

HELEN MYERS  
The Ohio State University

Fields of research: Language contacts, historical linguistics, semiotics of film and literature.

## PATTERNS OF ADAPTATION AND INTEGRATION OF ENGLISH LOANWORDS IN LITHUANIAN AND RUSSIAN

Anglų kalbos svetimžodžių adaptavimo  
ir integravimo būdai lietuvių  
ir rusų kalbose

### ANNOTATION

Besides being a language of international communication, English has become the largest source of borrowings for the contemporary world languages. However, despite the fact that borrowing from English is a commonly recognized linguistic phenomenon of the modern world, there is not much written about the incorporation of English borrowings into Lithuanian and Russian, languages that possess many shared linguistic features due to their close historical contacts. The goal of the present paper is to classify the major mechanisms of adaptation and integration of English loanwords in the linguistic systems of Lithuanian and Russian. Based on my research, there are many similarities in the patterns of borrowing English lexicon by Lithuanian and Russian. The most common pattern of integrating English loanwords in both languages is morphological adaptation, especially suffixation. Other mechanisms include phonological, morpho-phonological, syntactic adaptation and word creation. There are also a few distinguishable patterns of assimilating foreign material by these two languages. Based on the analyzed data, morphological adaptation is more productive in Lithuanian than in Russian. In general, the integration of English borrowings in Lithuanian and Russian reflects the most productive native patterns of word formation in both languages.

---

KEYWORDS: Borrowing, language contact, English loanwords, Lithuanian, Russian.  
ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: skolinys, kalbų ryšiai, anglų kalbos svetimžodžiai, lietuvių kalba, rusų kalba.

## ANOTACIJA

Anglų kalba yra ne tik tarptautinės komunikacijos kalba, bet ir didžiausias skolinių šaltinis šiuolaikinėms pasaulio kalboms. Nors skolinimasis iš anglų kalbos yra tapęs visuotinai pripažintu lingvistiniu šiuolaikinio pasaulio reiškiniu, anglų kalbos skolinių integravimas į lietuvių ir rusų kalbas, t. y. kalbas, dėl artimų istorinių ryšių turinčias daug bendrų lingvistinių bruožų, nėra dažnas tyrimų objektas. Šio straipsnio tikslas – suklasifikuoti pagrindinius anglų kalbos svetimžodžių adaptacijos ir integracijos mechanizmus lietuvių ir rusų kalbų sistemose. Tyrimas atskleidžia daug anglų kalbos leksikos skolinimosi būdų panašumų lietuvių ir rusų kalbose. Dažniausias anglų kalbos svetimžodžių integravimo būdas abiejose kalbose yra morfologinė adaptacija, ypač priesaginė daryba. Kiti integravimo būdai apima fonologinę, morfonologinę, sintaksinę adaptaciją bei žodžių darybą. Šių kalbų praktikoje naudojami ir keli skirtingi užsienio kalbos medžiagos asimiliavimo būdai. Kaip rodo analizuojami duomenys, morfologinė adaptacija produktyvesnė lietuvių nei rusų kalboje. Anglų kalbos skolinių integracija lietuvių ir rusų kalbose atskleidžia produktyviausius vietinius abiejų kalbų žodžių darybos būdus.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Besides being a language of international communication, English has also become the largest source of borrowings for the contemporary world languages. Anglicisms are being incorporated into different domains, but such areas as computer science, e-commerce, business, and international relations have traditionally experienced the greatest impact of English. Despite the fact that borrowing from English is a commonly recognized linguistic phenomenon of the modern world, not much has been written about the incorporation of English loanwords into Lithuanian and Russian.

## 1.1. Lithuanian background

Lithuanian belongs to the Baltic group of the Indo-European family of languages and, based on the data provided by Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig (eds.) 2013), is spoken by about 4 million people worldwide. Lithuanian has undergone fewer changes than any other language of the Indo-European family. Some of its reflexes are almost identical to those found only in extinct languages such as ancient Greek, Sanskrit, and Gothic, e.g., *vyras* ‘man’ Lt./*vȳras* ‘man’ Sanskrit, *platus* ‘wide’ Lt./*platus* ‘wide’ Gr., *sūnus* Nom. ‘son’, *sūnaūs* Gen. ‘son’ Lt./*sunus* Nom. ‘son’, *sunaus* Gen. ‘son’ Gothic<sup>1</sup>. One of the most prominent French

---

<sup>1</sup> The above examples are taken from: Zinkevičius 1998.

linguists, Antoine Meillet, claimed that anyone who wishes to hear the sound of Indo-European should listen to the Lithuanian peasant.

There were times in the history of Lithuanian when it experienced heavy influence from other languages. Scholars distinguish periods of Germanization, Polonization and Russification of the Lithuanian language. The term ‘Germanization’ refers to the linguistic influence experienced by Prussian Lithuanians, who lived in East Prussia since the 15<sup>th</sup> century and made up there the largest group of non-German population<sup>2</sup>. The so-called Prussian period was very important because the first printed texts in Lithuanian appeared in the Duchy of Prussia in the 16–17<sup>th</sup> centuries. These books became the source for the standard modern Lithuanian. However, the defeat of the Teutonic Order and the establishment of the Prussian German monarchy put Prussian Lithuanians and their language into an unfavorable situation. Eventually Lithuanian population in Prussia had shrunk considerably due to a plague and the following immigration to Germany during the 18–20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The policy of Germanization was tightened during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Lithuanian majority remained only north of the Neman River and areas south and southwest of the river.

The term ‘Polonization’ refers to the period of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth that was formed in 1569 between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and lasted until 1795. During this time the Lithuanian gentry was polonized and its members considered themselves to be Poles of Lithuanian origin (Zinkevičius 1998: 256). Polish became the dominant language while Lithuanian was considered pagan and was fought against in schools, churches, politics, etc. Only peasants continued to use Lithuanian during these times. Zinkevičius mentions the facts when peasants were punished for saying their prayers in Lithuanian (256).

