

Native vs. Borrowed Word Formation in Synchrony and Diachrony: Introduction

Marko Simonović¹ Laura Grestenberger² Gianina Iordăchioaia¹
Veronika Mattes¹ Martina Werner^{2,3}

¹University of Graz

²University of Vienna

³Austrian Academy of Sciences

49. Österreichische Linguistik-Tagung (ÖLT)
University of Klagenfurt
Dec. 5–8, 2025

Introduction

- Coexistence of borrowed and native word formation morphology is widespread cross-linguistically (Matras and Sakel 2007; Gardani et al. 2015) and may even be considered the norm.
- Still, even though labels such as *borrowed* vs. *native* or *Germanic* vs. *Latinate* are routinely employed in synchronic descriptive sources, the field remains very far from reaching any consensus on their status in models of grammar.
- From a diachronic perspective, theoretical work has only recently begun to systematically investigate how (different types) of language contact influence pathways of language change (e.g., Roberts 2007, 2021; Walkden et al. 2023, 2023)

Introduction

- Coexistence of borrowed and native word formation morphology is widespread cross-linguistically (Matras and Sakel 2007; Gardani et al. 2015) and may even be considered the norm.
- Still, even though labels such as *borrowed* vs. *native* or *Germanic* vs. *Latinate* are routinely employed in synchronic descriptive sources, the field remains very far from reaching any consensus on their status in models of grammar.
- From a diachronic perspective, theoretical work has only recently begun to systematically investigate how (different types) of language contact influence pathways of language change (e.g., Roberts 2007, 2021; Walkden et al. 2023, 2023)

→ This workshop aims to address this gap.

One classical concept: Strata

- Synchronic systems in which borrowed morphemes pattern together on various levels of grammar are often analysed as having lexical **strata** (Matras 2009; Haspelmath and Sims 2013).
- Strata can be characterised by:
 - phonological features (e.g., segments, stress patterns),
 - phonological processes (e.g., alternations),
 - morphological processes (e.g., statum-specific inflection or derivation),
 - restrictions on combinability with elements from other strata,
 - ...

One classical example: Latinate suffixes in English

- English *-ity* can serve as a prototypical Latinate morpheme (especially as compared to the native counterpart *-ness*).
 - It triggers a stress shift.
 - *atómic* vs. *atomíc-ity* (cf. *atómic-ness*).
 - It triggers velar softening.
 - *electri[k]* vs. *electri[s]ity*.
 - It does not combine with Germanic bases.
 - ✓ *humidity*, ✓ *humanity*, **wetity*, **slowity*.
 - ✓ *humidness*, ✓ *humanness*, ✓ *wetness*, ✓ *slowness*.
 - It often combines with bound bases
 - ✓ *society*, ✓ *quality*, **socie*, **qual*.
 - It often has an opaque interpretation.
 - e.g., in *hospitality*.

Borrowed vs. native in synchronic analyses

- Loanwords-specific grammar
 - Loanwords are a lexical class and can have their own co-phonology (e.g. Anttila (2002); Uchihara and Mendoza Ruiz (2022)).
- Feature [LOAN] (or a set of features for multiple strata)
 - Loanwords are marked with a special (diacritic) feature, which regulates the application or under-application of processes in them (e.g. Itō and Mester 1995; Jurgec 2010).
- Prespecification approach
 - Loanwords behave differently because they have different representations, but neither the grammar nor the lexicon is in any way sensitive to their being loanwords (e.g. Inkelas et al. 1997; Newell 2021).

Borrowed vs. native in diachrony

- Problem of contact between closely related languages: Borrowing or shared inheritance? (e.g., Bowerman 2013, Pat-El 2013, Robbeets 2015)

Criteria for distinguishing between internal and external changes (Pat-El 2013, 316) - focus on morphosyntactic *calques*:

- **Intermediate stages:** if two languages, known to be in contact, exhibit a similar pattern, but only in one of them are intermediate stages in the development of said pattern attested, that language is the source of the change. The language which only attests to the final result is more likely the borrowing language;
 - E.g., spread of formerly complex Gk. nominalizer *-ismos* in “learned” registers throughout Europe (*-ism*, etc.)

