprised to see that she had put on one of the Rabbit’s little white kid-gloves” (24). Kaniewska, in comparison, demonstrates again her preferred style and strategy of adding a stronger

emphasis on the emotive connotations of object diminutives by translating the same sentence as “że gdy rozmawiała sama ze sobą, wsunęła na rękę jedną z dwóch malutkich bielusiękich rękawiczek Królika” ‘that when she was talking to herself, she put on one of the two Rabbit’s small-DIM white-DIM gloves’ (31).

Animate beings also are conceptualized by Kaniewska and Dworak as requiring either a supposed ‘equivalent’ analytic construction or a co-occurring synthetic diminutive suffix and analytic construction, as for example Kaniewska translates “all sorts of little birds and beasts” (110) as “małe ptaszki różnych gatunków” ‘small birds-DIM of various types’ (149). Dworak, on the other hand, translates the same sentence as “najrozmaitsze małe ptaki i zwierzęta” ‘all sorts of small birds and animals’ (154), thus removing affection but emphasizing that the creatures are small in size.

The translators convey affection through the other diminutive constructions that are found in the last few paragraphs in the book, especially in Alice’s “tiny hands [that] were clasped upon her knee” (126). Dworak emphasizes the smallness of Alice’s hands through the combination of *drobne* ‘tiny’ and *rączki* (<*ręce*) ‘little hands’, while Kaniewska changes hands to arms and diminutivizes the adjective *szczupły* ‘slender/slim’ to emphasize the smallness and slenderness of Alice’s arms, which implies the smallness of Alice’s hands as well. The use of *tiny* is picked up by both translators and rendered as “drobne rączki dziewczynki” [*the little girl’s tiny hands-DIM*] (184) in Dworak’s translation and “oplatając kolana szczupłutkimi ramionami” ‘entwining her knees with her slender-DIM arms’ (170). To conclude the short analysis of items that are used in *little X* constructions, I re-state that although the translators under study use diminutive forms to various degrees at different times in the source text, they do use simple

diminutive suffixes that easily parallel English. For example, as I have discussed in the preceding paragraphs, the ‘little table’ becomes *stolik* (or *stoliczek* for a second-degree diminutive); ‘little door’ becomes *drzwiczki* (<*drzwi*); and, ‘little bottle’ becomes the mostly-lexicalized *butelka* (<*butla*). From this kind of direct translation, we can argue that the reverse is also true: simple synthetic diminutives in Polish can be effectively translated with the analytic ‘little X’ construction. However, although many simple synthetic diminutives occur, translated diminutives sometimes mimic the analytic construction while, at the same time, adding a diminutive affix in the analytic construction, creating ‘little X-dim’ or ‘little-DIM X’. For example, ‘little door’ is also translated as *malutkie drzwi*, thereby emphasizing affection through the diminutive affix in *malutkie:Pl*. In another example, ‘little key’ is translated as *malutki klucz*, where both words receive a diminutive affix, which further emphasizes the affection and positive evaluation of the key. As I mentioned earlier, diminutive constructions with co-occurring analytic and synthetic diminutives are very common in Polish. In this way, ‘native’ Polish literature and ‘translated’ Polish literature are similar and, to an extent, parallel English analytic constructions.

Before I continue to the ST *small X* and *tiny X* diminutive constructions, I will mention several other noteworthy object diminutives in the translations, specifically the strategies for translating *little house*, *little ledge of rock* and *little passage* (which differs in English from *small passage*). The first, *little house*, seems to easily parallel Polish and we would expect the translation to use the simple synthetic diminutive *domek*. However, Kaniewska renders the analytic construction with an analytic construction: “a na nim mały dom, wysoki na jakieś cztery stopy” ‘and on it a small house, about four feet high’

(75) for the following ST passage: "upon an open place, with a little house in it about four feet high" (56). Thus, through her translation, Kaniewska loses the positive emotional connotations and simply comments on the size, which is described at the end of the sentence. Dworak, in a similar way, also does not drop the analytic construction, though he creates a construction with co-occurring analytic and synthetic diminutives: "na której stał mały domek, wysoki na niewiele ponad metr" 'on which stood a small little house, approximately under a meter in height' (75). Dworak keeps the adjective *mały* 'small', but adds a diminutive suffix to the noun, as if ensuring some positive evaluation or affection for the house. It is interesting, therefore, that although it seems to be universally accepted that adding a simple diminutive suffix to the base noun creates an equivalent for a *little X* construction, none of the translators under study chose that strategy; rather, they decided to emphasize the 'smallness' over the 'littleness' of the house.¹⁸

The translation of *little ledge of rock* is slightly more complex because it is connected with the Mock Turtle's deep sorrow (cf. 1.3) and thus conveys some pity in the emotional connotations of the diminutive construction. In addition, the Polish language does not seem to have one equivalent for a ledge of rock that can be diminutivized. Thus, Kaniewska and Dworak had to employ creative means to convey the source diminutive construction and thus modified the original meaning somewhat to compensate for the difference between Polish and English. For example, Kaniewska translates the construction with the diminutive-to-zero strategy, specifically with *dlugi odlamek skały*,

¹⁸ Interestingly, Jolanta Kozak uses a simple translation that emphasizes the 'littleness' of the *little house* through *domek*. Arguably, however, *mały domek* could work here as well, as in the ST context that mentions the physical size of the house, thus emphasizing the size somewhat more than if the detail about the physical size had not been added.

as we can find in the sentence, “siedzącego samotnie na długim odłamku skały” ‘sitting lonely on a long splinter of rock’ (129) for the ST “sitting sad and lonely on a little ledge of rock” (95). Although the word *odłamek* appears to have an *-ek* diminutive suffix, the word is not a diminutive and does not come from **odłam*. Kaniewska, thus, removes the diminutive meaning in contrast with Dworak’s translation, which attempts to keep the source diminutive analytically. Dworak manipulates the construction somewhat through using a different base noun, but renders the source construction as *niewielka skalna półka* ‘small rock shelf’, though the word *niewielki* ‘small/not-big’ does not suggest quite a small a size as the analytic marker *mały* ‘small’. However, neither translation contributes to the sorrowful atmosphere created by the Mock Turtle’s exaggerated sorrow.

In English, the analytic markers *little* and *small* are differentiated by their emotional connotations; as I mentioned in 1.2, *little* conveys emotion, while *small* only comments on physical size. In *Alice in Wonderland*, there is a base noun, *passage*, which receives the analytic marker *small* in the first appearance in chapter 1, but receives the analytic marker *little* in a later chapter in reference to the same passage. Interestingly, although Kaniewska and Dworak differentiate between *small* and *little* through the addition of *mały* ‘small’ for the *little passage*, they do not use the analytic marker for *small passage*, which loses the diminutive meaning. Furthermore, both translators’ strategies create a different noun between *small passage* and *little passage*. The differences in the translations under examination are shown in table 2 below:

Table 3: Comparison of Polish Translations of *Little Passage* and *Small Passage*

English	Kaniewska	Dworak
small passage	korytarz	wąskie przejście
little passage	mała sień	mały korytarz

As is shown in the above table, Kaniewska translates *small passage* as *korytarz* ‘corridor’ that is described as small in the following sentence: “zobaczyła za nimi korytarz. Był mały, niewiele większy od szczurzej nory” ‘she saw behind them a corridor. It was small, not much bigger than a rat-hole’ (18-19) for the ST “Alice opened the door and found that it led into a small passage, not much larger than a rat-hole” (15). Thus, Kaniewska differs from the ST by moving the adjective into the next sentence and avoids a diminutive construction. Dworak also uses the strategies of manipulation and diminutive-to-zero, rendering the construction as *wąskie przejście* ‘narrow passage’. In chapter 7 of the ST, when the same passage is described through the analytic marker *little* in “then she walked down the little passage: and *then*—she found herself at last in the beautiful garden” (78), the translations under study do not add diminutive suffixes to acknowledge the shift in attitude towards the passage when Alice becomes small enough to pass through. Rather, Kaniewska uses *mała sieni* ‘small hall’ in the immediate context of “weszła do małej sieni” ‘she entered into the small hall’ (106); Dworak, likewise, uses *mały korytarz*. Thus, *little* is translated as *mały* ‘small’ in both translations under study rather than through a diminutive suffix (e.g. *korytarzyk*), and the two instances of *small* are not diminutivized at all through a diminutive construction. Instead, both Kaniewska and Dworak adopt the same strategy to manipulate the base noun. For example, *small passage* uses the noun *korytarz* ‘corridor’ and *little passage* uses the noun *sień* ‘hall’ in Kaniewska’s translation; Dworak uses *przejście* ‘passage’ and *korytarz* ‘corridor’ respectively. In conclusion, these two translators not only change the analytic markers but also the modified noun in order to create new meanings.

4.2.1 *Very small X and tiny X constructions*

The other translations of *small X* constructions translate directly through using the analytic marker *mały* before the noun. For example, Kaniewska and Dworak take advantage of the fact that in Polish, constructions with ‘small’ or ‘smaller’ do not have to be followed by a noun but can stand on their own. We can see this specifically in the translations of *small ones* (referring to birds) and *very small cake*. Dworak translates *small ones* as *małe [ptaki]* in the immediate context of “duże ptaki narzekały, że nie poczuły ich smaku, a małe krztusiły się” ‘the large birds complained that they couldn’t taste them, and the small [ones] choked’ (42). Kaniewska uses nearly the same wording, but uses the word *mniejsze* ‘smaller’ rather than *małe*, thus changing the construction to *smaller X* from *small X*. Also, the immediate context shows the direct comparison between the ‘large’ birds and the ‘small’ ones, which shows that physical size is the emphasis in the sentence.

The construction *very small cake* is interesting from a translation perspective because by adding an intensifier before the marker *small*, the original English construction only expresses a very small size, as in the immediate context: “Soon her eye fell on a little glass box that was lying under the table: she opened it, and found in it a very small cake, on which the words “EAT ME” were beautifully marked in currants” (18). Kaniewska and Dworak translate this construction with different strategies, but neither strategy creates an ‘equivalent’ diminutive construction. For example, Kaniewska adds diminutive suffixes to both the analytic marker and base noun in *malutkie ciasteczko* ‘small-DIM cake-DIM’ (<*małe ciastko*) in the following immediate context: “I wtedy nagle zauważyła pod stołem małe szklane pudełeczko: otworzyła je, a w środku znalazła malutkie ciasteczko, na którym pięknymi literami ułożonymi z rodzyneków napisano dwa

słowa: ZJEDZ MNIE” ‘And then she suddenly noticed under the table a small glass box-DIM: she opened it, and inside she found a small-DIM cake-DIM, on which was written with pretty letters laid from raisins two words: EAT ME’ (22). The diminutive construction for *very small cake* conveys strong affection as in ‘dear little small and tiny little cake’, which makes little sense in English; thus, ‘sweet little cake’ would convey the concept better. As we can see, the emotional connotations differ greatly from the original *very small cake*. Furthermore, the immediate context suggests that Kaniewska wanted to uphold the emotional intensity from the first diminutive construction, specifically *little glass box*, and positively evaluated the cake because of the ‘beautiful’ words. Dworak takes an entirely different approach which does not emphasize the small size of the cake but also does not introduce emotional connotations at all in his translation: “znalazła w środku nieduże ciastko” ‘she found inside it a not-big cake’ (20). Dworak’s version thus remains closer in emotional meaning to the ST construction even though the adjective *nieduży* can convey a slightly larger size than *mały*. Yet, it is interesting that both Dworak and Kaniewska remove the intensifier, when the equivalent intensifier *bardzo* ‘very’ could easily have been added to Kaniewska’s translation without adding any affectionate attitude towards the cake, such as in the direct translation *bardzo małe ciastko* ‘very small cake’.¹⁹

The diminutive construction *tiny X* implies that the subject is very small in dimension, which further suggests a synonymity with the *very small X* construction as we saw in the paragraph above and thus not convey an attitude besides what can be felt

¹⁹ Even though the intensifier *bardzo* could have been easily added to Kaniewska’s translation, it would not have been possible to add to Dworak’s translation because of his choice of analytic marker, specifically *nieduży*. In Polish, the construction **bardzo nieduże X* does not exist, except perhaps in defamiliarizing situations.

towards something small in size. However, the translators under study both preferred to use a diminutivized form of *mały* in a synthetic-analytic diminutive construction, thus suggesting that both translators conceptualize the analytic marker *tiny* as conveying emotional connotations through the tiny size of the subject; or, the ‘tiny’ size evokes stronger positive connotations than constructions containing the analytic marker *small*. For example, the “two or three pairs of tiny white kid-gloves” (38) are diminutivized without the adjective *drobny* ‘tiny’ that would not convey emotional connotations; rather, both translators use the first-degree synthetic adjective diminutives *maleńki* and *malutki* in Kaniewska’s “dwie albo trzy pary maleńkich rękawiczek z białej skorki” ‘two or three pairs of small-DIM gloves from white leather’ (52) and Dworak’s “dwie czy trzy pary malutkich, białych, skórzanych rękawiczek” ‘two or three pairs of small-DIM, white, leather gloves’ (49) respectively. Likewise, the same adjective diminutives are used for the ST diminutive construction *a tiny golden key* as used in its immediate context of “she came upon a little three-legged table, all made of solid glass: there was nothing on it but a tiny golden key, and Alice’s first idea was that this might belong to one of the doors of the hall” (15). Kaniewska, in her translation, emphasizes the diminutiveness of the analytic marker but leaves the noun unchanged in the construction, but immediately after uses the diminutive *kluczyk* ‘key-DIM’ to add diminutive meaning. Specifically, the *tiny golden key* is translated as *maleńki złoty klucz* ‘small-DIM golden key’ in “a na tym stoliczku nie leżało nic poza maleńkim złotym kluczem. Alicja od razu przyszło do głowy, że kluczyk będzie pasował do jakichś drzwi” ‘and on the table-DIM-DIM lay nothing besides a small-DIM golden key. It immediately occurred to Alice that the key-DIM will fit to some door’ (18). Dworak adds a diminutive suffix to the noun and a

different diminutive suffix than Kaniewska to the analytic marker, thus emphasizing the diminutive meaning in the translated construction *malutki złoty klucz*, which conveys more emotional connotations in the immediate construction, “leżał na nim wyłącznie malutki złoty klucz. Pierwsza myśl Alicji była taka, że pasuje on tylko to jednych drzwi” ‘on it lay solely a small-DIM golden key-DIM. Alice’s first thought was such that it fits only to one door’ (16). The immediate context shows Dworak’s strategy to use the diminutive construction itself to convey a strong emotional component, rather than spreading diminutives throughout the passage. Furthermore, a comparison of the two translators suggests that it is difficult, if not impossible, to talk about very small objects in Polish without evoking an emotional response²⁰.

In conclusion to the simple *little X*, *small X* and *tiny X* constructions, it becomes clear that although both Kaniewska and Dworak often conceptualize these seemingly ‘simple’ analytic constructions differently and thus use different diminutives, they also use the same synthetic diminutives and analytic diminutive constructions on rare occasions. This suggests that these simple suffixes might not be so easy to translate after all, especially when the translators’ styles of writing and translation strategies are taken into consideration. The overwhelming majority of these ‘translated’ diminutives involved the translators creating co-occurring synthetic and analytic diminutive constructions rather than synthetic or analytic ones. For example, even the simple analytic construction *little house* becomes *mały domek* in Dworak’s translation. This suggests that these Polish translators try to keep the ST analytic constructions intact, perhaps because *little* is equated with *small* (as suggested through the translations of *little passage* and *small*

²⁰ Although both translators chose a diminutive that back-translates as ‘small-DIM’, it would be worthwhile to investigate whether a difference in emotional connotation or diminutive meaning arises between *malutki* and *mały*.

passage, where it becomes apparent that these translators did not consider there to be a difference between the two constructions, could not find an ‘equivalent’ diminutive or chose not to show this difference). Furthermore, the diminutive constructions where analytic and synthetic diminutives co-occur (as discussed in 2.2) are used more often than synthetic diminutives, which can be a reason why such constructions appear frequently in the translations under study. Lastly, these ‘translated’ diminutives suggest, as I mentioned earlier, that the ‘translated’ diminutive is a paradox that is not completely part of either language or culture, but existing in what I term a ‘third space’ that briefly intersects with both SL and TL and yet exists outside the two languages. The paradox of ‘translated’ diminutives also occurs for diminutive constructions that contain preceding adjectives, as I will discuss in the following paragraphs.

4.2.2 Diminutive Constructions with Preceding Adjectives

The diminutive constructions with preceding adjectives (e.g. the adjective ‘neat’ in the construction *neat little house*) provide more opportunity for diminutive formation in Polish because, while in the English language adjectives are not diminutivized, the adjectives in native Polish children’s literature frequently receive diminutive affixes, as I mentioned in chapter 2.2 and showed in the preceding paragraphs with constructions including *malutki X* or *maleńki X* diminutive constructions. Based on the preceding adjective used in the diminutive construction, I will first discuss constructions that convey positive evaluation and/or emotion (e.g. *neat little house*), then move on to constructions that convey irony (e.g. *nice little stories* for stories that were not ‘nice’), and then conclude the sub-section with the diminutive constructions that convey negative evaluation (e.g. *poky little house*). In most cases, the translators appear to keep the

translated diminutive construction as close to the ST as possible (though, perhaps, with the exception of those translations that add *mały*), though all ‘translated’ diminutive constructions convey a strong emotional undercurrent that is typical for the Polish language.

The first translated diminutive constructions that I would like to examine use *mały* with a diminutive suffix to the noun. Unlike the *little/small X* constructions discussed in the preceding paragraphs, these translated diminutive constructions with a preceding adjective always contain a diminutive affix, and the affix is almost always attached to the base noun. The decision made by the translators to add the diminutive suffix to the base noun shows that the translators aimed to emphasize the emotional connotations that are conveyed by the base noun rather than by the analytic marker or the meaning evoked by the accompanying adjective. For example, the White Rabbit’s *neat little house* that appears in the immediate context of “she came upon a neat little house, on the door of which was a bright brass plate with the name ‘W. RABBIT’ engraved upon it” (39) is translated through a diminutive-to-diminutive strategy by both translators, although some additional smallness of size is conveyed through the ‘translated’ diminutive construction. Kaniewska uses *śliczny mały domek* ‘beautiful small house-DIM’ to convey positive evaluation and to describe the Rabbit’s house as pretty in appearance through the diminutive construction’s immediate context of “znalazła się tuż przed ślicznym małym domkiem. Na jego drzwiach lśniła miedziana wizytówka z wygrawerowanym napisem B. KRÓLIK” ‘she found herself already in front of a beautiful small house-DIM. On its doors gleamed a copper card engraved with the inscription W. RABBIT’ (51-52). Likewise, Dworak’s Alicja finds herself “przed małym schludnym domkiem” ‘before a

small neat house-DIM' (49); thus, Dworak's choice of 'equivalent' diminutive construction conveys the same amount of diminutive meaning as Kaniewska. Likewise, the *tidy little room* that Alice finds in the *neat little house* is translated with the similar *mały X-DIM* construction with shows a 'fondness towards and smallness of' (Bielec 1998) the inanimate subject. The White Rabbit's *tidy little room* occurs when Alice enters the house "found her way into a tidy little room with a table in the window" (38). For the *tidy little room*, Kaniewska emphasizes the emotional connotations by adding an additional diminutive suffix and also emphasizes the small size of the room through the position of the analytic marker before the adjective diminutive in *mały, czyściutki pokoik* 'small, clean-DIM room-DIM', as found in "dotarła do małego, czyściutkiego pokoiku z oknem, pod którym stał stół" 'she reached a small, clean-DIM room-DIM with a window, under which stood a table' (52). Dworak also translates directly but without the analytic marker in the following immediate context: "Alicja dotarła do ładnie urządzonego pokoiku ze stolikiem przy oknie" 'Alice reached a nicely furnished room-DIM with a table-DIM next to the window' (49), which is the closest translation to the source diminutive construction, even though the word 'table' receives a diminutive suffix.

In order to show how the diminutive meaning of 'fondness towards and smallness of' is shown to animate beings through the translations of positive diminutive constructions with preceding adjectives, I turn to the *nice little dog* that Alice talks fondly about to the Mouse in the immediate context of "[t]here is such a nice little dog, near our house, that I should like to show you!" (27) and *dear little puppy* in Alice's exclamation, "And yet what a dear little puppy it was!" (46). The former diminutive construction is conceptualized as physically small and loveable in Kaniewska's translation and *taki*

śliczny mały piesek ‘such a beautiful small dog-DIM’ in the context of “[o]bok mojego domu mieszka taki śliczny mały piesek – wielka szkoda, że nie mogę ci go pokazać!” ‘next to my house lives such a beautiful small dog-DIM – it’s a large pity that I cannot show him to you!’ (35). The latter construction, *dear little puppy*, is translated through the diminutive-to-zero strategy in order to avoid conveying a smallness of size (perhaps because the puppy was gigantic compared to Alice) and to emphasize its loveability, as is found in the immediate context of “[a]le i tak był śliczny i kochany!” ‘but even so he was beautiful and loveable!’ (62). In both diminutive constructions, Kaniewska constrains the emotive component to the diminutive construction rather than spreading diminutives throughout the passage (e.g. by adding diminutive suffixes to the house). Dworak’s TT, which is discussed in the following paragraph, uses a diminutive-to-diminutive construction, following the former construction used by Kaniewska in the above examples.