When the Commonwealth lost its political dominance and was partitioned among Russia, Prussia, and Austria at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the largest part of Lithuania became part of the Russian Empire. Tsarist government implemented a number of Russification policies including a ban on Lithuanian press, and Lithuania became part of the new Russian administrative area called North Western Kraj (region). Reestablishment of the Lithuanian State took place in 1918 after World War I (259).

So far Lithuanian was able to preserve its archaic features even in the times of the toughest subjugation by other languages, especially by Polish, German and Russian. However, some scholars express serious concern regarding the present

---

<sup>2</sup> The historical information about Lithuanian language is based on Zinkevičius 1998.

day English borrowings into Lithuanian language (The Society of Lithuanian language 1993; Klimas 1994). Hundreds of Anglicisms started appearing in Lithuanian during recent decades, especially in the spoken vernacular of the younger city dwellers. Many of these Anglicisms first came via music, i.e., songs, records, CDs, videos, radio, TV, films, as well as with visiting rock bands from the West. Various Lithuanian newspapers, journals, and popular illustrated magazines published articles calling on the editors, journalists, writers, TV, and radio announcers to stop this flood of English borrowings into Lithuanian, which appeared in almost all spheres of life (Klimas 1994). Alarmed linguists are trying to predict whether Lithuanian will be able to withstand such intense influence of English and retain its unique archaic features.

## 1.2. Russian background

The historical neighbor of the Balts, Russian, has found itself in a similar situation when Anglicisms had flooded into its domains after Russia opened up politically and culturally for the international exchange after the fall of the Soviet Union. Russian is a member of the East Slavic group of languages and is spoken by approximately 162 m people worldwide (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig (eds.) 2013). The term ‘Runglish’, which was first invented by Russian cosmonauts in 2000 to describe their communication with American colleagues on the International Space Station (“The Expedition One Crew”), is now broadly used to illustrate dangerous penetration of English into all domains of Russian life, an alarming treat to the purity of the language of Pushkin, Tolstoy, and Dostoevsky. To emphasize the importance of this process, the Federal law of Russian Federation “About the state language of the Russian Federation” signed by the Russian government in 2005 (rg.ru) contains the clause which disallows using foreign words in Russian as the state language unless such words have no Russian equivalents. Among other governmental measures designed to raise public interest for Russian and its purity, was declaring 2007 the Year of Russian language (Newsru.com).

## 1.3. Goals

Throughout the long period of the shared historical development after branching out from the Indo-European family, Baltic and Slavic languages developed many common innovations, which are still present in these languages. In the current study, I make an attempt to investigate whether Lithuanian and Russian use similar mechanisms of incorporating English borrowings into their linguistic systems. For my research, I use materials of various genres found in the vast corpus

of the online written medium such as online newspapers, blogs, forums, technological sites, and academic articles. Since Internet undoubtedly reflects the most recent linguistic interaction of different languages, it allows discerning the consecutive stages of the foreign words adaptation by the target languages. Based on my monitoring of the Anglicisms incorporated in online communication, I define the most common patterns of integrating English loanwords in Lithuanian and Russian and compare these patterns to establish similarities and differences in the ways these languages adapt English borrowings.

Based on the fact that inflectional and word-formation systems of Lithuanian and Russian share many common features, I expect that mechanisms of integrating English loanwords in these languages should share many similarities as well.

## II. SOCIAL MOTIVATIONS FOR ENGLISH LEXICAL BORROWINGS IN LITHUANIAN AND RUSSIAN

Following classification by Weinreich, which was adapted by many scholars working in the language contact field, there are two major social motivations for lexical borrowings: need and prestige. Modern development of technology, media, business, and rock music in the West, and especially in America, and spreading it around the globe during the recent decades created the need 'to designate new things, persons, places and concepts' (Weinreich 1968: 56). Modernization of societies constantly creates the need to update languages with new resources. New borrowings from English are flooding into many world languages including Lithuanian and Russian, filling the gaps in their lexicons (Winford 2010: 38).

In the following example (1) integration of English 'multimedia' in Lithuanian and Russian represents not just lexical borrowing, but first of all it reflects borrowing of the entire concept of 'using, involving, or encompassing several media' (Meriam-Webster).

(1) *multimedija* (Lt.) / *mul'timedia* (Rus.) 'multimedia'

It is not always clear what motivates borrowing. In some cases a borrowed word replaces the native one with the same meaning. The example (2) demonstrates how English loanword *daiver* replaces Russian *nyrjal'sčik* with the equivalent meaning.

(2) *daiver* (Rus.) 'diver' – *nyrjal'sčik* (Rus.) 'diver'

The concept of diving existed in Russian language from the ancient times and therefore was supported by the word denoting this concept. In fact, many Slavic

languages have variants of the root *nyr-/nir-* in the words that indicate objects or actions pertaining to diving, e.g., *nyrka* (Blrs.) ‘kind of duck’ (Носовичъ 1984: 343); *wynurzyć* (Pol.) ‘to come to the surface’ (*Vasmer Etymological Dictionary*), Cro. *ponirati* ‘sink / disappear’ (Bujas 2008: 1112), etc. The fact that this root exists in other languages of the Slavic family indicates its Common Slavic origin. It is clear that the borrowing *daiver* was not motivated by need. Prestige in this case also seems an unlikely motivation, as there is no tendency in modern Russian towards replacing general vocabulary with its English counterparts. However, the borrowing *daiver* has lately become increasingly popular in some domains and even surpassed in frequency the usage of native Russian *nyrjal’ščik*. According to the Russian National Corpus (accessed August 26, 2013), *daiver* is used 4 times in fictional and non-fictional literary texts and 54 times in newspapers, while *nyrjal’ščik* was used 50 times in literary texts and only 33 times in newspapers. In the majority of contexts, *daiver* denotes ‘diving as a profession’ while the native *nyrjal’ščik* has more general usage and may denote both ‘a professional diver’ and ‘the one who dives for pleasure or hobby’. However, this distinction is subtle and we can find the contexts where *daiver* is almost synonymous to *nyrjal’ščik* (3):

- (3) A akvalang dajut tem, u kogo est’ sertifikat daivera-ljubitelja.  
 ‘Those get the aqualung who have a certificate of the amateur diver.’

