

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF LITHUANIAN LITERATURE AND FOLKLORE

LINA INČIURAITĖ-NOREIKIENĖ

**THE MORPHEMIC STRUCTURE AND FORMATION OF NOUNS
AND ADJECTIVES WITH (NEO)CLASSICAL ELEMENTS IN
MODERN LITHUANIAN**

Summary of Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2017

Dissertation was prepared at Vilnius University in 2012–2016.

Research supervisor:

Prof. Habil. Dr. **Bonifacas Stundžia** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H)

Research scientific advisor:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H)

The dissertation will be defended at the Academic Council of Philology, Vilnius University:

Chair – Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Antanas Smetona** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H)

Members:

Dr. **Daiva Murmulaitytė** (Institute of Lithuanian Language, Humanities, Philology – 04H)

Prof. Habil. Dr. **Danguolė Mikulėnienė** (Institute of Lithuanian Language, Humanities, Philology – 04H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Renáta Panocová** (University of Pavol Jozef Šafárik, Humanities, Philology – 04H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Vilma Zubaitienė** (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04H)

The official defense of the dissertation will be held in the public meeting of the Council of Philological Sciences at 15 p.m. on 08 March 2017 in the Kristijonas Donelaitis Auditorium, Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University. Address: 5 Universiteto st., Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was sent out on 08 February 2017.

The text of the dissertation is available at Vilnius University Library and on Vilnius University web page: www.vu.lt/lt/naujienos/ivykiu-kalendorius.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS
LIETUVIŲ LITERATŪROS IR TAUTOSAKOS INSTITUTAS

LINA INČIURAITĖ-NOREIKIENĖ

**DABARTINĖS LIETUVIŲ KALBOS VARDAŽODŽIŲ SU
(NEO)KLASIKINIAIS ELEMENTAIS MORFEMINĖ SANDARA IR
DARYBA**

Daktaro disertacija
Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H)

Vilnius, 2017

Disertacija rengta 2012–2016 m. Vilniaus universite.

Mokslinis vadovas:

Prof. habil. dr. **Bonifacas Stundžia** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H)

Mokslinis konsultantas:

Doc. dr. **Jurgis Pakerys** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkas – doc. dr. **Antanas Smetona** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H)

Nariai:

Dr. **Daiva Murmulaitytė** (Lietuvių kalbos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H)

Prof. habil. dr. **Danguolė Mikulėnienė** (Lietuvių kalbos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H)

Doc. dr. **Renáta Panocová** (Pavlo Jozefo Šafariko universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H)

Doc. dr. **Vilma Zubaitienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2017 m. kovo mėn. 08 d. 15 val. Filologijos fakulteto Kristijono Donelaičio auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2017 m. vasario mėn. 08 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje ir VU interneto svetainėje adresu: www.vu.lt/lt/naujienos/ivykiu-kalendorius.

INTRODUCTION

The **subject** of research is the morphemic structure of nouns and adjectives with (neo)classical elements¹ and their formation in modern Lithuanian. In foreign literature, neoclassical elements are commonly called bound constituents of classical origin (i.e. Ancient Greek and/or Latin) which are used to form compounds (Panocová 2016, 2015a, 2015b; Olsen 2015; Bauer 2014, 1998; Pakuła-Borowiec 2013; Harastani et al. 2012; Petropoulou 2009; ten Hacken 2012; Iacobini, Giuliani 2010; Plag 2003; Lüdeling et al. 2002; Lang 1990, and etc.). In this dissertation, a (neo)classical element is a prefix, suffix, compound constituent, root or stem of Greek and/or Latin origin. The episodic discussion of these elements in Lithuanian linguistics (Urbutis 2009, 1978; Vaicekauskienė 2007; Keinys 2005, 1979; Rudaitienė 2002, 2001; Kupčinskaitė 1997, and etc.) motivated the research of morphemic and word formation analysis. Neoclassical words, in a broad sense, are lexemes of Greek and/or Latin origin, despite the fact that they came into the recipient language through intermediate languages. Some hybrid words might have stems of Germanic, Slavic or Romance origin, however, more than 90% of nouns and adjectives have a (neo)classical stem. In hybrid words, indigenous elements are mixed with the elements borrowed from the classical languages. To be more precise, if a stem, one of several stems or a derivational affix is borrowed, such formations are considered to be hybrid (cf. Fowler 2009, 241). Hybrid formations are divided into derivatives and compounds. Derivatives are combinations of stems and affixes, whereas compounds are combinations of two free stems as well as the first bound and second free stem. Derivatives are further divided into prefixed, suffixed and paradigmatic or inflectional derivatives (Lith. *galūnių vediniai*).

In the compendium of Lithuanian nouns and adjectives with (neo)classical elements, hybrid nouns make up 63% of all words and adjectives – 37%. Derivatives containing (neo)classical stems with three highly productive suffixes, i.e. *-inink-as*, *-ė*, *-ùm-as*, *-im-as* were chosen for the morphemic segmentation of nouns. Three of the most productive indigenous suffixes, i.e. *-in-is*, *-ė*, *-išk-as*, *-a*, *-ing-as*, *-a* were selected for the

¹ In this dissertation, the first bound constituent (neo-) is written in brackets as hybrid words can have a stem only of Greek or Latin origin.

morphemic segmentation of adjectives. The latter suffix is of limited productivity in comparison to *-in-is*, *-ė* and *-išk-as*, *-a*. Regarding word formation, all nouns consisting of a (neo)classical stem and an indigenous affix as well as an indigenous stem and a borrowed affix are investigated in this thesis. Adjectives consisting of (neo)classical stems and indigenous prefixes or suffixes such as *-išk-as*, *-a* and *-ing-as*, *-a* are all investigated, except for the adjectives ending in *-in-is*, *-ė*. A representative sample was chosen taking into account the number of adjectives found with the former two suffixes.

The problem and relevance of research. The dissertation addresses problems related to morphemic structure, word formation and classification of (neo)classical elements in Lithuanian.

The first problem lies in the morphemic segmentation of hybrid words. Difficulties arise when delineating morphemic boundaries within borrowed stems. For instance, the stem of a noun *bombárd-a* ‘bombard’ is borrowed from the French word *bombarder* (which is probably based on Latin *bombus* ‘booming, humming’). In Lithuanian, the noun *bòmb-a* ‘bomb’ exists. If, in this case, the foreign suffix *-ard-* is distinguished, then an idiosyncratic morpheme, which does not occur elsewhere in the Lithuanian language, would appear. Rimkutė, Kazlauskienė and Utkā (2016, 163–164; ALKMŽ [1] 2011, 5–6) encountered with similar difficulties. Seeking solutions, the thesis refers to the studies investigating the morphemic segmentation of words (Urbutis 2009, 1978; Keinys 2009). However, in these studies, more attention is paid to the morphemic structure of indigenous words in standard Lithuanian, rather than to the morphemic structure of hybrid words in contemporary Lithuanian.

The dissertation seeks to answer the question of whether or not word formation relations of nouns and adjectives with (neo)classical elements could be established in Lithuanian. This question does not seem easy to answer, as (neo)classical nouns and adjectives could have received Lithuanian derivational suffixes in the recipient language through morphological adaptation (cf. Pakerys 2016a, 2016b; Vaicekauskienė et al. 2014). It is very likely that nouns and adjectives with prefixes of classical origin are not formed in the recipient language, but are copied from other languages (cf. Panocová 2015, 88; on prefixed verbs cf. Pakerys 2013, 11–12). It is significant to clarify whether in both cases prefixed and suffixed nouns as well as adjectives could be regarded as Lithuanian derivatives. In both cases it is argued that a synchronic derivational link can

be established if hybrid nouns and adjectives form derivational oppositions with (neo)classical words which motivate them both formally and semantically.

Word formation of nouns and adjectives with (neo)classical elements might pose problems because in modern Lithuanian correlative word formation, i.e. word formation on a Neo-Latin basis, has not been fully investigated and described. Urbutis (2009, 293; 1978, 249; on correlative derivation cf. Marchand 1969, 218–219) mentioned it only in passing. As he pointed out, describing word formation synchronically, only functional relations between words should be taken into consideration, meanwhile genetic word relations are the concern of diachronic linguistics.

From a theoretical viewpoint, the morphological status of constituents forming (neo)classical hybrid compounds is also a challenging problem for morphological theory (cf. Panocová 2015, 62). In Lithuanian and other language word formation systems, neither the place of (neo)classical elements is precisely defined, nor there are unanimous opinions on their morphological status. (Neo)classical elements (e.g. *aero-*, *bio-*, *geo-*) are not considered to be independent words or real affixes. In the English dictionaries², they are given dual affiliation assignments, namely as prefixes or as compound constituents. One of the difficulties is to distinguish prefixes from initial compound constituents and suffixes from final compound constituents (cf. Prčić 2008; 2005). The difference is significant and relevant since it lets us assign a word either to derivatives or compounds.

Applying the principles of synchronic word formation analysis, the **aim** of the research is to investigate the morphemic structure and formation of nouns and adjectives with (neo)classical elements in modern Lithuanian. In order to achieve this aim, the following **objectives** have been set:

1. to compose a compendium of Lithuanian nouns and adjectives with (neo)classical elements;
2. to give an overview of the morphological status of compound constituents derived from Greek and Latin and to discuss their role in the Lithuanian morphological system;

² OALD, CALD, MED, AHD, CED, LDOCE, MWD, OED.

3. to lay down the principles of morphemic and word formation analysis applied in this dissertation;
4. to segment hybrid words into morphemes, identify and describe predominant morphemic structural patterns and compare them with the morphemic structure of indigenous words;
5. to investigate and describe the formation of hybrid words and compare them with the formation of indigenous words.

The following **theses** are to be defended:

1. The morphemic structure of hybrid nouns and adjectives is the same as the morphemic structure of indigenous nouns and adjectives. Quadri-morphemic words are predominant in hybrid nouns and penta-morphemic words are predominant in hybrid adjectives.
2. In hybrid nouns, indigenous suffixes fulfil only a derivational function, whereas in hybrid adjectives they fulfil both derivational and adaptational functions.
3. Derivatives formed by attaching a borrowed prefix to an indigenous stem morphologically differ from indigenous prefixed derivatives and derivatives formed by attaching an indigenous prefix to a borrowed stem, whereas hybrid suffixed derivatives and compounds with the first or second (neo)classical stem do not differ morphologically from indigenous suffixed derivatives and indigenous compounds, except for compounds with the first bound stem.
4. The integration of adjectives (with non-native base words and indigenous suffixes) into the Lithuanian word formation system is much closer to the integration of verbs rather than nouns.

Data collection and research methods. The main source of **data** is the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (DLKT). This corpus encompasses about 140 million words, thus, it is by far the largest corpus of the Lithuanian language. A substantial part of this corpus comprises the General Press, namely texts both from regional and national newspapers, the Popular Press as well as the Special Press, i.e. specialised newspapers and magazines. The remainder of it is composed of fiction, memoirs, scientific and popular literature, and various official texts. The Corpus of

Academic Lithuanian³ (CorALit), the electronic Dictionary of Internationalisms (TŽŽ_e), the Alphabetical Dictionary of Lithuanian Language Morphemics (ALKMŽ), the Dictionary of Contemporary Lithuanian (DŽ₇) and the electronic Dictionary of Lithuanian (LKŽ_e) are used as additional data sources. On the basis of these sources, a compendium was compiled by predetermined selection criteria. The words were selected not only according to initial and final combining forms⁴, but also according to indigenous and borrowed affixes⁵. In order to have a more comprehensive compendium, words from the corpora with indigenous and borrowed suffixes (e.g. *-ing-as*, *-ing-o*; *-izm-as*, *-izm-o*) as well as with final combining forms (e.g. *-cid-as*, *-cid-o*, *-cid-ui*) were extracted in all case forms. It is significant to point out that DLKT and CorALit have several drawbacks. The major drawback is that both corpora do not have any kind of morphological or part of speech annotation. It is also worth noting that they were not always helpful, especially when searching for the base word. In that case, the Google search engine helped greatly. However, despite these drawbacks, corpora, as a source of research material, were chosen for three reasons. Firstly, both in Lithuanian and cross-linguistically, a lack of corpus-based studies on word formation has been noticed. Secondly, corpora serve as a research tool for the identification of word formation models, determining distribution of morphemes, measuring productivity of affixes⁶, checking frequency of formations. Thirdly, DLKT and CorALit still have not been widely investigated from the perspective of word formation. Using the older version of DLKT⁷, Mikelionienė (2000) defended her thesis and later published two articles on potential and occasional formations (Mikelionienė 2008; 2002).