Only a few of these constructions that primarily convey a positive evaluation through a preceding adjective do not use the analytic marker *mały* but just diminutive suffixes added to the base noun. Although the addition of the analytic marker meaning ‘small’ can convey some emotion because small things (especially the animals that Alice is so fond of, which is discussed in greater detail in chapter 1.3) generally convey a positive emotion including fondness, the constructions without analytic markers render a similar emotional level to the original diminutive construction. For example, Dworak’s translation of *such a nice little dog* seems to be rendered directly to convey the same affection through *taki miły piesek* ‘such a dear little dog-DIM / doggie’ in the immediate construction of “niedaleko naszego domu mieszka taki miły piesek, którego chętnie bym

pani pokazała!” ‘close to our house lives such a dear little dog-DIM, which I would readily show you’ (32), where Alice’s use of the third-person *pani* ‘Mrs’ to refer to the Mouse shows that Alice is speaking formally. Likewise, Dworak translates *dear little puppy* as *taki miły szczeniaczek* ‘such a dear puppy-DIM’ in the following immediate context: “A jednak to był taki miły szczeniaczek!” ‘But still it was such a dear little puppy!’ (61). By using the diminutive *szczeniaczek*, Dworak finds a diminutive-to-diminutive strategy that allows for an ‘equivalent’ diminutive that does not necessarily mean that the puppy is small in size beyond the fact that puppies are, generally smaller than the adults of their kind; in addition, he adds the intensifier *taki* to both diminutive constructions, which emphasizes Alice’s feelings towards the dogs.

The ironic *nice little stories* that the ‘wise little Alice’ refers to when finding the bottle marked ‘drink me’ in the context found below uses a similar construction as the diminutive constructions discussed in the preceding paragraphs:

for she had read several nice little stories about children who had got burnt, and eaten up by wild beasts, and other unpleasant things, all because they *would* not remember the simple rules their friends had taught them: such as, [...] if you drink much from a bottle marked “poison”, it is almost certain to disagree with you, sooner or later (17).

Thus, as the context shows, these ‘nice little stories’ were not pleasant, and thus convey a sense of irony, and also some immaturity concerning Alice’s thinking about the consequences of drinking a bottle marked ‘poison’. In both TTs this diminutive construction is translated without the analytic marker, though Kaniewska evokes stronger emotional connotations by adding a diminutive affix to the adjective. Likewise, the

translated context is almost identical to the ST and does not add diminutive suffixes to any other words (e.g. *beasts* or *bottle*) in order to create a more childlike effect, specifically as shown in (10) below:

- (10) Alicja przeczytała już niejedną miłą historyjkę o dzieciach, które się spaliły albo zostały pożarte przez dzikie zwierzęta, albo miały inne nieprzyjemne przygody, a wszystko dlatego, że NIE PAMIĘTAŁY kilku prostych zasad, jakich uczyli je życzliwi przyjaciele, na przykład [...] jeżeli napijesz się z butelki z napisem „trucizna”, to z pewnością ci to zaszkodzi – prędzej czy później.
- Alice read through already more than one nice-DIM story-DIM about children who had burned themselves or were devoured by wild animals, or had other nasty adventures, and all because they DID NOT REMEMBER several straightforward rules, as her kind friends were taught, for example [...] if you drink from a bottle with the label ‘poison’, then for sure it will bother you – sooner or later (Kaniewska 19)

Dworak translates the entire passage nearly identically to Kaniewska with the exception that the adjective is not diminutivized in “niejedną miłą historyjkę o dzieciach” ‘more than one nice story-DIM about children’ (Dworak 18). Thus, these constructions with positive meanings suggest that both translators are more likely to use a synthetic diminutive and convey the analytic marker *little* through a diminutive suffix. This can furthermore suggest that the Polish language does not use the analytic marker *mały*

before the synthetic diminutive *historyjka* ‘story-DIM’ which refers to a ‘short story’ that is short in length but not particularly small in size in the same way as a room or animal.

Two diminutive constructions with negative evaluation, specifically *poky little house* and *sharp little chin*, are treated differently than the positive constructions and appear to create an obstacle for translators perhaps because in Polish the primary function of the diminutive is to convey positive evaluation or affection rather than negative connotations. As I discuss in greater detail in chapter 1.3, the *poky little house* refers to the house Alice’s acquaintance Mabel lives in, as shown in its immediate context of Alice’s tearful conclusion that “I must be Mabel after all, and I shall have to go live in that poky little house, and have next to no toys to play with” (23-24). The *sharp little chin*, on the other hand, refers to the Duchess’ chin, as shown in its immediate context: “said the Duchess, digging her sharp little chin into Alice’s shoulder” (92). Thus, neither object is viewed favourably by Alice, though not as negatively as it would be if described without the analytic marker *little*. When considering the translations, the noun in the latter construction given above appears to cause the most difficulty because a diminutive suffix cannot be attached to the base noun because the Polish noun for *chin* can also mean *beard* and a diminutive suffix would refer to a type of beard rather than a chin. Thus, in order not to depart from typical Polish diminutive use of these nouns, several of the translations under investigation either remove the diminutive affix, the analytic marker, or both. For example, Dworak interprets the adjective *poky* in *poky little house* to mean that the house is physically small because of his ‘equivalent’ translation of *ciasny* ‘cramped/narrow’. Kaniewska, on the contrary, uses the adjective *brzydki* ‘ugly’ as the translation of *poky*. Thus, the translations insert the analytic marker to create the

construction *ciasny mały domek* ‘cramped small house-DIM’ in the immediate context of “[c]hyba jednak jestem Mabel i będę musiała zamieszkać w tym ciasnym małym domku, prawie bez zabawek” ‘I probably am after all Mabel and I will have to live in that cramped small little house, practically without toys’ (Dworak 27) and *brzydki mały dom* ‘ugly small house’ in the immediate context of “[w]ygląda na to, że jednak jestem teraz Mable i będę musiała mieszkać w tym jej brzydkim małym domu bez żadnych zabawek” ‘it seems that I am now after all Mable and I will have to live in that ugly small house of hers without any toys’ (31). Dworak uses a diminutive suffix on *dom* ‘house’, thus creating a slightly positive emotional connotation regarding the house and not making the house sound quite as horrible as Kaniewska’s ‘ugly small house’. In a sense, Kaniewska’s translation has a similar level of diminutive meaning as *poky house*, while Dworak’s translation conveys the meaning of *poky little house*, which is not quite as negative or ominous as the former construction. The translators, however, found more difficulty in finding an ‘equivalent’ diminutive for the ST diminutive construction *sharp little chin*. For this construction, Dworak uses a diminutive-to-zero strategy by removing the preceding adjective and diminutive: “wbijając brodę jeszcze mocniej w ramię Alicji” ‘drilling her chin/beard even more strongly into Alice’s shoulder’ (127). Kaniewska uses the same diminutive-to-zero strategy, but uses the adjective *koścista* ‘bony’ to precede the noun in the immediate context of “kłując ramię Alicji swoją kościstą brodą” ‘stabbing Alice’s arm with her bony chin’ (125). Thus, when back-translated, both translations mean ‘(bony) chin’ and suggest that the ST diminutive construction *sharp little chin* might be untranslatable into Polish. In contrast, the former diminutive construction, *poky little house*, was an obstacle to the translators because of their conceptualization of the

diminutive construction, and possibly also because of the difficulty in creating a diminutive construction that emphasizes a negative attitude towards the subject but allows for a little positive evaluation through the analytic marker *little*.

Although the diminutive construction *sharp little chin* could not be easily translated into Polish, the diminutive construction *such a tiny little thing* in Alice's exclamation, "really I'm quite tired of being such a tiny little thing!" (38) also creates an obstacle for translators. The obstacle is caused because of the diminutive construction's two analytic markers (*tiny* and *little*), the intensifier *such* and the rather ambiguous English term *thing*, which neutrally can refer to any object, idea, person and so forth. Because the Polish language does not have a similar noun to add a diminutive suffix to, we can quickly see that the translators will use other means to convey the source concept. The two translators use an equivalent intensifier (*taki*), but that is where the similarity between Kaniewska's and Dworak's translations ends. Dworak's translation, which arguably is closer in meaning to the original, uses the diminutivized analytic marker *malutki* 'small-DIM' for *tiny little* and uses the noun *stworzenie* 'creature' for the source *thing*. In its immediate context, the construction reads, "bo mam już dość bycia takim malutkim stworzeniem" 'because I already have enough of being such a small-DIM creature' (49). The construction does not convey the strong emotion that propels Alice's exclamation, but the general meaning can be found in the translation. Kaniewska takes a different route and takes out all analytic markers from their *little X* constructions and base noun; rather, her Alice says, "jestem zmęczona byciem kimś tak maleńkim!" 'I am tired of being someone so small-DIM!' (52). Although the noun *thing* is replaced by *someone* (referring to a person), the translator changes the construction so that the emphasized

word is the last one, specifically *maleńki*, which brings her smallness of size to the forefront.

In conclusion, the last two examples demonstrate that certain diminutive constructions exist in English that are not directly translatable into Polish. Although both translators under study are consistent and identical in the above, it is difficult to establish a certain translating pattern for either translators. Dworak appears more inclined to use synthetic diminutives than Kaniewska in general, while Kaniewska appears to be more likely to remove diminutive suffixes and replace them with an analytic marker, thus keeping an analytic construction, as in the ST. In the next paragraphs, I end this subsection with a discussion about the added object diminutives that did not occur in the ST.

4.2.3 Added Diminutives

I would like to briefly address the added diminutives that can be grouped together, specifically those that can be considered cultural, such as for example those concerning food and drink items. They are added into every translation under examination so that the text would not come across as foreign to the reader. The added diminutives that refer to food and drink include *obiadek* ‘dinner-DIM’, *łyżeczka* ‘spoon-DIM’, *winko* ‘wine-DIM’, *talerzyk* ‘plate-DIM’ and *masełko* ‘butter-DIM’ (see Appendix C for a list of added diminutives in each translation). For example, the Mad Hatter says, “[i] już pół do drugiej, czas na obiadek!” ‘and it’s already one thirty, time for dinner-DIM!’ (Kaniewska 99), the March Hare comments that “[m]asełko było NAJLEPSZEJ jakości” ‘the butter-DIM was the BEST type’ (Kaniewska 98) regarding the butter they were putting in their watches and the March Hare tells Alice, “[n]apij się winka” ‘have some wine-DIM’ (Kaniewska 95) after Alice sits down at their table uninvited. In addition, early in the

story, Alicja refers to her cat Dinah's bowl of milk, which is translated as a synthetic diminutive such as *miseczka* 'bowl-DIM' in all translations. For example, Alice says the following when she thinks of Dinah while she falls down the rabbit-hole: "Mam nadzieję, że nie zapomną dla niej o miseczce mleka w porze podwieczorku" 'I hope that they won't forget for her a saucer-DIM of milk during afternoon tea' (15) in Dworak's translation. These additions suggest that the Polish language typically diminutivizes nouns that concern certain types of food or objects that are smaller in size for several reasons, including because the object is used by a pet (such as Dinah) and also because they are a significant part of hospitality and cordiality in Polish culture. Thus, these diminutives express, at most, positive evaluation (in the context of *Alice in Wonderland*).

Some of these diminutives that modify food and drink items do convey a sense of emotion in their particular contexts. For example, when the Mad Hatter explains to Alicja about Time being a person in control of time, as the March Hare whispers to himself, "Och, obiadek, jak byłoby to miło!" "Oh, how nice it would be to have dinner-DIM!" (Kaniewska 99), thereby putting a strongly positive evaluation on having dinner. Although the addition suggests that the diminutive *obiadek* can convey positive meanings and be translated as 'dear little dinner', it appears that the conceptualization of dinner as a 'dear' and 'little' is part of the Polish culture and not used in English. Several other diminutives convey diminution more than emotional meaning, including *łyżeczka*, which refers to a teaspoon rather than a regular spoon (*łyżka*) or *talerzyk*, which refers to a type of smaller plate (although in the ST the word is simply 'plate'). Thus, the addition of some of these diminutives can cause the translations to convey additional emotion than would be expected in English.

An additional issue regarding the addition of a group of diminutives includes bodies of animals or clothing belonging to children or animals. As I mentioned in chapter 2.2, the bodies of animals and children often are diminutivized because of the positive emotion that these animals and children evoke in the speaker or narrator. For example, animals' bodies are often represented by diminutives, including *pyszczek* 'snout, muzzle-DIM' or *łapki* 'paws-DIM' which suggests a specific diminutive use in the Polish language regarding animals (especially pets) with affection and positive emotion. For example, "[p]yszczek miała blady („z emocji” – pomyślała Alicja)” 'her little face was pale ("from emotion", thought Alice)' (Dworak 33). These types of diminutives suggest that these diminutives must fulfil an important function in the Polish language and consequently fulfil an important role in the translations of *Alice in Wonderland*. However, unlike the food and drink in the preceding paragraph, these diminutives convey affection, even though their use is largely Polish and is not used to the same degree in English (cf. 1.2).

As I stated earlier, diminutives that centre on clothing or animals' bodies are highly emotional but also common to Polish but not English; thus, there are some diminutives that are not typically parallel, although there are some exceptions like *hanky* or *those cute little ears*. The frequent diminutives used by Alice in the TTs when she describes animals' bodies suggest her love for animals. For example, Alice describes how Dinah "lize łapki i myje sobie pyszczek" 'licks her little paws and washes her little snout' (Kaniewska 34) thus showing her affection for Dinah. In a more emotional outburst by the White Rabbit, fur and whiskers undergo diminution, specifically in "[n]a moje drogie łapki! Na moje futerko i wąsiki!" 'my dear little paws! My little fur and little whiskers!'

(Kaniewska 48), which add an additional affectionate nuance in the Polish language.

Thus, diminutive use is shown by the added diminutives in order to fit the world of Polish diminutives. We can conclude that the Polish language adds diminutives to animals' bodies for emphasis of the speaker's affection towards the subject, a strategy which does not occur in English (cf. 1.2, 1.3).

Alicja also refers to her body with diminutives, specifically her arms and shoulders, which evoke both affection, concern and on occasion irony. For example, in one chapter she grows so tall that she only sees the forest below like a green ocean; yet, gives her arms and shoulders diminutive suffixes. Specifically, she asks, "I gdzie się podziały moje ramionka? I, och, moje rączki" 'And where are my little shoulders? And, oh, my little hands' (Kaniewska 72). Here, *ramionka* (< *ramiona*) and *rączki* (< *ręce*) each receive one simple diminutive suffix. Although the emotion would have been stronger with double diminutives, the use of these diminutives suggests heightened emotion, also suggested through the use of the interjection *och* 'oh'. In another situation, Alicja refers to the nose of the baby-pig in some alarm: "[o]ch, przecież tu jest jego śliczny nosek" 'oh, but here is his beautiful little nose' (Kaniewska 84); or, as Dworak's translation puts it: "Już po jego drogim nosku!" 'Already for his dear little nose!' (84). Thus, both examples above suggest a heightened emotional reaction from a potentially dangerous situation concerning 'dear little' hands, shoulders and nose.

In conclusion, what is interesting about these added diminutives is that they are most often synthetic diminutives, suggesting that the strange assortment of analytic and co-occurring analytic and synthetic diminutive constructions are limited to diminutives

translated from the English ST. In the following sub-section, I discuss the few event nouns and the ways that translators approach translating these analytic constructions.

4.3 Event²¹ and Verbal Nouns

Diminutivized event nouns are translated differently from object nouns, where the analytic marker *mały* is prevalent. In the translations under study, none of the event nouns in (*gave a little scream, little shriek, little sharp bark, queer little toss or a little feeble squeaking voice*) are translated using *mały*, even though, as in the object nouns above, the analytic marker *little* precedes the noun in the ST diminutive construction. Thus, the translators used either a diminutive-to-diminutive strategy or a diminutive-to-zero/manipulation strategy and as such avoided *mały* because event nouns in Polish cannot be physically small. This goes back to the previous sub-section and arguably shows that *mały* is, above all, a marker that is equivalent to *small* and therefore emphasizes smallness of size. Since Polish event nouns cannot differentiate and convey the concept of ‘small’ and ‘little’ event nouns like English, which uses diminutive constructions (e.g. *a small voice/a little voice or a small scream of laughter/a little scream of laughter*), event nouns are difficult to directly translate from English into Polish.

The difference between Polish and English event noun diminutives causes the translated *little X* constructions to often replace *little* with the adjective *cichy* ‘quiet’ because many of these event nouns cannot, or typically do not, receive diminutive

²¹ By ‘event’ noun, I specifically mean nouns that cannot be sensed and measured by touch and sight, unlike the object diminutives discussed in the previous sub-section (e.g. *table, dog, nose*), but are not abstract nouns because the events can be heard and sometimes seen (e.g. *toss of her head*). Often, these ‘event’ nouns are used in delexical structures, which names and focuses on a complete event, not one that focuses on the action of the verb (cf. Arndt, Havey and Nuttall 2000:124). It has been pointed out that delexical structures in English are often translated as single verbs in Slovene (Verbinc 2004), which is true of these delexical structures /diminutive constructions under examination as well.

suffixes and the analytic marker *mały* cannot precede the noun, except perhaps in defamiliarizing situations. For example, although the *two little shrieks* from the ST “[Alice] spread out her hand again, and made another snatch in the air [...] there were *two little shrieks*” (42) are translated as non-diminutive nouns, specifically as *dwa ciche piski* ‘two quiet shrieks’ in the immediate context of “[t]ym razem rozegły się DWA ciche piski” ‘this time there rang out TWO quiet shrieks’ (Kaniewska 56), the noun *pisk* ‘shriek’ does not take a diminutive suffix to create a synthetic diminutive such as for example **piskeczki*. Likewise, later in the book “Alice gave a little scream of laughter” (84), which emphasizes the event and short duration of Alice’s scream, thus distinguishing the diminutive construction from the simple verb ‘screamed’ and also from the other possible diminutive constructions, including (*gave a*) *small scream of laughter* and (*gave a*) *tiny scream of laughter*, all of which arguably convey a slightly different diminutive meaning from each other. However, since these small differences in meaning are not typical to the Polish language, Kaniewska translates *a little scream of laughter* as “Alicja parsknęła cichym śmiechem” ‘Alice burst into quiet laughter’ (115); Dworak, on the other hand, seems to misinterpret the source diminutive by his translation, “Alicja wybuchnęła śmiechem” ‘Alice exploded in laughter’ (114) and thus completely removes any evidence of the ST’s diminutiveness of Alice’s scream of laughter. In addition, *the little sharp bark* that alerts Alice to an enormous puppy standing near her also is manipulated by both translators, exchanging the analytic marker *little* for the adjective *cichy* ‘quiet’, specifically in *ciche (ostre) szczeknięcie* ‘a quiet (sharp) bark’ in the immediate contexts of “[r]ozglądała się bezradnie wśród drzew, gdy nagle ciche, ostre szczeknięcie sprawiło, że podniosła głowę i spojrzała w górę [...] zobaczyła przed sobą

ogromnego szczeniaka” ‘she looked around helplessly through the trees, when suddenly a quiet, sharp bark was made, that she lifted her head and looked up [...] she saw before her an enormous puppy-DIM’ (Kaniewska 60) and similarly in “[g]dy rozglądała się wśród drzew, ciche szczeknięcie kazało jej szybko podnieść wzrok. Ogromne szczenię patrzyło na nią z góry” ‘when she looked around herself in the trees, a quiet bark caused her to quickly lift her eyes. An enormous puppy looked at her from above’ (60). Thus, some English diminutive constructions cannot be rendered into Polish, making the translators use a diminutive-to-zero strategy. Likewise, the difference between the two languages also leaves the ‘translated’ diminutive in its paradoxical state, being perhaps not completely ‘Polish’ and not conveying the diminutive meaning of the English ST either.

The affectionate meanings of the diminutive construction, *queer little toss of her head*, is also lost in translation because it is unusual to diminutivize *podrzucenie*, the Polish noun for ‘toss’. In the ST, the diminutive construction is part of the elder sister’s dream that occurs after Alice wakes up in the following immediate context: “she could hear the very tones of her voice, and see that queer little toss of her head to keep back the wandering hair that *would* always get into her eyes” (126). In context, the ‘event’ base noun, *toss*, contributes towards the strong affection that the elder sister feels towards Alice. This affection, demonstrated through *little toss*, is omitted in Kaniewska’s translation (though an attempt is made to make up for the omission through the addition of the analytic marker *mała* ‘small’ to refer to Alice). Thus, Kaniewska’s translation reads, “widziała każdy niecierpliwy ruch głowy, którym mała odgarniała niesforne włosy, ZAWSZE opadające na oczy” ‘she saw every impatient movement of her head, which the small (one) brushed her unruly hair, ALWAYS falling on her eyes’ (171).

Dworak, similarly, uses a diminutive-to-zero strategy with his construction, *odrzuca głowe* ‘throws her head’ in “i widziała, jak na swój sposób odrzuca głowę, by pozbyć się niesfornego kosmyka włosów, który zawsze wpadał jej do oczu” ‘and saw, how in her own style she tosses her head to get rid of her unruly lock of hair, which always fell into her eye’ (184). Although the rest of the immediate context is translated and both translators make an effort to keep the verb, interestingly neither translator follows an earlier translation that manages to keep the diminutiveness through “niewielki ruch głowy” ‘small movement of her head’ (Słomczyński 1967:104).