I believe that replacement of Russian *nyrjal’ščik* and other native words are not necessarily motivated by prestige but rather by the general tendency towards language simplification.

There are similar examples in the Lithuanian language as well. For example, English borrowing *brauseris* (Lt.) ‘browser’ is often used to replace native *nar ykle* (Lt.) which originally meant ‘barrier on the river to catch fish, net’, but with the development of technology it also started being used to denote ‘browser’. Lithuanian search engine google.lt (Accessed August 26, 2013, <http://www.google.lt/#fp=a5f7ece00357cd65&q=brauseris>) returned 514,000 tokens of *brauseris* used by the Lithuanian web sites to denote ‘browser’ and 1,080,000 tokens of *naršykle*, the majority of which are used in the meaning ‘browser’, e.g., *Naršyklė „Firefox“* ‘browser Firefox’, and some of them in the meaning ‘net to catch fish’, e.g., *Iš naršyklės atnešė aukšlių* ‘(they) brought bleaks from the net’. It seems plausible that some domains, in this case the domain of technology, incorporate English words not only out of the need ‘to fill the gaps in their lexicons’ (Winford 2010: 38), but also due to a general tendency among speakers of different languages to use some kind of universal terminology which simplifies communication.

The question that arises from the analysis of this situation is whether both words, a borrowing and a native lexeme, will survive. According to Weinreich,

transfer of foreign words that do not represent a new concept and therefore reduplicate an existing vocabulary create confusion in the usage which is usually restricted to the first stages of language contact (Weinreich 1968: 54). Eventually one of the terms may be abandoned, or both of them may remain in the language within the fixed range of contexts.

### III. TYPES OF BORROWINGS IN LITHUANIAN AND RUSSIAN

Before we can analyze English borrowings in Lithuanian and Russian, it is important to clarify the terminology that will be used to define borrowing and its types.

Borrowing is traditionally distinguished from interference, or transfer, which is associated with the second language acquisition (Winford 2010). In borrowing, materials from a non-dominant source language (SL) are imported into a recipient language (RL) via the agency of speakers for whom the latter is the dominant, or primary, language, i.e., RL agentivity. (Winford 2005: 377). Borrowing typically involves vocabulary and sometimes elements of structure. Borrowed items undergo assimilation of a certain degree and become fully integrated into the linguistic system of an RL. Their reproduction does not require knowledge of a SL by speakers. At the same time unassimilated items are often referred to as code switching (Loveday 1996; Myers-Scotton 2003) and usually require bilingualism and conscious attention on the speakers' part. Haugen's typology (1950: 212) divides borrowings into importation and substitution based on the presence or the absence of the markers of foreignness. When speakers substitute morphemes in the borrowed words, they demonstrate recognition of the equivalence between these morphemes (213). However, Haugen's typology does not include phonological imitation. Lexical borrowings usually undergo adaptation not only at the level of morphology but on the other levels as well, until they became indistinguishable from the native material (Winford 2005). In this work I follow the typology proposed by van Coetsem and supported by many modern linguists who describe borrowing as a dynamic process of imitation and adaptation rather than its final results. Imitation is described by van Coetsem as the 'primary mechanism' of borrowing, which produces an approximation of an SL item (van Coetsem, quoted from Winford 2005). Imitation is often followed by adaptation, which involves the assignment to a loanword of the linguistic features typical to this word class in the RL. The products of this process are 'direct' loanwords and loan blends, which represent additions to RL at different stages of their integration without affecting an RL

structure. The majority of English borrowings in Lithuanian and Russian fit into the category of ‘direct’ loanwords and loan blends. Examples (3) and (5) are the illustrations of the ‘direct’ loanwords which are incorporated into the recipient languages in their ‘pure’ forms without modification except for adding inflectional affixes to indicate agreement in gender, case, and number. Examples (4) and (6) are loan blends and demonstrate the process of attaching derivational suffixes to a borrowed stem in order for a borrowed item to fit into a borrowing category. In case of *brutal’nost’* (Rus.) (example 4) from English ‘brutality’, suffix *-NOST’* is a marker of abstract feminine noun and is synonymous to English suffix *-ITY-* in words like ‘mortality, partiality’, etc. Lithuanian suffix *-AV-* in *finansavo* ‘financed’ is a modified form of the verbal suffix *-AU-* which becomes *-AV-* before a vowel.

- (3) *prediktor* (Rus.) ‘predictor’ – direct loanword
- (4) *brutal’-NOST’* (Rus.) ‘brutality’ – loan blend  
brutal.Noun.Abstr.Fem.
- (5) *singl-AS* (Lt.) ‘single (CD)’ – direct loanword  
singl.Noun.Masc.Nom.Sg
- (6) *finans-AV-O* (Lt.) ‘financed’ – loan blend  
finans.Verb.Past.Sg

Other types of lexical borrowings such as loan shifts are also present in Lithuanian and Russian but are not as numerous as loanwords. Examples (7) and (8) illustrate Russian and Lithuanian calques of English ‘skyscraper’. In case of Lithuanian (example 8), vowel /o/ is used to connect translated roots *dang-* ‘sky’ and *-raižis* ‘scraper’.