Several **research methods** have been applied in this dissertation. One of them is the synchronic approach to morphemic and word formation analysis. Theoretical principles for morphemic segmentation are formulated by Urbutis (2009, 165–166).

³ This corpus consists of about 9 million words. It includes academic texts from biomedical sciences, humanities, physical sciences, social sciences, and technological sciences.

⁴ A list of initial and final combining forms was compiled according to TŽŽ_e and the Dictionary of Prefixes, Suffixes, and Combining Forms (PSCF).

⁵ A list of indigenous affixes was made according to the Grammar of Contemporary Lithuanian (2006), whereas a list of borrowed affixes was made according to TŽŽ_e and the alphabetical list of stem-final elements drawn up by Pakerys (1991).

⁶ Quantitative methods for measuring productivity of affixes have been developed by Cowie and Dalton-Puffer (2002), Bauer (2001), Plag (1999), Baayen (1993), and etc.

⁷ The newer version of this corpus was not available at that time.

Some of the principles are laid down by the author of the dissertation, particularly when morpheme detection concerns the borderline cases between (neo)classical bound stems. Segmenting morphemes into the smallest meaningful units, first of all, indigenous or borrowed affixes were separated and then (neo)classical stems were analysed. In order to make segmentation transparent, free and bound morphemes were manually hyphenated. Regarding synchronic word formation analysis, genetic relations are not taken into consideration, as the current functional relations between formations and their base words have been investigated (Urbutis 2009, 40; 1978, 31; DLKG₄ 2006, 86).

The comparative method applied in the dissertation allows comparison of the morphemic structure and formation of hybrid words with the morphemic structure and formation of indigenous words and identification of the similarities and differences between them.

The corpus-based method involves a computerized search of lexemes and their frequency. Sometimes the semantics of unclear hybrid formations was checked in a concordance line. In linguistics, corpus-based methodology is known as an objective and a reliable method of research.

Qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis will permit determination of which affixes and (neo)classical compound constituents are dominant and how many words are derived with them.

Review of earlier research. Neoclassical words in European languages are quite widespread and constitute a substantial part of vocabulary. As has been pointed out by Stein (1977, 15), neoclassical formations have not been investigated systematically. However, over the following decades, a number of publications on neoclassical formations have appeared. In Lithuanian, an analogous situation can be observed – little research has been conducted on neoclassical lexis from the perspective of morphemic structure and word formation.

One of the first works related to Lithuanian morphemics is the book *Morphemic analysis* written by Kuosienė (1986). The author introduces a general theory of morphemics and illustrates it with examples. Adhering to the principles of synchronic word formation analysis, Keinys published the book *Morphemics of Standard Lithuanian* (2009). He also combines theory with practice, and at the end of the book he provides a glossary of morphemic terms. Keinys referred to Urbutis' monograph *Word formation*

theory (2009, 1978), which is a substantial contribution to word formation studies in Lithuanian. In his monograph, Urbutis formulates the principles of morphemic segmentation and formation of words, highlights the difference between morphemic and derivational analysis, and focuses on morphonological phenomena which had not been studied intensively at that time. However, none of these works are based on a quantitative analysis except for recently conducted research by Rimkutė, Kazlauskienė and Utkā (2016). These authors define and describe the morphemic structural models of inflective parts of speech such as nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, and verbs. Three dictionaries of morphemics (each of them consists of 3 parts), i.e. Alphabetical Dictionary of Lithuanian Language Morphemics, Inverse Alphabetical Dictionary of Lithuanian Language and Frequency Dictionary of Lithuanian Language Morphemics (2011) as well as Lithuanian Language Morphemics Database (2013) are compiled. Even though the morphemic segmentation of some words is debatable (e.g. *auto-biogrāf-in-is*, *-ė* ‘autobiographical’, *degener-āc-in-is*, *-ė* ‘degenerative’), the morphemic analysis carried out by the authors is quite detailed; however, a lack of research dedicated only to the morphemic structure of hybrid words and their comparison with the morphemic structure of indigenous words has been noticed.

Word formation research has received more attention than morphemic analysis of words. Urbutis (2009, 239; 292–293; 1978, 248–249; cf. LKE 2008, 137) is one of the first Lithuanian scholars who mentioned correlative word formation and noticed the phenomenon of truncation in (neo)classical stems. In her dissertation, Mikėlionienė (2000) highlighted some of the features of (neo)classical words; one of them is the convergence of constituents (e.g. *stereo-*, *retro-*, *turbo-*) towards independent lexemes. Keinys also analysed hybrid formations and provided some insights into the structure of borrowings as well as combinatorial properties of hybrid compounds.

Not only word formation, but also morphological adaptation of borrowed words is getting more attention. Valeckienė (1967) is one of the first scholars who described how borrowings are adapted in the recipient language. Vaicekauskienė (2013) observes that if a borrowing is adapted orthographically, it means that it will always be adapted morphologically. In his dissertation, Lanza (2009) investigated morphological adaptation of Italian loanwords in Lithuanian. Using Wohlgemuth’s (2009) direct and indirect

insertion strategies, Pakerys (2013) studied morphological adaptation of verbal borrowings in modern Lithuanian. The author's suggested a five-option typology used to describe the morphological adaptation of borrowed adjectives in Lithuanian and Latvian deserves attention (cf. Pakerys 2016a; 2016b; 2016c).

Foreign scholars, namely Panocová (2016; 2015a; 2015b), Ralli (2013), Prčić (2008; 2005), Baeskow (2004), Lüdeling (2006), Skujiņa (2002, 1997), ten Hacken (2012; 2000), Bauer (1998), Warren (1990) Marchand (1969) offered significant insights into the complex nature of neoclassical word formation. It should be noted that their research are not based on corpora data, except for Pakuła-Borowiec (2013) who investigated four morphemes of classical origin (*super-*, *ekstra-*, *mega-* and *hiper-*) in the Polish National Corpus. She noticed that these morphemes perform different syntactic functions, i.e. as prefixes used with nouns, adjectives, adverbs and free morphemes in the function of nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and exclamations.

Bauer (1998) is one of the first scholars who presented a more detailed discussion on neoclassical compounds. He proposed a three-dimensional system, namely (1) the simplex-derivative-compound dimension, (2) the native-foreign dimension, and (3) the non-abbreviated-abbreviated dimension. Neoclassical compounding is a label given to one small section within this three-dimensional space; however, actual words may diverge from the prototype greatly (Bauer 1998, 419–420). Baeskow (2004) treats neoclassical compounds under a special class of compounds. In her monograph, she introduces prototypical neoclassical compounds and moves to cases diverging from it. Observations on the structure of neoclassical words and the rules involved in the formation of such words are made in ten Hacken's (2000; 1994) articles. Together with Panocová (2014, 1059) he investigated the treatment of neoclassical formatives in English and Russian dictionaries. They arrived at the conclusion that in Russian, neoclassical formations are borrowings from languages such as English or French and their internal structure belongs to the domain of etymology. In her works, Panocová (2016; 2015a; 2015b; 2012b) introduced an onomasiological account of neoclassical word formation in English. She demonstrated that no rigid distinction between native and neoclassical word formation needs to be made in Štekauer's onomasiological word formation model since it helps to avoid a number of complicated problems.

Little research to date has specifically focused on the comparison of neoclassical formations with indigenous formations. In their article, Lüdeling, Schmid and Kiokpasoglou (2002) have illustrated that neoclassical word formation does not differ fundamentally from native word formation. Petropoulou (2009) examined the structure of neoclassical compounds by considering the status of constituent elements as well as drawing a parallel with certain types of compounds in modern Greek. Her comparative analysis has shown that the final constituents of neoclassical compounds can have either verbal or nominal characteristics, which impose certain restrictions on their combinations and determine the structure of the compounds they form.

The structure of dissertation

The dissertation comprises:

1. Introduction. It identifies the object of research, defines its aim and objectives, and emphasizes the relevance of the topic.
2. Methodology section. It introduces the collection of data, its processing and the methods applied.
3. Empirical part. It focuses on the morphemic analysis and formation of hybrid nouns and adjectives.
4. Conclusions.
5. A list of data sources, references and an appendix.

The dissertation also contains a list of abbreviations, a glossary of linguistic terms, and an index of derivational formants.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

MORPHEMIC STRUCTURE OF HYBRID NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES

The quantitative morphemic analysis of nouns has shown (cf. Table 1) that the number of morphemes in hybrid nouns differs. The derivatives suffixed with *-inink-as*, *-ē* contain from three to five morphemes, the derivatives suffixed with *-ùm-as* contain from three to eight morphemes and the derivatives suffixed with *-im-as* contain from four to eight morphemes. Unlike hybrid derivatives ending in *-im-as*, a vast number of

indigenous derivatives consist of three morphemes (e.g. *tyr-ìm-as* ‘research’, *draud-ìm-as* ‘prohibition’).

Table 1. The number of morphemes in hybrid nouns

	<i>-inink-as, -ė</i>	<i>-ùm-as</i>	<i>-im-as</i>
Number of morphemes	from 3 to 5 morphemes	from 3 to 8 morphemes	from 4 to 8 morphemes
Total number (percentage) of nouns found	718 (18.09%)	1481 (37.31%)	1770 (44.60%)

Morphemic structural models of indigenous and hybrid derivatives are similar (e.g. ^{(N)CL}ROOT-^{IND}SUF-^{IND}SUF-FL *anonim-išk-ùm-as* ‘anonymity’ vs. ^{IND}ROOT-^{IND}SUF-^{IND}SUF-FL *dalyk-išk-ùm-as* ‘efficiency’). The main difference between them is that hybrid derivatives are composed of free (e.g. *form-ãv-im-as* ‘formation’) and bound stems (e.g. *geo-dèz-inink-as, -ė* ‘geodesist’), whereas indigenous derivatives are composed of only free stems (e.g. *vikr-uõl-išk-as, -a* ‘quick’). Furthermore, hybrid nouns can consist of four bound stems (e.g. *mikro-limfo-cito-toks-išk-ùm-as* ‘microlymphocytotoxicity’), meanwhile indigenous nouns generally consist of two free stems (e.g. *saldž-ia-liežuv-ãv-im-as* ‘treacle’). Various morphemic combinations have shown that even four indigenous derivational morphemes can form a hybrid noun (e.g. *be-idėj-išk-ùm-as* ‘lack of ideas’). Indigenous prefixes together with a reflexive affix (Lith. *sangrąžos afiksas*) also combine with non-native base verbs (e.g. *iš-si-balans-ãv-im-as* ‘becoming imbalanced’).

The most dominant morphemic structural model is quadri-morphemic nouns (e.g. *barbar-išk-ùm-as* ‘barbarism’, *daktilo-skòp-inink-as, -ė* ‘dactylographer’, *kompens-ãv-im-as* ‘compensation’) which constitute almost half (46.70%) of all nouns. Penta-morphemic nouns (e.g. *anti-human-išk-ùm-as* ‘antihumanity’, *de-form-ãv-im-as* ‘deformation’, *ultra-tri-atlòn-inink-as, -ė* ‘ultratriathlete’) make up more than a quarter (26.75%) of all nouns. Tri-morphemic nouns (e.g. *absoliut-ùm-as* ‘absoluteness’, *farmãc-inink-as, -ė* ‘pharmacist’) comprise less than a fifth (17.92%). Hexa-morphemic nouns (e.g. *daug-ia-etn-išk-ùm-as* ‘multiethnicity’, *individ-u-al-iz-ãv-im-as* ‘individualization’) account for 7.72% of all nouns. Hepta-morphemic nouns (e.g. *de-form-at-yv-išk-ùm-as* ‘deformativity’, *de-centr-al-iz-ãv-im-as* ‘decentralization’) make up only 0.85% of all analysed nouns and octa-morphemic nouns (e.g. *daug-ia-metod-o-*

log-išk-ùm-as ‘multimethodology’, *de-termin-o-log-iz-ãv-im-as* ‘determinologization’) are very rare (0.05%).