The verbal noun (gerund) *pattering in a little pattering of feet* occurs three times throughout the story, and all refer to the White Rabbit’s ‘pattering’ as he runs. In the Polish translations under study, the diminutive translation is translated as *tupot* ‘pattering’, *cichy tupot* ‘quiet pattering’ and *tupot małych stóp* ‘pattering of small feet’²². Neither translation uses the synthetic diminutive *tupotek* or modifies the gerund itself through *mały tupot*, which suggests that the gerund does not typically undergo diminution. In the following instance where both translators opt for the diminutive-to-zero strategy, the gerund is used when Alice hears the White Rabbit running along the hall. The fact that both translators used a diminutive-to-zero strategy on this type of verbal noun and added analytic markers for the other instances suggests that, as in the diminutive constructions *little key* or *little table* discussed in the previous section, the translators conceptualized the construction differently than suggested in the ST and thus caused the meaning of the TTs ‘equivalents’ to differ from the original. For example, Kaniewska translates *a little pattering of feet* as *tupot czyichś kroków* ‘pattering of

²² It appears that ‘small’ is the literal back-translation here because as we see in the following section, the translators have Alice refer to her ‘poor little feet’ as *stóпки* ‘feet-DIM’ (‘little feet’). Thus, *stópy* do typically receive diminutive suffixes to convey the emotive component of the diminutive.

somebody's steps'. Similarly, Dworak uses *tupot* in the following translation: "Po jakimś czasie usłyszała tupot stóp w oddali i pośpiesznie otarła oczy, żeby zobaczyć, kto nadchodzi" 'After some time she heard the pattering of feet in the distance and quickly wiped her eyes in order to see who was approaching' (25). A comparison of these translations with the ST "[a]fter a time she heard a little pattering of feet in the distance, and she hastily dried her eyes to see what was coming" (21) shows that the translators were faithful to the original context and wording, but were not able to convey the emotive or 'small' component through *mały tupot* or *tupotek*. In the other instances in the story, *little pattering of steps* does receive an analytic marker or adjective to bring the TT construction closer to the original, specifically through *cichy tupot* 'quiet pattering' in Dworak's translation and *tupot małych stóp* 'pattering of little feet' in Kaniewska's translation, specifically in the context of "znów usłyszała w oddali tupot małych stóp, więc podniosła głowę w nadziei" 'again she heard in the distance the pattering of small feet, so she lifted her head with hope' (48). However, the analytic marker is placed after the gerund, and although the adjective 'quiet' can convey some of metaphorical smallness of sound, the construction does not convey the original diminutive meaning. Likewise, the translation of the third instance in "then came a little pattering of feet on the stairs" (40) as *tupot małych stóp* and *tupot* by Kaniewska and Dworak respectively reinforces my previous observation that in Polish, gerunds such as *pattering* do not typically receive diminutive suffixes or analytic markers in order to convey a combination of diminutive meaning and smallness of size.

The only diminutive noun that receives diminutive suffixes in the translations under study is the translation of *little voice*, specifically Bill's voice, which is described

as *a little feeble, squeaking voice* when he returns to consciousness after he is kicked up the chimney by Alice in the passage, “[I]ast came a little feeble, squeaking voice (‘That’s Bill,’ thought Alice)” (43) and the White Rabbit’s *shrill little voice* when he calls Alice’s name in court, specifically in “Alice watched the White Rabbit as he fumbled over the list, feeling very curious to see what the next witness would be like [...] Imagine her surprise, when the White Rabbit read out, at the top of his shrill little voice, the name ‘Alice!’” (117). The translations, with the exception of Kaniewska’s *drżący, piskliwy głos* ‘trembling, squeaky voice’ in “[n]ieco, drżący, piskliwy głos odpowiedział (‘To Bill’ – pomyślała Alicja)” ‘somewhat trembling, squeaky voice replied (‘That’s Bill’ – thought Alice)’ (59) all add a simple diminutive suffix to *głos* ‘voice’ and thus use the synthetic diminutive *głosik* ‘voice-DIM’. For example, the White Rabbit in Dworak’s translation “odczytał swym skrzeczącym głosikiem” ‘read out in his (own) shrill little voice’ (Dworak 167), while Kaniewska’s White Rabbit reads in a *cichy, cieniutki głosik* ‘quiet, thin-DIM voice-DIM’ in “wyobraźcie sobie jej zdziwienie, kiedy Biały Królik cichym, cieniutkim głosikiem wyczytał kolejne imię z listy: -ALICJA!” ‘imagine her surprise when the White Rabbit in a quiet, little thin little voice read out the next name from the list: ‘Alice!’ (158). By adding the diminutive affix to the adjective, Kaniewska’s translation thus adds and emphasizes stronger emotional connotations than the source diminutive construction.

As we have seen above, the event and verbal nouns have to be approached differently than object nouns because the translators cannot emphasize a smallness of size with an event noun that has no physical dimensions. Thus, the translators change strategies, replacing *little* with *cichy* ‘quiet’ and, when possible, adding a diminutive

suffix. This demonstrates the large difference between diminutive formation in the English and Polish languages and how nouns can be conceptualized as diminutives in both languages. In order to explore the differences between English and Polish further, I turn to *poor little X* constructions in the following sub-section, focusing on the *poor little X* construction as it is used regarding Alice, Bill, the baby-pig and the puppy that Alice encounters.

4.4 **Poor little X constructions**

The translations of the nine *poor little X* constructions introduce the Polish root *bied-* to form ‘equivalent’ diminutives. In other words, the translators use words that are derived from the root, including *biedak* ‘poor person’, *biedactwo* ‘poor thing’, the adjective *biedny* ‘poor’ and other similar forms. Once again, constructions with co-occurring analytic and synthetic diminutives are used (e.g. *biedne male stworzonko* ‘poor small creature-DIM’) and analytic constructions (e.g. *biedna mala jaszczurka* ‘poor small lizard’). Despite the fact that these constructions refer to four characters (thus animate beings), with the exception of Alice’s feet, the choice of type of diminutive construction appears to be picked randomly as in some cases with object noun diminutive constructions; that is, an overview of all the translations does not show a clearly different strategy between the two translators under study and thus can, perhaps, indicate that these constructions are interchangeable in the Polish language. Thus, I will address each character individually, beginning with Alice, then commenting on Alice’s reaction to the puppy, and ending with a discussion of the baby that turns into a pig and the lizard, Bill.

Alice is referred to by the narrator as *the poor little thing* once in the book, after Alice drinks from the bottle and subsequently shrinks in size but leaves the key on the

table. In desperation, “she tried her best to climb up one of the legs of the table, but it was too slippery; and when she had tired herself out with trying, the poor little thing sat down and cried” (18). In translating the diminutive construction, Kaniewska and Dworak produce target constructions that are different from each other. While one translator emphasizes smallness and hopelessness, the other translator emphasizes the meaning of ‘poorness’. Specifically, Kaniewska focuses on Alice’s small physical size and seemingly hopeless situation through the construction, *maleńka, bezradna dziewczynka* ‘small-DIM, hopeless girl-DIM’ in the following context: “próbowała nawet wspiąć się po jednej ze stołowych nóg, ale były za śliskie, więc zmęczona tymi próbami maleńka, bezradna dziewczynka usiadła i rozplakała się” ‘she even tried to climb up one of the table legs, but they were too slippery, therefore, tired from these attempts the small-DIM, hopeless little girl sat down and cried’ (22). As I discussed in the sub-section on object diminutives, the analytic marker *maleńki* ‘small-DIM’ means ‘tiny’, but with a strong emotional undercurrent, which emphasizes the meaning of pity and empathy through a roundabout way, without using the direct translation of the adjective *poor*. However, Dworak also uses a unique construction for his translations of *poor little X* constructions by using a rather uncommon word, specifically *bidulka* in “nawet spróbowała wspiąć się po jednej z nóg stolika, ale bidulka wciąż się ześlizgiwała; kiedy już się zmęczyła próbem, usiadła i zaczęła płakać” ‘she even tried to climb on one of the table-DIM legs, but the bidulka constantly slipped off; when she already tired herself out from trying, she sat down and began to cry’ (20). The word *bidulka* seems to appear in few dictionaries; but, based on the context and root *bi(e)d-*, which arguably comes from *biedny* ‘little’ and uses the feminine (diminutive) suffix *-ulka*, the word conveys the meaning of poorness,

attributed to a female animate being. In this way, Dworak is able to avoid using a form of ‘small’ and emphasize the pooriness; at the same time, he gets around the obstacle of translating the word *thing*, which has no equivalent in the Polish language, as discussed in the construction *such a tiny little thing*.

Alice uses *poor little X* construction in two exclamations; the first refers to her feet, while the second refers to an animate being, specifically an enormous puppy that gives the *little sharp bark* that I discussed earlier. However, we can assume that Alice feels about the same affection and endearment towards the puppy and her feet, since the former appears in the immediate context of “‘Poor little thing!’ said Alice, in a coaxing tone, and she even tried hard to whistle at it; but she was terribly frightened all the time at the thought that it might be hungry” (44) and the latter in “Oh, my poor little feet, I wonder who will put on your shoes and stockings for you now, dears? I’m sure *I sha’n’t* be able! I shall be a great deal too far off to trouble myself about you” (20). The straightforward translation of *my poor little feet* is rather expected and follows the pattern of the majority of object nouns that are preceded with an adjective, with the adjective *biedny* ‘poor’ to precede *mały* and the base noun with a simple diminutive suffix. For example, Dworak’s translation runs as follows: “Och, moje biedne, małe stóпки, kto was teraz będzie ubierał w buciki i pończochy, moje kochanie? Ja na pewno nie będę już mogła!” ‘Oh, my poor, small feet-DIM, who will put on your boots-DIM and stockings, my dears? I definitely won’t be able to anymore’ (24), which emphasizes the irony of Alice calling her gigantic feet ‘small’ and conveys Alice’s emotional reaction with a very similar, if not equivalent, diminutive construction. Likewise, Kaniewska has her Alice say the following: “Och, moje biedne małe nóżki...Zastanawiam się, kto teraz będzie

wkładał na was buciki i skarpetki, moje kochanie? Bo ja na pewno już nie dam sobie z tym rady!” ‘Oh, my poor small feet-DIM...I wonder, who will now put on you boots-DIM and socks-DIM, my dears? Because I definitely will not handle it anymore!’ (27). While the translation of the *poor little X* construction about Alice’s feet is relatively straightforward, the translation of *poor little thing!* in reference to the puppy is not so straightforward. For example, Dworak lessens the emotional impact and diminutive meaning significantly by having Alicja simply say *biedactwo* ‘poor thing’ without the exclamation mark in the following context: “Biedactwo – powiedziała Alicja przymilnym głosem i spróbowała zagwizdać na szczeniaka” “‘Poor (little) thing,’ said Alice with an ingratiating voice and tried to whistle at the little puppy’ (60). Kaniewska, in comparison, heightens the emotion by her translation of “[m]aleńkie biedactwo! – powiedziała łagodnie Alicja i usiłowała na niego zagwizdać, choć przez cały czas była potwornie przerażona, że piesek może być głodny” “‘small-DIM poor thing!’ said Alice gently and tried to whistle at him, even though the entire time she was terribly frightened that the dog-DIM might be hungry’ (60), which also gives an impression, perhaps intentionally ironic, that the puppy is small, when in fact it is enormous in comparison with Alice. However, Kaniewska’s translation does convey the ST diminutive construction along with Alice’s affection for animals with greater emphasis than Dworak’s translation.

It must be mentioned that the word *biedactwo* does not typically receive a diminutive suffix, which is demonstrated through the fact that such a form does not appear in any of the translations under study. Rather, it is used interchangeably with forms of *mały*, including *maleństwo* ‘little thing’ and the diminutive *maluszek* ‘baby’ (< *maluch* ‘toddler’), both of which refer to a very young child or animal. Thus, the term is

especially adequate for the baby that turns into a pig in Alice's arms, which is referred to three times as *the poor little thing* and is translated using all the various forms mentioned above. Kaniewska chooses *biedny maluszek* 'poor baby', *biedne maleństwo* 'poor little thing' and *biedne male stworzonko* 'poor small creature-DIM'; similarly, Dworak chooses *biedactwo* 'poor thing', *biedne maleństwo* 'poor little thing' and *male biedactwo* 'small poor thing'. At no instance do the translators use the same construction for the same source construction. Thus, the translator's conceptualization of the context, character and emotional understanding is the cause of these translations, which do not have a clear pattern or reason. The only noticeable outcome of the translations rests in the fact that Kaniewska's translations of the baby-pig use more diminutive suffixes than Dworak, specifically in *maluszek* and *stworzonko*.

The last character in this sub-section to be discussed is Bill, who, among other diminutive constructions, is referred to as *the poor little juror*, *the poor little thing* and *the poor little Lizard*. For this character, the translators under study move away from the diminutives used for the baby-pig, such as *maluszek*; rather, they approach translation with the fact that Bill is a lizard (an animal), a worker for the White Rabbit and a juror. Interestingly enough, the translations of *poor little thing* for the constructions where Bill is the subject do not involve an analytic marker; rather, they are translated directly, specifically as *biedne stworzonko* 'poor creature-DIM' (Kaniewska 161) and *biedna jaszczurka* 'poor lizard' (Dworak 170) for the ST "Alice looked at the jury-box, and sat that, in her haste, she had put the Lizard in head downwards, and the poor little thing was waving its tail about in a melancholy way, being quite unable to move" (119). Thus, the diminutive constructions used here fit well, and in the immediate context, the

construction conveys the fact that the subject is ‘little’ and ‘poor’, specifically in Kaniewska’s translation: “Alicja popatrzyła na ławę przysięgłych i spostrzegła, że w pośpiechu usadziła Jaszczurkę do góry nogami i teraz biedne stworzonko smutno wymachiwało ogonem” ‘Alice looked at the jury-bench and noticed that in her hurry she put the Lizard in upside-down and now the poor little creature sadly waved its tail back and forth’ (Kaniewska 161). Dworak, in comparison, removes the analytic marker ‘little’ to use the construction that is back-translated as ‘poor lizard’ and thus has no diminutive meaning. In its immediate context, the diminutive meaning is not added in any other way except perhaps through the use of the name/wordplay *Jasiek* (discussed in 2.1.1), specifically in “Alicja spojrziała na ławę i zobaczyła, że w pośpiechu posadziła Jaśka do góry nogami; biedna jaszczurka machała smutno ogonem” ‘Alice glanced at the bench and saw that in her haste she had put Jasiek in upside-down; the poor lizard waved its tail sadly’ (170). A comparison of the two translations shows that Dworak conveys slightly less diminutive meaning and consequently less emotion towards Bill. Thus, in the case of Bill, Kaniewska takes the unusual path, translating *the poor little juror* as *biedak* in *biedak przysięgły* ‘poor juror’, although in the immediate context, Kaniewska quickly introduces ‘small’ again afterwards: “że biedak przysięgły – a była nim ta mała jaszczurka imieniem Bill” ‘that the poor juror – and it was the small lizard with the first name Bill’ (150) for the ST immediate context: “She did it so quickly that the poor little juror (it was Bill, the Lizard) could not make out at all what had become of [his pencil that squeaked]; so, after hunting about for it, he was obliged to write with one finger for the rest of the day” (112). As in the former example, Bill is placed in a circumstance that evokes pity towards him (see 1.3 for a more detailed discussion), and the translators

emphasize the evoked pity, but not the ‘littleness’ that is usually caused by the smaller-than-usual size of the subject (cf. 1.2). This small size is, however, used by Dworak in his translation of the same passage: “dziewczynka zrobiła to tak szybko, że biedny mały ławnik (był to jaszczurka Jasiak) nawet nie zauważył, co się stało” ‘the little girl did it so quickly that the poor small/little juror (it was the lizard Jan-DIM-DIM) did not even realize what had happened’ (156-157). Although Dworak’s diminutive-to-zero strategy in the former example created a *poor X* construction instead of a *poor little X* construction, the strategies for *poor little juror* switch between the two translators; here, Dworak’s ‘equivalent’ analytic construction evokes both pity and ‘littleness’. In the third example, which occurs when Alice “ran out of the house, and found quite a crowd of little animals and birds waiting outside. The poor little Lizard, Bill, was in the middle, being held up by to guinea-pigs, who were giving it something out of a bottle” (44), is given the same ‘equivalent’ diminutive-to-diminutive construction, specifically *biedna mała jaszczurka* ‘poor small/little lizard’. The immediate context is also worded similarly in both translations; therefore, I will only provide Dworak’s translation: “wybiegła z domu i zobaczyła na podwórzu spore zbiegowisko niewielkich zwierzątek i ptaków. Jasiak, biedna mała jaszczurka, stał pośrodku podtrzymywany przez dwie świnki morskie” ‘she ran from the house and saw in the yard a big crowd of small animals and birds. Jan-DIM-DIM, the poor small lizard, stood in the middle, held up by two guinea pigs’ (58). Thus, while the two translators did not use the same strategy in the first two examples discussed, they used the same strategy in the translation of the third *poor little X* construction, which suggests that the diminutive meaning of smallness and pity might be especially apparent in the third construction, but that the level of diminutive meaning

conveyed is strongly dependant on the translator's individual understanding of the character and the diminutive construction.

Thus, the most common issue in translating *poor little X* constructions was the base noun, specifically *thing*, which caused the translators to find an equivalent noun that suited the subject. Because of the characters, the translators could choose words that conveyed pity and 'littleness' through unusual or infrequently used words (e.g. *bidulka*), and convey emotion through diminutives including *maluszek* and *stworzonko*, while other meanings of pity were conveyed through the common word *biedactwo* 'poor thing'. Although these diminutive constructions did not use the analytic marker *mały* as often as in object nouns (only about half of the *poor little X* constructions used *mały* or a diminutive form of *mały*), it did appear to convey smallness of size. Thus, we can conclude that the translators used the language at their disposal to create constructions that conveyed pity, although not many constructions used synthetic diminutives.

In conclusion to this case study on Polish translations, it has been shown that diminutives in the original English constructions were translated using various strategies as outlined in chapter 3. The strategy (or strategies) chosen appear to be based on the translators' skill, conceptualization and understanding of both source and target language diminutives and the individual English-Polish linguistic and cultural constraints. The addition of diminutives in each translation shows that diminutives are used in different ways in Polish than in English by the fact that the added diminutives modify items not diminutivized in English, such as those pertaining to food and drink. The loss of diminutive shows the same of English, suggesting that both languages are 'diminutive-rich' in their unique subjects that typically undergo diminution.

Chapter 5: Case Study: Russian Translations

The second case study focuses on the Russian translations of *Alice in*

Wonderland. As in the Polish case study, the chapter aims to answer the main question, specifically the following: What strategies did Demurova and Shcherbakov adopt and what did they emphasize to produce an ‘equivalent’ emotional meaning?

5.1 Names and Terms of Endearment

Compared with the Polish translations, diminutive forms of names and terms of endearment feature more prominently in the Russian translations. The specific character’s names that receive diminutive suffixes outside the ST diminutive forms of names are the Fish-Footman, Alice’s nurse, Cheshire-Puss, the Mouse, the Mock Turtle; and, the name *Bill* is also manipulated so that the translated name sounds like the English diminutive form *Billy*. In the following paragraphs, I will begin with the translations of *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie*, and then continue to the other added diminutive forms. A comparison table of the translations of names and the terms of endearment can be found in table 4 below.

Table 4: Russian Translations of Names and Terms of Endearment

English ST	Shcherbakov	Demurova
Elsie	Чарлора [<i>Charlora</i>]	Элси [<i>Elsi</i>]
Lacie	Алиса [<i>Alisa</i>]	Лэси [<i>Lesi</i>]
Tillie	Тилли [<i>Tilli</i>]	Тилли [<i>Tilli</i>]
Cheshire-Puss	Мурчик-Чеширчик [<i>Murchik-Cheshirchik</i>]	Котик! Чешик! [<i>Kotik! Cheshik!</i>]
Bill	Билли [<i>Billi</i>]	Билль [<i>Bill’</i>]
Mock Turtle	Черепаха-Телячьи-Ножки [<i>Cherepaha-Teljach’i-Nozhki</i>]	Черепаха-Квози [<i>Cherepaha-Kvozi</i>]
Nurse	Нянечка [<i>Njanechka</i>]	Няня [<i>Njanja</i>]
Fish-Footman	Лакей-Рыбешка [<i>Lakej-Ryboshka</i>]	Лакей-Лещ [<i>Lakej-Leshch</i>]

The translations of the personal names (and wordplay) *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie* lose their diminutiveness, arguably because the translators pick up and emphasize the wordplay involved. As Sutherland (1970) writes, “‘Elsie = ‘L.C.’ = ‘Lorina Charlotte’; ‘Lacie’ = an anagram on ‘Alice’; ‘Tillie’ = diminutive of Edith’s pet name, ‘Matilda’ (Sutherland 24). Despite the wordplay, however, the names are diminutive forms as well (cf. 1.3). Demurova’s transliteration strategy (although she provides extensive footnotes on the wordplay and background of the names) gives the same sounding names in her translation (Элси [*Elsi*], Лэси [*Lesi*], Тилли [*Tilli*]) but these translated names do not convey any emotion to the Russian reader. Shcherbakov’s manipulation strategy, which interestingly translates the names as the original names that Carroll makes anagrams and wordplay from, specifically *Чарлора* [*Charlora*] (from *Charlotte*), *Алуца* [*Alisa*] (from *Alice*, which became the anagram/diminutive *Lacie* in the ST) and then transliterates *Tillie* as *Тилли* [*Tilli*] rather than *Matylda*. Shcherbakov essentially uses a diminutive-to-zero strategy because the altered forms do not convey diminutive meaning. Since Shcherbakov does not provide footnotes, he thus loses both the wordplay and the diminutive forms.

