



Sergei Monakhov

Conference Report:

49. Österreichische Linguistiktagung. Workshop “Native vs. Borrowed Word Formation in Synchrony and Diachrony” (5–6 December 2025; Klagenfurt, Austria)

The workshop “Native vs. Borrowed Word Formation in Synchrony and Diachrony” took place from the 5th to the 6th of December, 2025 in Klagenfurt (Austria) as part of the 49. Österreichische Linguistiktagung. It focused on the cross-linguistically widespread but still understudied phenomenon of the coexistence of borrowed and native word-formation morphology (Matras & Sakel 2007; Gardani et al. 2015). The workshop included 13 presentations offering a comprehensive and theoretically informed exploration of morphological borrowing across many languages (Ancient Greek, Bosnian / Croatian / Montenegrin / Serbian, Dutch, English, French, Georgian, German, Greek, Italian, Korean, Latin, Lithuanian, Palestinian Arabic, Polish, Russian, Slovenian, Turkish) and domains (derivation, compounding, nominalization, morphological productivity, and affix rivalry, among many others).

The key perspectives of the workshop were outlined in the introductory talk by the convenors **Marko Simonović** (University of Graz), **Laura Grestenberger** (University of Vienna), **Gianina Iordăchioaia** (University of Graz), **Veronika Mattes** (University of Graz), and **Martina Werner** (Austrian Academy of Sciences) as follows. From a synchronic perspective, it has been observed that in many languages, borrowed morphemes pattern systematically on various levels of grammar and remain distinct from the native ones (Matras 2009; Haspelmath & Sims 2013). These distinctions can be characterized along several dimensions: 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, etc. For example, English *-ity* can serve as a prototypical Latinate morpheme (especially as compared to the native counterpart *-ness*): (i) it triggers a stress shift (e.g., *atómic* vs. *atómic-ity*; cf. *atómic-ness*), (ii) it triggers velar softening (e.g., *electri[k]* vs. *electri[s]ity*), (iii) it does not combine with Germanic bases (e.g., *humidity*, *humanity*, **wetity*, **slowity*; *humidness*, *humanness*, *wetness*, *slowness*), (iv) it often combines with bound bases (e.g., *society*, *quality*), and (v) it is often semantically opaque (e.g., *hospitality*). There are different theoretical ways to explain this very special behavior of borrowed morphemes. First, loanwords can be analyzed as a lexical class that can have their own co-phonology (Anttila 2002; Uchihara & Mendoza Ruiz 2022). Second, loanwords can be interpreted as marked with a special feature (or a set of features for multiple lexical strata) which regulates the application or under-application of certain morphophonological processes (Itō & Mester 1995; Jurgec 2010). Third, the specificity of loanwords can be accounted for by the fact that they simply have different representations whereas neither the grammar nor the lexicon are in any way sensitive to their loanword status (Inkelas et al. 1997; Newell 2021).

From a diachronic perspective, the distinction between native and borrowed word-formation morphology corresponds to the important dichotomy of internal and external morphological / morphosyntactic change (Pat-El 2013). Specifically, while internal change is directional, proceeding generally from the ‘lexical’ to the ‘functional’ pole (Grestenberger 2023), external change (borrowing) may be counter-directional, targeting morphologically complex forms while bypassing their bases or related words and leading to the increased morphological opacity in the recipient language. Taking this into account allows, among other things, to investigate how different types of language contact influence language change (Robbeets 2015; Roberts 2021; Walkden et al. 2023).

From a language acquisition perspective, it is remarkable that borrowed morphology becomes productive relatively late (typically from middle school age to young adulthood) and follows a developmental trajectory distinct from native morphology. Specifically, different studies attested a considerably weaker manifestation of overgeneralization in borrowed morphology as a result of its higher opacity (Tyler & Nagy 1989; Bar-Ilan & Berman 2007; Mattes 2018). If this distinction is not driven by a [\pm native] feature but by

correlated phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties, one can further expect to find variation within borrowed morphology depending on its degree of integration, including phonological and semantic transparency and distributional constraints.

