A derivational approach to borrowed denominal personal nouns in contemporary Lithuanian

Keywords: derivational relationship; borrowed denominal personal nouns; transparent derivation; non-transparent derivation; contemporary Lithuanian.

In the last ten years, there has been increasing interest in the relationship between word formation and borrowing (cf. ten Hacken, Panocová 2020; Panocová 2015). The adaptation of borrowings into different languages has been widely researched (cf. Ralli 2016; Gardani et al. 2014; Haspelmath, Tadmor 2009; Wohlgemuth 2009; Matras, Sakel 2007). However, these studies have predominantly focused on how borrowings adapt to the phonological and morphological system of the recipient language, rather than on their derivational relationships.

The following 2 research questions are posed:1) Does a derivational approach to borrowed denominal personal nouns explain derivational relationships in contemporary Lithuanian? 2) Are borrowings suffixed with *-istas, -ė* the most frequent among denominal personal nouns? Denominal personal nouns have been chosen because they represent one of the major categories in derivational morphology, naming people according to their roles, professions, affiliations or characteristics, e.g., *satyrikas, -ė* 'satirist' ⇠ *satyra* 'satire'. The research examines borrowed denominal personal nouns with eight suffixes, namely: *-istas, -ė* (*aferistas, -ė* 'fraudster'), *-ikas, -ė* (*sokratikas* 'Socratic'), *-(i)antas, -ė* (*diplomantas, -ė* 'diplomant'), *-(i)atas, -ė* (*stipendiatas, -ė* 'stipendiate'), *-(ion)ierius, -ė* (*doktrinierius, -ė* 'doctrinaire'), *-orius, -ė* (*auditorius, -ė* 'auditor'), *-aras, -ė* (*archyvaras, -ė* 'archivist') and *-eris, -ė* (*fermeris, -ė* 'farmer').

The derivational relationships between borrowed denominal personal nouns are analysed by considering both formal and semantic aspects of derivational morphology. The transparency of a derivational approach depends on how easily the meaning and structure of the suffixed borrowing can be analysed in relation to its base word. Therefore, I distinguish between transparent and non-transparent (opaque) derivation. In transparent derivation, the relationship between borrowed denominal personal nouns and their base words is both structurally and semantically clear (e.g., *skandalistas, -ė* 'scandalist' ⇠ *skandalas* 'scandal'), whereas in non-transparent or opaque derivation, this relationship is not easily identifiable – either because the base exists only as a bound stem that cannot stand alone and must combine with an affix to form a word (e.g., *fašistas* 'fascist' ⇠ *fašizmas* 'fascism') or because it lacks a recognizable base word (e.g., *okulistas, -ė* 'ophthalmologist' ⇠ ?). I suggest treating such personal nouns as simplex borrowings within Lithuanian.

The research relies on the data from the electronic Dictionary of Internationalisms *Interleksis* (DI). The synchronic approach to the derivation of borrowed suffixed personal nouns has been adopted in the research (cf. Urbutis [4]2005, 1965). It is planned to analyse approximately 300 borrowed denominal personal nouns.

The expected results of the study suggest that denominal personal nouns suffixed with *-istas, -ė* constitute the largest category, accounting for 44% of the total. Nouns suffixed with *-orius, -ė* make up 17%, *-ikas, -ė* 13%, *-(i)antas* 11%, *-(ion)ierius* 10%, *-(i)atas, -ė* 2%, *-eris* 2%, and *-aras* 1%. A derivational approach to borrowed denominal personal nouns cannot always account for the relationship between the base word and the suffixed borrowing, especially in cases of opaque derivation. Personal nouns that contain borrowed suffixes but do not share a recognizable root are considered simplex borrowings.

References

Gardani, Francesco, Peter Arkadiev, Nino Amiridze (eds.) 2015, *Borrowed morphology* (Language contact and bilingualism 8), Berlin, Boston, Munich: De Gruyter Mouton.

Haspelmath, Martin, Uri Tadmor (eds.) 2009, *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matras, Jaron, Janete Sakel 2007, *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Panocová, Renáta 2015, *Categories of word formation and borrowing: An onomasiological account of neoclassical formations*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Pius ten Hacken, Renáta Panocová (eds.) 2020, *T*he *interaction of borrowing and word formation*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ralli, Angela 2016, Strategies and patterns of loan verb integration in Modern Greek varieties, in Angela Ralli (ed.), *Contact Morphology in Modern Greek dialects*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press, 73–108.

Urbutis, Vincas 1965, Daiktavardžių daryba, in Kazys Ulvydas (ed.), *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika I: Fonetika ir morfologija*, Vilnius: Mintis, 251–473.

Urbutis, Vincas [4]2005, Daiktavardžių daryba, in Vytautas Ambrazas (ed.), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, 4-oji pataisyta laida, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 86–167.

Wohlgemuth, Jan 2009, *A typology of verbal borrowings* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 211), Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sources

DI – Kompiuterinis tarptautinių žodžių žodynas [Computerised Dictionary of Internationalisms] ‘Interleksis’, Vilnius: Alma littera, Fotonija, 2003.