In some instances in the translations under study, proper names receive diminutive suffixes in order to add an element of diminutiveness and emotional connotations to specific characters. For example, in Shcherbakov’s translation, the proper names of the Mock Turtle, the Mouse and the Fish-Footman gain diminutive suffixes outside of direct speech; that is, diminutives become their proper names throughout the translation. Specifically, the Fish-Footman is translated as *Лакей-Рыбёшка* [*Lakej-*

Rybjosshka], where *рыбёшка* [*rybjoshka*] (< *рыба* [*ryba*]) ‘fish-DIM’; the Mouse is translated as *Мышка* [*Myshka*] (< *Мышь* [*Mysh*’]) ‘Mouse-DIM’; and, the Mock Turtle is translated as *Черепаха-Телячьи-Ножки* [*Cherepaha-Teljach'i-Nozhki*] ‘Turtle-Veal-Legs-DIM’ where *ножки* [*nozhki*] is derived from *ноги* [*nogi*] ‘legs’. It is interesting that the translations of these characters’ names seem to be chosen to receive diminutive suffixes, thus receiving emotional connotations not conveyed in the ST. The former character, the Fish-Footman, probably receives a diminutive suffix for two possible reasons, specifically so that the name can rhyme with that of the Frog-Footman, whose name is *Лакей-Лягушка* [*Lakej-Ljagushka*] ‘Footman-Frog’; and also to convey a strong emotional impact because of the diminutive’s connotation of insignificance. When considered in the context of the story, there is no reason for the Fish-Footman (and not the Frog-Footman) to be singled out as conveying a connotation of disdain or unimportance besides his status as a footman/servant. Wordplay, however, is brought to the forefront in the context because the two footmen exchange notes for the Duchess that contain wordplay. For example, in the short scene where the Frog-Footman appears, he performs an action that is repeated by the Frog-Footman afterwards, in (11) below:

- (11) начал с того, что извлек из-под мышки огромный конверт, величиной чуть ли не с него самого
- nachal s tovo, chto izvlek iz-pod myshki ogromnyj konvert, velichinoj chut' li ne s nego samogo*

to begin with, that he drew from under his arm a huge envelope, almost the same size as himself (77)

Near the end of the short scene, Alice can hardly contain her laughter when “они отвесили друг другу церемонный поклон, причем их кудри потешно перепутались” [*oni otvesili drug drugu ceremonnyj poklon, prichem ih kudri poteshno pereputalis'*] ‘they responded to each other with a stiff bow, and their hair messed up comically’ (78). The other two characters can also convey some emotion; for example, Alice first finds the Mock Turtle sitting sadly on ‘a little ledge of rock’ which causes her to pity him (cf 1.3).

Terms of endearment express varying degrees of affection and emotion in both translations under study, which can be due to the synthetic diminutive and/or the immediate context. In direct discourse, Demurova adds diminutive forms for the polite term *Cheshire-Puss* and when Alice calls after the Mouse, saying “Mouse dear! Do come back again” (27). Shcherbakov does add one more diminutive form in direct discourse, specifically when Alice imagines speaking to her nurse, saying “Coming in a minute, nurse!” (38), which Shcherbakov translates as “Нянечка, одну секундочку!” [*Njanechka, odnu sekundochku!*] ‘Nurse-DIM-DIM, one second-DIM!’ (59). Back-translated, the phrase reads, “dear (little) nurse, just one little second!”, thereby giving the phrase more of a childish and affectionate attitude from Alice’s perspective than in the ST passage. In addition, Demurova does, like Shcherbakov, use the simple diminutive *мышка* [*myshka*] ‘little mouse’ in Alice’s utterance, “Мышка, милая!” [*Myshka, milaja!*] ‘Mouse, dear!’ (31), thus emphasizing, though only slightly through the synthetic diminutive, the affection that Alice feels to the Mouse at that moment in the book, although the diminutive is more typical in ‘native’ Russian children’s stories. The

affection that Alice feels towards the Cheshire Cat is emphasized by both Russian translators through a zero-to-diminutive strategy, much in a similar manner as the Polish translations discussed in the preceding section. Specifically, their translations use *Мурчик-Чеширчик* [*Murchik-Cheshirchik*] ‘Puss-DIM-Cheshire-DIM’ and *Котик! Чешик!* [*Kotik! Cheshik!*] ‘Kitty! Little Cheshire!’ (Demurova). Thus, although Demurova differs in her strategy of translating diminutive forms of proper names than Shcherbakov, she does emphasize a moment of heightened emotional intensity between Alice and a character she feels particularly fond of.

The last name that I will discuss, namely Bill, receives an interesting translation by both translators under study. Unlike the Polish translation by Dworak in the preceding section, neither Shcherbakov nor Demurova choose a Russian diminutive form. This strategy keeps the name closer to the original *Bill*, since the name *Bill* is not a diminutive form. However, Shcherbakov translates the name as *Билли*, which, when transliterated back into English or said out loud, becomes and sounds like the diminutive form *Billy/Billie*, which has the diminutive suffix *-ie* or *-y*. Thus, Russian readers only get a sense of diminutiveness if they know of the English diminutive name. Demurova, in contrast, uses the same transliteration strategy that she uses with *Elsie*, *Lacie* and *Tillie*, thus translating *Bill* as *Билль* [*Bill*']. Unlike the Polish translation by Dworak, neither translator attempts to ‘Russify’ the name.

The ST uses several endearing terms, including the word *dear* to refer to a person in discourse. However, like the character Miss Cornelia in chapter 1.2, who uses the diminutive form *dearie* consistently, Demurova frequently adds the diminutive suffix *-очка* [*-ochka*], thus rendering the translation to roughly mean *dearie* through the term

милочка [*milochka*] ‘dear-DIM’ (<тилая). This is interesting because, in comparison with Shcherbakov, Demurova preferred not to add diminutives for names in the above translations. For example, Alice thinks to herself, “I’ll stay down here! It’ll be no use their putting their heads down and saying ‘Come up again, dear!’” (24). Demurova uses a zero-to-diminutive strategy, translating the sentence as “Поднимайся, милочка, к нам” [*Podnimajsja, milochka, k nam*] ‘Get up, dear-DIM, to us’ (26). The diminutive suffix used, specifically *-очка* [*-ochka*], is paraphrased by Wierzbicka (1984) as “I feel something good toward you of the kind that people feel speaking to small children” (260), which emphasizes Alice’s age and adds an emotional connotation that Shcherbakov does not add to his translation. Later in Demurova’s translation, the same Russian diminutive is used in her translation of the Mouse’s question to Alice, “How are you getting on now, my dear?” (30) and Alice’s exclamation “Oh, my dear Dinah!” (36), which is translated as “Ну как, милочка, подсыхаешь?” [*Nu kak, milochka, podsyhaesh’?*] ‘Well, dear-DIM, are you getting dry?’ (34) and “Ах, Дина, милочка!” [*Ah, Dina, milochka!*] ‘Ah, Dinah, dear-DIM!’ (41) respectively. Although many instances of *dear* are not translated by Demurova, but rather as *дорогой* [*dorogoy*] ‘dear’, a brief overview of Demurova’s translation of *dear* suggests that Demurova conceptualized several instances of *dear* as conveying more emotion than is implied through the ST *dear*.

The diminutive constructions that are formed with an analytic marker preceding personal first names and animate beings (e.g. *little sister* and *(wise) little Alice*) imply a smallness of size and an emotive component. Similarly to the ST, diminutive constructions with a name do not receive diminutive suffixes; rather, the analytic marker

маленький [*malen'kij*] ‘little’ precedes the name. For example, Shcherbakov’s removes some of the emotive component in the immediate context of “thinking of little Alice and all her wonderful Adventures” (125) through his translation of “и думала о маленькой Алисе и обо всех её чудесных приключениях” [*i dumala o malen'koj Alise i obo vseh ejo chudesnyh prikljuchenijah*] ‘and she thought about little Alice and about all her miraculous adventures’ (153); likewise, Demurova’s translation is nearly identical, also using the diminutive construction *маленькая Алиса* [*malen'kaja Alisa*] ‘little Alice’. In the same paragraph in the ST, Alice is mentioned as *little Alice* again. In this instance, both translators remove *маленький* in a diminutive-to-zero strategy, so that *little Alice* becomes merely *Alisa* ‘Alice’, as in Demurova’s translation: “Сначала она увидела Алису” [*Snachala ona uvidela Alisu*] ‘First she saw Alice’ (135). Thus, the strong undercurrent of affection that Alice’s elder sister feels for her little sister is not quite as apparent in either translation, which is further evident in the translation of *little sister*, which receives diminutive suffixes in only one of the two instances that it occurs in the concluding paragraphs of the book. For example, both translators manipulate and lose the first instance of *little sister* by translating the diminutive construction as *младшей* [*mladshej*] ‘younger’ in “странные создания из рассказа младшей” [*strannye sozdanija iz rasskaza mladshej*] ‘strange creatures of the younger [sister’s] story’ (153) or as *Алиса* [*Alisa*] ‘Alice’ in Demurova’s translation. Turning to the last instance of *little Alice* in the book, the translators differ in the emotional connotations conveyed through each diminutive construction. Shcherbakov creates a co-occurring diminutive construction that conveys affection and endearment in *маленькая сестричка* [*malen'kaja sestrichka*] ‘little sister-DIM’ in “потом она представила себе, как ее

маленькая сестричка станет в свое время взрослой женщиной” [*potom ona predstavila sebe, kak jejo malen'kaja sestrichka stanet v svoje vremja vzrosloj zhenshhinoj*] ‘she imagined how her little sister-DIM will become in time an adult woman’ (154). Demurova comments on Alice’s size and age, and does not convey the affection and expressiveness conveyed through Shcherbakov’s double diminutive suffix through her ‘equivalent’ of *malen'kaja sestra* ‘little sister’, shown in its immediate context: “она представила себе, как ее маленькая сестра вырастет” [*ona predstavila sebe, kak ee malen'kaja sestra vyrastet*] ‘she imagined, how her little sister will grow up’ (135). Although the examples above suggest that Demurova’s translation conveys less emotion than Shcherbakov’s, her translation captures the positive evaluation of *wise little Alice* in “It was all very well to say ‘Drink me’, but the wise little Alice was not going to do *that* in a hurry” (17). While Shcherbakov’s translates word-for-word and provides the usual ‘equivalent’ translation in *умная маленькая Алиса* [*umnaja malen'kaja Alisa*] ‘wise little Alice’, Demurova removes the analytic marker and adds a diminutive affix to the adjective in *умненькая Алиса* [*umnjen'kaja Alisa*] ‘wise-DIM Alice’ in “[э]то, конечно, было очень мило, но умненькая Алиса совсем не торопилась следовать совету” [*eto, konechno, bylo ochen' milo, no umnen'kaja Alisa sovsem ne toropilas' sledovat' sovetu*] ‘this, of course, it was very nice, but the wise-DIM Alice took the time to follow the advice’ (19). This way, Shcherbakov’s diminutive construction uses the analytic marker to diminutivize Alice, Demurova emphasizes how ‘wise’ Alice was by adding the diminutive suffix to the adjective.

In conclusion, the translation of names and terms of endearment can be grouped into two categories: those that are used in spoken discourse and proper or personal names

of a character. In the former, diminutive suffixes are commonly attached to the name in order to convey the affectionate or negative attitude that Alice feels towards the subject; in the latter, no attempt is made to ‘Russify’ the names through choosing an ‘equivalent’ name, although Shcherbakov’s translation suggests a combination of wordplay and diminutiveness for a specific group of characters. Demurova, on the other hand, attempts to keep the character’s names as close to the ST as possible emotionally, without conveying additional diminutive attitude. When she does add diminutives to her TT, the diminutives she uses occur in moments of heightened emotion, and the diminutive suffixes are added not to the proper or personal name itself, but to a term of endearment such as *dear* or when directly speaking to a character with a term of endearment (specifically in the translation of *Cheshire-Puss*). Thus, the two translators differ from each other because Shcherbakov conceptualizes characters as conveying diminutive emotion, while Demurova conceptualizes terms of endearment in direct discourse to convey diminutiveness, rather than characters themselves. Thus, this fundamental difference creates two quite different translations.

5.2 Object Nouns

Alice in Wonderland has many object diminutives in the ST and object diminutives are found in each of the translations under study, which suggests the significant role and linguistic function of diminutives in both the Russian and English languages (cf. 1.2 and 2.1). In this section, I will analyze direct translations of object nouns, beginning with the items and body parts of animals and Alice, including a key, house, table, ledge of rock, bottle, eyes and door that appear in simple *little X* analytic constructions with no preceding adjectives. Next, I discuss simple *small X* and *tiny X*

analytic constructions (e.g. *tiny hands, small passage*). The analysis will be followed by analytic constructions with preceding adjectives in constructions that convey positive meanings (e.g. *tidy little room*) and end with constructions that convey negative meanings (e.g. *poky little house*) before moving to the most complex construction, specifically *such a tiny little thing*. The sub-section will finish with types of added object diminutives in each translation under study.

I would like to begin with the simple *little X* diminutive objects that appear after Alice enters into Wonderland, specifically a dark hall with many doors and “a little three-legged table, all made of solid glass” (15), which leads her to examine the doors, where she finds “a low curtain she had not noticed before, and behind it was a little door about fifteen inches high: she tried the little golden key in the lock, and to her great delight it fitted!” (15). Later, she comes back to the table and finds “a little bottle on it” (16). Although the placement of the simple diminutives are placed seemingly erratically, the *little X* constructions are also used erratically in the translations, showing that each translator under study conceptualized the emotional undercurrent differently and played around with the diminutive suffixes in order to create a specific emotional level. For example, Shcherbakov uses a diminutive-to-zero strategy for the translation of *the little golden key* above, thus replacing the diminutive with the base noun *ключ [kljuch]* ‘key’ in the following immediate context: “Алиса вложила ключ в замочную скважину, повернула, и – о, радость! – замок щелкнул” [*Alisa vlozhila kljuch v zamochnuju skvazhinu, povernula, i – o, radost! – zamok shhelknul*] ‘Alice put the key in the keyhole, turned, and – oh, joy! – the lock clicked’ (34). For the next use of the diminutive construction, Shcherbakov finds an ‘equivalent’ diminutive in *золотой ключик [zolotoj*

kljuchik] ‘golden key’, which suggests that Shcherbakov wanted to de-emphasize the diminutiveness of the key in the first instance above, but wanted to emphasize affectionate meaning in the second instance in its immediate context of “Увы и ах! Подойдя к дверце, Алиса спохватилась, что забыла золотой ключик” [*Уву i ah! Podojdja k dverce, Alisa spohvatilas', chto zabyla zolotoj kljuchik*]. ‘Alas! Approaching the door, Alice realized that she had forgotten the little golden key’ (37). Demurova, on the other hand, follows a different pattern than Shcherbakov. Demurova uses *ключик* [*kljuchik*] ‘key-DIM’ first in the immediate context of “Алиса вставила ключик в замочную скважину – и, к величайшей ее радости, он подошел!” [*Alisa vstavila kljuchik v zamochnuju skvazhinu – i, k velichajshej jejo radosti, on podoshol*] ‘Alice entered the little key in the keyhole – and, to her great joy, it fit!’ (19). Demurova then uses *золотой ключик* [*zolotoj kljuchik*] in the second use of the diminutive, thus keeping the same emotional level as in the ST *little golden key*. Thus, from the beginning, it is clear that the translator’s understanding of the ‘emotional colouring’ of the ST and the translator’s vision for the translation creates a text paradoxically similar and yet different from the ST.

Despite the translator’s individual patterns of using diminutives, the translations of *little X* constructions are rendered, in most cases, as simple synthetic diminutives without the preceding analytic marker *маленький* [*malen'kij*] ‘little’, which was commonly used in the Polish translations. Thus, the translators under study seem to emphasize the ‘littleness’ and emotion associated with the analytic marker *little* through a common simple suffix. However, Bratus (1969) writes that while “diminutives with the suffix -ик [-ik] are used predominantly with hypocoristic meaning [...] the chief meaning

of the majority [of these types of diminutives] is smallness” (18-19). Likewise, as I mentioned in 2.1, “these are diminutives, [...] the emotive character of which is either not present or is very weak. [...] Such words, according to native speakers, refer regularly to smaller than usual objects [...] and the emotive component is more or less suppressed” (Volek 1987:104). Thus, we can argue that the translations convey similar levels of emotional connotations, though not exactly the same because the analytic marker *little* has a clear emotive component. For example, *little key* becomes *ключик [kluchik]* ‘key-DIM’, which has its own entry in the PWN *Polsko-Rosyjski Słownik* ‘Polish-Russian Dictionary’; *little table* becomes *столук [stolik]* ‘table-DIM’; *little bottle* becomes *флакончик [flakonchik]* ‘(scent) bottle-DIM’ in Shcherbakov’s translation and *пузырек [puzyrek]* ‘bottle-DIM’ in Demurova’s translation; and, *little house* becomes *домик [domik]* ‘house-DIM’, which will be discussed in greater detail below. Despite the fact that the emotive component may not be as strong as in the ST *little X* construction, the translators under study use diminutive-to-diminutive strategies, specifically a simple analytic construction to a simple synthetic diminutive strategy. Unlike the seemingly random use of analytic constructions, synthetic diminutives and the often-used co-occurring analytic and synthetic diminutives in the translations of objects in the two Polish translations under study, these two Russian translations present us with a rather straightforward translation of *little X* diminutive constructions that keep similar emotional intensity as the ST *little X* constructions by not adding additional diminutive suffixes to the base noun to emphasize the levels of affection towards the subject or, in most cases, using *маленький [malen'kij]* to emphasize smallness of size. Instead, the simple synthetic diminutive objects convey mainly smallness and some, if any, emotive meaning.

The Russian translations under study use *маленький* [*malen'kij*] ‘small’ very sparingly compared with the Polish translations. Such analytic diminutive constructions tend to occur most often on first contact with an object or if the object is markedly small in size. For example, when Alisa first encounters the little bottle on the table, Shcherbakov creates a co-occurring synthetic and analytic diminutive construction through *маленький флакончик* [*malen'kij flakonchik*] ‘small bottle-DIM’, specifically in the following sentence: “Но на столике обнаружился маленький флакончик” [*No na stolike obnaruzhilsja malen'kij flakonchik*] ‘But on the little table was found a small little bottle’ (34). However, in the following use of *little bottle*, Shcherbakov drops the analytic marker and uses only the synthetic diminutive, which suggests that when Alisa first notices the bottle, it appears small in size to her; once that fact is established, the analytic marker is no longer used. As in the *little bottle* above, in the first instance of the *little door*, the analytic marker *маленький* [*malen'kij*] is used with the synthetic diminutive *дверца* [*dverca*] ‘door-DIM’, which is more or less a lexicalized synthetic diminutive because it has its own entry in the dictionary, thus emphasizing the small size but conveying little, if any, emotive meaning. For example, the translations of the *little door* emphasize the size of the door (as in the ST), whose height is described in the same sentence, specifically in the following: “За ним оказалась маленькая дверца, всего в пятнадцать дюймов высотой” [*Za nim okazalsja malen'kaja dverca, vsego v pjatnadcat' djujmov vysotoj*] ‘Behind it was a little door, no bigger than fifteen inches in height’ (Shcherbakov 34). Thus, it appears that the emphasis on an object’s small size is typically restricted to when Alice first comes across the object or when the narrator wants to emphasize the physical dimensions of the object.

Although both translators under study used simple synthetic diminutives to convey emotional connotations and affection towards the objects, neither translator caught, or decided to show, the difference between the ST *small* and *little* in the diminutive constructions *small passage* and *little passage*, as if *small* and *little* were interchangeable and conveyed the same emotional connotations. In the ST, however, the two instances of the passage refer to exactly the same passage as Alice comes across the same passage twice, yet the passage is a ‘small passage’ in its first use when Alice cannot pass through it because she’s too large, and as ‘little passage’ in its second use several chapters later, once Alice has control over her size and finally goes through the passage and finally finds herself “in the beautiful garden, among the bright flower-beds and the cool fountains” (78). Thus, although the two constructions refer to the same passage, the two constructions show a different attitude and diminutive meaning in the ST towards the passage. However, Shcherbakov and Demurova conceptualized the two constructions differently and thus their translations differ not only from the ST, but also from each other. For example, while both Shcherbakov and Demurova translate *little passage* as *коридорчик*²³ [*koridorchik*] ‘corridor/passage-DIM’ with the simple *-ик* [*-ik*] diminutive suffix, both translators appear to have encountered difficulty with translating *small passage*, though in different ways. Shcherbakov renders *small passage* nearly in the same way as *little passage*, translating both constructions as *коридорчик* [*koridorchik*], but

²³ Bratus (1969) claims that “the meaning of smallness is predominant” (21) in diminutives including *koridorchik*, which may suggest a further obstacle for translators in creating a difference between *small passage* and *little passage* that stems from the Russian language. If accurate, Bratus’ claim suggests that *koridorchik* exists somewhere between the meanings of ‘littleness’ and ‘smallness’, perhaps dependent on context. However, Vladimir Nabokov, in his translation of *Alice in Wonderland*, seemingly effortlessly creates the original emotive and semantic difference between the two constructions by adding a diminutive suffix to the preceding adjective, effectively translating *small passage* as *узкий проход* [*uzkij prohod*] ‘narrow passage’ and *little passage* as *узенький проход* [*uzjen’kij prohod*] ‘narrow-DIM passage’. This way, the above-mentioned obstacle of simple diminutives attached to base nouns is passed by, while managing to convey the positive emotional meaning of *little passage*.

adding the adjective *узкий* [*uzkij*] ‘narrow’ before the base noun in (12b) below, which is contrasted with the translation of *small passage* in (12a) below:

(12a) За ней начинался коридорчик, не шире крысиной норы.

Za nej nachinalsja koridorchik, ne shire krysinoj nory.

Beyond it began a (little) corridor, not wider than a rat burrow. (Shcherbakov 34)

(12b) Тогда она пробралась по узкому коридорчику и наконец очутилась в чудесном саду

Togda ona probralas' po uzkomu koridorchiku i nakonec ochutilas' v chudesnom sadu

then she snuck through the narrow (little) corridor and finally found herself in the wonderful garden (Shcherbakov 86)

Despite the addition of the adjective, Shcherbakov makes the two diminutives convey the same emotional meaning; unlike the original constructions, the difference in emotional meaning is completely lost. In this case, *маленький коридор* [*malen'kij koridor*] ‘small corridor’ could have been an ideal ‘equivalent’ for *small passage*. Although *узкий* [*uzkij*] ‘narrow’ is not an analytic marker and does convey a smaller size, it is used for the translation of *little passage*, where the smallness of size is not emphasized in the way it is emphasized in *small passage*, where Shcherbakov does not use the adjective but only the synthetic diminutive *коридорчик* that emphasizes smallness of size and perhaps some emotive meaning. Demurova, interestingly, takes a

different approach to *small passage*; specifically, she translates *small passage* as *нора* [*nora*] ‘burrow/hole’ in the following immediate context: “Она открыла дверцу и увидела за ней нору, совсем узкую, не шире крысиной” [*Ona otкрыla dvercu i uvidela za nej noru, sovsem uzkuju, ne shire krysinoj*] ‘She opened the door and saw behind it a hole, quite narrow, no wider than a rat (19). Demurova’s translation, which, although not preceded by an analytic marker or diminutivized through a diminutive suffix but described as ‘completely narrow’, can arguably be conceptualized as slightly smaller physically than *little corridor*. On the object-language level, we can say that Demurova’s *small passage/little passage* pair is deviant from Carroll’s original: while Alice sees the same passage (though with a different diminutive meaning) in the ST, in Demurova’s version Alice first sees a (small) corridor and then a burrow with no diminutive nuances. Thus, Demurova’s diminutive-to-zero/manipulation strategy does, unlike Shcherbakov’s strategy, indeed show that there is some difference in diminutive meaning between the two constructions, though without diminutivization as used by the ST diminutive constructions.