The quantitative morphemic analysis of hybrid adjectives has shown (cf. Table 2) that tri-morphemic and quadri-morphemic adjectives are the most dominant. Adjectives with the suffix *-in-is*, *-è* contain from three to eight morphemes, whereas adjectives with the suffix *-išk-as*, *-a* contain from three to seven morphemes and adjectives with the suffix *-ìng-as*, *-a* have from three to five morphemes. The morphemic structural models of words with the former two adjectival suffixes, as a result, are much more diverse.

Table 2. The number of morphemes in hybrid adjectives

	<i>-in-is</i> , <i>-è</i>	<i>-išk-as</i> , <i>-a</i>	<i>-ìng-as</i> , <i>-a</i>
Number of morphemes	from 3 to 8 morphemes	from 3 to 7 morphemes	from 3 to 5 morphemes
Total number (percentage) of adjectives found	10004 (78.77%)	2533 (19.94%)	164 (1.29%)

Morphemic structural models of indigenous and hybrid adjectives are similar (e.g. ^{(N)CL}ROOT-^{IND}SUF-FL *minerãl-išk-as*, *-a* ‘mineral’ vs. ^{IND}ROOT-^{IND}SUF-FL *abêcêl-išk-as*, *-a* ‘alphabetical’). The main difference between hybrid and indigenous adjectives is that the former consist of free (e.g. *tendenc-ìng-as*, *-a* ‘tendentious’) and bound stems (e.g. *geo-krât-in-is*, *-è* ‘geocratic’), whereas the latter consist of free stems (e.g. *űk-išk-as*, *-a* ‘economical’). Bound stems are rare in adjectives suffixed with *-ìng-as*, *-a*, however, they are fairly common in adjectives suffixed with *-in-is*, *-è* and *-išk-as*, *-a*. A small number of adjectives with the former suffix might be the reason why bound stems are quite uncommon. A combination of six (neo)classical bound stems is possible only in hybrid adjectives (e.g. *ezo-fago-gastro-duodeno-fibro-skòp-in-is*, *-è* ‘esophagogastroduodenofibrosopic’), whereas the indigenous ones consist only of two free stems (e.g. *buk-a-pròt-išk-as*, *-a* ‘stupid’).

Quadri-morphemic words (e.g. *aero-kòsm-in-is*, *-è* ‘aerospace’, *demo-grãf-išk-as*, *-a* ‘demographic’, *dis-harmon-ìng-as*, *-a* ‘disharmonious’) are the most dominant and comprise almost half (47.93%) of all adjectives. Tri-morphemic words (e.g. *agres-ìng-as*, *-a* ‘aggressive’, *bìbl-in-is*, *-è* ‘biblical’, *liberãl-išk-as*, *-a* ‘liberal’) constitute more than a third (38.44%) of all adjectives. Penta-morphemic adjectives (e.g. *anti-civiliz-ãc-in-is*, *-è* ‘anticivilizational’, *indo-europ-iêt-išk-as*, *-a* ‘Indo-European’, *ne-toler-ant-ìng-*

as ‘non-tolerant’) make up more than one tenth (12.35%). Hexa-morphemic words (e.g. *neo-imper-ial-ist-in-is*, -ė ‘neoimperialistic’, *literat-ūr-o-lòg-išk-as*, -a ‘literaturological’) account for 1.20% of all adjectives. Hepta-morphemic words (e.g. *de-centr-al-iz-ãc-in-is*, -ė ‘decentralizational’) make up only 0.07% of all analysed adjectives and octa-morphemic adjectives (e.g. *ezo-fago-gastro-duodeno-fibro-skòp-in-is*, -ė ‘esophagogastroduodenofibrosopic’) are particularly rare (0.02%).

Hybrid nouns and adjectives are interpreted as cases of indirect insertion strategy (Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė, Stundžia 2015, 35–36), which manifests an integrational effort to adapt borrowings with the help of affixation (on adaptation of verbal borrowings, cf. Pakerys 2013, 5; the phenomenon of verbalizing derivation in the case of adaptation of borrowings as verbs, cf. Wohlgemuth 2009, 94ff.). The morphemic analysis revealed that in hybrid nouns, indigenous suffixes perform only the derivational function, whereas in hybrid adjectives, they perform both derivational and adaptational functions.

FORMATION OF HYBRID NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES

Hybrid derivatives formed from a (neo)classical stem and an indigenous suffix and an indigenous stem and a borrowed suffix are integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and do not differ from the indigenous derivatives. The analysed hybrid nouns confirmed the following distribution of word formation categories according to the number of derivatives: *nomina actionis* (30.88%), *abstracta* or *nomina qualitatis* (29.39%), *deminutiva* (13.95%), *nomina attributiva* (7.69%), *nomina gentilia* and *nomina regionalia* (7.47%), *nomina agentis* (4.99%), *nomina professionalia* or *nomina auctoris* (4.89%), *nomina loci* (0.40%), *nomina instrumenti* (0.18%) and *nomina verborum et sententiarum* (0.16%). Indigenous nouns have a different distribution of word formation categories starting with *deminutiva* and finishing with *nomina feriarum et ritualia* (cf. DLKG₄ 2006, 87–145).

The category of *nomina actionis* comprises the largest number of hybrid derivatives. The most productive and regular suffix -*im-as* (95.06%) is attached to the past-tense stem of the base verb (e.g. *adorãv-im-as* ‘adoration’ ← *adorãv-o* (PAST of *ador-úo-ti* ‘to adore’)). Hybrid derivatives are formed from verbs with three different suffixes -*úo-ti* (e.g. *dotãv-im-as* ‘subsidy’ ← *dotãv-o* (PAST of *dot-úo-ti* ‘to subsidize’),

-in-ti (e.g. *kultūr-in-im-as* ‘education’ ← *kultūr-in-o* (PAST of *kultūr-in-ti* ‘to educate’ ← *kultūr-à* ‘culture’) and -é-ti (e.g. *liberalēj-im-as* ‘becoming more liberal’ ← *liberalēj-o* (PAST of *liberal-é-ti* ‘to liberalize’ ← *liberāl-as*, -é ‘liberal’). The latter two nouns pass through a two-step derivation. Derivatives with the suffix -uōt-é (4.89%) are not numerous. Most of them are derived from verbal infinitives and also undergo a two-step derivation (e.g. *formul-uōt-é* ‘formulation’ ← *formul-úo-ti* ‘formulate’ ← *fōmul-é* ‘formula’) and two derivatives are formed from prefixed verbs (e.g. *pérfráz-uot-é* ‘rephrasing’ ← *pérfráz-uot-ti* ‘rephrase’). Only one derivative with the suffix -sen-a (0.05%) is formed (e.g. *filosofúo-sen-a* ‘philosophization’ ← *filosof-úo-ti* ‘philosophize’ ← *filosòf-as*, -é ‘philosopher’). In the category of *nomina actionis* a borrowed suffix -āc-ij-a tends to attach to native bases usually in non-codified language (cf. Mikelionienė 2000, 69). Only seven suffixed derivatives are formed out of verbs with an extended suffix -iz-úo-ti (e.g. *pramoniz-āc-ij-a* ‘industrialization’ ← *pramon-izúo-ti* ‘industrialize’ ← *prāmon-é* ‘industry’).

The category *nomina qualitatis* includes formation types of distinct productivity. Hybrid nouns are derived with the following suffixes: -ùm-as (85.95%), -ỹst-é (7.49%) and -y’b-é (6.56%). The majority of derivatives suffixed with -ùm-as are formed from adjectives and only three of them are formed from nouns (e.g. *barbar-ùm-as* ‘barbarity’ ← *bárbar-as* ‘barbarian’). These derivatives have quite an impressive variety of base words suffixed with -išk-as (e.g. *drastišk-ùm-as* ‘drasticity’ ← *drāstišk-as*, -a ‘drastic’), -al-ùs, -i (e.g. *formal-ùm-as* ‘formality’ ← *formal-ùs*, -i ‘formal’ ← *form-a* ‘form’), -ìng-as (e.g. *elasting-ùm-as* ‘elasticity’ ← *elastìng-as*, -a ‘elastic’) and -yv-ùs (e.g. *instinktyv-ùm-as* ‘instinctivity’ ← *instinktyv-ùs*, -i ‘instinctive’ ← *instìnkt-as* ‘instinct’). Some base words refer to past passive participles (e.g. *disciplinuot-ùm-as* ‘a way of being disciplined’ ← *disciplinúot-as*, -a ‘disciplined’ ← *disciplinúo-ti* ‘to discipline’ ← *disciplin-à* ‘discipline’), present passive participles (e.g. *cituojam-ùm-as* ‘quotability’ ← *citúojam-as*, -a ‘quotable’ ← *cit-úo-ti* ‘to quote’) or participles of necessity (e.g. *neinformuotin-ùm-as* ‘unnecessity to inform’ ← *neinformúotin-as*, -a ‘the one who does not have to be informed’). However, it is not always the case that during the word formation process several derivation steps are possible. These steps can be absent in nouns having suffixless base words (e.g. *global-ùm-as* ‘globality’ ← *global-ùs*, -i ‘global’). Word formation variants occur between two derivatives with different

suffixes (e.g. *beprincipišk-ùm-as* ‘lack of principles’ ← *beprincipišk-as*, -a ‘unprincipled’ / *beprinciping-ùm-as* ‘lack of principles’ ← **beprinciping-as*, -a ‘unprincipled’). Hybrid derivative base words can compete with morphologically adapted borrowed adjectives (e.g. *fatališk-ùm-as* ‘fatality’ ← *fatālišk-as*, -a ‘fatal’ / *fatal-ùm-as* ‘fatality’ ← *fatalùs*, -ì ‘fatal’). Derivatives suffixed with *-ỹst-é* and *-ýb-é* are usually derived from nouns (e.g. *agronom-ỹst-é* ‘agronomy’ ← *agronòm-as*, -é ‘agronomist’; *multipiliet-ýb-é* ‘multiple citizenship’ ← *multipiliēt-is*, -é ‘a person with multiple citizenship’) than from adjectives (e.g. *beform-ỹst-é* ‘formlessness’ ← *befòrm-is*, -é ‘formless’; *absoliut-ýb-é* ‘absoluteness’ ← *absoliut-ùs*, -ì ‘absolute’). Sometimes suffixes *-ýb-é* and *-ùm-as* can carry similar meanings (e.g. *abstrakt-ýb-é* / *abstrakt-ùm-as* ‘abstractiveness’ ← *abstrakt-ùs*, -ì ‘abstract’). The category *nomina qualitatis* contains nouns with indigenous stems and borrowed suffixes *-izm-as* (63.74%), *-iad-à* (20.88%) and *-ian-à* (15.38%). The former suffix can be attached both to appellative (e.g. *pažaduk-izm-as* ‘tendency to make promises’ ← *pažadùk-as*, -é ‘a person who tends to make promises’) and proper nouns (*kubil-izm-as* ‘kubilism’ ← *Kubìl-ius* ‘surname of a Lithuanian former prime minister’), whereas the latter two borrowed suffixes are usually attached to proper nouns (e.g. *čiurlion-iad-à* ‘event dedicated to the creations of Čiurlionis’ ← *Čiurlión-is* ‘surname of a Lithuanian painter and composer’; *daukant-ian-à* ‘event dedicated to the creations of Daukantas’ ← *Daũkant-as* ‘surname of a Lithuanian historian and writer’).