Borrowed vs. native in diachrony

- **Consistency across categories:** if two languages, known to be in contact, exhibit the same pattern, but in only one of them is the change consistent across various categories or related patterns, that language is the source of the change. The language with the restricted distribution is more likely the borrowing language.
 - w.r.t. morphology: restricted combinatory possibilities, morphological opacity

In theoretical terms,

- “Internal” morphological/morphosyntactic change is directional (\approx from ‘more lexical’ to ‘more functional’, e.g., Grestenberger 2023),
- “external” change/**borrowing** may famously target morphologically complex forms while bypassing their bases or related words.
 - increased morphological opacity in the recipient language, “counterdirectional” mappings in the recipient grammar.

Borrowed vs. native in diachrony

- Example: German verbalizer *-ier-*:
 - *format-ier-en* 'format-V-INF' 'to format'
 - *drangsal-ier-en* 'harrassment-V-INF' 'to harrass'
 - *aktiv-ier-en* 'active-V-INF' 'to activate'
 - borrowed from a French infinitival suffix from the 12th c. onwards
 - **counterdirectional development** due to the opacity of the French stem vowel + infinitival morpheme, from the perspective of the source language speaker (Gardani 2018).
- a predicted opacity difference depending on the contact situation and the way in which universal principles and aspects specific to the source and recipient languages interact in the acquisition and integration of complex morphological structures

Borrowed vs. native in language acquisition

- Working hypothesis: borrowed morphology becomes productive relatively late, typically from middle school age to young adulthood
- it follows a developmental trajectory distinct from native affixes, such as a considerably weaker manifestation of overgeneralisation as a result of **higher opacity** (e.g., Tyler and Nagy 1989; Bar-Ilan and Berman 2007; Mattes 2018)
- If this distinction is *not* driven by a $[\pm\text{native}]$ feature but by correlated phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties, we further expect variation within borrowed morphology depending on its **degree of integration**, including phonological and semantic transparency and distributional constraints.

Borrowed vs. native in language acquisition

Degree of integration:

- German nativized verbalizer *-ier-*:
 - attaches to native bases:
 - *lack-**ier**-en* 'to varnish'
 - *drangsal-**ier**-en* 'to harass'
 - and to borrowed bases:
 - *diskut-**ier**-en* 'to discuss'
 - *aktiv-**ier**-en* 'to activate'

- German nominalizer *-ion-*:
 - attaches only to borrowed and bound bases
 - *Diskuss-**ion*** 'discussion'
 - *Lekt-**ion*** 'lesson'

→ We expect differences in the pathway of acquisition of these two suffixes — specifically, we expect *-ier-* to be acquired earlier than *-ion-*.

Research questions

- Is the distinction between native and borrowed items part of the grammatical knowledge of speakers? How insightful is it to view this coexistence in terms of competition or rivalry?
 - IORDĂCHIOAIA & MONAKHOV; LAKS & NASSAR; RAINER; REVITHIADOU, MITTAS & MARKOPOULOS; SIMONOVIĆ, KOVAČEVIĆ, VINKE & MIŠMAŠ; SLEEMAN; WEBSTER
- What drives speakers' perception of 'nativeness' and what are the consequences for the process of morphological integration?
 - MOLLOY
- How do languages integrate borrowed word forming morphology from different languages (e.g., Latinate and English borrowing in German), and (how) does this give rise to different "strata" of word formation patterns?
 - AMIRIDZE, ASATIANI & BARATASHVILI; SLEEMAN

Research questions

- How universal are the various proposed “borrowability scales” and what is their status in the different theoretical approaches to word formation?
- What are the differences in the integration or nativization of borrowed morphemes between different morphological types (e.g. compounding vs. derivation vs. inflection) and what might be the morphological reason behind these empirical differences?
 - INČIURAITĖ-NOREIKIENĖ; INČIURAITĖ-NOREIKIENĖ & STRAIŽYTĖ; LAKS & NASSAR; MOLLOY
- How do borrowed categorizers (e.g., *-ier-* in German, *-eer-* in Dutch) arise?
 - SIMONOVIĆ, KOVAČEVIĆ, VINKE & MIŠMAŠ; SLEEMAN