The key research questions the workshop engaged with were formulated by the convenors as follows. Is the distinction between native and borrowed items part of the grammatical knowledge of speakers? What drives speakers’ perception of nativeness and what are the consequences of the process of morphological integration? How do languages integrate morphology borrowed from different sources (e.g., Latinate and English borrowings in German), and (how) does this give rise to different strata of word-formation patterns? 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? How do borrowed affixes become native-like diachronically? Is there a difference between the development of borrowed vs. native morphology during L1 acquisition? Do languages differ w.r.t. the importance of nativeness for morphological productivity and if so, how is this distinction best modelled?

Nino Amiridze (Tbilisi State University), **Rusudan Asatiani** (Tbilisi State University), and **Zurab Baratashvili** (Tbilisi State University / The Australian National University) presented their study on verb formation and loan verb accommodation (LVA) within various Georgian language contact settings, specifically focusing on the Imerkhevan dialect’s long-term contact with Turkish and modern spoken Georgian’s contact with Russian (from the middle of the 19th century until the beginning of the 1990s) and with English (since the late 1990s). By selecting these three distinct scenarios, the research compares the effects of diverse donor languages and varying intensities of contact, ranging from the several-century-long influence of Turkish to the relatively brief exposure to English. The primary objective of the analysis is to identify the specific accommodation devices utilized in each variety and to situate Georgian’s preverb-based strategies within the broader typological framework of LVA. Drawing on data from the Georgian Dialect Corpus, the study concludes that Georgian employs a specific variation of the ‘direct

insertion' strategy described by Wohlgemuth (2009). The investigation reveals a distinct developmental pattern in how Georgian integrated foreign verbs over time. At the beginning of each contact period, Georgian used the preverb *da*—the most grammaticalized among Georgian preverbs—as the sole means of LVA. As the contact intensified, other possible preverbs became activated to facilitate the integration of new lexical items. The authors claim that this transition from a single-preverb strategy to a more diversified morphological approach reflects internal restructuring of the verbal system rather than simple replication of donor-language patterns.

Lina Inčiuraitė-Noreikienė (Vilnius University) gave two closely related talks: on hybrid compounds in Lithuanian (in co-authorship with **Danguolė Straižytė** [Vilnius University]) and on hybrid prefixed derivatives in Lithuanian. Both studies draw upon data from three major Lithuanian dictionaries and the Corpus of Contemporary Lithuanian Language. The first study investigates the morphological structure of compounds with borrowed constituents in Lithuanian and their integration into the native word-formation system. A characteristic feature of Lithuanian compounding is the combination of two stems—mostly simplex—that function as free words. This is best illustrated by native compounds such as *žand-i-kaul-is* ('jawbone'), which combine the independent stems *žand-as* ('jaw') and *kaul-as* ('bone'). In contrast, certain borrowed stems used in compounds, such as *-skopas* ('-scope'), remain bound and cannot function independently. This distinction motivates an analysis based on the relationship between free and bound stems. From this perspective, the research introduces two types of hybrid compounds in Lithuanian, categorized by the degree of their morphonological integration. The first type consists of compounds with a native first stem and a borrowed second stem; these generally conform to the established patterns of native compounds in the recipient language. The second type comprises compounds with a bound first stem, which generally show no morphonological accommodation or integration into the Lithuanian word-formation system. Finally, the study examines the distribution of determinative and copulative hybrid compounds, providing a comprehensive overview of how these diverse elements are synthesized in the Lithuanian language.

The second study looks into the morphological structure of hybrid prefixed derivatives. The research raises a central question regarding the extent to which hybrid prefixed

derivatives of different degree of integration resemble indigenous prefixed derivatives. The study establishes that while prefixation is a vital method for noun formation in Lithuanian, it yielded fewer derivatives compared to other morphological processes. The research classifies hybrid derivatives into two distinct groups: those formed from borrowed bases with indigenous prefixes, and those formed from indigenous bases with borrowed prefixes. Furthermore, the analysis introduces a distinction between two types of integration into the native word-formation system. The first type consists of morphologically integrated hybrid derivatives, which exhibit no structural differences from indigenous ones, while the second type consists of non-integrated derivatives that remain structurally distinct. The study also identifies the most frequent borrowed prefixes that combine with indigenous stems and examines cases of morphological ambiguity, where formations can be interpreted as either suffixed or prefixed depending on the chosen base word. Through these combined observations, the study provides an important insight into how hybrid forms are assimilated within the current functional state of the Lithuanian language.