The evidence found in this section suggests several important points about both the translators and the Russian language. Specifically, the translators do not reflect the difference between the analytic markers *small* and *little* as demonstrated in *little/small passage*; the *little X* constructions are translated directly (e.g. *little house* → *домик* [*domik*]), but encounter obstacles when preceding adjectives are added to the diminutive constructions (e.g. in *sharp little chin* and *neat little stories*). Generally, the translations suggest that although many parallels exist between English and Russian diminutive constructions, there is the odd diminutive construction that becomes ‘lost in translation’

through a diminutive-to-zero strategy or manipulation that causes the translated construction to convey different meanings and emotional levels than in the source construction.

5.2.1 *Very small and tiny X constructions*

Diminutive constructions that convey a small physical size through (*very*) *small X* and *tiny X* constructions appear to cause problems for the two translators, who seem to prefer simple diminutive suffixes or a diminutive-to-zero strategy. The most apparent example is Shcherbakov's and Demurova's translation of *a very small cake* as *пирожок* [*pirozhek*] 'pastry/pie' as found in its immediate context: "Шкатулочка свободно открылась, и в ней оказался пирожок, на котором изюмом были красно выложены слова «СЪЕШЬ МЕНЯ»" [*Shkatulochka svobodno ottylas', i v nej okazalsja pirozhok, na kotorom izjumom byli krasno vylozheny slova «SJESH MENJA»*] 'The box freely opened, and there was a cake, on which raisins were lined with the red words "EAT ME"' (Shcherbakov 38). The translation does not emphasize the extremely small size of the cake at all; rather, the translation presents a regular noun for a common, but very Russian, pastry. Although *пирожок* [*pirozhek*] is a small pastry by definition, this translation of *very small cake* is not similar structurally because the noun is not preceded by an analytic marker equivalent of *small* or *very small* which would emphasize only physical smallness. Neither do the translations use a synthetic diminutive including *тортик* [*tortik*] 'cake-DIM'. Thus, both translators use a diminutive-to-zero strategy, when *very small cake* could have easily been translated as *маленький пирожок* [*malen'kij pirozhok*] 'very small pastry/pie'. Here, the base noun presents a strong cultural obstacle for translators because desserts such as cakes strongly differ in size and

shape between cultures; thus, the base noun can account for the diminutive-to-zero strategy used by both translators for the specific ST construction above.

The translations of *tiny X* constructions appear to have caused similar problems for the two translators, as the translations under study either translate directly (as in the translation of *tiny golden key* as *крошечный золотой ключик* [*kroshechnyj zolotoj kluchik*] (19) by Demurova, for example) or move from extreme affection and endearment to simply ‘small’ depending on the translator (as in the translation of *tiny hands* as *нежные ручонки-DIM-DIM* [*nezhnye ruchonki-DIM-DIM*] (Shcherbakov 153)). The apparent difficulty of translating these constructions appears to be caused by conflicting understandings of the emotional level of *tiny*; that is, the less-researched analytic marker *tiny* has not been established to convey a sense of ‘littleness’ or ‘smallness’, which may have influenced the translators’ decisions. For example, Demurova translates Alice’s *tiny hands* as *маленькие руки* [*malen'kie ruki*] ‘small hands’, which can be used to refer to the hands of an adult or child. Although the translation appears closer to the original, it does not quite convey the emotive meaning of Alice’s *tiny hands*, as *маленькие* implies smallness, not the ‘very small’ that is implied by the use of *tiny*; in addition, as discussed in the previous chapter (2.1), a child’s hands are rarely, if ever, referred to as small without a diminutive suffix in Russian. Yet, since Demurova’s translation suggests that she aims to keep the translation as close to the source construction as possible or understands ‘tiny’ to not convey affection, it is understandable why the diminutive suffix does not appear. Shcherbakov, in contrast, does not use *маленький* ‘small’; rather, he adds the double diminutive suffix *-онки* to ‘hands’, creating *ручонки* [*ruchonki*] (< *ручки* [*ruchki*] < *руки* [*ruki*]) ‘hands-DIM-DIM’ in the

immediate context: “Нежные ручонки снова обняли её колени, ясные, живые глаза глянули на неё” [*Nezhnye ruchonki snova obnjali ejo koleni, jasnye, zhivye glaza gljanuli na nejo*] ‘Sweet little arms around her knees again, clear, bright eyes looked at her’ (153). Furthermore, Shcherbakov adds the adjective *нежные* [*nezhnie*] ‘tender/delicate’ to precede the noun, thus creating a strong sense of affection in a translated construction that could mean in English ‘delicate, dear, little tiny hands’. These are not Demurova’s translation of *tiny hands*; instead, they are exceptionally dear and affectionate hands that, in their immediate context, emphasize the affection and love that Alice’s elder sister feels for Alice. Despite this apparent problem with *tiny*, the translations of *tiny little golden key* are surprisingly similar as the rather direct translations *крохотный золотой ключик* [*krohotnij zolotoj kljuchik*] ‘tiny golden key-DIM’ and *крошечный золотой ключик* [*kroshechnij zolotoj kljuchik*] ‘tiny golden key-DIM’ by Shcherbakov and Demurova respectively, which are contrasted in their immediate contexts in (13a) and (13b) below for the ST “there was nothing on it except a tiny golden key, and Alice's first thought was that it might belong to one of the doors of the hall; but, alas!” (15).

- (13a) а на столике – крохотный золотой ключик и больше ничего! «Наверное, это ключ от одной из дверей», - сразу же сообразила Алиса
- a na stolike – krohotnyj zolotoj kljuchik i bol'she nichego! «Navernoe, jeto kljuch ot odnoj iz dverej», - srazu zhe soobrazila Alisa*
- and on the table - a tiny golden key, and nothing else! "Perhaps this is the key to one of the doors" - immediately realized Alice (Shcherbakov 33)

(13b) На нем не было ничего, кроме крошечного золотого ключика. Алиса решила, что это ключ от одной из дверей, но увы!

Na njom ne bylo nichego, krome kroshechnego zolotogo kljuchika. Alisa reshila, chto jeto kljuch ot odnoj iz dverej, no uvy!

On it was anything other than a tiny golden key. Alice thought it was the key to one of the doors, but alas! (Demurova 19)

As is shown above, translators use an adjective for the ST adjective ‘tiny’ that means *tiny/minute* and have separate entries in the *Oxford Russian Dictionary*; likewise, both add a simple diminutive suffix for the key. Neither translator adds any extra words within the immediate context to add or remove diminutive meaning; rather, the translators focused on translating the diminutive construction. The translations thus add some affection towards the key that might be felt because of the ‘tininess’ of the key, which is later referred to as the ‘little key’ in the ST. Thus, the noun ‘hands’ was an obstacle for the translators because translations of a young child’s body usually include diminutive suffixes to convey affection. In this way, the translators were unanimous in the translation of a tiny object, especially since simple synthetic object diminutives are usually neutralized to emphasize smallness of size, as I discussed for simple synthetic object diminutives in preceding paragraphs.

5.2.2 *Little X constructions*

In a similar way to the Polish translations, the Russian translations of *little ledge of rock* are slightly more emotionally complex compared to simple *little X constructions*,

such as *little key*. This is because the phrase is connected with the Mock Turtle's deep sorrow (cf. 1.3) and thus conveys some pity in the emotional connotations of the diminutive construction. In addition, the Russian (and Polish) language does not seem to have one equivalent for a ledge of rock that can be diminutivized. Thus, the translators use manipulation and diminutive-to-zero strategies which generally results in diminutive loss: see *обломок скалы* [*oblomok skaly*] 'a fragment of rock' and *скалистый уступ* [*skalistyj ustup*] 'ledge of rock' in Shcherbakov's and Demurova's translations in their respective contexts below in (14a) and (14b):

(14a) и вот вдали показался Черепаха-Телячьи-Ножки, одиноко и печально

сидящий на обломке скалы

i vot vdali pokazalsja Cherepaha-Teljach'i-Nozhki, odinoko i pechal'no

sidjashhij na oblomke scaly

and there appeared in the distance Turtle Veal Leg, by himself and sadly sitting on a fragment of rock. (118)

(14b) он лежал на скалистом уступе и вздыхал с такой тоской, словно сердце у

него разрывалось. Алиса от души пожалела его.

on lezhal na skalistom ustupe i vzdychal s takoj toskoj, slovno serdce u nego

razryvalos'. Alisa ot dushi pozhalela ego.

he lay on a rocky ledge and sighed with such longing, as if his heart was breaking.

Alice from her soul felt sorry for him (103)

Thus, both translators under study rendered the diminutive construction differently but without a diminutive suffix or marker, which suggests a difficulty in translating the source construction. In addition, they do not add any diminutive suffixes or even *маленький* [*malen'kij*] to show that the ledge of rock was smaller than a typical ledge of rock.

Before continuing to the translations of *little X* constructions with preceding appreciative qualifiers and adjectives, I would like to sum up the ‘simple’ diminutive constructions discussed above. From the evidence gathered in the analysis, it can be suggested that the Russian language has many parallels to English, notably through the simple *little X* construction through a simple diminutive suffix (cf. 2.1). Unlike the Polish translators, who preferred to emphasize smallness of size and affection through co-occurring synthetic and analytic diminutives, the Russian translators kept most of the ‘littleness’ and emotional connotations by a direct translation from the ST analytic construction to a simple synthetic diminutive that often emphasized the small size rather than the diminutive’s emotive meaning. However, the translators did not distinguish between the one object noun (specifically *passage*) that was used at two different points in the book, once with *small* and the other time with *little*, suggesting either that neither translator was aware of the difference between the two analytic markers or that they decided not to show the difference between the analytic constructions by a synthetic or analytic ‘equivalent’. Likewise, the translation of *tiny X* constructions suggest that a direct translation does exist between English and Russian through an adjective including *крохотный* [*krohotnij*] ‘tiny/minute’. This arguably comes from the fact that in Russian a child can be referred to as *кроха* [*kroha*] or *крошечка* [*kroshka*] to show attitude.

However, since the analytic marker *tiny* remains under-researched, it is difficult to say whether the translated diminutive construction does contain an emotive component.

5.2.3 *Little X constructions with Preceding Adjectives*

Diminutive constructions with preceding adjectives fall into three main categories in the ST: positive evaluation/affection (e.g. *tidy little room*), negative evaluation (e.g. *poky little house*) and irony (specifically *nice little stories*). The translators frequently follow the typical Russian way of adding diminutive affixes to adjectives, thus increasing affection (as discussed in 2.1 on ‘native’ Russian children’s literature). Thus, the translations under study appear more Russian than typically English; this effect adds to the paradox of a translated text as both a copy of the original in another language and a new book in its own right.

The construction, *nice little stories*, appears to convey positive evaluation by itself; however, as Gardner (2000) notes, the stories “were not so nice. They were the traditional fairy tales, filled with episodes of horror and usually containing a pious moral” (17). Thus, in context, the construction conveys irony. Both Shcherbakov and Demurova, whether or not they picked up on the irony, create a sense of irony through their translations of *очень милые истории* [*ochen’ milyje istorii*] ‘very nice stories’. Thus compare (15a) with the ST in (15b):

(15a) Алиса уже успела прочесть несколько очень милых историй о детях,

которые были неосторожны с огнём [...] из-за того, что они не потрудились

вспомнить простейших дружеских наставлений

Alisa uzhe uspela prochest' neskol'ko ochen' milyh istorij o detjah, kotorye byli neostorozhony s ognjom [...] iz-za togo, chto oni ne potrudilis' vspomnit' prostejshih družeskih nastavlenij

Alice already had time to read some very nice stories about children, who were not careful with fire [...] and because of that, they did not bother to remember simply friendly instructions (Shcherbakov 35)

(15b) for she had read several nice little stories about children who had got burnt, and eaten up by wild beasts [...] all because they *would* not remember the simple rules their friends had taught them” (17)

Demurova, in a similar way, renders *nice little stories* as *преlestные истории* [*prelestnyje istorii*] ‘charming/delightful stories’ respectively. However, despite the positive evaluation, both translators use a diminutive-to-zero strategy and thus remove the diminutive connotations expressed through the marker *little*. Neither translator adds a diminutive suffix to the base noun because the diminutive of the base noun *исторюйка* [*istoriyka*], which is uncommonly used and which means ‘funny’ or ‘anecdotal’, rather than ‘nice’. Furthermore, neither translator conveys an altered sense of diminutiveness through the analytic marker *маленький* [*malen'kij*]; nor do they manipulate the base noun to convey a shorter type of story²⁴. Interestingly, however, Shcherbakov adds the intensifier *очень* [*ochen'*] ‘very’ to his translation when it is not required, whereas it was not used in the translation of *a very small cake*, as discussed previously. Thus, these

²⁴ For example, Nabokov (1923) uses the base noun *рассказ* [*rasskaz*] ‘tale’ to render *nice little stories* as *милые рассказы* [*milije razskaziki*] ‘dear tales-DIM’.

translations and, perhaps, misplacements of diminutives show how differently each translator conceptualized the diminutives.

The diminutive constructions that express positive evaluation are more easily translated with parallel Russian diminutives, although diminutive affixes are often added to the adjectives, as in Demurova's *миленькая комнатка* [*milen'kaja komnatka*] 'nice-DIM room-DIM' for *tidy little room* in the ST context, "she had found her way into a tidy little room with a table in the window" (38). Likewise, Demurova's and Shcherbakov's translations add a diminutive affix in the adjective in *чистенький домик* [*chisten'kij domik*] 'clean-DIM house-DIM' for *neat little house*. These translated Russian diminutives "imply a loving or tender attitude of the speaker to the subject" (Bratus 43), which, from their frequent use in the translations, suggest that the English source constructions also convey a similar positive attitude towards the subject. In these positive constructions, both Shcherbakov and Demurova take the same strategy and rarely differ. For example, the translations of *neat little house* are identical, and the translations of *tidy little room* only differ through choice of adjective and one diminutive affix, while every base noun receives the same diminutive suffix. The diminutive constructions that refer to animals are treated likewise, such as in "возле нашего дома есть такая милая собачка!" [*vozle nashego doma est' takaja milaja sobachka!*] 'next to our house is such a dear little dog!' (Shcherbakov 46) or "[р]ядом с нами живет такой милый песик!" [*r]jadom s nami zhivjot takoj milyj pjosik!*] 'next to our house lives such a dear little dog?' (Demurova 31). Thus, these two translations under study show the strong parallelism between English diminutive constructions with preceding appreciative qualifiers and Russian diminutive constructions with a similar structure.

The two diminutive constructions that convey negative evaluation or depreciation are translated differently by both translators, which shows that, like the Polish translations, the construction *sharp little chin* does not easily parallel English, while *poky little house* receives a diminutive suffix that has no equivalent in English yet conveys the source construction's meaning. Specifically, the diminutive construction *poky little house* uses the diminutive suffix *-ушко* [-ishko] in both translations under study, which by itself conveys (like the *-ёшка* [-joshka] diminutive suffix in *Лакей-рыбёшка*) “disparagement or a condescending irony” (Bratus 33). (Refer to 2.1 for further discussion on these suffixes.) Thus, both translators use diminutive-to-diminutive translation by choosing a synthetic diminutive that conveys negative evaluation, although the translation may convey more forceful negative evaluation than is suggested in *poky little house*, where the negative aspect is softened by the use of the analytic marker *little* (compare *poky house*). For example, Shcherbakov effectively conveys Alice's worry about no longer being herself, but another girl named Mabel: “и мне придётся жить в их убогом домишке, и у меня не будет игрушек” [*i mne pridjotsja zhit' v ih ubogom domishke, i u menja ne budet igrushek*] ‘and I will have to live in their poverty-stricken/wretched house-DIM, and I won't have any toys’ (42) for the ST passage, “and I shall have to go and live in that poky little house, and have next to no toys to play with” (23-24). Demurova, alternatively, chooses the adjective *старый* [staryj] ‘old’ in *старый домишко* [staryj domishko] ‘old house-DIM’, which is not implied through *poky*. Thus, the translation of *poky little house* shows an instance of the use of a Russian diminutive suffix combined with the preceding adjective ‘poverty-stricken’ or ‘old’ conveys negative

evaluation such as disparagement in a similar way that English diminutive constructions are preceded by an adjective such as *poky* in order to convey negative connotations.

Both translators use a diminutive-to-zero strategy with the translation of the Duchess' *sharp little chin*, which is first described as merely 'sharp' in the narrator's comment that the Duchess "was exactly the right height to rest her chin on Alice's shoulder, and it was an uncomfortably sharp chin. However, she did not like to be rude: so she bore it as well as she could" (91-92). After the first description of the chin, the two instances describe her chin using the analytic marker *little*. The two translators' common strategy suggests that either both translators conceptualized the source diminutive construction in the same way, or, more likely, that a negative diminutive construction is not typically created from *подбородок* [*podborodok*] 'chin' in Russian. Thus, the English diminutive construction's meaning can be considered 'untranslatable' into Russian because Demurova loses both the adjective and diminutive in her translation, "и снова вонзила свой подбородок в Алисино плечо" [*i snova vonzila svoj podborodok v Alisino plecho*] 'and again thrust her chin into Alice's shoulder' (101); in a similar manner, Shcherbakov loses the diminutive but keeps the adjective in *острый подбородок* 'sharp chin'. In this case, the diminutive-to-zero strategy is the only available option for the translators because the diminutive *подбородочек* [*podborodoček*] 'chin-DIM' suggests a very small chin, such as that of a baby; likewise, the addition of *маленький* [*malen'kij*] 'small' would not retain the original meaning of *little*. However, it is interesting that neither translator chose to add a diminutive affix to the adjective, to create *остренький подбородок* [*ostren'kij podborodok*] 'sharp-DIM chin', a type of collocation which occurs frequently in 'native' Russian children's

literature²⁵ (cf. 2.1). Nevertheless, since both translators used a diminutive-to-zero strategy, the underlying attitude towards the Duchess' chin is lost, thus causing a slight shift in the portrayal of Alice's attitude towards the Duchess' character.

5.2.4 *Such a tiny little thing* construction

The most complex diminutive construction, *such a tiny little thing*, also is translated differently by each translator; furthermore, they do not appear to have caused too much difficulty for the translators. As stated previously, the word *thing* is slippery, as it can refer to a person, object or idea of any grammatical gender, which is impossible to translate into Russian because of grammatical gender in Russian, where every noun is divided into a class, including masculine, feminine, neuter, animate and inanimate. Despite the grammatical restriction, both translators chose words that convey a similar physical size as the original, though only Shcherbakov uses a diminutive-to-diminutive strategy. Both combine the analytic markers *tiny* and *little*, and also *thing* into one word. Specifically, Shcherbakov translates *such a tiny little thing* as *такой малюсенькой* [*takoj maljusen'koj*] 'so small-DIM'; likewise, Demurova chooses *такой крошкой* [*takoj kroshkoj*] 'such a crumb (as from a piece of bread)'.

(16a) Очень было бы кстати немного подрасти, а то мне уже надоело быть такой малюсенькой». (59)

Ochen' bylo by kstati nemnogo podrasti, a to mne uzhe nadoelo byt' takoj maljusen'koj».

It would be a very little way to grow up, and I was already tired of being so tiny.

²⁵ Although the translator Nabokov is outside of this case study, I would like to add that he used the *остренький подбородок* [*ostren'kij podborodok*] construction in his famous 1923 translation of *Alice in Wonderland*.

(16b) Мне бы очень хотелось опять подрасти. Надоело быть такой крошкой! (44)

Mne by ochen' hotelos' opjat' podrasti. Nadoelo byt' takoj kroshkoj!

I would really like to grow up again. I'm tired of being such a baby/crumb!

Thus, although Demurova's translation does not use a diminutive suffix, and technically speaking, uses a diminutive-to-zero strategy and manipulation, the word *крошка* [*kroshka*] 'crumb' or 'baby' refers to something extremely small; in fact, Alice refers to herself as something so small that Alice does not see herself as a girl or animate being anymore. Using this word with an intensifier does show Alice's strong emotional reaction to her physical size. Shcherbakov, on the other hand, causes the analytic marker *маленький* [*malen'kij*] 'small' to receive a diminutive suffix and avoids the difficulty in translating the word *thing*. These two translations show that it is relatively simple for the Russian language to suggest the extreme smallness of an object while keeping diminutive meaning intact through extensive diminutive suffixes.