Diminutives with indigenous suffixes and (neo)classical stems are quite numerous in Lithuanian. Almost each noun consisting of a (neo)classical stem can be used to derive diminutives. However, some of the diminutive suffixes are more productive than others, cf. e.g.: *-(i)ùk-as*, -é (47.85%), *-ėl-is*, -é (38.10%), *-ėl-is*, -é (5.57%), *-(i)ũkšt-is*, -é (3.60%), *-(i)õk-as*, -é (1.86%), *-ýt-is*, -é (1.51%), *-áit-is*, -é (1.28%), *-ėž-as* (0.12%), *-ùž-is*, -é (0.12%). If *-ėl-is*, -é and *-ėl-is*, -é (e.g. *film-ėl-is* ‘meliorative of *filmas*’ ← *film-as* ‘film’, *bibliotek-ėl-é* ‘meliorative of *bibliotekà*’ ← *bibliotek-à* ‘library’) are regarded as allomorphs of the same suffix, then these suffixes together with *-(i)ùk-as*, -é (e.g. *dinozaur-iùk-as*, -é ‘small dinosaur’ ← *dinozáur-as*, -é ‘dinosaur’) would be approximately equal in productivity. In standard Lithuanian, the most productive suffixes *-ėl-is*, *-ėl-é* and *-ėl-is*, *-ėl-é* are in complementary distribution: the first suffix pair is attached to disyllabic nouns, whereas the second one is attached to polysyllabic

nouns (Stundžia 2016, 3095; DLKG₄ 2006, 90; LKG I 1965, 264). Diminutive suffixes *-iūkšt-is*, *-ė* and *-(i)ðk-as*, *-ė* are also attached to borrowed stems (e.g. *aktor-iūkšt-is*, *-ė* ‘pejorative of *āktorius*, *-ė*’ ← *āktor-ius*, *-ė* ‘actor’, *meistr-ùž-is*, *-ė* ‘meliorative of *méistras*, *-ė*’ ← *méistr-as*, *-ė* ‘master’). The dialectal meaning is retained in the derivatives suffixed with *-(i)ðk-as*, *-ė* (e.g. *studenč-iðk-as*, *-ė* ‘pejorative of *studeñt-as*, *-ė*’ ← *studeñt-as*, *-ė* ‘student’). The suffixes *-ýt-is*, *-ė* and *-áit-is*, *-ė* are commonly used in works of fiction and carry the meaning of smallness and pleasure (e.g. *problem-ýt-ė* ‘meliorative of *problemà*’ ← *problem-à* ‘problem’, *altor-áit-is* ‘meliorative of *altōrius*’ ← *altōr-ius* ‘altar’), meanwhile derivatives suffixed with *-ėž-as* have a pejorative meaning (e.g. *europ-ėž-as*, *-ė* ‘pejorative of European’ ← *Europ-à* ‘Europe’). Processes of intensification such as diminution can lead to affix pleonasm, e.g. *bankuž-ėl-is* ‘meliorative of *bankùžis*’ ← *bankùž-is* ‘meliorative of *bánkas*’ ← *bánk-as* ‘bank’, *figurėl-ýt-ė* ‘meliorative of *figūrēlē*’ ← *figūrēl-ė* ‘meliorative of *figūrà*’ ← *figūr-à* ‘figure’ (Lehmann 2005, 145; more on affix pleonasm cf. Gardani 2015, 537–550). Diminutives differ from other categories that they do not result from a process of derivation but from a process of modification in which word class is retained and just the meaning is modified (cf. Schneider 2013, 137–138; Urbutis 2009, 199–200). The same suffix can carry both a diminutive and a pejorative meaning, thus, context plays a crucial role in specifying the meaning of a suffix (e.g. *simpātiškas automobil-iùk-as* ‘a nice little car’ ← *automobil-is* ‘car’ vs. *suklēręs autobus-iùk-as* ‘a clapped-out minibus’ ← *autobùs-as* ‘bus’).

In the category *nomina attributiva*, the most productive suffix attached to (neo)classical stems is *-inink-as*, *-ė* (97.38%), whereas suffixes *-uðl-is*, *-ė* (0.87%), *-aĩn-is*, *-ė* (0.87%), *-iðk-as*, *-ė* (0.44%) and *-ėiv-a*, *-ė* (0.44%) have proved to be unproductive. The vast majority of *-inink-as*, *-ė* derivatives denote people named according to their achieved result (e.g. *aštuntfinal-inink-as*, *-ė* ‘eighth finalist’ ← *aštuntfinal-is* ‘eighth final’), a particular disease (e.g. *āstm-inink-as*, *-ė* ‘asthmatic’ ← *astm-à* ‘asthma’), behaviour or way of thinking (e.g. *dògm-inink-as*, *-ė* ‘dogmatist’ ← *dogm-à* ‘dogma’), and etc. A small minority of derivatives are formed from adjectives (e.g. *privāt-inink-as*, *-ė* ‘a person who owns property’ ← *privat-ùs*, *-i* ‘private’). The suffix *-inink-as*, *-ė* also attaches to abbreviations (e.g. *EBSW-inink-as*, *-ė* ‘a person who works for EBSW’ ← *EBSW* ‘proper name of a company’). Sometimes nouns might not form derivational

oppositions, particularly if the meaning of both nouns is the same (e.g. *antikonservātor-inink-as*, -*é* ‘anticonservative’ / *antikonservātor-ius*, -*é* ‘anticonservative’). Derivatives suffixed with *-inink-as*, -*é* can denote things, however, such cases are not typical and are considered to be word formation mistakes (e.g. *sekùnd-inink-as* ‘clock’ ← *sekùnd-é* ‘second’ vs. *sekùnd-inink-as* ‘a customer of the bank *Sekund-é*’ ← *Sekùnd-é* ‘proper name of a bankrupt bank’). Overall, four derivatives are formed with the suffix *-uōl-is*, -*é* (e.g. *agresyv-uōl-is*, -*é* ‘aggressive person’ ← *agresyv-ùs*, -*ì* ‘aggressive’ ← *agrès-ij-a* ‘aggression’) and *aĩn-is*, -*é* (e.g. *lager-aĩn-is* ‘person who was in a concentration camp’ ← *lāger-is* ‘concentration camp’). Only two nouns are derived by *-éiv-a*, -*é* attachment (e.g. *stil-éiv-a* ‘stylish person’ ← *stīl-ius* ‘style’). The category *nomina attributiva* contains 17 hybrid derivatives with the indigenous stem and a borrowed suffix *-ist-as*, -*é*. The base words of these derivatives can be common (*vabal-ist-as*, -*é* ‘person driving a Volkswagen Beetle’ ← *vābal-as* ‘Volkswagen Beetle’) and proper nouns (*čiurlion-ist-as*, -*é* ‘čiurlionist’ ← *Čiurlionis* ‘proper name of a Lithuanian painter and composer’). Only one derivative is formed from an adjective (*nuog-ist-as*, -*é* ‘undressed person’ ← *núog-as*, -*à* ‘undressed’).

The category of *nomina gentilia* and *nomina regionalia* contains derivatives with the suffixes *-iēt-is*, -*é* (97.75%) and *-išk-is*, -*é* (3.25%). The former suffix is very productive not only with indigenous, but also with non-neoclassical stems (e.g. *egipt-iēt-is*, -*é* ‘Egyptian’ ← *Egipt-as* ‘Egypt’), whereas the latter suffix is unproductive (e.g. *london-išk-is*, -*é* ‘resident of London’ ← *Lòndon-as* ‘London’).

The category of *nomina agentis* comprises a sizeable class of derivatives. The suffix *-toj-as*, -*a* attaches productively to infinitives with the suffix *-úo-ti* (92.53%), e.g. *egzamin-úo-toj-as*, -*a* ‘examiner’ ← *egzamin-úo-ti* ‘to examine’ ← *egzāmin-as* ‘examination’. 4.87% of derivatives are derived from infinitives with the suffix *-in-ti* (e.g. *nòrmin-toj-as*, -*a* ‘standardizer’ ← *norm-in-ti* ‘standardize’ ← *nòrm-a* ‘norm’) and 2.60% of derivatives are derived from infinitives with the suffix *-áu-ti* (e.g. *humoráu-toj-as*, -*a* ‘humorist’ ← *humor-áu-ti* ‘to joke’ ← *hùmor-as* ‘humour’). A tendency to derive words denoting chemical substances with the suffix *-toj-as*, -*a* has been noticed (e.g. *oksìdin-toj-as* ‘oxidizer’ ← *oksìd-in-ti* ‘oxidize’ ← *oksìd-as* ‘oxide’). Such derivatives are regarded as word formation mistakes because words denoting chemical substances

are, as a rule, derived by *-ìkl-is* attachment (e.g. *oksid-ìkl-is* ‘oxidizer’ ← *oksid-as* ‘oxide’).

In the category of *nomina professionalia*, the most productive suffix is *-inink-as*, *-è* (97.33%), e.g. *bibliofilòtyr-inink-as*, *-è* ‘a person investigating bibliophily’ ← *bibliofilòtyr-a* ‘bibliophilic investigation’, whereas the least productive suffix is *-íen-è* (2.67%), e.g. *president-íen-è* ‘wife of a president’ ← *prezideñt-as*, *-è* ‘president’. The latter suffix characterizes the matrimonial status of women. Hybrid derivatives often contain a truncated stem, as formants *-ij-* and *-ik-* are omitted (e.g. *enciklopèd-inink-as*, *-è* ‘encyclopedia’ ← *enciklopèd-ij-a* ‘encyclopedia’, *metòd-inink-as*, *-è* ‘methodologist’ ← *metòd-ik-a* ‘methodology’). Not only profession nouns (e.g. *etiùd-inink-as ponas Krescas* ‘composer of études Mr. Kresc’ ← *etiùd-as* ‘étude’), but also instrument nouns can be derived with the suffix *-inink-as*, *-è*, however, such cases are extremely rare and are regarded as word formation mistakes (e.g. *apdulkèjës etiùd-inink-as* ‘dusty portable étude composing device’ ← *etiùd-as* ‘étude’). Word formation variants can be observed between derivatives having the same suffix and base word (e.g. *dokument-ãl-inink-as*, *-è* / *dokumeñt-inink-as*, *-è* ‘documentalist’ ← *dokumeñt-in-is*, *-è* ‘documentary’) and derivatives having the same suffix but distinct base words (*parfumèr-inink-as*, *-è* ‘perfumer’ ← *parfumèr-ij-a* ‘perfumery’ / *parfùm-inink-as*, *-è* ‘perfumer’ ← *parfùm-as* ‘perfume’). Word formation variants are likewise noticed between hybrid and correlative derivatives having the same base words (*akvãrium-inink-as*, *-è* / *akvarium-ìst-as*, *-è* ‘aquarist’ ← *akvãrium-as* ‘aquarium’), and hybrid derivatives and borrowings (*literat-ũr-inink-as*, *-è* ‘litterateur’ ← *literat-ũr-à* ‘literature’ / *literãt-as*, *-è* ‘litterateur’).

In the category of *nomina loci* the most productive suffix is *-ýn-as*. Overall, 25 derivatives are recorded with this suffix. The derivatives denote not only places visited by people (e.g. *filolog-ýn-as* ‘location where philology students study’ ← *filològ-as*, *-è* ‘philologist’), but also places where something is kept (e.g. *adres-ýn-as* ‘addressee list’ ← *ãdres-as* ‘address’).

The category of *nomina instrumenti* includes derivatives suffixed with *-tùv-as*, *-ìkl-is* and *-uòkl-is*. Only seven derivatives are formed by affixing the former suffix (e.g. *chlorin-tùv-as* ‘a chlorinator’ ← *chlòr-in-ti* ‘to chlorinate’ ← *chlòr-as* ‘chlorine’) and five derivatives are formed by affixing the latter two suffixes (e.g. *masaž-ìkl-is* / *masaž-*

uðk-lis ‘massage device’ ← *masaž-úo-ti* ‘to massage’ ← *masãž-as* ‘massage’, *lit-uðkl-is* ‘soldering iron’ ← *lit-úo-ti* ‘to solder’).

The category of *nomina verborum et sententiarum* does not contain many derived nouns. Overall, 8 derivatives in *-ýb-è* are formed from nouns denoting nationalities (e.g. *amerikon-ýb-è* ‘Americanism’ ← *amerik-ðn-as, -è* ‘American’ ← *Amèrik-a* ‘America’). Only 2 nouns with borrowed suffixes are recorded (e.g. *vokiet-izm-as* ‘Germanism’ ← *vókiet-is* ‘German’, *žemait-izm-as* ‘a word from the Žemaitian dialect’ ← *žemaĩt-is, -è* ‘žemaitian person’).