Research questions

- How do borrowed affixes become native-like diachronically?
→ RAINER
- Is there a difference between the development of borrowed vs. native morphology during L1 acquisition at different diachronic stages of 'integration'?
- Why do languages differ w.r.t. the importance of 'nativeness' for morphological productivity and if so, how is this distinction best modelled?
→ BIRZER; REVITHIADOU, MITTAS & MARKOPOULOS; WEBSTER
- What role does prescriptivism play w.r.t. what counts as 'native' or 'borrowed' and w.r.t. morphological productivity?
→ MOLLOY

Conclusion

- Still no consensus on the status of borrowed vs. native morphology in grammar
- This workshop will quite probably not result in consensus, either — but we hope it will sharpen our understanding of the synchronic status and diachronic development of borrowed vs. native morphology from different theoretical perspectives.

Thank you!
Hvala!
Danke!

References I

- Anttila, A. (2002). Morphologically conditioned phonological alternations. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20(1), 1–42.
- Bar-Ilan, L. and R. A. Berman (2007). Developing register differentiation: the Latinate-Germanic divide in English. *Linguistics* 45(1), 1–35.
- Bowern, C. (2013). Relatedness as a factor in language contact. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2), 411–432.
- Gardani, F. (2018). On morphological borrowing. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 12(10), e12302.
- Gardani, F., P. Arkadiev, and N. Amiridze (Eds.) (2015). *Borrowed morphology*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Grestenberger, L. (2023). The diachrony of verbalizers in Indo-European: Where does *v* come from? *Journal of Historical Syntax* 7(6–19), 1–40.
doi.org/10.18148/hs/2023.v7i6-19.156.
- Haspelmath, M. and A. Sims (2013). *Understanding morphology*. Routledge.
- Inkelas, S., C. O. Orgun, and C. Zoll (1997). The implications of lexical exceptions for the nature of grammar. In J. J. McCarthy (Ed.), *Optimality Theory in Phonology: A Reader*, pp. 542–551. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

References II

- Itō, J. and A. Mester (1995). Japanese phonology. In J. Goldsmith (Ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jurcic, P. (2010). Disjunctive lexical stratification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41(1), 149–161.
- Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact*. Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Y. and J. Sakel (Eds.) (2007). *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mattes, V. (2018). *Derivationsmorphologie und Wortarten im Erstspracherwerb des Deutschen: Mit einem Fokus auf dem Schuleintrittsalter*. Habilitation thesis, University of Graz.
- Newell, H. (2021). Deriving level 1/level 2 affix classes in english: Floating vowels, cyclic syntax. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 68(1–2), 31–76.
- Pat-El, N. (2013). Contact or inheritance? Criteria for distinguishing internal and external change in genetically related languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2), 313–328.
- Robbeets, M. (2015). Common denominal verbalizers in the Transeurasian languages: borrowed or inherited? In F. Gardani, P. Arkadiev, and N. Amiridze (Eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, pp. 137–154. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

References III

- Roberts, I. (2007). *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, I. (2021). *Diachronic syntax* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tyler, A. and W. Nagy (1989). The acquisition of English derivational morphology. *Journal of Memory and Language* 27, 649–667.
- Uchihara, H. and J. Mendoza Ruiz (2022). Minimality, maximality and perfect prosodic word in alcozauca mixtec. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 40(2), 599–649.
- Walkden, G., J. Klemola, and T. Rainsford (2023). An overview of contact-induced morphosyntactic changes in early English. In S. M. Pons-Sanz and L. Sylvester (Eds.), *Medieval English in a Multilingual Context: Current Methodologies and Approaches*, pp. 239–277. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30947-2_9.
- Walkden, G., G. H. McCarley, R. Montero, M. Rolf, S. Einhaus, and H. Kauhanen (2023). Sociolinguistic typology meets historical corpus linguistics. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 121(3), 546–567.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.12275>.