The first day of the workshop concluded with a talk by **Petra Sleeman** (University of Amsterdam) dedicated to borrowed word formation in French and specifically, to the deverbal nominalizing suffix *-ing*. Historically, research on French morphology, such as the work of Dell & Selkirk (1978), distinguished between native and non-native (learned) Latinate suffixes, noting that only the latter could trigger backing of the preceding vowel (e.g., *fleur* [flœʁ] ‘flower’ → *floral* [flɔʁal] ‘floral’). More recent linguistic theories, building upon the syntactic approach to morphology (e.g., Creemers et al. 2015; Don et al. 2015), propose a three-way distinction of French suffixes: (i) root suffixes (e.g., *-able*, *-ique*) are categorially flexible, attach closely to roots, and affect stress; (ii) head suffixes (e.g., *-ment*, *-age*), corresponding to Dell & Selkirk’s (1978) native suffixes, are rigid category assigners and are stress-neutral; finally, (iii) first head suffixes (e.g., *-[a]tion*) are intermediate, attach to bound roots, and trigger learned backing. This more complex system allows to explain why some French suffixes that are not strictly learned still cause the stem vowel to back, unlike pure head suffixes. Sleeman claims that the borrowed suffix *-ing* should be classified as a root suffix. While Latinate root suffixes like *-al* and *-eux* typically trigger learned backing, the study observes that this specific phonological process does not apply to *-ing*. Corpus research reveals that *-ing* in French attaches exclusively to English verbs

which lack autonomous status within the French lexicon and can therefore be analyzed as bound roots. Furthermore, the study demonstrates the categorial flexibility of the suffix. Although *-ing* generally forms nouns in French, the research identifies instances where *-ing* forms are used as verbal forms in place of French infinitives. This evidence of functional versatility supports the argument that *-ing* operates as a root suffix. By situating a borrowed English element within the structural levels of French morphology, the study provides a clearer understanding of how foreign suffixes can be integrated into a recipient language.

Opening the second day of the workshop, **Nikolas Webster** (University of California, Santa Cruz) presented his study examining the morphosyntactic differences between Sino-Korean and native Korean predicates and challenging traditional views on root categorization and argument structure. The research highlights a fundamental distinction: Sino-Korean predicates require a light verb in the sentential domain but lack verbal functional structure within their corresponding process nominals. Conversely, native Korean predicates require verbal functional structure in process nominals but disallow light verbs in the sentential domain. These findings suggest that argument structure is not inherently tied to a specific syntactic domain but originates from the root itself. Consequently, the study argues that both Sino-Korean process nominals and their predicate counterparts utilize a $\sqrt{(\text{Root})P}$ (Harley 2014), where roots function as heads capable of projecting phrases and taking complements. The investigation draws on these observations to challenge decompositional morphosyntactic theories that assume roots to be syntactically deficient and unable to exist in a structure without categorization (e.g., Alexiadou 2014; Embick & Marantz 2008). The data suggest that ‘root categorization’ is not a genuine grammatical function. Because Sino-Korean loanwords resist combination with native derivational affixes, they generate predicates with transparent morphological forms that map directly onto their underlying structures. The author argues that while categorizing heads exist, they serve only to demarcate transitions between verbal and nominal domains and do not attach directly to roots. Finally, the study proposes that loanwords should be used as a diagnostic for determining the size of the minimal unit that can be exponed post-syntactically (Bobaljik 2012). By analyzing these loanword structures, researchers could predict which syntactic information is obscured by the morphological

forms of native predicates. Webster concludes that rigorous cross-linguistic investigation of loanwords provides a vital methodology for resolving longstanding questions regarding the nature of argument structure and the role of syntactic categorization.