- (7) *nebo-skrëb* (Rus.) ‘skyscraper’ – loan translation (calque)  
sky-scraper
- (8) *dang-o-raižis* (Lt.) ‘skyscraper’ – loan translation (calque)  
sky-o-scraper

In order to communicate concepts borrowed from English, both Lithuanian and Russian also use creations, which can be comprised of only native words or morphemes, or combinations of the native material with foreign constituents. It is not always possible to explain motivation for such creations. Based on the typologies developed by Haugen and Winford, the following example (9) represents a purely native creation used to express in Russian the sign ‘@’, which is in English vocalized as the spatial preposition ‘at’. The reason why Russians decided to use the diminutive form of a noun ‘dog’ in the meaning of the sign @ is not clear at all, but there are numerous examples of naming this sign after animals in other lan-

guages as well. For example, it is called 'a worm' in Hungarian, 'a cat' in Finnish, 'a duck' in Greek, and 'a snail' in Korean<sup>3</sup>.

- (9) *sobač-K-A* ' @ sign' - native creation  
Dog.Noun.Diminutive-Fem.Nom.Sg

Hybrid creations, which are bilingual in nature (Haugen 1950) and involve transfer of some structural patterns of the recipient languages, represent productive type of word formation in both Lithuanian and Russian. Hybrid in example (10) from Lithuanian is a fixed noun phrase, which consists of the native head noun *svetaine* 'guest-room' and the borrowed modifier *internetu*, which is adapted to the Lithuanian agreement system through the addition of the native inflectional affix *-o* which denotes masculine singular noun in genitive case.

- (10) *internetu svetaine* (Lt.) 'website' – hybrid creation  
internet.Masc.Gen.Sg.-guest-room

Example (11) illustrates a compound hybrid from Russian, comprised of the direct loanword *dip* 'dip' and the native *namazka* 'spread' - a feminine noun of the first declension in *-a*, which, being the head of this compound, governs its inflection.

- (11) *dipnamazka* (Rus.) 'dip' – compound hybrid creation  
dip-spread

#### IV. PHONOLOGICAL, MORPHO-PHONOLOGICAL, MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC INTEGRATION OF BORROWINGS

##### IV.1. Phonological integration

The degree to which borrowings assimilate to the linguistic system of a recipient language depends on the fact how long a borrowing has existed in the language and other sociological factors. However, the time itself does not influence the rate of assimilation; it influences the rate of frequency of use that intensifies the degree of assimilation (Holden 1976). To become fully integrated, borrowings undergo a number of sound changes to conform to a phonological system of the target language.

---

<sup>3</sup> Компьютеры и жизнь. «Собачка» @: Мифы и реальность», accessed August, 27, 2013, <http://articles.org.ru/blog/item/170>

The following examples (1–8) illustrate a few discernible patterns of phonological adaptation of English loanwords found in Lithuanian and Russian:

1. English near-open front vowel [æ] becomes in Russian either the mid central [ə] or open front unrounded [a]:

(12) est**A**blishment (Engl.) – *ist**E**blišment* (Rus.): [æ] → [ə]

(13) artif**A**ct (Engl.) – *artef**A**ct* (Rus.): [æ] → [a]

2. English open-mid back vowel [ɔ] becomes in Russian close-mid back [o]:

(14) sh**O**pping (Engl.) – *sh**O**ping* (Rus.): [ɔ] → [o]

3. English diphthong [ɔu] also transforms in Russian into [o]:

(15) disc**O**unt (Engl.) – *disk**O**nt* (Rus.): [ɔu] → [o]

4. English mid central [ə] becomes in Lithuanian close front [i]:

(16) b**U**sinEss (Engl.) – *b**I**zn**I**s* (Lt.): [ə] → [i]

5. English approximant [w] becomes in Russian labiodental fricative [v]:

(17) **W**ok (Engl.) – ***V**ok* (Rus.)

6. Voiced final consonants in English loanwords undergo devoicing in Russian, i.e. [d] → [t]:

(18) bran**D** (Engl.) – *bren**D*** (Rus.): [d] → [t]

7. Palatalized consonants often lose their palatalization, i.e. [nʲ] → [n]:

(19) dimi**N**utive (Engl.) – *dimi**N**utiv* (Rus.): [nʲ] → [n]

8. Palatalization of non-palatalized consonants before front vowels is another common pattern of phonological adaptation of English loanwords in Russian, i.e. [l] → [lʲ]:

(20) p**L**ease (Engl.) – *p**L**iz* (Rus.): [l] → [lʲ]

The majority of borrowings loses their phonological markers of foreignness and conforms to the native system of pronunciation of the recipient language. However, sometimes, especially at the first stages of integration, borrowed words retain phonological forms they had in the source language despite the fact that their forms contradict to the native norms. This is illustrated by the examples (21) and (22), in which consonants [r] and [z] remain hard before the front vowel [e] while Russian phonology requires palatalization of the consonants in this position. However, in the case of the borrowed *juzer*, both, hard and soft, variants of [z] are already

present in Russian, which demonstrates gradual leveling of the language towards phonological adaptation of the loanwords to the native linguistic norms.

- (21) sp**R**ead (Engl.) - *spRed* (Rus.): [r] → [r] (according to native norms, should be [r] → [r'])  
(22) u**S**er (Engl.) - *juZer* (Rus.): [z] → [z] (should be [z] → [z'])

#### IV.2. Morpho-phonological adaptation

In order to fully fit into either Russian or Lithuanian native linguistic systems, some borrowings simultaneously undergo both phonological and morphological changes. Most productive phonological processes include voicing/devoicing/palatalization of consonants, vowel reduction in unstressed positions and vowel replacement according to rules of the native phonology. Changes on the morphological level usually involve addition of native inflectional and/or derivational suffixes without the word class conversion.