In Lithuanian, conversion is a derivational process which seems to be much more productive than prefixation. The result of conversion is a new word which differs from the base word in the inflectional paradigm and frequently, but not necessarily, also in the word class (cf. Stundžia 2016, 3102). According to Lithuanian word formation tradition, words formed by conversion are labelled as paradigmatic or inflectional derivatives. However, paradigmatic derivatives containing a borrowed stem are rare in Lithuanian (e.g. *spèrm-is* ‘male reproductive cell in gymnosperms and angiosperms’ ← *spèrm-a* ‘sperm’). Two paradigmatic derivatives are derived from proper nouns (e.g. *euròp-is* ‘Europium’ ← *Europ-à* ‘Europe’, *germãn-is* ‘Germanium’ ← *Germãn-ij-a* ‘Germania’). In the stem of the latter derivative, the affix *-ij-* is erased.

Most derivatives containing an indigenous prefix and a borrowed stem (e.g. *pó-grup-is* ‘subgroup’ ← *grùp-è* ‘group’) are integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and do not differ morphonologically from the indigenous prefixed derivatives (e.g. *pó-šeim-is* ‘subclass’ ← *šeim-à* ‘family’), whilst derivatives with borrowed prefixes and indigenous stems (e.g. *anti-dìdvyr-is, -è* ‘antihero’ ← *dìdvyr-is, -è* ‘hero’) are not integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and morphonologically differ from indigenous prefixed derivatives, except for the derivative *anti-kūn-is* ‘antibody’ (← *kūn-as* ‘body’) that besides a change in inflection has also a stressed prefix. Lithuanian has fewer indigenous prefixes (17) than the borrowed ones (> 21). The most productive borrowed prefixes are *super-* (40.09%), e.g. *super-dvìratininkas, -è* ‘supercyclist’ ← *dvìratininkas, -è* ‘cyclist’, and *anti-* (18,68%), e.g. *anti-lietùvis, -è* ‘antilithuanian’ ← *lietùvis, -è* ‘Lithuanian’. Some of the prefixed derivatives may in principle receive two different interpretations. For instance, they can be interpreted as prefixed derivatives due to a reasonable derivational link between a prefixed derivative, and its base word may be

established (e.g. *super-atsargùmas* ‘supercaution’ ← *atsargùmas* ‘caution’). However, they can also be interpreted as suffixed derivatives (e.g. *superatsarg-ùm-as* ‘supercaution’ ← *superatsarg-ùs*, -ì ‘supercautious’). Circumfixation as a morphological process, although relatively rare in nouns, does occur in Lithuanian. For instance, *anti-grūt-inink-as*, -ė ‘person opposing Grūtas Parkas’ contains two bound morphemes (*anti-* and *-inink-*) which are attached to the base word simultaneously.

Morphonological behaviour of hybrid compounds that consist of the first indigenous and second borrowed constituent (e.g. *kiet-metal-is* ‘strong metal’ ← *kiet-as*, -à, ‘strong’ + *metāl-as* ‘metal’) and the first borrowed and second indigenous constituent (e.g. *betòn-vež-is* ‘concrete truck’ ← *betòn-as* ‘concrete’ + *vėž-a* (PRESENT of *vėž-ti* ‘to carry’)) does not differ from indigenous compounds (e.g. *rūd-ó-vež-is* / *rūd-vež-is* ‘ore truck’ ← *rūd-à* ‘ore’ + *vėž-a* (PRESENT of *vėž-ti* ‘to carry’)). Compounds that are made of the first (neo)classical bound stem and second indigenous stem (e.g. *bio-gėrim-as* ‘biodrink’ ← *bio-* + *gėrim-as* ‘drink’) show no morphonological integration, which is characteristic of hybrid compounds with the first indigenous and second (neo)classical constituent as well as compounds with the first (neo)classical and second indigenous constituent. However, in spoken language, a tendency to adapt and integrate words with the first (neo)classical bound stem can be observed (e.g. *turb-ó-grąžt-is* ‘turbo drill’ ← *turbo* + *grąžtas* ‘drill’). The most productive bound stems in hybrid compounds are *pseudo-* (15.83%), e.g. *pseudobaĩsas* ‘pseudovoice’, *mikro-* (12.80%), e.g. *mikroerdvė* ‘microspace’, *auto-* (9.29%) *autodiėnos* ‘autodays’, *tele-* (7.68%), e.g. *teležėnklas* ‘telesign’. Some compounds with the first bound stem could receive two interpretations. In the first interpretation, they could be regarded as derivatives (e.g. *agromiřkinink-ỹst-ė* ‘agroforestry’ ← *agromiřk-inink-as*, -ė ‘agroforester’, whereas in the second interpretation they could be regarded as compounds (*agro-miřkininkỹstė* ← *agro-* + *miřkininkỹstė* ‘forestry’). The majority of analysed Lithuanian compounds with (neo)classical constituents as well as indigenous compounds are determinative, namely, they are characterized by a subordinate relation in which the first constituent modifies the second one that functions morphosyntactically and semantically as the head of the construction (e.g. *bendr-a-áutor-is*, -ė ‘co-author’ ← *beĩdr-as*, -à ‘common’ + *áutor-ius*, -ė ‘author’). Moreover, there are also some copulative compounds that encompass a

coordinative relation between the native and borrowed constituent (e.g. *gėlž-beton-is* ‘ferroconcrete’ ← *gelež-īs* ‘iron’ + *betòn-as* ‘concrete’).

Hybrid (neo)classical adjectives are to be interpreted as cases of indirect insertion strategy, as they are integrated with the help of derivational affixes. As to correlative formations and borrowed simplex words, they are attributed to the cases of direct insertion strategy, as they are integrated with the help of adaptational affixes (cf. Wohlgemuth 2009, 87ff.). The largest number of adjectives with the borrowed stems are recorded with indigenous suffixes *-in-is*, *-ė* (78.77%), *-išk-as*, *-a* (19.94%) and only 1.29% with *-ing-as*, *-a*. In hybrid adjectives, suffixes fulfil two functions, namely derivational and adaptational. The former function could be observed in adjectives containing (neo)classical base words (e.g. *civil-in-is*, *-ė* ‘civil’ ← *civil-is* ‘civilian’, *dèmon-išk-as*, *-a* ‘demonic’ ← *dèmon-as* ‘demon’, *afekt-ing-as*, *-a* ‘affective’ ← *afèkt-as* ‘affect’). The latter function is predominant in adjectives that do not have any base words in the recipient language, e.g. *aforìst-in-is*, *-ė* ‘aphoristic’ (TŽŽ_e only *afor-izm-as* ‘aphorism’), *odiòz-išk-as*, *-a* ‘odious’ (TŽŽ_e only *odiòz-in-is* ‘odious’), *chaot-ing-as*, *-a* ‘chaotic’ (TŽŽ_e only *chaos-as* ‘chaos’).

Hybrid adjectives are derived from nouns (e.g. *balzām-in-is*, *-ė* ‘balmy’ ← *balzām-as* ‘balm’, *elìps-išk-as*, *-a* ‘elliptical’ ← *èlips-ė* ‘ellipsis’, *aromat-ing-as*, *-a* ‘aromatic’ ← *aromāt-as* ‘aroma’). It has been noticed that they tend to have truncated stems (formants *-ij-*, *-ik-*, *-os-* are omitted), e.g. *dinām-išk-as*, *-a* ‘dynamic’ ← *dinām-ik-a* ‘dynamics’, *disharmon-ing-as*, *-a* ‘disharmonious’ ← *disharmòn-ij-a* ‘disharmony’, *migrāc-in-is*, *-ė* ‘migrational’ ← *migrāc-ij-a* ‘migration’, *kòsm-in-is* ‘cosmic’ ← *kòsmos-as* ‘universe’. Some of the adjective pairs compete with each other (e.g. *adaptỹv-in-is*, *-ė* / *adaptyv-ūs*, *-ì* ‘adaptive’). Competition between two derivatives with different suffixes can be also observed (e.g. *ritm-išk-as* / *ritm-ing-as* *judesỹs* ‘rhythmic(al) movement’) (cf. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė, Stundžia 2016). Hybrid suffixed derivatives also compete with borrowed adjectives (e.g. *sakrāl-išk-as*, *-a* / *sakral-ūs*, *-ì* ‘sacred’).

The majority of hybrid adjectives containing an indigenous prefix and a borrowed stem (e.g. *apy-normal-is*, *-ė* ‘rather normal’ ← *normal-ūs*, *-ì* ‘normal’) are integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and morphonologically do not differ from indigenous prefixed adjectives (e.g. *apy-jauk-is*, *-ė* ‘rather comfortable’ ← *jauk-ūs*, *-ì* ‘comfortable’), whereas derivatives containing a borrowed prefix and an indigenous

stem are not morphologically integrated and differ from indigenous prefixed derivatives. The most productive borrowed prefixes are *super-* (32.38%), e.g. *super-aštrūs*, -i ‘super sharp’ ← *aštrūs*, -i ‘sharp’ and *anti-* (31.52%) *anti-veidrodis*, -ė ‘antispecular’ ← *veidrodis*, -ė ‘specular’. Circumfixation seems exceedingly rare in noun formation; however, it is fairly common in adjective formation. Circumfixation is realized mostly by simultaneously adding an indigenous prefix and suffix: e.g. *po-šok-in-is*, -ė ‘after shock’ ← *šokas* ‘shock’, *iki-* ‘pre-’ (16.67%), e.g. *iki-ministèr-in-is*, -ė ‘pre-ministerial’ ← *ministèr-ij-a* ‘ministry’, *prieš-* ‘before’ (16.67%), e.g. *prieš-agrès-in-is*, -ė ‘pre-aggressive’ ← *agrès-ij-a* ‘aggression’.

Morphological behaviour of hybrid compound adjectives that consist of the first indigenous and second (neo)classical constituent (e.g. *plač-ia-ekrān-is*, -ė ‘wide-screen’ ← *plat-ūs*, -i ‘wide’ + *ekrān-as* ‘screen’) are integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and do not differ morphologically from indigenous compounds (e.g. *plač-ia-ašmėn-is*, -ė ‘wide-bladed’ ← *plat-ūs*, -i ‘wide’ + *ašm-uõ* ‘blade’), meanwhile (neo)classical hybrid compounds with the first bound stem and the second indigenous stem are not morphologically integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system (e.g. *kvazi-gyvėnimiškas*, -a ‘quasi-lifelike’ ← *kvazi* + *gyvėnimiškas*, -a ‘lifelike’). The most productive bound stem attached to Lithuanian stems is *pseudo-* (32%), e.g. *pseudo-taikūs*, -i ‘pseudopeaceful’ ← *pseudo* + *taikūs*, -i ‘peaceful’. Only one adjective with the first bound stem is morphologically integrated *mega-lāp-is*, -ė ‘megaleaf’. Finally, compounds with the first bound stem and the second hybrid stem are also numerous (e.g. *biopsichosociāl-in-is*, -ė ‘biopsychosocial’, *multifunkc-in-is*, -ė ‘multifunctional’). The latter adjective competes with the morphologically integrated adjective *multifunkc-is*, -ė ‘multifunctional’.