5.2.5 Added Diminutives

The Russian translations by Shcherbakov and Demurova add object diminutives that are not found in the ST, especially in regards to bodies and body parts. These additions help keep the translation more 'Russian', as discussed in the previous chapter (2.1), which showed the diminutive forms of body parts and their consistent use in 'native' Russian children's literature. Thus, in Shcherbakov's translation, we find these types of added diminutives, including *ручка* [*ruchka*] 'hand-DIM', *глазки* [*glazki*] 'eyes-DIM', *шерстка* [*sherstka*] 'fur-DIM' and *лапка* [*lapka*] 'paw-DIM'. The latter example

occurs several times, for example when Alice dreams she's walking hand-in-hand with Dinah: “видела сон, как идут с Динной под ручку” [*videla son, kak idut s Dinoj pod ruchku*] ‘she saw a dream, how she walks hand-in-hand with Dinah’ (33) or when the White Rabbit exclaims “О, мои лапки!” [*O, moi lapki!*] ‘Oh, my little paws!’ (58). The synthetic diminutive *шерстка* [*sherstka*] ‘fur-DIM’ occurs when Alice describes a friendly dog: “Шерстка курчавая, коричневая!” [*Sherstka kurchavaja, korichnjevaja!*] ‘Fur-DIM curly, brown!’ (46). Most of these refer to animals’ bodies and demonstrate the affection that is typically felt towards animals. For example, Shcherbakov adds *лапки* [*lapki*] ‘paws’ in Alice’s fond utterance regarding her cat Dinah: “как она облизывает лапки, как она умывается” [*kak ona oblizyvaet lapki, kak ona umyvaetsja*] ‘how she licks her little paws, how she washes her face’ (46) for the ST “licking her paws and washing her face” (26). Demurova, also, adds the diminutive *шерстка* ‘fur-DIM’ in a description of the Mouse’s fur: “Шерстка у Мыши стала дыбом” [*Sherstka u Myshi stala dybom*] ‘The Mouse’s little fur stood on end’ (30). In this way, the translators can create a more ‘Russian’ emotional colouring to their translations, which would sound bland and stick out as translations without some added diminutives to ‘normalize’ the text.

The Russian translations under study also add diminutive objects of food or drink, although less often than the Polish translations. In this case, the additions include *молочко* [*molochko*] ‘milk-DIM’ (< *молоко* [*moloko*] ‘milk’) as Alice worries whether they will give her cat Dinah her milk while she’s falling down the rabbit-hole in the following immediate context: “-Надеюсь, они не забудут в полдник налить ей молочка” [*“-Nadejus', oni ne zabudut v poldnik nalit' ej molochka*] ‘I hope that they

won't forget for her afternoon snack to pour her milk-DIM' (Demurova 17).

Interestingly, Shcherbakov does not add a diminutive of 'milk' here, rather, the object that holds it receives the diminutive suffix, specifically in the following context:

“Надеюсь, ей не забудут налить в блюдечко молока” [*Nadejus', ej ne zabudut nalit' v bljudechko moloka*] ‘I hope that they won't forget to pour milk in her saucer-DIM’ (32).

Thus, both translators add a diminutive suffix to a word that is not part of the ST context, “I hope they'll remember her saucer of milk at tea-time” (14). This addition of diminutives to an animal's bowl or drink shows Russian (and Polish, as the Polish translators also added diminutives here) culture and how one's affection towards a pet extends towards its food and other realia.

5.3 Event and Verbal Nouns

This thesis places 'event nouns' and verbal nouns (e.g. *pattering*) in a separate section. The reason for this is that I argue that, because these types of nouns differ from the object nouns with physical dimensions that can be seen and touched, the diminutive constructions convey slightly different meanings than those conveyed by object nouns. This can be shown through the fact that as a group these nouns are translated differently than the object nouns seen in the preceding section, as will be shown below.

Russian does not easily form diminutives from event and verbal nouns. Of the four main diminutivized event nouns used in *Alice in Wonderland*, only the noun *voice* receives a diminutive suffix in the translations under study, while the nouns *bark*, *shriek* and *scream* are replaced by verbs in the past tense with no indication of diminutiveness surrounding them in their immediate contexts as I will show in the following paragraphs. Thus, translators use a diminutive-to-diminutive strategy only for one diminutive

construction; otherwise, the diminutive-to-zero strategy and manipulation used by both Shcherbakov and Demurova results in diminutive loss to a greater extent than found in the Polish translations discussed in the preceding section. These translations suggest that in Russian, an attitude and/or smallness is not attributed to nouns like *scream*, which, are not often used as nouns; instead, the sentence structure changes the noun into a verb.

Voice is the only noun to form a diminutive in the translations in this section. In most cases *voice* receives a diminutive suffix or double diminutive, thus creating the synthetic diminutives *голосочек* [*golocohek*] ‘voice-DIM-DIM’ and *голосок* [*golosok*] ‘voice-DIM’ (from *голос* [*golos*]). In addition, the addition of *голосок* to refer to the White Rabbit’s whisper in Shcherbakov’s translation suggests that the diminutive is widely-used in the Russian language and to varying degrees of expressiveness. For example, by using the double diminutive, Shcherbakov emphasizes the ‘deariness’ and ‘littleness’ of the White Rabbit’s voice, as the diminutive conveys a positive emotional attitude to a higher degree than a simple diminutive suffix and the source diminutive construction through the White Rabbit’s shrill call for Alice as a witness in court: “Белый Кролик пронзительным тонким голосочком возвестил: -Алиса!” [*Belyj Krolik pronzitel'nyim tonkim golosochkom vozvestil: -Alisa!*] ‘the White Rabbit in a piercing shrill voice-DIM-DIM announced: “Alice!’ (143). Except for Demurova’s translation of Bill’s *little feeble, squeaking voice* that Alice hears after she kicks Bill up the chimney and renders him momentarily unconscious as an analytic construction where the diminutive affects the adjective ‘shrill’ in *тоненький слабый голос* [*tonen'kij slabyj golos*] ‘shrill-DIM weak voice’, the other two translations add the diminutive to the base noun in the simple synthetic diminutive *голосок* [*golosok*]. The diminutivization of the

base noun conveys an equivalent emotional meaning to the source construction in *тоненьким голоском* [*tonenkim golockom*] ‘shrill little voice’ (Demurova 125) and *пискливый голосок* [*pisklivyj golosok*] ‘squeaky little voice’ (Shcherbakov 65). Thus, although the translations under study suggest that *голос* [*golos*] can receive several suffixes to convey a positive attitude and affection, the use differs on the translator’s conceptualization of the source diminutive construction and his or her own preference for using diminutives.

The diminutive constructions *sharp little bark*, *two little shrieks*, *little shriek*, *little scream* and *a little scream of laughter* all become either non-diminutive nouns including *писк* [*pisk*] ‘squeak’ or, more often, past-tense verbs, including *вскрикнула* [*vskriknula*] ‘[she] screamed’ as in the context when the pack of cards attacks Alice and she wakes up from her dream, where Demurova uses the latter verb in her translation: “Она вскрикнула – полуиспуганно, полугневно, - принялась от них отбиваться... и обнаружила, что лежит на берегу, головой у сестры на коленях” [*Ona vskriknula – poluispuganno, polugnevno, - prinjalas' ot nih otbivat'sja... I obnaruzhila, chto lezhit na beregu, golovoj u sestry na kolenjah*] ‘She screamed – half-frightened, half-angered - began to fight back from them ... and found herself lying on the beach, her head in her sister’s lap’ (Demurova 133). Although the ST “she gave a little scream, half of fright and half of anger, and tried to beat them off, and found herself lying on the bank” (124), contains a delexical structure and thus focuses on the short and completed event (the scream) rather than screaming for an indefinite period of time, the translations are forced to focus on the action of screaming (cf. Arndt, Harvey and Nuttall 2000:124). Likewise, Shcherbakov uses the same perfective verb *вскрикнула* [*vskriknula*] ‘[she] screamed’ that

refers to a very short, loud, completed scream in his translation, with almost the exact wording as Demurova's translation. The former noun suggests that the two nouns used by Shcherbakov and Demurova, specifically *ниск* [*pisk*] 'squeak' and *крик* [*krik*] 'cry/shout' respectively, do not typically receive diminutive suffixes, such as for example **нискчик* [**piskchik*] 'squeak-DIM' or are preceded by analytic markers.²⁶ Likewise, the translations of *scream* and *bark* result in diminutive loss through the translator's diminutive-to-zero strategy, though the translation keeps some of the softness and 'littleness' implied by the analytic marker *little* (compare *little scream* and *scream*). For example, the enormous puppy's *sharp little bark* becomes "кто-то громко тьякнул" [*kto-to gromko tjavknul*] 'someone loudly yapped' (Demurova 50) and Alice's *little scream of laughter* at the White Rabbit's news that the Duchess boxed the Queen of Heart's ears becomes *радостно фыркнула* [*radostno fyirknula*] 'joyfully snorted' (Demurova 92) and "чуть не взвизгнула от смеха" [*chut' ne vzvizgnula ot smeha*] 'almost shrieked from laughter'.

The verbal noun (gerund) *pattering in a little pattering of feet* occurs three times throughout the story, and all refer to the White Rabbit's 'pattering' as he runs. In the Russian translations under study, Shcherbakov uses *топот маленьких ножек* [*topot malen'kih nozhkek*] 'pattering of dear little feet' twice and *топот ножек* [*topot nozhkek*] 'pattering of little feet' once; Demurova uses *топот маленьких ног* [*topot malen'kih nog*] 'pattering of little feet' twice and *легкий звук шагов* [*lehkij zvuk shagov*] 'light sound of steps' once. In a similar way to the Polish translations discussed in the previous

²⁶ Interestingly, Nabokov's translation does use an analytic marker in *little shriek*, specifically in *маленький взвизг* [*malen'kij vzvizg*] 'small cry', which suggests that these constructions were used in Russian, although it may have been an infrequent occurrence in typical Russian language. However, like the two translators examined in the case study, Nabokov does use verbs (rather than nouns) for the other event nouns under discussion.

section, the gerund never receives the diminutive suffix or analytic marker; rather, it modifies the noun *feet*. For example, in the first instance, Alice hears “a little pattering of feet in the distance, and she hastily dried her eyes to see what was coming” (21).

Although both translators add the analytic marker to modify the noun *feet*, only Shcherbakov adds a diminutive suffix to *feet*, as shown in the following immediate context: “услышав приближающийся топот маленьких ножек, Алиса утерла слезы, чтобы посмотреть, кто это” [*uclyšhav priblizhajushchijcja topot malen'kih nozhek, Alisa uterla sljozy, shtoby posmotret', kto eto*] ‘hearing the approaching pattering of dear little feet, Alice wiped away her tears so that she could see who it was’ (40). Thus, the ST *a little pattering of feet* becomes *a pattering of dear little feet* in Shcherbakov’s TT and *a pattering of little feet* in Demurova’s translation, thus shifting the analytic marker and diminutive meaning from *pattering* to *feet*. This strategy is repeated by both translators in the second and third instances of the diminutive construction, specifically when all the animals leave Alice crying and lonely, and “she again heard a little pattering of footsteps in the distance, and she looked up eagerly, half hoping that the Mouse had changed his mind, and was coming back to finish his story” (36) and when Alice, in the White Rabbit’s house, hears “a little pattering of feet on the stairs” (40). In the second instance, Alice hears *а легкий звук шагов* [*lehkij zvuk shagov*] ‘light sound of steps’ in Demurova’s translation, specifically in (17) below:

(17) Немного спустя снова послышался легкий звук шагов. Она оглянулась. (41)

Nemnogo spustja snova poslyshalsja legkij zvuk shagov. Ona ogljanulas'.

A little later, she again heard a light sound of footsteps. She looked back.

Or, in the last instance, when Alice hears the Rabbit ascend the stairs, Shcherbakov's translation of *топот ножек* [*topot nozhek*] 'pattering of little feet' removes the analytic marker and shifts the emotive component to the diminutive suffix: "На лестнице раздался топот ножек. Это явился Кролик" [*Na lestnice razlalsja topot nozhek. Jeto javilsja Krolik*] 'On the stairs sounded the pattering of little feet. It was the Rabbit' (61), while Demurova shifts the diminutive meaning entirely to the analytic marker preceding *feet* through the construction *маленьких ног* [*topot malen'kih nog*] 'pattering of small feet'. However, as I stated previously, all of the translators' strategies modify *feet* rather than *pattering*, and furthermore their use (analytic marker and/or diminutive suffix) change between translations and instances, creating different emotional colouring and intensity of diminutive meaning.

Although the narrator used *a little scream/shriek* in the ST instead of *a small scream/shriek* or *screamed/shrieked*, the translators under study do not, and most likely cannot, differentiate in Russian between the subtle differences of meaning between diminutivized event nouns, event nouns and verbs that are used in English. Although the translators chose verbs that do not convey the metaphorical smallness and emotive component of the ST diminutive construction, they chose verbs such as *shrieked* that, as in English, suggest the sound came from a girl or animal,. Thus, the translators under study translate event nouns (except for *little voice*) very differently from object nouns because event nouns rarely undergo diminution in Russian. Therefore, we can argue that although the verb used does not have diminutive meaning, it is the closest and most 'equivalent' translation possible in Russian.

5.4 *Poor little X constructions*

The translations of *poor little X* constructions under study are generally translated similarly; that is, not much difference exists between the two translators' strategies. Below I will show how the diminutive construction *poor little thing* easily parallels Russian *бедняжка* [*bednjazhka*] 'poor little thing' and is often the 'equivalent' translation used by Shcherbakov and Demurova. Despite this apparent parallel between English and Russian, the translations are not so simple. As I will discuss below, the translators used several strategies, including 'equivalence' (*poor little X* → *бедняжка* [*bednjazhka*] 'poor little thing'), non-equivalence (*poor little X* → *poor X*; *poor X* → *бедняжка* [*bednjazhka*] 'poor little thing') and other forms of manipulation. Overall, these strategies cause the emotional level of pity and empathy to differ between translations and between the ST and TT.

Both translators under study emphasize *poor*, which is the adjective that conveys pity or empathy, but the diminutive and emotion conveyed by *little* is changed or lost. In other words, Shcherbakov and Demurova occasionally treat *poor little X* as if it did not contain *little* as in a *poor X* construction. For example, in certain contexts (as is discussed in greater detail in the following paragraphs), the translators replace *poor little thing* in reference to Alice as *бедная Алиса* [*bjednaja Alisa*] 'poor Alice' in the following original context: "and when she had tired herself out with trying, the poor little thing sat down and cried" (18). As one translation puts it, "Устав от безуспешных попыток, бедная Алиса наконец села и расплакалась" [*Ustav ot bezuspeshnyh popytok, bednaja Alisa nakonec sela i rasplakalas'*] 'Tired of failed attempts, poor Alice finally sat down and cried' (37). By adding *бедная Алиса* [*bednaja Alisa*] 'poor Alice', the translators emphasize 'poor', thus conveying pity towards Alice; however, the emotional

connotations conveyed by the diminutive construction are lost. In a similar way, the translators translate *poor little Lizard* as *бедный Билли* [*bjednij Billy*] ‘poor Bill’ (Shcherbakov 65), though Demurova adds a diminutive to the noun ‘lizard’ through *бедный Ящерка Билль* [*bjedny jashherka Bill*] ‘poor little Lizard Bill’ (Demurova 49). The same strategy is used with both translations of *the poor little juror* and Shcherbakov’s translation of *poor little Lizard*, which is translated as *бедный Билли* [*bjednij Billy*] ‘poor Bill’. The diminutive construction occurs when Alice runs out of the White Rabbit’s house and finds “[t]he poor little Lizard, Bill, was in the middle, being held up by two guinea-pigs, who were giving it something out of a bottle” (44), which Shcherbakov translates as the following: “Бедный Билли оказался маленькой ящерцей, посреди толпы две морские свинки поддерживали его под руки и поили чем-то из бутылки” [*Bednyj Billi okazalsja malen'koj jashhercej, posredi tolpy dve morskije svinki podderzhivali ego pod ruki i poili chem-to iz butylki.*] ‘Poor Bill turned out to be a little lizard, in the middle of a crowd of two guinea pigs supported him under the arms and fed him something from a bottle’ (65). Thus, as I have discussed above, several of the *poor little constructions* are translated as if the ST construction was not a diminutive construction but a *poor X* construction.

The strategy of omission is rare, but it is used once by both translators in reference to the baby-pit. In one instance of *poor little thing*, both translators remove the diminutive construction entirely through the strategy of omission, which is a rarely-used strategy by translators. In the latter example, both translators translate ‘baby’ but not the following construction in “she kept tossing the baby violently up and down, and the poor little thing howled so” (62). For example, Shcherbakov’s translation of the passage runs

as follows: “так яростно взялась подбрасывать младенца, а он в ответ так завопил” [*tak jarostno vzjalas' podbrasyvat' mladenca, a on v otvet tak zavolil*] ‘so violently took to tossing the baby, and in response he yelled back so’ (82). Thus, although *poor little thing* is replaced by ‘he’, the original construction is lost, thereby influencing again the emotional colouring of the TT.

The translators do use some ‘equivalent’ diminutives to convey smallness and emotion. The other two translations of *poor little thing* in reference to the baby-pig, for example, are translated as *бедняжка* [*bednjazhka*] ‘poor little thing’. In addition, both translators emphasize Alice’s strong affection for animals in her exclamation, “Poor little thing!” (45), in reference to an enormous puppy that wants to play with her. Specifically, both translators add different additional words and manipulate the text to render Alice’s exclamation quite dramatic and more affectionate than the source construction. While Shcherbakov inserts the interjection “ах ты” [*ah ty*] (66) in *ах ты, мой беденький!* [*ach ty, moy beden'kii!*] ‘oh you, my poor thing-DIM!’, Demurova creates the dramatic “Бе-е-dnen’kii, ма-а-len’kii!” (50) in the following context: “Гигантский щенок смотрел на нее огромными круглыми глазами и тихонько протягивал лапу, стараясь коснуться ее. -Бе-е-дненький, ма-а-ленький! – сказала заискивающе Алиса” [*Gigantskij shhenok smotrel na nejo ogromnymi kruglymi glazami i tihon'ko protjagival lapu, starajas' kosnut'sja jejo. -Be-e-dnen'kij, ma-a-len'kij! – skazala zaiskivajushhe Alisa*] ‘A gigantic puppy looked at her with large round eyes and quietly-DIM stretched out its paw, trying to touch her. –Po-o-r-DIM, li-i-ittle (thing)’ said Alice fawningly’ (50). Thus, the translator provides more of a phonetic transcription of the length and emphasis of the exclamation and adds the adverb diminutive *тихонько* [*tihon'ko*]

‘quietly-DIM’ to emphasize the quietness of the puppy’s actions. Thus, through the above examples, the translations show that an ‘equivalent’ diminutive exists for *poor little X* constructions in the Russian language, although the translators’ preferences and understanding of the source and target languages appear to influence their decisions.

Although the synthetic diminutives *беденький* [*bjednjen'kij*] ‘poor-DIM’ and *бедняжка* [*bednjazhka*] ‘poor little thing’ parallel English *poor little thing*, the latter Russian construction is, interestingly, used as a translation of *poor X* constructions, which, arguably alters the emotional feel of the story. For example, in Shcherbakov’s translation, the narrator’s exclamation of *poor Alice!* in the ST context of “Poor Alice! It was as much as she could do, lying down on one side, to look through into the garden with one eye; but to get through was more hopeless than ever: she sat down and began to cry again” (21), is shown in its immediate context: “Бедняжка! Прижавшись к полу, она только одним глазком могла полюбоваться садом. Он был еще более недостижим, чем прежде. И Алиса снова села и заплакала” [*Bednjazhka! Prizhavshis' k polu, ona tol'ko odnim glazkom mogla poljubovat'sja sadom. On byl eshhe bolee nedostizhim, chem prezhdde. I Alisa snova sela i zaplakala*] ‘Poor thing! Pressed against the floor, she could only admire the garden with one eye. It was even more unattainable than ever. And Alice sat back down and began to cry’ (40). In an earlier example, Shcherbakov adds additional emotional meaning through adding *бедняжка* [*bednjazhka*] ‘poor little thing’ for the original *poor Alice*; and, in addition, Shcherbakov adds yet more diminutive meaning, emotion and even irony through the addition of *глазок* [*glazok*] ‘eye-DIM’ when Alice is so large in size that she can only peep through the small passage with one eye. Likewise, later in the text, the constructions are reversed: instead of *poor X* being

translated as *poor little X*, in this example, *poor little X* is translated as *poor X*. Thus, the fact that the translations occasionally replace *poor X* and *poor little X* constructions with the same synthetic diminutive, specifically *бедняжка* [*bednjazhka*] ‘poor little thing’, can create somewhat of a puzzle as to how the translator understood and chose to convey the different meaning between *poor X* and *poor little X* constructions.

From the evidence above, we can assume that the translators felt that *poor little X* constructions focused on *poor* more than ‘littleness’ as conveyed through the use of the analytic marker *little* in the construction. Thus, many translations (especially those with names) lost the emotional connotations of *little* and essentially became *poor X* constructions through a diminutive-to-zero strategy. On the other hand, both translators attempted to show Alice’s love for animals, as shown in previous sub-sections, through the exaggeration of emotion in the translation of Alice’s exclamation of “Poor little thing!” upon meeting the puppy. Thus, this section does not highlight the difference between the Russian and English language; instead, it shows the translators’ attitude towards and understanding of the *poor little X* constructions.

In conclusion to this case study on the translation of diminutives into Russian, it is evident that the two Russian translators, typically translate differently regarding strategies used to convey diminutive meaning and emotional connotations. The fact that Demurova provides extensive footnotes throughout the book, including footnotes on the wordplay in the names of the three little sisters in the Dormouse’s tale, for example, is a significant strategy not adopted by Shcherbakov, who only includes a slightly longer introduction to his TT. Rather than including additional background material in the form of footnotes, Shcherbakov makes his TT more ‘Russian’ by adding, for example, diminutive suffixes

to proper names. As with the Polish translators, Demurova and Shcherbakov often interpret differently from each other, but when viewed at as a whole, the levels of 'emotional colouring' remain similar in each translation.