- (23) educational (Engl.) – *edukac-**IN-IS*** (Lt.) – phonological adaptation: regressive palatalization of [t] → [s'] before a front vowel [i]; morphological adaptation: addition of the adjectival suffix -IN- and the inflectional suffix -IS which is traditionally used in Lithuanian to denote masculine singular adjectives in nominative case.  
(24) tran**S**action (Engl.) – *tranZakc-**IJA*** (Rus.) – phonological adaptation: voicing of the consonant [s] into [z] before a vowel; morphological adaptation: addition of the inflectional suffix -IJA to denote a -ja-stem feminine noun in nominative singular.  
(25) conver**S**ion (Engl.) – *konverT-AC-IJA* (Rus.) – phonological adaptation: replacement of post-alveolar fricative [ʒ] in the loanword with dental stop [t]; morphological adaptation: addition of the suffix -AC- indicating feminine noun. Morphological element of this adaptation is a very productive pattern in Russian and can also be seen in *annotacija* (Rus.) 'annotation', *reputacija* (Rus.) 'reputation', *dissertacija* (Rus.) 'dissertation', etc.

#### IV.3. Morphological adaptation

Based on the data analyzed in this study, morphological assimilation seems to be the most productive pattern of integrating English borrowings in both Lithuanian and Russian. In the majority of cases, affixes are added to a borrowed nominal base either to create a neologism of a different morphological class or to transfer a word into another semantic group without changing its word class. Lithuanian and Russian use both derivational suffixes and prefixes, but my analysis shows that in both languages suffixation is far more productive than prefixation as a way to adapt borrowings.

- (26) *brutal'-**NOST'*** (Rus.) 'brutality', *virulent-**NOST'*** (Rus.) 'virulence'  
(27) *diminutiv-**N-YJ*** (Rus.) 'diminutive.ADJ.'

- (28) **NE-diskont-IROVA-NN-YJ** (Rus.) ‘undiscounted (amount)’  
 (29) *internet-**IN**-IS* (Lt.) ‘pertaining to internet’  
 (30) *finans-**AV**-O* (Lt.) ‘financed.Verb’  
 (31) *finans-**AV-IM**-AS* (Lt.) ‘a process of financing’  
 (32) *monitor-**AV**-O* (Lt.) ‘monitored.Verb’  
 (33) *monitor-**AV-IM**-AS* (Lt.) ‘a process of monitoring’  
 (34) **AT-kod-UO-TI** (Lt.) ‘to decode’

The examples (26–34) illustrate a variety of morphological devices that are used by Lithuanian and Russian to integrate English borrowings into their linguistic systems. The nouns in example (26) are adapted through addition of the suffix **-NOST**’- which indicates the abstractness of a noun analogically to Russian *vozmožNOST* ‘opportunity’, *sposobNOST* ‘ability’, *pokorNOST* ‘humility’, etc., and is synonymous to English nominal suffixes **-ITY** and **-ENCE** as in ‘mobility, excellence’, etc. The example (27) represents a derivative adjective, created by the addition of the Russian adjectival suffix **-N-** to a nominal stem of the directly borrowed noun *diminutiv* (Rus) ‘diminutive.Noun’. The same process, but in Lithuanian, is demonstrated by the example (29). In the examples (30) and (32) the addition of the verbal suffix **-AV-** changes a noun into a verb, while the verbal ending **-O** denotes past tense. However, the nominal stems in these examples, *finans-* and *monitor-*, have undergone in Lithuanian a further development and through the addition of the nominal suffix **-IM-** they have become verbal nouns (31, 33). Inflectional ending **-AS** is a marker of masculine gender, singular number, and nominative case. Lithuanian verb *atroduoti* ‘to decode’ in example (34) was formed by the simultaneous addition of the native verbal suffix **-UO-** and prefix **AT-**, which is synonymous to English prefixes **de-** and **re-** ‘to reverse the effect of an action, or to repeat an action’, as in Lithuanian *atsukti* ‘to unscrew’, *atgaviniamas* ‘reanimation’, *atgyti* ‘to revive’, etc.

The example (28) represents the most complex case of adaptation among the above examples, in which the borrowed nominal stem *diskont* (Rus.) ‘discount’ has undergone the process of adding the negative prefix *ne-* and a chain of suffixes: verbal suffix **-IROVA-** and the participial suffix **-NN-**.

#### IV.4. Syntactic adaptation

##### IV.4.1. Markers of syntactic agreement

The majority of English borrowings have become syntactically integrated into Lithuanian and Russian linguistic systems through attachment of the native inflectional endings to denote gender, number, case, and tense. The examples (35–40)

illustrate a variety of markers in Russian and Lithuanian that denote syntactic agreement of borrowed nouns, adjectives, and verbs.

- (35) *džynsY* (Rus.) 'jeans' (-Y is a marker of Nom./Acc.Pl.noun)
- (36) *bekgraundOV* (Rus.) '(of) the backgrounds' (-OV is a marker of Masc.Gen.Pl.noun)
- (37) *autsaiderIS* (Lt.) 'outsider' (-IS is a marker of Masc.Nom.Sg.noun)
- (38) *biznesmanAMS* (Lt.) 'to the businessmen' (-AMS is a marker of Masc.Dat.Pl.noun)
- (39) *moderavO* (Lt.) 'moderated' (-O is a marker of a verb in past tense)
- (40) *volatil'nYMI* (Rus.) '(with) a volatile' (-YMI is a marker of Instr.Pl.adjective)

#### IV.4.2. Double marking of plurality

Some nominal borrowings in Russian demonstrate a double marking of plural:

- (41) *kukisY* (Rus.) 'cookies.Pl'
- (42) *mafinsY* (Rus.) 'muffins.Pl'

Both nouns in the examples (41) and (42) underwent the assignment of Russian plural marker -y while retaining English marker of plurality -s.

