On the morphological status of neoclassical elements in Lithuanian

In word formation theory, the morphological status of the constituents forming neoclassical compounds remains a complicated problem. Similarly, Panocová (2012: 185) puts forward an idea that it is not easy to describe neoclassical word formation because of the heterogeneous nature of the neoclassical compounds and their constituents. Many labels are used to refer to the constituents of neoclassical compounds, namely neoclassical formatives (ten Hacken 2012), affixoids (Hansen et al. 1985), initial/final combining forms (Bauer 1998, 1983), affixes (Williams 1981), semi-affixes (Marchand 1969). In my paper I would like to argue that such a large number of invented terms to name neoclassical elements is unnecessary. As Kastovsky (2009: 12) precisely observes, the notions of word, stem, affix, affixoid, clipping and blending are enough to deal with the formations in question.

As regards the morphological status of neoclassical elements, the research addresses two questions, namely How do neoclassical elements differ from each other, and Do neoclassical elements belong to stems or affixes (e.g. the neoclassical element -graf- in graf-à ‘column’, graf-em-à ‘grapheme’, grafo-lòg-ij-a ‘grahology’, vazo-grañ-fij-a ‘vasography’)? In order to find answers to the above mentioned questions, the research dwells upon the combinability properties of neoclassical elements in the IT resources such as the DLKT (2011) and TŽŽe (2003).

As far as combinability properties of neoclassical elements are concerned, it was noticed that they are used not only in borrowings, which in the Lithuanian language are instances of simple loan translations, but also in the formation of hybrid suffixed derivatives and compounds (biològ-išk-as, -a, biològ-in-is, -ė ‘biologic(al)’, bio-kùr-as ‘biofuel’, bio-atsparum-as ‘bioreistance’).
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