On directly and indirectly borrowed verbal derivational affixes in Lithuanian

A prevalent assumption in the linguistic literature is that affixes are usually borrowed indirectly when the complex lexical loans are segmented in the recipient language and their affixes are extracted for the use with native bases (cf. Paul 1891: 469–470, Weinreich 1953: 31–32, Fleischmann 1977: 275). However, according to Seifart (forthc.), in some cases direct borrowing can be the only or primary process responsible for productive loan affixes. He notes that direct borrowing can be assumed when the recipient language has no or few complex loanwords with the borrowed affix and when that affix typically occurs with native bases. On the other hand, when the borrowed affix is frequently found in complex loan words and rarely occurs with native bases, we should assume indirect borrowing. The directness of borrowing is not a binary feature and is best understood as a scale, cf. Figure 3 in Seifart (forthc.).

It is well known that some Lithuanian dialects have borrowed a number of Slavic verbal prefixes and suffixes (Zinkevičius 1966: 30–31, 334). We have examined the data of five Lithuanian dialectal dictionaries1 and the preliminary analysis shows that the verbal prefixes of Slavic origin, namely da-, pad- and raz- are most probably borrowed directly, because they show a strong tendency to combine with the native bases (ca. 95%), cf. similar observations in Wiemer 2009: 373, 378, 383. On the other hand, the Slavic suffixes -avo-ti and -ui-ti are probably best treated as cases of indirect borrowing due to their tendency to occur with Slavic bases (ca. 70%).

In our paper we would like to explore the processes of direct/indirect borrowing of Slavic verbal affixes into Lithuanian in more detail and to discuss the strengths and possible weaknesses of the criterion of occurrence of borrowed affixes with (non-)native bases.