Similar phenomenon, used by the speakers of American Lithuanian, was described by Lionginas Pažūsis (1982: 325). He suggests that speakers either are not aware of the plural value of the English suffix -s, or perhaps they neglect it, and take it as a part of the imported stem:

- (43) *byncAI* (Lt.) 'beans.Pl'
- (44) *šiusAI* (Lt.) 'shoes.Pl'

In the examples (43) and (44), taken from Pažūsis (1982), the Lithuanian plural suffix -ai is added to the stems which retain their English marker of plurality -s.

In Russian, some of English borrowings have both variants of plural – with English marker of plurality -s (41–42) and without it (45–46):

- (45) *mafiny* (Rus.) 'muffins.Pl'
- (46) *kuki* (Rus.) 'cookies.Pl'

In both Lithuanian and Russian, some of the borrowings form singular based on the direct importation of their original plurals, usually with the addition of the marker of syntactic agreement in Lithuanian:

- (47) *kukis* (Rus.) 'cookie.Sg'
- (48) *rimpsAS* (Lt.) 'shrimp.Sg'

Based on the theory of Weinreich cited above, coexistence in Lithuanian and Russian of the borrowings with and without double marking of plurality as well as

the variants of the loaned single nouns based either on the importation of the original singles or plurals, indicates the initial stage of borrowing which will eventually result in the surviving of the preferential forms.

#### IV.5. Similarities and differences in integrating borrowings from English into Lithuanian and Russian

Due to a highly inflectional nature of Lithuanian and Russian and their many shared linguistic features developed diachronically, there are many similarities in the ways these languages incorporate English borrowings. The majority of borrowed items in both of these languages are nouns, which are assigned the markers of syntactic agreement that are characteristic for the recipient language. Functional morphemes, such as affixes, are borrowed very rarely; instead, native class-converting elements are usually attached to nominal stems in order to form derivatives.

Nonetheless, there are at least a few distinguishable patterns of assimilating English borrowings by Lithuanian and Russian. First of all, the examples analyzed in this study demonstrate that Lithuanian uses native material more often than Russian, and therefore many English loanwords that are quite common in Russian are not found in Lithuanian. The examples (49–52) illustrate cases when Lithuanian uses native material while Russian has adapted borrowed words to express the same concept. However, this is a preliminary claim, which requires more detailed statistical confirmation.

- |                               |                             |                                   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (49) 'user'                   | – <i>juzer</i> (Rus.)       | – <i>vartotojas</i> (Lt.)         |
| (50) 'website'                | – <i>veb-sajt</i> (Rus.)    | – <i>interneto svetaine</i> (Lt.) |
| (51) 'spider' (internet term) | – <i>spajder</i> (Rus.)     | – <i>voras</i> (Lt.)              |
| (52) 'supervisor'             | – <i>supervajzor</i> (Rus.) | – <i>prižiuretojas</i> (Lt.)      |

Another noticeable difference is that Russian often uses direct loanwords with zero endings, while Lithuanian nouns typically do not have zero endings and therefore loanwords receive native markers of syntactic agreement attached to their borrowed stems (53).

- (53) *stritreiser* (Rus.) – *stritreiseris* (Lt.) 'street racer'

Based on the analyzed data, morphological adaptation is less productive in Russian than in Lithuanian, where a borrowed nominal stem often serves as the starting point for a long chain of derivatives. For example, there are at least 4 new

words formed from the borrowed nominal base 'monitor-' in Lithuanian (54) but only 2 in Russian (55).

- (54) *monitor-* (Lt.) – *monitor* 'monitor.Noun' (used mainly in direct quotes), *monitorius* 'monitor.Noun.Sg.M', *monitorINIS* 'pertaining to monitor.Adj.Sg.M', *monitorAVIMAS* 'a process of monitoring.Noun.Sg.M', *monitorUOTI* 'to monitor.Verb.Inf', *monitorINGAS* 'monitoring.Noun.Sg.M', *monitorINGINIS* 'pertaining to monitoring.Adj.Sg.M'.
- (55) *monitor-* (Rus.) – *monitor* 'monitor.Noun.Sg.M', *monitoring* 'monitoring.Noun.Sg.M', *monitoringOVYJ* 'pertaining to monitoring.Adj.Sg.M'.

As a result of such intense morphological activity, English borrowings within Lithuanian linguistic system undergo class conversion more often than English loanwords in Russian.

## V. CONCLUSION

English has become the largest source of lexical borrowings for many world languages, including Lithuanian and Russian, the languages that shared a long period of close development that resulted in many similar linguistic features. This paper represents an attempt to define and classify the major mechanisms of assimilating English borrowings in modern Lithuanian and Russian. Comparison of these patterns illustrates that there are obvious similarities as well as differences in the ways these languages integrate English loanwords. For this research, I focused on the corpora presented by the wide variety of Internet sites, which due to their dynamism reflect the most recent borrowings. Besides the online press, technological and political sites, forums and blogs, I examined the corpora based on the fictional literary texts.

However, many questions remain unanswered. For example, what motivates reanalysis of some older borrowings such as French loanword *ekspluatacija* (Rus.) 'exploitation' into the recent English borrowing *eksplotei n* (Rus.)? Another topic to be analyzed is whether and how certain types of contexts establish appropriateness of using borrowings versus native material, when such is available.

It is evident that both Lithuanian and Russian experience substantial influence of English, especially in the domains of technology, sports, fashion, politics, and business. However, it is impossible to establish even approximate distribution of English loanwords across these and other domains without having performed a statistical analysis of the borrowing database which, to my knowledge, does not exist. Such analysis would help us better realize what impact English borrowings have on the recipient languages in general and what weight they have within different domains.