Conclusion

Diminutives have long been claimed to be nearly non-existent in the English languages, formed through constructions with analytic markers such as *small, little, dear* (Borden 2005; Wierzbicka 2003), while diminutives in synthetic languages including Russian and Polish have been researched often and established as a fundamental aspect of these languages, an aspect which has been claimed to reflect their cultures. Based on this understanding of diminutives, this thesis set out to examine and establish the significant emotive connotations of diminutives in noun phrases in the English, Polish and Russian languages, especially in translations of Carroll's classic children's book *Alice in Wonderland*.

The function of diminutives is similar in all three languages under study. Specifically, the main function of diminutives is to convey a (metaphorical) smallness and/or an emotive component. The kinds of emotions conveyed do not differ much between the three languages as the meanings of affection, pity, disparagement and irony were all observed in English, Polish and Russian children's literature. Also, children and women figure predominantly in the places that the diminutives were used. The main difference between English and the two Slavic languages, however, remains in the structural composition of the diminutives, specifically between diminutive constructions that include an analytic marker and diminutives created solely from diminutive affixes. Although analytic diminutives are overlooked in discussions of diminutives in English (see Wierzbicka 2003; Taylor 2003), the evidence suggests that analytic markers can function and convey meanings that are similar to those of synthetic diminutives. As I mention below, it is the words that undergo diminutivation that cause the main obstacle

in conveying diminutive meaning; both English and Polish/Russian have words that are not used in one language or the other. The fact that English, Polish and Russian have a set of diminutives unique to their language shows that alongside Polish and Russian, English does have many diminutives, which are used in children's literature.

Furthermore, the addition of diminutives in all Polish and Russian translations and 'native' children's literature showed that, in Slavic children's literature at least, the 'cute' bodies of animals and young children are represented using diminutive suffixes. Likewise, food and drink, and also adverbs and adjectives that represent diminished notions (e.g. Russian *тихонько* [*tihon'ko*] 'quietly') receive diminutive suffixes in Russian and Polish. The 'native' English children's literature, including *Alice in Wonderland*, did not make a significant distinction between bodies of animals/children and adults; neither did the English children's literature focus on diminutives of food and drink. This is a significant linguistic and conceptual difference in the use of English and Polish/Russian diminutives, one which should be considered when translating children's stories into Polish and Russian.

There are some aspects of the translatability of English diminutives which present challenges for Polish and Russian translators. First, the English language has two neutral analytic markers that cannot be used interchangeably (*small* and *little*), while Polish and Russian have only one such neutral marker (*mały* and *маленький* [*malen'kij*]), and even these two markers do not have the same semantic-pragmatic meanings (cf. 2.3). Since both languages have only one neutral analytic marker, each marker conveys the meanings of both *small* and *little*, though to different extents depending on contextual factors. Based on historical evidence, it appears that Polish *mały* typically conveys a meaning

closer to the English *small*, while Russian *маленький* [*malen'kij*] typically conveys a meaning closer to English *little*. Diminutive suffixes convey an emotive component and are more directly the equivalents of little X constructions. Thus, analytic diminutive constructions can be an obstacle for translators, especially when translating between English and Polish/Russian.

The study of diminutives presented here is a potential source of significant information for translators and for researchers interested in cross-linguistic and cultural research. The future development of this topic would benefit from a study of English (and Slavic) diminutives, both 'native' diminutives and 'translated' diminutives from various languages in different genres of written literature. The genres that could be considered include: detective fiction, which contains diminutive clues gathered by the detective; romance, which deals with women, children and issues regarding love and endearment; historical fiction, which could show how a modern author uses diminutives from past centuries (e.g. from Chaucer's time, when English was a synthetic language); and, fantasy/sci-fi to investigate how authors use diminutives in futuristic and fantasy worlds and in invented languages (e.g. Tolkien's languages of Middle-Earth). These genres could be analyzed through various methodologies including corpus and cognitive linguistics in order to further explore and establish the extent and variety of diminutive meanings, uses and functions. Furthermore, it would be apposite to study specific literature written in different varieties of English, such as Canadian English or Australian English (or the regional dialects of Polish, for example) in order to find out whether specific regional or national varieties prefer certain synthetic diminutives or analytic diminutive constructions.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Bazhov, P.P. *Malahitovaja shkatulka [Malachite Casket]*. Moskva: Pravda, 1985. Print.

Carroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass*. Ed. Peter Hunt. Oxford/New York: Oxford, 2009. Print.

---. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów i Po Drugiej Stronie Lustra [Alice in Wonderland and On the Other side of the Looking-Glass]*. Trans. Bogumiła Kaniewska. Poznań: Vesper, 2010. Print.

---. *Alicja w Krainie Czarów [Alice in Wonderland]*. Trans. Krzysztof Dworak. Warszawa: Buchmann, 2010. Print.

---. *Priključenija Alisy v Strane Chudes [Alice's Adventures in Wonderland]*. 1967. Trans. Nina Demurova. Moskva: Pressa, 1992. Print.

---. *Priključenija Alisay v Strane Chudes [Alice's Adventures in Wonderland]*. Trans. Alexander Shcherbakov. Moskva: Hudozhectvennaja Literatura, 1977. Print.

---. *Аня въ Странѣ Чудесъ (Anya v Stranye Chudes): The Nabokov Russian Translation of Lewis Carroll's Alice in Wonderland*. 1923. New York: Dover, 1976. Print.

---. *The Annotated Alice: Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through the Looking-Glass*. Ed. Martin Gardner. New York: Norton, 2000. Print.

DiTerlizzi, Tony, and Holly Black. *A Giant Problem*. New York: Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers, 2008. Print.

Grabowski, Jan. *Puc, Bursztyn i Goście [Puc, Burshtyn and Company]*. Warszawa:

Nasza Księgarnia, 1989. Print.

Grin, A.C. *Alije Parusa [Red Sails]*. Moskwa: Sovietskaja Rossija, 1980. Print.

Keene, Carolyn. *The Carousel Mystery*. New York: Aladdin Paperbacks, 2003. Print.

Korczak, Janusz. *Kajtuś Czarodziej [Kaytek the Wizard]*. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia,

1978. Print.

---. *Król Maciuś Pierwszy [King Matty the First]*. Poznań: Podsiedlik, Ranowski i Spół,

1997. Print.

L'Engle, Madeleine. *A Wrinkle in Time*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1962.

Print.

Lewis, C.S. *The Last Battle*. 1956. New York: HarperTrophy, 2000. Print.

Montgomery, L.M. *Anne of the Island*. 1915. Toronto: Seal Books, 1981. Print.

---. *Anne of Windy Poplars*. 1936. Toronto: Seal Books, 1996. Print.

---. *Anne's House of Dreams*. Toronto: Bantam Books, 1987. Print.

---. *Pat of Silver Bush*. 1933. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1989. Print.

Musierowicz, Małgorzata. *Imieniny [Name Day]*. Łódź: Akapit, 1998. Print.

Pagaczewski, Stanisław. *Porwania Profesora Gąbki [The Kidnapping of Professor*

Gabek]. 1965. Kraków: Wydawn. Literackie, 2002. Internet resource.

Porter, Eleanor H. *Pollyanna*. 1913. *Planet PDF*. Online resource.

Raevskij, Boris. *Tol'ko vperjod [Only Forward]*. Leningrad: Gos. Izd. dets. lit, 1959.

Web. 25 Feb 2013.

Rowling, J.K. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. Vancouver: Raincoast Books, 2000.

Print.

---. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. London: Bloomsbury, 2005. Print.

---. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury, 1997. Print.

Sienkiewicz, Henryk. *W Pustyni i w Puszczy [In Desert and in Wilderness]* 1912.

Kraków: Greg, 2003. Print.

Siesicka, Krystyna. *Piosenka Koguta [The Song of the Rooster]*. Łódź: Akapit, 1998.

Print.

Szklarski, Alfred. *Tomek Wśród Łowców Główn [Tomek Amongst the Headhunters]*.

Warszawa: MUZA SA, 2000. Web. 7 Jan 2013.

Tolkien, J.R.R. *The Hobbit*. 1937. London: HarperCollins, 1995. Print.

Twain, Mark. *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. 1876. London: Scholastic Publications,

1983. Print.

White, E B. *Charlotte's Web*. 1952. New York: Harper, 1952. Print.

Secondary Sources:

Arndt, Valerie, Paul Harvey and John Nuttall. *Alive to Languages: Perspectives on*

Language Awareness for English Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge

UP, 2000. Print.

- Balci, Alev. "A Comparative Analysis of Different Turkish Translations of *Alice in Wonderland* by Lewis Carroll on Pun Translation". MA thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, 2005.
- Bertills, Yvonne. "Intertextualities, continued: The Connotations of Proper Names in Tove Jansson." Ed. Roger D. Sell. *Children's literature as communication : the ChiLPA project*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. Print.
- Bielec, Dana. *Polish: An Essential Grammar*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.
- Bonvillain, Nancy. *Language, Culture, and Communication: The Meaning of Messages*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall, 2003. Print.
- Borden, Richard. Introduction. *Encounters with Lise and Other Stories*. By Leonid Dobychin. Trans. Richard Borden and Natalia Belova. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2005. vii-xxvii. Print.
- Borras, F M, and Reginald F. Christian. *Russian Syntax: Aspects of Modern Russian Syntax and Vocabulary*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1971. Print.
- Bratus, B V. *The Formation and Expressive Use of Diminutives*. London: Cambridge UP, 1969. Print.
- Brinton, Laurel J, and Leslie K. Arnovick. *The English Language: A Linguistic History*. Oxford: Oxford, 2006. Print.
- Brinton, Laurel J, and Donna Brinton. *The Linguistic Structure of Modern English*. Amsterdam/Philedelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. Print.
- Bryant, William C. *Prose Writings of William Cullen Bryant*. Ed. Parke Godwin. New York: Appleton, 1889. Internet resource.

- Craik, George L. *A Compendious History of English Literature, and of the English Language, from the Norman Conquest: With Numerous Specimens*. London: Griffin, 1871. Print.
- Cubberley, Paul. *Russian: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.
- "diminutive, adj. and n.". OED Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. Web. 22 Mar 2013.
- Długosz, Natalia. "Porównanie Wybranych Typów Słowotwórczych w Zakresie Rzeczownikowych formacji deminutywnych z Różnymi Formantami w Języku Polskim i w Języku Bułgarskim." [*A Comparison of Selected Types of Word Formations in the Area of Noun Diminutive Formation in Various Formations in the Polish Language and Bulgarian Language.*] *Linguistica Copernicana* 2.2 (2009):273-286. Print.
- Dziwirek, Katarzyna, and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk. *Complex Emotions and Grammatical Mismatches: A Contrastive Corpus-Based Study*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2010. Print.
- Gottlieb, Henrik. "You Got the Picture? On the Polysemiotics of Subtitling Wordplay". *Traductio, Essays on punning and Translation*. Ed. Dirk Delabastita. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997. 207-232. Print.
- Hejwowski, Krzysztof. *Kognitywno-Komunikacyjna Teoria Przekładu [Cognitive-Communicative Theory of Translation]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2009. Print.

- Hewson, Lance. *An Approach to Translation Criticism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2011. Print.
- Jurafsky, Dan. "Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive". *Language*, 72.3 (1996): 533-577. Print.
- Kelly, Catriona. *Children's World: Growing Up in Russia, 1890-1991*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007. Print.
- Kubáčková, Jana. "Keeping Czech in Check: A Corpus-Based Study of Generalization in Translation." *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 4.1 (2009):33-51. Web. 20 Dec. 2012.
- Malmor, Izabela. *Słownik Etymologiczny Języka Polskiego [Etymological Dictionary of the Polish Language]*. Warszawa – Bielsko-Biała: Wydawnictwo Szkolne PWN, 2009. Print.
- Mills, Sara. *Feminist Stylistics*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Miodunka, Władysław. *Cześć, Jak Się Masz? [Hi, How are You?]*. Kraków: Universitas, 2006. Print.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Naciscione, Anita. *Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. Print.
- Protassova, Ekaterina and Maria D. Voikova. "Diminutives in Russian at the Early Stages of Acquisition." *The Acquisition of Diminutives: A Cross-Linguistic*

Perspective. Ed. Ineta Savickienė. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007. 43-72. Print.

Reid, A.A., and W.D Marslen-Wilson. "Lexical Representation of Morphologically Complex Words: Evidence from Polish." *Morphological Structure in Language Processing*. Eds. R.H. Baayen and R. Schreuder. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. 287-336. Print.

Romaine, Suzanne. *Communicating Gender*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1999. Print.

Schneider, Klaus P. *Diminutives in English*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003. Print.

Sutherland, Robert D. *Language and Lewis Carroll*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970. Print.

Szczepańska, Elżbieta. "Zdrobnienia Dawnej i Dziś – Kilka Uwag na Materiale Czeskim i Polskim" ["Diminutives Historical and Present – Some Observations on Czech and Polish Materials"]. *Bohemistyka* 4.1 (2009): 250-260. Print.

Taylor, John R. *Linguistic Categorization*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. Print.

Vrbinc, Marjeta. "Delexical Structures Contrastively: A Common Trap for Non-Native Speakers". *English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries* 1.1 (2004): 61-78. Web. 4 March 2013.

Volek, Bronislava. *Emotive Signs in Language and Semantic Functioning of Derived Nouns in Russian*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987. Print.

Waddington, Patrick. *Advanced Translation from Russian Prose*. London: Pergamon, 1965. Print.

Wawrzyński, Jan. *Mały Słownik Rosyjsko-Polski Polsko-Rosyjski [Small Russian-Polish Polish-Russian Dictionary]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN SA, 2006. Print.

Weaver, Warren. *Alice in Many Tongues: The Translations of Alice in Wonderland*. Madison: U of Wisconsin Press, 1964. Print.

Wierzbicka, Anna. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: the Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. Print.

Wood, Julia T. *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture*. Belmont, CA: Thompson/Wadsworth, 2012. Print.

Xiao, Richard and Ming Yue. "Using Corpora in Translation Studies". *Contemporary Corpus Linguistics*. Ed. Paul Baker. London: Continuum, 2009. 237-261. Print.

Appendix

Appendix A

Diminutive affixes in Polish and Russian.

Appendix A1. Polish Diminutive Affixes.

1. Masculine diminutive affixes:

-ak (*pies – psiak, kot – kociak* used as diminutive forms for the names of young things);

-ek (*dom – domek, kwiat – kwiatek*) or in ‘broader’ variant: -uszek (*placek – placuszek*), -aszek (*kij – kijaszek*), -ątek (*kawałek – kawałatek*);

-ik/-yk (*but – bucik*) or ‘broader’ variant: -czyk (*ślusarz – ślusarczyk*);

2. Feminine diminutive affixes:

-ka (*kokarda – kokardka*) or its ‘broader’ variants: -eczka (*uzda – uzdeczka*), -yczka (*twarz – twarzyczka*), -ułka (*deska – deszczułka*), -uszka (*paczka – paczuszka*), -etka (*orgia – orgietka*), -eńka (*chwila – chwileńka* used as a diminutive and a hypocoristic);

3. Neuter diminutive affixes:

-ko (*błoto – błotko*) or broader variants: -eczko (*miasto – miasteczko*), -eńko (*cudo – cudeńko*), -etko (*pole – poletko*), -uszko (*jabłko – jabłuszko*), -onko (*strzemię – strzemionko*), -ątko (*piskłę – pistkłatko*), -ączko (*strzemię – strzemiączko*);

4. Derivatives from nouns in genitive plural or regular plural nouns:

-ki (*plecy – plecki*), -iki/-yki (*konszachty – konszachciki; kleszcze – kleszczyki*), -iczki (*drzwi – drzwiczki*), -uszki (*majtki – majtuszki*);

-ka (*jasła – jasełka*), -eczka (*usta – usteczka*)

-based on Długosz (2009:28-29)

Appendix A2. Russian Diminutive Affixes.

1. Masculine diminutive affixes:

-ек [-ek] (звонок – звоночек), -ик [-ik] (сад - садик), -чик (зуб - зубчик), -ок [-ok] (остров - островок);

-ец [-jes] (мороз - морозец)

2. Feminine diminutive affixes:

-к- [-k-] (гора - горка), -очк- [-ochk-] (ваза - вазочка), -ечк- [-echk-] (игрушка - игрушечка);

-ц- [-c-] (дверь - дверца), -иц- [-ic-] (вещь - вещица)

3. Neuter diminutive affixes:

-чк- [-chk-] (облако - облачко), -ышк- [-yshk-] (гнездо - гнёздышко), -ечк- [-echk-] (время - времечко), -ик- [-iko] (колесо - колёсико);

-ц- [-c-] (слово - словцо), -ец- [-jes-] (письмо - письмецо); -иц- [-ic-] (масло - маслице)

4. Derivatives from nouns in genitive plural or nominative plural diminutive suffixes:

-к- [-k-] (дети - детки), -ик- [-ik-], -чик- [-chik-] (шаровары - шароварчики);

-ц- [-c-] (сени - сенцы)

5. Diminutive-hypocoristic forms:

-ишк- [-ishk-] (лгун - лгунишка, мысль – мыслишка, город - городишко, письмо - письмишко, дрова - дровишки);

-ушк- [-ushk-] (комната - комнатушка), -юшк- [-jushk-] (зверь - зверюшка);

-онк-, -онк- [-onchk-] (собака - собачонка, старик - старичонка, деньги - деньжонки), -ёнк-, [-jonk-] –ёнк- [-jonk-] (лошадь - лошаdёнка, сила - силёнка, глаза - глазёнки);

-ёшк- [-joshk-] (рыба - рыбёшка);

-еньк- [-en'k-] (рука - рученька), -оньк- [-on'k-] (берёза – берёзонка);

-юшк- [-jushk-],- юшк- [-jushk-] (дядя - дядушка, поле - полюшко)

-based on Długosz (2009:28-29)²⁷

Appendix B: Translations of Diminutives

Appendix B1: Translations of all Diminutives without Context (POLISH)

English ST	Kaniewska	Dworak
Chapter 1		
an ignorant little girl	jakiś głuptas 'some kind of idiot'	mała ignorantka 'small ignorant (girl)'
a little three-legged table	stoliczek na trzech nogach 'table-DIM-DIM on three legs'	stolik na trzech nogach 'table-DIM on three legs'
a tiny golden key	maleńki złoty klucz 'small-DIM golden key'	malutki złoty klucz 'small-DIM golden key'
a little door	drzwi 'doors'	niewielkie drzwi 'small doors'
the little golden key	złoty klucz 'golden key'	złoty klucz 'golden key'
a small passage	korytarz 'corridor'	wąskie przejście 'narrow passageway'
the little door	małe drzwi 'small doors'	drzwiczki 'doors-DIM'
a little bottle	butelka 'bottle'	butelecza 'bottle-DIM'
the wise little Alice	nasza mała Alicja 'our small/little Alice'	mądra Alicja 'wise Alice'
nice little stories	milutka historyjka 'dear-DIM story'	miła historyjka 'small story-DIM'
the little door	malutkie drzwi 'small-DIM doors'	drzwiczki 'doors-DIM'
the little golden key	złoty klucz 'golden key'	mały złoty klucz 'small golden key-DIM'
the poor little thing	maleńka, bezradna dziewczynka	bidulka 'poor little thing'

²⁷ In Russian linguistics, suffixes and endings are always discussed as separate categories and for that reason all endings have been cut from the source but has left Długosz's way of presenting suffixes (gender/plural) for consistency.