CONCLUSIONS

1. (Neo)classical elements, the morphological status of which is still being discussed in literature, in Lithuanian function as prefixes or stems. The latter are known as free or bound stems. In Lithuanian bound elements function as productive ones which can become free in the future, as, for instance, the prefix *ultra-*. The basic difference between prefixes and bound stems is that the former can change the position in a word, i.e. they can be the first or second stem of a compound, whereas a prefix occupies only a fixed position, i.e. it comes before a root and modifies its meaning.
2. The following similarities and differences in the morphemic structure between indigenous and hybrid nouns and adjectives are highlighted.
 - 2.1. Indigenous words consist of only free stems, whereas hybrid words consist of free and bound stems. Hybrid words can contain four bound stems, meanwhile in the morphemic structure of indigenous words, a combination of more than two free stems occurs rarely.
 - 2.2. In the group of words derived by adding indigenous suffixes to (neo)classical bases, quadri-morphemic words dominate. Although hybrid and indigenous words have a similar number of morphemes, tri-morphemic hybrid nouns suffixed with *-im-as*, unlike indigenous ones, do not exist.
 - 2.3. According to the number of morphemes, the most common morphemic structural patterns of hybrid words are the following: a) ^{(N)CL}ROOT-^{IND}SUF-FL; b) ^BSTEM-^{(N)CL}ROOT-^{IND}SUF-FL; c) ^{(N)CL}ROOT-^{IND}SUF-^{IND}SUF-FL. These models differ from the indigenous structural models in the presence of bound stems.
 - 2.4. In indigenous nouns and adjectives, a suffixal consonant may function as a separate morpheme, meanwhile in (neo)classical nouns and adjectives suffixal consonants are not detected.
 - 2.5. Bound and free stems of classical origin first of all combine with other bound and free stems as well as affixes of classical origin, whereas indigenous affixes tend to combine both with indigenous as well as bound, free stems and affixes of classical origin.
3. In the word formation system of contemporary Lithuanian, the following similarities and differences between indigenous and hybrid nouns and adjectives are highlighted.

- 3.1. Derivatives formed by attaching indigenous nominal and adjectival suffixes to (neo)classical base words and derivatives formed by attaching borrowed nominal suffixes to indigenous base words, are integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and do not differ morphologically from indigenous derivatives. The analysed hybrid nouns confirmed the following distribution of word formation categories in accordance with the number of derivatives: *nomina actionis*, *abstracta* or *nomina qualitatis*, *deminutiva*, *nomina attributiva*, *nomina gentilia* and *nomina regionalia*, *nomina agentis*, *nomina professionalia* or *nomina auctoris*, *nomina loci*, *nomina instrumenti* and *nomina verborum et sententiarum*. The distribution of indigenous words assigned to a particular word formation category differs from the distribution of hybrid words. The most productive noun suffixes are *-im-as*, *-um-as*, *-inink-as*, *-ė*, *-iēt-is*, *-ė*, *-ūk-as*, *-ėl-is*, *-toj-as*, *-a*. Derivatives with borrowed suffixes attached to indigenous base words, except for *-izm-as* derivatives, are not very widespread. 78,77% of adjectives are found with the suffix ending in *-in-is*, *-ė*. Adjectives in *-išk-as*, *-a* constitute 19,94% of all adjectives, whereas adjectives in *-ing-as*, *-a* comprise 1,29%.
- 3.2. Paradigmatic derivation from (neo)classical nouns, unlike indigenous ones, is not characteristic of Lithuanian.
- 3.3. The majority of derivatives formed by attaching an indigenous prefix to (neo)classical base words are integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and morphologically do not differ from indigenous prefixed derivatives. Derivatives with borrowed prefixes attached to indigenous base words are not integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system, except rare cases. When a borrowed prefix is attached to an indigenous or hybrid base word, a word does not undergo any morphological changes. Some (neo)classical prefixed derivatives could be interpreted both as prefixed and suffixed derivatives, whereas in indigenous prefixed derivatives such dual interpretation is not possible.
- 3.4. Compound nouns with the first or second (neo)classical free constituent are integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and morphologically do not differ from indigenous compounds. Compound adjectives with the first

indigenous and second (neo)classical free constituent are also integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system and do not differ morphologically from indigenous compounds. Adjectives with the first (neo)classical and second indigenous constituent have not been found. It has been noticed that compound nouns with the first (neo)classical bound stem show a tendency to be integrated into the Lithuanian word formation system. Sometimes hybrid compounds can be interpreted as suffixed derivatives. Dual interpretation is possible when the first (neo)classical compound constituent is bound. The majority of analysed Lithuanian compounds with (neo)classical constituents as well as indigenous compounds are determinative, namely, they are characterized by a subordinate relation in which the first constituent modifies the second one which functions morphosyntactically and semantically as the head of the construction. Moreover, there are also some copulative compounds that encompass a coordinative relation between the native and (neo)classical constituent.

- 3.5. In the formation of adjectives, unlike in that of nouns, words are derived by prefixation-suffixation and compounding-suffixation. In mixed type derivatives, some prefixes are more productive than others. Adjectives formed by compounding-suffixation are considered to be word formation mistakes as the suffix does not any add any derivational meaning.
4. In Lithuanian, words with (neo)classical elements are adapted by using direct and indirect insertion strategies. The latter function is applied to (neo)classical words, which in the recipient language are integrated by using adaptational flections, whereas indirect insertion strategy is applied when words are integrated into the recipient language by using derivational affixes. According to the performed function of indigenous suffixes and the degree of integration of prefixed derivations, the formation of hybrid adjectives is much closer to the formation of verbs than nouns. In verbs and adjectives derived from (neo)classical bases, indigenous suffixes can fulfil adaptational and derivational functions, whereas in nouns indigenous suffixes fulfil only derivational functions. Secondly, in adjectives and verbs formed by attaching an indigenous prefix to (neo)classical bases, morphological expression of derivatives is not changed, except for the indigenous prefixed

derivatives. Thirdly, the integration of bound stems into the Lithuanian word formation system is more common in nouns than in adjectives. Fourthly, in indigenous and hybrid noun derivatives, the suffix is stressed, meanwhile accentuation in indigenous and hybrid adjectives differs. In hybrid adjectives, the stem and not the suffix is usually stressed.

Approbation of dissertation

Published **articles** on the topic of the dissertation:

1. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia 2016, Searching for competing patterns in morphological derivation: The case of adjective borrowing, *Skase Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 13(2), 189–214.
2. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia 2015, On Word Formation Patterns of Hybrid Neoclassical Nouns and Adjectives in Lithuanian, In Stephen Kessler, Artūras Judžentis (eds.), *Contributions to Syntax and Morphology*, 27–50.
3. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina 2015, Lietuvių kalbos dūriniai su neoklasikiniais dėmenimis, *Baltistica* (50)2, 245–259.
4. Inčiuraitė Lina 2013, On the Question of Neoclassical Compounds in Lithuanian, *Verbum* (4), 60–69.
5. Inčiuraitė Lina 2013, Kognityvinis požiūris į žodžių darybą, *Taikomoji kalbotyra* (2), 1–24.

Talks given on the topic of the dissertation at international conferences and seminars:

1. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, *XII tarptautinis baltistų kongresas*, 2015 m. spalio 28-31 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: On the Morphological Status of Neoclassical Elements in Lithuanian.

2. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Jurgis Pakerys, Bonifacas Stundžia, *XII tarptautinis baltų kongresas*, 2015 m. spalio 28-31 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: On Directly and Indirectly Borrowed Verbal Affixes in Lithuanian.
3. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia, *Word-Formation Theories II / Typology and Universals in Word Formation III*, 2015 m. birželio 26-28 d., Slovakija, Košicė. Pranešimo tema: Searching for Competing Patterns in Morphological Derivation: the Case of Adjective Borrowing.
4. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, *Šiuolaikiniai kalbotyros tyrimai: iššūkiai ir sprendimai*, 2015 m. gegužės 15 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Tiesioginis ir netiesioginis afiksų skolinimasis.
5. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Aktualieji senosios rašties ir dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tyrimai*, 2014 m. rugsėjo 19-21d., Lietuva, Druskininkai. Pranešimo tema: Neoklasikinių dūrinių daryba lietuvių kalboje.
6. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Kalbotyros doktorantų dirbtuvės: tyrimai, problemos ir atradimai*, 2014 m. birželio 06 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Hibridiniai priesaginiai daiktavardžiai Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstyne.
7. Inčiuraitė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia, *Nauji baltų kalbų sintaksės ir morfologijos tyrimai*, 2014 m. gegužės 29-30 d., Vokietija, Lubminas. Pranešimo tema: On Word-Formation Patterns of Neoclassical Nouns and Adjectives in Lithuanian.
8. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Vietos genijus – asmenybė ir kūryba kaip erdvės vaizdinys*, 2014 m. gegužės 08 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Hibridiniai priesaginiai vardažodžiai Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstyne.
9. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Lingvistiniai, didaktiniai ir sociokultūriniai kalbos funkcionavimo aspektai*, 2014 m. balandžio 24-25 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Hibridiniai dariniai su neoklasikiniais elementais lietuvių kalboje.

Lina Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė (born 1983) completed her English and Russian language studies at Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities in 2006 (BA in Linguistics), where she also obtained her Master's degree in 2008 (MA in Linguistics, CUM LAUDE). In 2012–2016, she studied for her PhD at Vilnius University. She has published five articles on the topic of the dissertation, has given nine talks at international conferences as well as PhD students' workshops. Since 2011 she has been working at Vilnius University Institute of Foreign Languages Department of English for Physical and Biomedical Sciences.

Research interests: word formation, morphology.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mgr. Kurt Magsamen for his proofreading. All remaining errors are of course my own.

DABARTINĖS LIETUVIŲ KALBOS VARDAŽODŽIŲ SU (NEO)KLASIKINIAIS ELEMENTAIS MORFEMINĖ SANDARA IR DARYBA

Santrauka

Darbo objektas – dabartinės lietuvių kalbos vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais morfeminė sandara ir daryba. Užsienio literatūroje (neo)klasikiniais elementais paprastai vadinami nesavarankiški iš klasikinių kalbų kilę dėmenys, kurie vartojami sudarant dūrinius (Panocová 2016, 2012a, 2012b; Olsen 2015; Bauer 2014, 1998; Pakuła-Borowiec 2013; Harastani et al. 2012; Petropoulou 2009; ten Hacken 2012; Iacobini, Giuliani 2010; Plag 2003; Lüdeling et al. 2002; Lang 1990 ir kt.). Disertacijoje (neo)klasikiniu elementu laikomas graikų arba lotynų kalbų kilmės priešdėlis, priesaga, dūrinio dėmuo, šaknis ar kamienas. Epizodiškas šių elementų aptarimas lietuvių kalbotyroje (Urbutis 2009, 1978; Vaicekauskienė 2007; Keinys 2005, 1979; Rudaitienė 2002, 2001, 1988, 1978; Kupčinskaitė-Ryklienė 1997 ir kt.) paskatino pasirinkti juos šio tyrimo objektu. Gali pasitaikyti vienas kitas germanų, slavų ar romanų kilmės darybos pamatą turintis vardažodis, tačiau daugiau nei 90 % vardažodžių sudaro (neo)klasikinį darybos pamatą turintys žodžiai. Disertacijoje jais plačiąja prasme laikomi visi žodžiai, kurių šaltinis – graikų arba lotynų kalba, nesvarbu, ar jie į kalbą pateko tiesiogiai, ar per kalbas tarpininkes.

Lietuvių kalbos vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais sąvade (toliau – Sąvadas) beveik du trečdalius hibridinių žodžių sudaro daiktavardžiai (63 %), o būdvardžiai – 37 %. Morfeminei segmentacijai pasirinkti iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių išvesti vediniai su trimis pačiomis dariausiomis priesagomis (*-inink-as*, *-ė*, *-um-as*, *-im-as*). Būdvardžių morfeminei segmentacijai taip pat pasirinkti trys savo darumu išsiskiriantys darybos formantai (*-in-is*, *-ė*, *-išk-as*, *-a*, *-ing-as*, *-a*). Darybiškai nagrinėjant daiktavardžius tiriami visi vediniai, išvesti iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių su indigeniomis priesagomis, bei vediniai, išvesti iš indigenių pamatinių žodžių su skolintais priešdėliais ir priesagomis. Būdvardžių vediniai, padaryti iš savakilmių pamatinių žodžių su skolintais priešdėliais, bei priesagų *-išk-as*, *-a* ir *-ing-as*, *-a* vediniai, padaryti iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių, tiriami visi, išskyrus priesagos *-in-is*, *-ė* vedinius. Itin produktyvios priesagos *-in-is*, *-ė* vedinių reprezentatyvi imtis (2985

būdvardžiai, arba 52,53 %) sudaryta atsižvelgiant į su kitomis priesagomis užfiksuotą bendrą būdvardžių skaičių.