EXAMPLES OF ENGLISH BORROWINGS  
IN LITHUANIAN AND RUSSIAN

TABLE 1. Loanwords assimilated phonologically

Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss	Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss
<i>Akaynt</i>	Rus.	'account'	Monitor	Rus.	'monitor'
<i>Andėground</i>	Rus.	'underground'	<i>Pica</i>	Lt.	'pizza'
<i>Bėkgraund</i>	Rus.	'background'	<i>Plis</i>	Rus.	Please
<i>Beneficiary</i>	Rus.	'beneficiary'	Prediktor	Rus.	'predictor'
<i>Juzer</i>	Rus.	'user'	<i>Šoping</i>	Rus.	'making purchases'
<i>Kampus</i>	Rus.	Campus	<i>Svop</i>	Rus.	Swap

TABLE 2. Loanwords assimilated morpho-phonologically

Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss	Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss
<i>Biodegraduodamai</i>	Lt.	'biodegradable'	Pikas	Lt.	'peak'
<i>Installjacija</i>	Rus.	'installation'	<i>Precipitacija</i>	Rus.	'precipitation'
<i>Monitoris</i>	Lt.	'monitor'	<i>Šopingas</i>	Lt.	'making purchases'

TABLE 3. Loanwords assimilated morphologically

Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss
<i>Atkoduoti</i>	Lt.	'decode'
<i>Konsolidirovat'</i>	Rus.	'consolidate'
<i>Monitoravimas</i>	Lt.	'a process of monitoring'
<i>Monitorinis</i>	Lt.	'pertaining to monitoring' (adj.)
<i>Neirovirulentnost'</i>	Rus.	'neurovirulence'

TABLE 4. Loanwords which obtained the markers of syntactic agreement

Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss	Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss
<i>Autsaideris</i>	Lt.	'outsider'	<i>Friki</i>	Rus.	'freaks'
<i>Břifingas</i>	Lt.	'briefing'	<i>Kukisy</i>	Rus.	'cookies'
<i>Dispenseris</i>	Lt.	'dispenser'	<i>Monitorius</i>	Lt.	'monitor'
<i>Džinsai</i>	Lt.	'jeans'	<i>Rolly</i>	Rus.	'rolls'
<i>Failas</i>	Lt.	'file'			

Patterns of Adaptation and Integration  
of English Loanwords in Lithuanian and Russian

TABLE 5. Creations, in which native material is used

Loanword	Recipient language	Gloss	
<i>Blanko-veksel'</i>	Rus.	'blank note'	Hybridization
Kollekcija <i>bannerov</i>	Rus.	'banner pool'	Hybridization
<i>Laundž-muzyka</i>	Rus.	'lounge-music'	Hybridization
Ob-nulit'	Rus.	Zero out	Creation using native morphemes
Vnutrisocyumnyje seti	Rus.	'social-networking sites'	Hybridization

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Rus – Russian	Cro – Croatian
Lt – Lithuanian	Pol – Polish
BCS – Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian	SL – Source Language
Blgr – Bulgarian	RL – Recipient Language
Blrs – Byelorussian	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnbrook Geoff, Danielsson Pernilla, and Mahlberg Michaela (eds.) 2005: *Meaningful texts: the extraction of semantic information from monolingual and multilingual corpora*. London; New York: Continuum.
- Bender H. Harold A. *Lithuanian etymological index*. Accessed August, 15, 2013. [http://www.archive.org/stream/lithuanianetymol00bendrich/lithuanianetymol00bendrich\\_djvu.txt](http://www.archive.org/stream/lithuanianetymol00bendrich/lithuanianetymol00bendrich_djvu.txt)
- Benson Morton 1959: English loanwords in Russian. – *Slavic and East European Journal* 3, 248–267.
- Bujas Ž. 2008: *Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Fasmer Maks 1967: *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Progress".
- Filipovič Rudolf 1982. *The English Element in European Languages*. Vol. 2. Zagreb: University of Zagreb.
- Haugen Einar 1950: The analysis of linguistic borrowing. – *Language* 26, 210–31.
- Holden Kyril 1976: Assimilation Rates of Borrowings and Phonological Productivity. – *Language*. Vol. 52, No. 1, 131–147.

Holden Kyril 1980: Russian Borrowing of English. – *The Slavic and East European Journal*. Vol. 24, No. 4, Winter, 387–399.

Klimas Antanas 1991: Prefixes and suffixes in the Lithuanian verbal system. – *Lituanus. Lithuanian quarterly journal of arts and sciences*. Volume 37, No. 4, Winter.

Klimas Antanas 1994: The Anglicization of Lithuanian. – *Lituanus. Lithuanian Quarterly Journal of Arts and Sciences*. Vol. 40, 2. Summer. [http://www.lituanus.org/1994\\_2/94\\_2\\_01.htm](http://www.lituanus.org/1994_2/94_2_01.htm)

Lewis M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig (eds.) 2013: *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Seventeenth edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>. Accessed August, 15, 2013.

Loveday Leo J. 1996: *Language Contact in Japan: A Socio-linguistic History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Meriam-Webster. *An encyclopedia Britannica company*. Accessed August, 25, 2013, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>

*Multidisciplinary approaches to code switching*. 2009. Eds. Ludmila Isurin, Donald Winford, Kees de Bot.

*Newsru.com*. “Владимир Путин объявил 2007 год годом русского языка”. Accessed August, 23, 2013. <http://www.newsru.com/russia/31dec2006/zyk.html>

Pažūsis Lioginas 1982: The morphological integration of English loan nouns in American Lithuanian. – *The English element in European languages*. Vol. 2. Zagreb.

*rg.ru. Российская газета*. – Документы. Accessed August, 23, 2013. <http://www.rg.ru/2005/06/07/yazyk-dok.html>.

*Russian National Corpus*. Accessed August, 26, 2013. <http://www.ruscorpora.ru/en/>

Skardžius Pranas 1943: *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*. Vilnius: Lietuvos mokslų akademija.