	‘small-DIM, hopeless girl-DIM’	
a little glass box	małe szklane pudełeczko ‘small glass box-DIM’	małe szklane pudełeczko ‘small glass box-DIM’
a very small cake	malutkie ciasteczko ‘small-DIM pastry-DIM’	nieduże ciastko ‘small pastry’
a little bit	kawałeczek ‘piece-DIM-DIM’	odrobina ‘crumb/particle/shred’
Chapter 2		
my poor little feet	biedne moje nóżki ‘my poor feet-DIM’	moje biedne, małe stópki ‘my poor, small feet-DIM’
the little golden key	złoty kluczyk ‘golden key-DIM’	mały złoty kluczyk ‘small golden key-DIM’
a little pattering of feet	tupot czyichś kroków ‘pattering of some steps’	tupot stop ‘pattering of feet’
that poky little house	brzydki mały dom ‘ugly small house’	ciasny mały domek ‘cramped small house-DIM’
the Rabbit's little white kid gloves	malutkie bielusienkie rękawiczki ‘small-DIM white-DIM gloves’	króliczne rękawiczki ‘rabbit's gloves’
the little door	małeńkie drzwiczki ‘small-DIM doors-DIM’	małych drzwi ‘small doors’
the little door	drzwi ‘doors’	drzwiczki ‘doors-DIM’
the little golden key	mały złoty klucz ‘small golden key’	mały złoty kluczyk ‘small golden key-DIM’
one of its little eyes	ze swych małych oczu ‘of one of its small eyes’	oczko ‘eye-DIM’
such a nice little dog	taki śliczny mały piesek ‘such a beautiful small dog-DIM’	taki miły piesek ‘such a dear dog-DIM’
a little bright-eyed terrier	młodziutki brązowy terrier ‘young-DIM bronze terrier’	jasnooki terrier ‘bright-eyed terrier’
Chapter 3		
the small ones	mniejsze ‘smaller (ones)’	małe ‘small (ones)’
a little bird	mały ptaszek ‘small bird-DIM’	ptaszek ‘bird-DIM’
a little pattering of footsteps	tupot małych stop ‘pattering of small feet’	cichy tupot stop ‘quiet pattering of feet’
Chapter 4		
a Little Bill	Bill ‘Bill’	mały Jasiek ‘small Jan-DIM-DIM’
the little door	małe drzwiczki ‘small doors-DIM’	małe drzwiczki ‘small doors-DIM’
a neat little house	śliczny mały domek ‘beautiful small house-DIM’	schludny domek ‘tidy house-DIM’
a tidy little room	mały, czyściutki pokój	ładny urządzony pokój

	‘small, clean-DIM room-DIM’	‘nicely furnished room-DIM’
tiny white kid gloves	małeńkie rękawiczki z białej skóry ‘small-DIM gloves from white leather’	malutkie, białe, skórzane rękawiczki ‘small-DIM, white, leather gloves’
a little bottle	mała buteleczka ‘small bottle-DIM’	mała buteleczka ‘small bottle-DIM’
such a tiny little thing!	taki małeńki ‘so small-DIM’	taki malutki stworzeń ‘such a small-DIM creature’
the little magic bottle	zaczarowana buteleczka ‘magical bottle-DIM’	mała magiczna buteleczka ‘small magic bottle-DIM’
a little pattering of feet	tupot małych stop ‘pattering of small feet’	tupot stop ‘pattering of feet’
little shriek	cichy pisk ‘quiet shriek’	pisk ‘shriek’
<i>two</i> little shrieks	DWA ciche piski ‘two quiet shrieks’	dwa ciche piski ‘two quiet shrieks’
little cartwheels	turkot małego wózka ‘the rattle of a small cart’	turkot małych kółek wozu ‘the rattle of small wheels of the cart’
a little animal	małe zwierzątko ‘small creature-DIM’	małe zwierzęcia ‘small creature’
a little feeble, squeaking voice	drżący, piskliwy głos ‘quavering, squeaky voice’	drżący, piskliwy głosik ‘quavering, squeaking voice-DIM’
little pebbles	małe kamyczki ‘small pebbles’	kamyczki ‘pebbles’
little cakes	małe ciasteczka ‘small pastries-DIM’	małe ciasteczka ‘small pastries-DIM’
little animals and birds	ptaki i małe zwierzęta ‘birds and small animals’	niewielkie zwierzęta i ptaki ‘small animals and birds’
the poor little Lizard	biedna mała jaszczurka ‘poor small/little lizard’	biedna mała jaszczurka ‘poor small/little lizard’
a little sharp bark	ciche, ostre szczeknięcie ‘quiet, sharp bark’	ciche szczeknięcie ‘quiet bark’
poor little thing!	małeńkie biedactwo ‘small-DIM poor little thing’	biedactwo ‘poor little thing’
a little bit of stick	patyk ‘stick’	mały kijek ‘small stick’
a dear little puppy	on był śliczny i kochany ‘he was beautiful and loveable’	taki miły szczeniaczek ‘such a dear puppy-DIM-DIM’
Chapter 5		
a little girl	mała dziewczynka ‘small girl-DIM’	mała dziewczynka ‘small girl-DIM’
little girls	małe dziewczynki ‘small girls-DIM’	małe dziewczynki ‘small girls-DIM’
little girls	małe dziewczynki ‘small girls-DIM’	małe dziewczynki ‘small girls-DIM’

a little girl	mała dziewczynka 'small girl-DIM'	mała dziewczynka 'small girl-DIM'
a little house	mały dom 'small house'	mały domek 'small house-DIM'
Chapter 6		
the poor little thing	biedne maleństwo 'poor little thing'	biedactwo 'poor little thing'
a queer- shaped little creature	malutkie stworzonko 'small-DIM creature'	---
the poor little thing	biedny malusiek 'poor baby-DIM'	biedne maleństwo 'poor little thing'
the little thing	maleństwo 'little (thing)'	maleństwo 'little (thing)'
the poor little thing	biedne małe stworzonko 'poor small creature-DIM'	małe biedactwo 'small poor little thing'
the little creature	prosie 'piglet/suckling pig'	stworzenie 'creature'
Chapter 7		
three little sisters	trzy małe siostrzyczki 'three small sisters-DIM'	trzy małe siostry 'three small sisters'
Elsie	Ela	Ela
Lacie	Lala	Hela
Tillie	Tila	Matylda
three little sisters	trzy małe siostrzyczki 'three small sisters-DIM'	trzy małe siostry 'three small sisters'
a little shriek	--	cichy pisk 'quiet shriek'
the little glass table	szklany stoliczek 'glass table-DIM-DIM'	szklany stolik 'glass table-DIM'
the little golden key	mały złoty klucz 'small golden key-DIM'	mały złoty klucz 'small golden key-DIM'
the little passage	mała sień 'small hall'	mały korytarz 'small corridor'
Chapter 8		
the little dears	śliczne maleństwa 'beautiful little (things)'	---
a little scream of laughter	parsknęła cichym śmiechem 'burst out in a quiet laugh'	wybuchnęła śmiechem 'exploded in laughter'
Chapter 9		
sharp little chin	koścista broda 'bony chin'	broda 'chin'
sharp little chin	broda 'chin'	broda 'chin'
a little ledge of rock	długi odłamek skały 'long piece of rock'	niewielka skalna półka 'small rock shelf'
Chapter 11		
little birds and beasts	małe ptaszki różnych gatunków	małe ptaki i zwierzęta

	i inne stworzenia 'small birds-DIM of various types and other creatures'	'small birds and animals'
little girls	dziewczynki 'girls-DIM'	dziewczynki 'girls-DIM'
the poor little juror	biedak przysięgły 'poor juror person'	biedny mały ławnik 'poor small juror'
shrill little voice	cichy, cieniutki głosik 'quiet, thin-DIM voice-DIM'	skrzeczący głosik 'shrill voice-DIM'
Chapter 12		
the poor little thing	biedne stworzonko 'poor creature-DIM'	biedna jaszczurka 'poor lizard'
the unfortunate little Bill	nieszczęsny mały Bill 'unlucky small Bill'	nieszczęsny mały Jasiak 'unlucky small Jan-DIM-DIM'
a little scream	krzyknęła cicho 'screamed quietly'	krzyknęła 'screamed'
little Alice	Alicja 'Alice'	mała siostrzyczka 'small sister-DIM'
little Alice	mała Alicja 'small/little Alice'	mała Alicja 'small/little Alice'
the tiny hands	szczuplutkie ramiona 'slender arms'	drobne rączki 'tiny hands-DIM'
that queer little toss of her head	--	odrzuca głowę 'throws her head'
her little sister's dream	mała siostrzyczka 'small sister-DIM'	snu jej małej siostrzyczki 'dream of her small sister's-DIM'
little sister	mała siostrzyczka 'small sister-DIM'	mała siostrzyczka 'small sister-DIM'
little children	małe dzieci 'small children'	małe dzieci 'small children'

Appendix B2: Translations of all Diminutives without Context (RUSSIAN)

English ST	Shcherbakov	Demurova
an ignorant little girl	необразованная девочка neobrazovannaja devochka 'uneducated girl'	страшная невежда strashnaja nevezhdha 'terrible ignorant'
a little three-legged table	столлик на трех ножках stolik na trjoh nozhkah 'table-DIM on three legs'	стеклянный столлик на трех ножках stekljannyj stolik na trjoh

		nozhkah 'glass table-DIM on three legs'
a tiny golden key	крохотный золотой ключик krohotnyj zolotoj kljuchik 'tiny golden key-DIM'	крошечный золотой ключик kroshechnyj zolotoj kljuchik 'tiny golden key-DIM'
a little door	маленькая дверца malen'kaja dverca 'little door-DIM'	маленькая дверца malen'kaja dverca 'little door-DIM'
the little golden key	ключ kljuch 'key'	ключик kljuchik 'key-DIM'
a small passage	коридорчик koridorchik 'corridor-DIM'	нора nora 'burrow/hole'
the little door	дверца dverca 'door-DIM'	маленькая дверца malen'kaja dverca 'little door-DIM'
a little bottle	маленький флакончик malen'kij flakonchik 'a little bottle-DIM'	пузырек puzyrek 'bottle-DIM'
the wise little Alice	умная маленькая Алиса umnaja malen'kaja Alisa 'smart little Alice'	умненькая Алиса umnen'kaja Alisa 'smart-DIM Alice'
nice little stories	очень милых историй ochen' milyh istorij 'very nice stories'	прелестные истории prelestnye istorii 'lovely stories'
the little door	дверца dverca 'door-DIM'	дверца dverca 'door-DIM'
the little golden key	золотой ключик zolotoj kljuchik 'golden key-DIM'	золотой ключик zolotoj kljuchik 'golden key-DIM'
the poor little thing	бедная Алиса bednaja Alisa 'poor Alice'	бедная Алиса bednaja Alisa 'poor Alice'
a little glass box	стеклянная шкатулочка stekljannaja shkatulochka 'glass casket-DIM'	маленькая стеклянная коробочка malen'kaja stekljannaja korobochka 'little glass box'
a very small cake	пирожок pirozhok 'pastry/pie'	пирожок pirozhok 'pastry/pie'
a little bit	кусочек kusocek 'bit-DIM'	откусила от пирожка otkusila ot pirozhka 'she took a bite of cake'
Chapter 2		
my poor little feet	мои бедные ножки	бедные мои ножки

	moi bednye nozhki 'my poor feet-DIM'	bednye moi nozhki 'my poor feet-DIM'
the little golden key	золотой ключик zolotoj kljuchik 'golden key-DIM'	золотой ключик zolotoj kljuchik 'golden key-DIM'
a little pattering of feet	топот маленьких ножек topot malen'kih nozhkek 'pattering of little feet-DIM'	топот маленьких ног topot malen'kih nog 'pattering of little feet'
that poky little house	убогий домишко ubogij domishko 'poky house-DIM'	старый домишко staryj domishko 'old house-DIM'
little white kid gloves	лайковая перчатка lajkovaja perchatka 'kid-glove'	крошечная перчатка kroshechnaja perchatka 'tiny glove'
the little door	дверь dver' 'door'	дверца dverca 'door-DIM'
the little door	та ta 'that'	дверца dverca 'door-DIM'
the little golden key	ключик kljuchik 'key-DIM'	золотой ключик zolotoj kljuchik 'golden key-DIM'
one of its little eyes	--	--
such a nice little dog	такая милая собачка takaja milaja sobachka 'such a dear dog'	такой милый песик takoj milyj pjosik 'such a dear dog-DIM'
a little bright-eyed terrier	терьерчик ter'erchik 'terrier-DIM'	маленький терьер malen'kij ter'er 'little terrier'
Chapter 3		
the small ones	маленькие malen'kie 'little (ones)'	птички ptichki 'birds-DIM'
a little bird	птички ptichki 'birds-DIM'	--
a little pattering of footsteps	топот маленьких ножек topot malen'kih nozhkek 'pattering of little feet-DIM'	легкий звук шагов lehkij zvuk shagov 'light sound of steps'
Chapter 4		
a Little Bill	Билли Billi	Билль Bill'
the little door	дверца dverca 'door-DIM'	дверца dverca 'door-DIM'
a neat little house	чистенький домик chisten'kij domik 'clean-DIM house-DIM'	чистенький домик chisten'kij domik 'clean-DIM house-DIM'

a tidy little room	чисто прибранная комнатка chisto pribrannaja komnatka 'clean tidied-up room-DIM'	маленькая комнатка malen'kaja komnatka 'little room-DIM'
tiny white kid gloves	пару перчаток paru perchatok 'a pair of gloves'	пару перчаток paru perchatok 'a pair of gloves'
a little bottle	флакончик flakonchik 'bottle/flask'	маленький пузырек malen'kij puzyrek 'little bottle (for perfume)'
such a tiny little thing!	такой малюсенькой takoј maljusen'koј 'so tiny'	такой крошкой takoј kroshekoј 'such a crumb'
the little magic bottle	флакончик flakonchik 'bottle/flask'	волшебный напиток volshevnij napitok 'magic potion'
a little pattering of feet	топот ножек topot nozhek 'pattering of feet-DIM'	топот маленьких ног topot malen'kih nog 'pattering of little feet'
little shriek	писк pisk 'squeak/peep'	крик krik 'cry/shout'
two little shrieks	писку было вдвое pisku bylo vdvoe 'there were two squeaks'	два вопля dva voplja 'two cries/howls'
little cartwheels	тарахтенье телеги tarahten'e telegi 'rattle of carts'	скрип колес skrip koles 'squeaking of wheels'
a little animal	маленькое животное malen'koe zhiivotnoe 'little creature'	зверек kto-to/zverek 'animal-DIM'
a little feeble, squeaking voice	дрожащий пискливый голосок drozhashhij pisklivyj golosok 'trembling squeaky voice-DIM'	тоненький, слабый голос tonen'kij, slabyj golos 'thin, weak voice'
little pebbles	мелкие камешки melkie kameshki 'little pebbles'	мелкие камешки melkie kameshki 'little pebbles'
little cakes	крохотные пирожки krohotnye pirozhki 'tiny pastries/cakes'	пирожки pirozhki 'pastries/pies/cakes'
little animals and birds	птицы и зверюшки pticy i zverjushki 'birds and animals-DIM'	птицы и зверюшки pticy i zverjushki 'birds and animals-DIM'
the poor little Lizard, Bill	Бедный Билли Bednyj Billi 'poor Billi'	бедный Ящерка Билль bednyj Jashherka Bill' 'poor Lizard-DIM Bill'
a little sharp bark	отрывистый лай otryvistyj laј 'abrupt bark'	громко тьякнул gromko tjavknul 'barked loudly'
poor little thing!	мой бедненький	бе-е-дненький, ма-а-

	moj bednen'kij 'my poor little thing'	ленький be-e-dnen'kij, ma-a-len'kij 'poor-DIM, little (thing)'
a little bit of stick	веточка vetochka 'twig/sprig'	палочка palochka 'stick'
a dear little puppy	очень миленький ochen' milen'kij 'very dear-DIM'	щенок-то какой чудесный shhenok-to kakoj chudesnyj 'what a wonderful puppy'
Chapter 5		
a little girl	маленькая девочка malen'kaja devochka 'little girl'	маленькая девочка malen'kaja devochka 'little girl'
little girls	маленькие девочки malen'kie devochki 'little girls'	маленькие девочки malen'kie devochki 'little girls'
little girls	девочки devochki 'girls'	девочки devochki 'girls'
a little girl	девочка devochka 'girl'	девочка devochka 'girl'
a little house	домик domik 'house-DIM'	маленький домик malen'kij domik 'little house-DIM'
Chapter 6		
the poor little thing	он on 'him'	--
a queer- shaped little creature	какой-то странный kakoj-to strannyj 'somehow strange'	--
the poor little thing	бедняжка bednjazhka 'poor little thing'	бедняжка bednjazhka 'poor little thing'
the little thing	мальш malysh	младенец mladenec
the poor little thing	бедняжка bednjazhka 'poor little thing'	бедняжка bednjazhka 'poor little thing'
the little creature	его jego 'his'	его jego 'his'
Chapter 7		
three little sisters	три сестрички tri sestrichki 'three sisters-DIM'	три сестрички tri sestrichki 'three sisters-DIM'
Elsie	Чарлора Charlora	Элси Elsi

Lacie	Алиса Alisa	Лэси Lesi
Tillie	Тилли Tilli	Тилли Tilli
three little sisters	три сестрички tri sestrichki 'three sisters-DIM'	три сестрички tri sestrichki 'three sisters-DIM'
a little shriek	пискнула pisknula 'squeaked'	взвизгнула vzvizgnula 'shrieked'
the little glass table	стеклянный столик stekljannyj stolik 'glass table-DIM'	стеклянный столик stekljannyj stolik 'glass table-DIM'
the little golden key	золотой ключик zolotoj kljuchik 'golden key-DIM'	ключик kljuchik 'key-DIM'
the little passage	коридорчик koridorchik 'corridor-DIM'	узкий коридорчик uzkij koridorchik 'narrow corridor-DIM'
Chapter 8		
the little dears	маленькие принцы и принцессы malen'kie princy i princessy 'little princes and princesses'	милые крошки milye kroschki 'dear little (things)'
a little scream of laughter	чуть не взвизгнула от смеха chut' ne vzvizgnula ot smeha 'almost shrieked with laughter'	радостно фыркнула radostno fyrknula 'joyfully snorted'
Chapter 9		
sharp little chin	подбородок podborodok 'chin'	подбородок podborodok 'chin'
sharp little chin	острый подбородок ostruj podborodok 'sharp chin'	подбородок podborodok 'chin'
a little ledge of rock	обломка скалы oblomka scaly 'fragment of rock'	скалистый уступ skalistyj ustup 'rocky ledge'
Chapter 11		
all sorts of little birds and beasts	птички, зверьки ptichki, zver'ki 'birds-DIM, animals-DIM'	птицы и зверюшки pticy i zverjushki 'birds and animals-DIM'
little girls	девочки devochki 'girls'	девочки devochki 'girls'
the poor little juror	бедный крошечный заседательчик bednyj kroshechnyj zasedatel'chik 'poor tiny juror-DIM'	бедный присяжный bednyj prisjazhnyj 'poor juror'

shrill little voice	тонкий голосочек tonkij golosoček 'shrill voice-DIM-DIM'	тоненький голосок tonen'kij gosok 'shrill-DIM voice-DIM'
Chapter 12		
the poor little thing	бедняжка bednjazhka 'poor little thing'	бедняга bednjaga 'poor thing'
the unfortunate little Bill	бедняга bednjaga 'poor thing'	бедняга bednjaga 'poor thing'
a little scream	вскрикнула vskriknula 'shrieked'	вскрикнула vskriknula 'shrieked'
little Alice	маленькая Алиса malen'kaja Alisa 'little Alice'	маленькая Алиса malen'kaja Alisa 'little Alice'
little Alice	Алиса Alisa	Алиса Alisa
the tiny hands	нежные ручонки nezhnye ruchonki 'delicate hands-DIM-DIM'	маленькие руки malen'kie ruki 'little hands'
that queer little toss of her head	вскинула голову vskinula golovu 'tossed her head'	встряхивает головой vstrjahivaet golovoj 'shakes her head'
her little sister's dream	рассказа младшей rasskaza mladshej 'younger's story'	Алиса Alisa 'Alice'
little sister	маленькая сестричка malen'kaja sestrichka 'little sister-DIM'	маленькая сестра malen'kaja sestra 'little sister'
little children	дети deti 'children'	другие дети drugie deti 'other children'

Appendix C: Added Diminutives

Added Diminutives in Each Translation (POL & RUS)

(In order of appearance; only provides page number for the first use of the diminutive)

Kaniewska

miseczka (17) 'bowl-DIM-DIM'
 cichutka nadzieja (19) 'quiet-DIM hope'
 buciki (27) 'boots-DIM'/'booties'
 skarpetki (27) 'socks-DIM'
 łapka (28) 'paw-DIM'
 wierszyk (30) 'poem-DIM'
 pyszczyk (34) 'face-DIM'
 oczka (35) 'eyes-DIM'
 mięciutkie (35) 'soft-DIM'
 głupiutka (54) 'silly-DIM'
 jabłuszka (55) 'apples-DIM' (=in the context of Pat's 'non-standard' speech)
 krzaczek (61) 'bush-DIM'
 troszeczkę (71) 'a little (bit)-DIM'
 ramionka (72) 'shoulders-DIM'
 rączki (72) 'hands-DIM'
 partyjka (79) 'party-DIM'
 nosek (84) 'nose-DIM'
 czajniczek (95) 'teapot-DIM'
 winko (95) 'wine-DIM'
 maselko (98) 'butter-DIM'
 obiadek (99) 'lunch-DIM'
 słówko (99) 'word-DIM'
 łyżeczka (100) 'spoon-DIM'/'teaspoon'
 talerzyk (104) 'plate-DIM'
 cichutko (110) 'quietly-DIM'
 serduszki (111) 'hearts-DIM'
 całutka (117) 'entire-DIM'
 dziecino (124) 'child-DIM:Voc'
 ranko (142) 'morning-DIM'

szybciutko (163) ‘quickly-DIM’

Dworak

miseczka (15) ‘bowl-DIM-DIM’

kociaczki (15) ‘kittens-DIM-DIM’

wąsiki (16) ‘whiskers-DIM’

pyszczek (32) ‘face/snout-DIM’

łapki (48) ‘paws-DIM’

Shcherbakov

книжка (29) [*knizhka*] ‘book-DIM’

ручка (33) [*ruchka*] ‘hand-DIM’ (also ‘pen’)

ботиночки (39) [*botinochki*] ‘shoes-DIM’

глазок (40) [*glazok*] ‘eye-DIM’

мышка (43) [*myshka*] ‘mouse-DIM’

шерстка (46) [*sherstka*] ‘fur-DIM’

лапки (46) [*lapki*] ‘paw-DIM’

конфетки (51) [*konfetki*] ‘candy-DIM’

усмешка (50) [*usmeshka*] ‘grin-DIM’

хвостик (54) [*hvoistik*] ‘tail-DIM’

нянечка (59) [*njanechka*] ‘nanny-DIM’

секундочка (59) [*sekundochka*] ‘second-DIM’

норка (59) [*norka*] ‘burrow-DIM’

яблочки (61) [*jablochki*] ‘apples’ (=in the context of Pat’s ‘non-standard’ speech)

тихонечко (77) [*tihonechko*] ‘quietly-DIM’

носик (81) [*nosik*] ‘nose-DIM’

хорошенькая пачкотня (136) [*horoshen'kaja pachkotnja*] ‘good-DIM bungling’

Demurova

книжка (13) [*knizhka*] ‘book-DIM’

молочко (17) [*molochko*] ‘milk-DIM’

ушки (18) [*ushki*] ‘ears-DIM’

милочка (26) [*milochka*] ‘dear (one)-DIM’

шерстка (30) [*sherstka*] ‘fur-DIM’

лапки (31) [*lapki*] ‘paws-DIM’

мышка (43) [*myshka*] ‘mouse-DIM’

норка (43) [*norka*] ‘burrow-DIM’

яблочки (46) [*jablochki*] ‘apples-DIM’ (=in the context of Pat’s ‘non-standard’ speech)

немножко (47) [*nemnozhko*] ‘a little-DIM’

котик (70) [*kotik*] ‘cat-DIM’ / ‘kitty’

словечко (81) [*slovehko*] ‘word-DIM’

тихонько (81) [*tihon’ko*] ‘quietly-DIM’