AGNĖ ALEKSAITĖ

NAMES OF CHARACTERISTICS
IN THE DATABASE OF LITHUANIAN NEOLOGISMS

S u m m a r y

For the purposes of identifying the productivity of the types of formation of neologisms that fall into the formational category of names of characteristics (nominal abstractions), the article focuses on the ongoing Database of Lithuanian Neologisms (DN), which registers new linguistic units (words, word formations, and abbreviations) that emerged at the turn of the century and have found common usage. The DN material has been analysed from a formational perspective and compared to the descriptions available in Lithuanian grammars of the second half of the 20th century (the Grammar of the Lithuanian Language (GLL) and the Grammar of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (GCLL)), where names of characteristics are grouped by the formational ability of formational affixes. There were 142 derivatives of formational suffixes found in the DN.

Analysis of the names of characteristics recorded in the DN has revealed that the suffix *-umas*, which was considered the most formational in the grammars (30 lexemes), surrenders its position to the suffixes *-ystė* (47 lexemes) and *-izmas* (41 lexemes). The international suffix *-izmas* is highly productive in the Lithuanian language, even though the GLL and the GCLL strongly concur on it not being formational. It is the analysis of derivatives of this suffix that has pointed to some changes in the formational foundation, with reliance on a more variegated foundation that has been left out of the traditional grammars, that is the syntagma, the word formation, and the abbreviation. By contrast, the productivity of the suffix *-ybė*, which is considered as highly formational both in the GLL and the GCLL, has somewhat diminished (17 lexemes). The database also contains records of 4 non-productive suffixes (*-ovė*, *-ulys*, *-yba*, *-ūra*) and one regenerate affix, *-esys*, which the GLL considers a rare suffix of nominal

abstractions that is only typical of dialects. Over the period covered by the study, 9 suffixes (*-enybė*, *-uma*, *-atvė*, *-atis*, *-astis*, *-ata*, *-(i)ava*, *-umė*, *-ra*) were not found in the DN at all.

Of course, compiled manually, the DN material does not offer a completely objective and detailed view of neologism formation, yet the limited study has shown that so far it is the only effective and systemic database for new linguistic units in Lithuania.

KEYWORDS: neologism, derivative, names of characteristics, word formation.

AGNĖ ALEKSAITĖ

The Institute of the Lithuanian Language

Petro Vileišio g. 5, LT–10308 Vilnius

agne.aleksaite@lki.lt