“The Expedition One Crew”, <http://spaceflight.nasa.gov>. Accessed 08/23/13

*The Toronto Star*. September 22, 2007. “Russish rules. Or Englishian; Russian hi-tech world peppered with anglicisms”. Accessed August, 15, 2013. [http://www.thestar.com/life/2007/09/22/russish\\_rules\\_or\\_englishian.html](http://www.thestar.com/life/2007/09/22/russish_rules_or_englishian.html)

Vasmer’s Etymological Dictionary. Accessed August 25, 2013, <http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/main.cgi?root=/usr/local/share/starling/morpho>

Weinreich Uriel 1968: *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. Mouton, The Hague, Paris.

Winford Donald 2010: Contact and borrowing. – *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Willey-Blackwell: A John and Sons, Ltd., Publications, 170–188.

Winford Donald 2005: Contact-induced changes. Classification and processes. – *Diachronica*. Volume 22, 2.

Zinkevičius Zigmąs 1998: *The History of the Lithuanian Language*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Zinkevičius Zigmąs 1980–1981: *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika*. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Мейе Антуан 1938: *Введение в сравнительное изучение индоевропейских языков*. Перевод Д. Кудрявского. Москва: Государственное социально-экономическое издательство.

Носовичъ И. И. 1984: *Словарь бѣлорускаго нарѣчія* (Specimina philologiae Slaviae). München: Verlag Otto Sagner.

## Anglų kalbos svetimžodžių adaptavimo ir integravimo būdai lietuvių ir rusų kalbose

### SANTRAUKA

Anglų kalba yra ne tik tarptautinės komunikacijos kalba, bet ir didžiausias skolinių šaltinis šiuolaikinėms pasaulio kalboms. Anglicizmai integruojami į įvairias sritis, tačiau tradiciškai didžiausią anglų kalbos įtaką patyrė kompiuterių mokslas, elektroninė prekyba, verslas ir tarptautiniai santykiai. Nors skolinimasis iš anglų kalbos yra tapęs visuotinai pripažintu lingvistiniu šiuolaikinio pasaulio reiškiniu, anglų kalbos skolinių integravimas į lietuvių ir rusų kalbas, t. y. kalbas, dėl artimų istorinių ryšių turinčias daug bendrų lingvistinių bruožų, nėra dažnas tyrimų objektas. Šio straipsnio tikslas – apibrėžti ir suklasifikuoti pagrindinius anglų kalbos svetimžodžių adaptacijos ir integracijos mechanizmus lietuvių ir rusų kalbų sistemose. Analizei naudota internete skelbiama medžiaga: internetiniai laikraščiai, interneto dienoraščiai, techniniai ir akademiniai straipsniai bei nacionalinis tekstynas. Tyrimas atskleidžia daug skolinimosi būdų panašumų lietuvių ir rusų kalbose, įskaitant ir tai, kad didžioji dauguma svetimžodžių yra daiktavardžiai, kuriems priskirti sintaksiniai giminės, linksnio ir skaičiaus žymikliai. Funkcinių morfemų, tokių kaip afiksai, skolinimasis yra retas reiškinys; vietoje jo, sudarant vedinius, vietiniai kalbos dalies keitimo elementai paprastai pridedami prie daiktavardžių kamienų. Dažniausias anglų kalbos svetimžodžių integravimo būdas abiejose kalbose yra morfologinė adaptacija, ypač priesaginė daryba. Kiti integravimo būdai apima fonologinę, morfonologinę, sintaksinę adaptaciją bei žodžių darybą. Dauguma sudarytų žodžių yra hibridai, kuriuose vietinė medžiaga naudojama siekiant pakeisti užsienio kalbos morfemas. Analizė parodė, kad abiejose kalbose technologijų sritis patyrė didžiausią įtaką. Antroje vietoje – verslas, muzika, maistas ir kitos sritys. Dėl savo dinamiškumo internetas ir spausdinta žiniasklaida pasižymi naujaisiais skoliniais, o literatūra ir knygos daugumos skolinių dažnai yra dar nespėję integruoti. Lietuvių ir rusų kalbų praktikoje naudojami ir keli skirtingi užsienio kalbos medžiagos asimiliavimo

būdai. Lietuvių kalboje kur kas dažniau naudojama vietinė medžiaga nei rusų kalboje, todėl dauguma anglų kalbos svetimžodžių, kurie yra gana dažni rusų kalboje, nevertojami lietuvių kalboje. Kitas pastebimas skirtumas yra tai, kad rusų kalboje svetimžodžiai dažnai vartojami su nulinėmis galūnėmis, o lietuvių kalbos daiktavardžiai paprastai neturi nulinių galūnių, bet turi kalbai būdingus sintaksinio derinimo žymiklius, pridėtus prie pasiskolintų kamienų. Kaip rodo analizuojami duomenys, morfologinė adaptacija lietuvių kalboje produktyvesnė nei rusų. Pasiškolintas daiktavardžio kamienas dažnai tampa daugelio lietuvių kalbos vedinių pagrindu, tuo tarpu rusų kalboje tokia daryba nėra labai produktyvi. Dėl tokios intensyvios morfologinės veiklos anglų kalbos skoliniai lietuvių kalbos sistemoje kalbos dalies kaitą patiria dažniau nei svetimžodžiai rusų kalboje. Anglų kalbos skolinių integracija lietuvių ir rusų kalbose atskleidžia produktyviausius vietinius abiejų kalbų žodžių darybos būdus.

Įteikta 2014 m. gegužės 29 d.

HELEN MYERS

*The Ohio State University, Department of Slavic and East European  
Languages and Cultures  
400 Hagerly Hall, 1775 College Rd, Columbus, OH 43210  
Myers.1107@osu.edu*