Tyrimo problema ir aktualumas. Disertacijoje keliamos su žodžių morfemine sandara, daryba ir (neo)klasikinių elementų klasifikacija susijusios problemos.

Pirmoji problema – (neo)klasikinių kamienų morfeminė skaida. Kyla sunkumų dėl morfemų ribų (neo)klasikiniuose kamienuose, pavyzdžiui, ar žodyje *bombárda* skirti morfemą *-ard-*, ar neskirti. Su panašiais sunkumais susidūrė Erika Rimkutė, Asta Kazlauskienė ir Andrius Utkas (2016, 163–164; ALKMŽ [1] 2011, 5–6). Ieškant sprendimo būdų remtasi morfeminiam žodžių skaidymui skirtomis studijomis (Urbutis 2009, 1978; Keinys 2009), tačiau jose daugiausia dėmesio kreipiamas į bendrinės lietuvių kalbos savakilmius žodžius

Disertacijoje sprendžiama problema, kiek galima įžvelgti vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais darybinius santykius lietuvių kalboje. Šią problemą daro sudėtingesnę tai, kad (neo)klasikinius kamienus turintys vardažodžiai kalboje recipientėje lietuviškas tos pačios darybos reikšmės priesagas gali būti gavę juos morfologiškai adaptuojant (plg. Pakerys 2016b, 2015a, 2015b; apie skolintų veiksmažodžių morfologinę adaptaciją žr. Pakerys 2013; Vaicekauskienė et al. 2013). Klasikinių kalbų kilmės priešdėlių vediniai kalboje recipientėje greičiausiai greičiausiai yra atsiradę ne savarankiškai, o kopijuojant kitų kalbų žodžius (plg. Panocová 2015, 88; plačiau apie skolintus priešdėlinius veiksmažodžius žr. Pakerys 2013, 11–12; Keinys 2005, 113). Svarbu išsiaiškinti, ar abiem atvejais priešdėlinius ir priesaginius vardažodžius galima būtų interpretuoti taikant darybinės analizės metodus. Kadangi disertacijoje remiamasi sinchroniniu darybinės analizės metodu, abiem atvejais į minėtus hibridinius vardažodžius siūloma žvelgti darybiškai, ypač kai lietuvių kalboje yra jų bendrakamieniai vardažodžiai, sudarantys darybos opozicijas su morfologiškai sudėtingesniais vardažodžiais.

Lietuvių kalboje vartojamų vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais daryba kelia problemų pirmiausia todėl, kad dabartinės lietuvių kalbos morfologinėje sistemoje iki galo nėra išsamiai ištirta ir aprašyta koreliacinių žodžių daryba, apimanti svetimų kilmės žodžius. Apie šių žodžių darybą prabėgomis yra užsiminęs Vincas Urbutis (2009, 293; 1978, 249; apie koreliacinę derivaciją žr. Marchand 1969, 218–219). Anot jo,

sinchroniškai aprašant darybos sistemą svarbiausia yra ne etimologija, o funkcinis žodžių kilmės suvokimas.

Teoriniu požiūriu yra aktuali (neo)klasikinių elementų klasifikacijos problema. Tiek lietuvių, tiek užsienio kalbų morfologinėje ir darybinėje sistemoje nėra tiksliai apibrėžta (neo)klasikinių žodžių vieta, nėra vieningos nuomonės ir dėl (neo)klasikinių elementų morfologinio statuso. Lietuvių ir kitų kalbų žodžių daryboje vartojami (neo)klasikiniai elementai (pvz.: *aero-*, *bio-*, *geo-*) nėra laikomi nei savarankiškais žodžiais, nei tikrais afiksais. Anglų kalbos žodynuose⁸ jie pateikiami pramaišui su priešdėliais, o kartais ir su dūrinio dėmenimis. Vienas iš sunkumų yra atskirti tarptautinius priešdėlius nuo pradinių žodžių dėmenų ir priesagas nuo galinių žodžio dėmenų. Skirtis yra svarbi ir aktuali, nes nuo to priklauso žodžio priskyrimas vediniams arba dūriniams.

Ši disertacija **aktuali** tuo, kad tai yra pirmasis bandymas išsamiau aprašyti dabartinės lietuvių kalbos vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais morfeminę sandarą ir darybą remiantis autentiška tekstynų ir žodynų medžiaga. Toks aprašas ne tik praplės lietuvių kalbos morfologijos ir žodžių darybos pažinimo lauką, bet ir, greta panašaus pobūdžio Europos kalbų aprašų, gali turėti reikšmės tolimesniems tyrimams. Teoriniu požiūriu svarbus disertacijoje iškeltas (neo)klasikinių priešdėlių nuo pradinių žodžio dėmenų ir priesagų nuo galinių žodžio dėmenų atskyrimo klausimas. Šio klausimo gvildenimas morfologiniu lygmeniu padės geriau suprasti vidinius lietuvių kalbos morfologinės ir žodžių darybos sistemos dėsnius.

Tikslas ir uždaviniai. Disertacijos **tikslas** – remiantis tekstynų medžiaga sinchroniniu aspektu ištirti dabartinės lietuvių kalbos vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais morfeminę sandarą ir darybą. Tikslui pasiekti keliama šie **uždaviniai**:

1. sudaryti lietuvių kalbos vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais sąvadą;
2. apsvarstyti iš lotynų ir graikų kalbų kilusių elementų morfologinį statusą ir aptarti jų vaidmenį lietuvių kalbos morfologinėje sistemoje;
3. apsibrėžti šiame darbe taikomus morfeminės ir darybinės analizės principus;

⁸ OALD, CALD, MED, AHD, CED, LDOCE, MWD, OED.

4. morfemiškai suskaidyti hibridinius vardažodžius, nustatyti ir aprašyti vyraujančius morfeminės struktūros modelius pagal morfemų skaičių, bei palyginti su indigenių žodžių morfemine sandara;
5. taikant sinchroninės darybinės analizės metodą ištirti ir aprašyti hibridinių vardažodžių darybą ir palyginti ją su indigenių žodžių daryba.

Su šiais tyrimo uždaviniais ir apibrėžtu tyrimo objektu bei tikslu yra glaudžiai susiję **ginamieji teiginiai**:

1. Hibridinių vardažodžių morfeminė sandara yra tokia pati kaip ir savakilmių vardažodžių morfeminė sandara. Hibridiniuose daiktavardžiuose vyrauja keturių morfemų žodžiai, o hibridiniuose būdvardžiuose – penkių morfemų žodžiai.
2. Hibridiniuose daiktavardžiuose indigenios priesagos atlieka darybinę funkciją, o hibridiniuose būdvardžiuose – tiek darybinę, tiek adaptacinę funkciją.
3. Vediniai, išvesti iš indigenių pamatinių žodžių su skolintais priešdėliais, morfonologiškai skiriasi nuo indigenių priešdėlių vedinių ir vedinių, išvestų iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių su savais priešdėliais, o hibridiniai priesagų vediniai ir dūriniai, kurių pirmasis arba antrasis sandas yra (neo)klasikinis, morfonologiškai nesiskiria nuo savakilmių priesagų vedinių ir dūrinių, išskyrus dūrinius, kurių pirmąjį sandą sudaro sietinis kamienas.
4. Būdvardžių, išvestų iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių su indigeniomis priesagomis, integracija į lietuvių kalbos darybos sistemą yra artimesnė veiksmažodžių integracijai nei daiktavardžių.

Darbo struktūra ir tyrimo eiga

Disertaciją sudaro įvadas, kuriame aprašomas darbo objektas, tyrimo problematika ir aktualumas, tikslas, uždaviniai, ginamieji teiginiai. Tyrimo kalbinė medžiaga, duomenų atranka ir metodai aptariami antrajame skyriuje, o trečiasis skyrius skirtas (neo)klasikinės leksikos tyrimų apžvalgai, skolintų priešdėlių ir priesagų atskyrimo nuo pradinių ir galinių žodžio dėmenų kriterijams, morfeminės ir darybinės analizės principams.

Tiriamosios darbo dalys yra dvi. Ketvirtajame skyriuje pateikiama hibridinių vardažodžių morfeminė sandara, o penktajame skyriuje – hibridinių vardažodžių daryba.

Darbo pabaigoje pateikiamos išvados, tolesnės numatomų tyrimų perspektyvos, šaltiniai, literatūros sąrašas, priedas.

Disertacijoje yra sutrumpinimų ir simbolių sąrašas, sąvokų žodynėlis, darybos formantų rodyklė.

Tyrimo medžiaga ir metodai. Pagrindinis tiriamosios medžiagos šaltinis yra *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstynas* (DLKT⁹). *Lietuvių mokslo kalbos tekstynas* (CorALit¹⁰), Tarptautinių žodžių žodynas *Interleksis* (TŽŽ_e), *Abėcėlinis lietuvių kalbos morfemikos žodynas* (ALKMŽ), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (DŽ⁷) ir elektroninis *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (LKŽ_e) naudojami kaip papildantys vardažodžių su (neo)klasikiniais elementais sąrašą šaltiniai. Remiantis pagrindine ir papildoma medžiaga morfeminei žodžių sandarai ir darybai analizuoti sudarytas sąvadas, į kurių įeina hibridiniai ir (neo)klasikiniai žodžiai, grupuojami pagal (neo)klasikinius pradinius / galinius žodžio dėmenis bei skolintus / indigenius sus. Į vieną žodžių grupę įeina visi žodžiai, turintys tam tikrą pradmenį / baigmenį arba priesagą / priešdėlį.

Šiame darbe taikoma keletas tyrimo metodų. Vienas iš jų – sinchroninė morfeminė ir darybinė žodžių analizė, kuri nuosekliai išdėstyta Vinco Urbučio (2009, 1978) monografijoje. Sinchroninė morfeminės skaidos analizė leidžia nustatyti hibridinių vardažodžių morfeminius struktūros modelius, o žodžių darybinė analizė suteikia instrumentariją vardažodžių darybos ypatumams išryškinti.

Lyginamuoju metodu siekiama atskleisti hibridinių ir savakilmių vardažodžių morfeminės sandaros ir darybos panašumus ir skirtumus.

Tyrime remiamasi tekstynų inspiruota metodologija, apimančia kompiuterizuotą lingvistinių elementų paiešką, leksemų dažnių sąrašus. Kartais neaiškių darinių semantika tiriama konkordanso eilutėje.

Disertacijoje pateikiama kokybinė ir kiekybinė analizė leis nustatyti kokie (neo)klasikiniai elementai vyrauja dabartinėje lietuvių kalboje, kiek hibridinių vardažodžių su jais pasidaryta.

⁹ DLKT sudaro grožinė ir negrožinė literatūra, administracinė literatūra, publicistika ir sakytinė kalba.

¹⁰ Ši tekstyną sudaro įvairių mokslo sričių – biomedicinos, humanitarinių, socialinių, fizinių mokslų, technologijų – leksika.

Išvados

1. (Neo)klasikiniai elementai, dėl kurių morfologinio statuso mokslinėje literatūroje tebediskutuojama, lietuvių kalboje funkcionuoja arba kaip priešdėliai, arba kaip kamienai. Pastarieji yra laisvieji ir sietiniai. Lietuvių kalboje skolinti priešdėliai ir sietiniai kamienai funkcionuoja kaip produktyvūs nesavarankiški elementai, kurie ateityje gali įgyti savarankiškumo, pavyzdžiui, kaip priešdėlis *ultra-*. Esminis skirtumas tarp priešdėlių ir sietinių kamienų yra tas, kad pastarieji gali keisti poziciją žodyje, t. y. eiti pirmuoju arba antruoju dūrinio dėmeniu, o priešdėlis užima fiksuotą poziciją, t. y. visada eina prieš šaknį ir modifikuoja jos reikšmę.
2. Konstatuoti tokie indigenių ir hibridinių vardažodžių morfeminės sandaros skirtumai.
 - 2.1. Savakilmiams vardažodžiams būdingi tik laisvieji kamienai, o hibridiniams vardažodžiams – tiek laisvieji, tiek sietiniai kamienai. Laisvieji kamienai sudaro dvinarius derinius, o sietiniai – keturnarius derinius.
 - 2.2. Priesaginių vardažodžių, padarytų iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių, grupėje vyrauja keturių morfemų žodžiai. Nors hibridiniams ir savos kilmės vardažodžiams būdingas panašus morfemų skaičius, trijų morfemų hibridinių priesagos *-im-as* vedinių, skirtingai nei indigenių, nėra sudaryta.
 - 2.3. Dažniausi hibridinių vardažodžių morfeminės struktūros modeliai yra tokie: a) ^{SK}ŠAKN-^{IND}PRIES-GAL; b) ^{SIET}KAM-^{SK}ŠAKN-^{IND}PRIES-GAL; c) ^{SK}ŠAKN-^{IND}PRIES-^{IND}PRIES-GAL. Hibridinių vardažodžių morfeminės struktūros modeliai nuo indigenių vardažodžių morfeminės struktūros modelių skiriasi sietinių kamienų buvimu.
 - 2.4. Indigeniuose vardažodžiuose priesaga gali būti sudaryta iš priebalsio, o (neo)klasikinę darybos pamatą turintiems vardažodžiams tai nebūdinga.
 - 2.5. Klasikinių kalbų kilmės sietiniai ir laisvieji kamienai jungiasi pirmiausia su kitais klasikinių kalbų kilmės sietiniais ir laisvaisiais kamienais bei afiksais, o savi afiksai linkę jungtis tiek su indigeniais, tiek su klasikinių kalbų kilmės sietiniais ir laisvaisiais kamienais bei afiksais.

3. Konstatuoti tokie indigenių ir hibridinių vardažodžių darybos panašumai ir skirtumai.
- 3.1. Vardažodžiai, išvesti iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių su savomis priesagomis, ir daiktavardžiai, išvesti iš indigenių pamatinių žodžių su skolintomis priesagomis, yra integruoti į lietuvių kalbos darybos sistemą ir morfonologiškai nesiskiria nuo savakilmių vedinių. Išanalizuoti hibridiniai daiktavardžiai rodo tokį darybos kategorijų išsidėstymą pagal vedinių skaičių: veiksmų pavadinimai, ypatybių pavadinimai, deminutyvai, vardažodinės ypatybės turėtojų pavadinimai, asmenų pavadinimai pagal jų kilimo ir gyvenamąją vietą, veikėjų ir veiksmožodinės ypatybės turėtojų pavadinimai, asmenų pavadinimai pagal profesiją, vietų pavadinimai, įrankių pavadinimai ir žodžių bei posakių pavadinimai.
- 3.2. Dariausios daiktavardžių priesagos, kurių vediniai pamatuoti skoliniais, yra *-im-as*, *-um-as*, *-inink-as*, *-ė*, *-iet-is*, *-ė*, *-uk-as*, *-ėl-is*, *-toj-as*, *-a*. Vedinių, padarytų iš savakilmių pamatinių žodžių su skolintomis priesagomis, išskyrus *-izm-as* vedinius, aptinkama nedaug. Dariausia būdvardžių priesaga yra *-in-is*, *-ė*. Su priesaga *-išk-as*, *-a* aptikta penktadalis būdvardžių, o su *-ing-as*, *-a* būdvardžių randama daug mažiau.
- 3.3. (Neo)klasikinių daiktavardžių galūninė daryba, skirtingai nei indigenių, lietuvių kalbai nėra būdinga.
- 3.4. Dalis vardažodžių, padarytų iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių su savais priešdėliais, yra integruoti į lietuvių kalbos darybos sistemą ir morfonologiškai nesiskiria nuo savos kilmės priešdėlių vedinių, o kita dalis – neintegruoti. Vardažodžiai, išvesti iš savakilmių pamatinių žodžių su skolintais priešdėliais, morfonologiškai nėra integruoti į lietuvių kalbos darybinę sistemą, išskyrus pavienius atvejus. Darybos formantą klasikinių kalbų kilmės priešdėliai sudaro vieni patys – jie jungiami prie darybos metu nepakintančio indigenaus arba hibridinio pamatinio žodžio. Kai kurie vediniai, padaryti iš savakilmių pamatinių žodžių su skolintais priešdėliais, gali būti interpretuojami ir kaip priesagų vediniai, o savų priešdėlių vediniai kitos interpretacijos neturi.
- 3.5. Daiktavardiniai dūriniai, kurių pirmasis arba antrasis (neo)klasikinis sandas yra laisvasis, yra integravęsi į lietuvių kalbos žodžių darybos sistemą ir

morfonologiškai nesiskiria nuo savos kilmės dūrinių. Būdvardiniai dūriniai, kurių pirmasis laisvasis sandas yra savas, o antrasis (neo)klasikinis, taip pat yra integravęsi į lietuvių kalbos žodžių darybos sistemą ir morfonologiškai nesiskiria nuo savakilmių dūrinių. Būdvardinių dūrinių, kurių pirmasis sandas būtų (neo)klasikinis, o antrasis indigenus, neaptikta. Pastebimas polinkis daiktavardinius dūrinius, skirtingai nei būdvardinius, kurių pirmąjį sandą sudaro sietinis kamienas, integruoti į lietuvių kalbos žodžių darybos sistemą. Kartais hibridiniai dūriniai gali būti interpretuojami ir kaip priesagų vediniai. Dvejopa interpretacija galima tuo atveju, kai dūrinio pirmuoju sandu eina sietinis kamienas. Pagal dūrinio sandų tarpusavio santykį hibridiniai dūriniai, kaip ir savos kilmės, yra determinatyviniai. Pirmasis sandas dažniausiai apibrėžia antrąjį, retokai antrasis – pirmąjį. Kopuliatyvinių dūrinių, kurių abu sandai būtų lygiaverčiai, tiek tarp hibridinių, tiek tarp indigenų dūrinių, pasitaiko keletas.

- 3.6. Būdvardžių daryboje, skirtingai nei daiktavardžių, užfiksuota priešdėlių-priesagų ir dūrybos-priesagų darybos būdu padarytų žodžių. Vieni priešdėliai cirkumfiksaciniuose vediniuose yra produktyvesni, kiti – mažiau produktyvūs. Dūrybos ir priesagų darybos būdu sudaryti būdvardžiai laikomi žodžių darybos klaidomis normos požiūriu, nes priesaga dūriniui jokios naujos darybinės reikšmės nesuteikia.
4. (Neo)klasikiniai vardažodžiai lietuvių kalboje adaptuojami panaudojant netiesioginio arba tiesioginio įterpimo strategijas. Pastaroji pritaikoma vardažodžiams, kurie į kalbą recipientę yra įtraukiami pasitelkiant adaptacines fleksijas, o netiesioginio įterpimo strategija pritaikoma tada, kai vardažodžiai į kalbą recipientę yra įtraukiami pasitelkiant darybinės priesagas. Pagal atliekamą indigenų priesagų funkciją ir priešdėlio vedinių integravimosi laipsnį hibridinių būdvardžių daryba artimesnė veiksmazodžių nei daiktavardžių darybai. Tiek veiksmazodžiuose, tiek būdvardžiuose savos priesagos gali atlikti darybinę ir adaptacinę funkciją, o daiktavardžiuose – tik darybinę. Antra, indigenūs priešdėliniai būdvardžiai ir veiksmazodžiai, išvesti iš (neo)klasikinių pamatinių žodžių, morfonologinės vedinių išraiškos paprastai nepakeičia, skirtingai nei lietuviškų priešdėlių daiktavardžiai. Trečia, sietinių kamienų integravimas į lietuvių kalbos darybos sistemą yra

dažnesnis daiktavardžių nei būdvardžių daryboje. Ketvirta, indigenių ir hibridinių daiktavardžių priesagų vediniuose visada kirčiuojama priesaga, o indigenių ir hibridinių būdvardžių kirčiavimas skiriasi. Pastaruosiuose dažniausiai kirčiuojama ne priesaga, o kamienas.

Darbo aprobavimas

Disertacijos tema paskelbti **straipsniai**:

1. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia 2016, Searching for competing patterns in morphological derivation: The case of adjective borrowing, *Skase Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 13(2), 189–214.
2. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia 2015, On Word Formation Patterns of Hybrid Neoclassical Nouns and Adjectives in Lithuanian, In Stephen Kessler, Artūras Judžentis (eds.), *Contributions to Syntax and Morphology*, 27–50.
3. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina 2015, Lietuvių kalbos dūriniai su neoklasikiniais dėmenimis, *Baltistica* (50)2, 245–259.
4. Inčiuraitė Lina 2013, On the Question of Neoclassical Compounds in Lithuanian, *Verbum* (4), 60–69.
5. Inčiuraitė Lina 2013, Kognityvinis požiūris į žodžių darybą, *Taikomoji kalbotyra* (2), 1–24.

Darbo tema skaityti **pranešimai** konferencijose ir seminaruose:

1. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, *XII tarptautinis baltistų kongresas*, 2015 m. spalio 28–31 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: On the Morphological Status of Neoclassical Elements in Lithuanian.
2. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Jurgis Pakerys, Bonifacas Stundžia, *XII tarptautinis baltistų kongresas*, 2015 m. spalio 28–31 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: On Directly and Indirectly Borrowed Verbal Affixes in Lithuanian.

3. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia, *Word-Formation Theories II / Typology and Universals in Word Formation III*, 2015 m. birželio 26-28 d., Slovakija, Košicė. Pranešimo tema: Searching for Competing Patterns in Morphological Derivation: the Case of Adjective Borrowing.
4. Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė Lina, *Šiuolaikiniai kalbotyros tyrimai: iššūkiai ir sprendimai*, 2015 m. gegužės 15 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Tiesioginis ir netiesioginis afiksų skolinimasis.
5. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Aktualieji senosios raštijos ir dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tyrimai*, 2014 m. rugsėjo 19-21d., Lietuva, Druskininkai. Pranešimo tema: Neoklasikinių dūrinių daryba lietuvių kalboje.
6. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Kalbotyros doktorantų dirbtuvės: tyrimai, problemos ir atradimai*, 2014 m. birželio 06 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Hibridiniai priesaginiai daiktavardžiai Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstyne.
7. Inčiuraitė Lina, Bonifacas Stundžia, *Nauji baltų kalbų sintaksės ir morfologijos tyrimai*, 2014 m. gegužės 29-30 d., Vokietija, Lubminas. Pranešimo tema: On Word-Formation Patterns of Neoclassical Nouns and Adjectives in Lithuanian.
8. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Vietos genijus – asmenybė ir kūryba kaip erdvės vaizdinys*, 2014 m. gegužės 08 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Hibridiniai priesaginiai vardažodžiai Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstyne.
9. Inčiuraitė Lina, *Lingvistiniai, didaktiniai ir sociokultūriniai kalbos funkcionavimo aspektai*, 2014 m. balandžio 24-25 d., Lietuva, Vilnius. Pranešimo tema: Hibridiniai dariniai su neoklasikiniais elementais lietuvių kalboje.

Lina Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė (g. 1983 m.) 2006 m. Vilniaus universitete Kauno humanitariniame fakultete baigė anglų ir rusų kalbos studijas (įgytas filologijos bakalauro laipsnis), 2008 m. – ten pat ir anglų kalbotyros magistro studijas (įgytas filologijos magistro laipsnis, CUM LAUDE). 2012–2016 m. studijavo Vilniaus universiteto doktorantūroje. Disertacijos tema paskelbti penki straipsniai, skaityti devyni pranešimai tarptautinėse konferencijose ir doktorantų seminaruose. Nuo 2011 m. dirba Vilniaus universiteto Užsienio kalbų instituto Fizinių ir biomedicinos mokslų anglų kalbos katedroje.

Mokslinių interesų sritys: žodžių daryba, morfologija.

Vilniaus universitetas
Filologijos fakultetas
Baltistikos katedra
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01131 Lietuva
El.p. lina.inciuraite@uki.vu.lt