Lior Laks (Bar-Ilan University) and **Maha Nassar** (Bar-Ilan University) discussed the emergence of doublets in Palestinian Arabic verb formation due to loanword integration, specifically focusing on the competition between the *CaCCaC* and *tCaCCaC* morphological patterns (e.g., *baʕrefna:s malyana-t* ‘I know people became millionaires’ vs. *tmalyan-et min il-ʔazme* ‘I became a millionaire from the crisis’). The research uses online data to illustrate how a single loanword, such as *malyo:n* ‘million’, can generate two distinct verbal forms—*malyan* and *tmalyan*—both denoting the intransitive event of ‘becoming a millionaire’. Semitic morphology relies highly on non-concatenative formation where verbs are formed in patterns. The patterns dictate the phonological shape of the verbs, including their prosodic structure, vowel placement, and affixation (Berman 1978; Aronoff 1994). While previous literature identified *CaCCaC* and *tCaCCaC* as the only productive patterns among the ten existing in Arabic, the study highlights a shift in how these patterns are used. The investigation reveals that the traditional boundaries of transitivity between these two patterns become increasingly unstable. Historically, *CaCCaC* was associated with transitive verbs, while *tCaCCaC* was reserved for intransitive ones. However, the analysis of new web-based data shows the frequent appearance of intransitive doublets, such as *hastar / thastar* ‘become hysterical’ and *banšar / tbanšar* ‘become punctured’. The study offers some generalizations regarding the distribution of these forms. It is observed that while *tCaCCaC* remains strictly intransitive, the *CaCCaC* pattern expands to host both transitive and intransitive types. This expansion is partly motivated by a preference for avoiding the phonological complexity of *tCaCCaC* which features an initial consonant cluster that some dialects tend to avoid. Furthermore, the research establishes that the unification of these two patterns is only possible when there is no functional contrast between transitive and intransitive meanings for the same concept. In cases where a morphological distinction remains necessary to mark transitivity—such as in the pair *makyaj* ‘put makeup on someone else’ vs. *tmakyaj* ‘put makeup on oneself’—the language continues to maintain the formal contrast.

Emma Molloy (University of Copenhagen) presented her study about the competition between native German plural affixes and the borrowed S suffix, providing a test case for how foreign morphology integrates into a native grammatical system. Historically, the S-plural is traced to contact with French and Low German and has been functionally described as a ‘default option’ used primarily for untypical nouns, such as borrowings and abbreviations (see Monakhov et al. [2025] for a recent review and discussion). The suffix is also traditionally characterized as a northernism in dialectology. The research uses synchronic experimental data to evaluate whether the distribution of S is best explained by regional dialect or by functional, phonological constraints. The investigation utilizes a completion task involving 219 native speakers from various regions within the German-speaking area. Participants were asked to pluralize both codified nouns and nonce words designed to test specific phonological constraints. The results strongly support the functional account over the regional one. Spatial autocorrelation modelling reveals no significant differences between High, Central, and Low German dialect areas. All participants preferred S for most codified tokens (many of which were borrowings) as well as for both vowel- and consonant-final nonce items. Building on the model proposed by Wiese (2009), Molloy argues for a three-level inflectional framework where S functions as a word-level affix used in the absence of a stored irregular or analogical pattern. The research concludes that the typicality effect—where a speaker’s perception of a word’s nativeness guides affix choice—offers a principled account of how morphological productivity is conditioned in modern German.

The workshop continued with **Franz Rainer’s** (WU Vienna) contribution that critically examined the concept of ‘neoclassical word formation’. Rainer argues that this concept does not constitute a relevant or homogeneous part of synchronic linguistic competence. From a synchronic perspective, neoclassical patterns are actually a series of smaller, internally consistent patterns that lack any unique traits distinguishing them from ordinary word-formation processes. By contrast, a diachronic approach justifies treating patterns derived from Greek and Latin as a collective group. However, even historically, the mechanisms driving these changes are identical to those governing change in word formation in general. The research demonstrates that differential outcomes across languages are primarily the result of cultural factors or the degree of proximity to donor

languages, a point illustrated through a comparative analysis of French and Italian. A major finding of the diachronic investigation concerns the historical neglect of Modern Latin. The study reveals that many loan translations from Modern Latin went unnoticed. Furthermore, the analysis shows that many neologisms—particularly in the sciences prior to the 19th century—were not formed on a vernacular basis. Instead, they were constructed by bilingual writers using Greek or Latin word-formation principles and then immediately adapted to the vernacular language. The talk concluded by highlighting a shift that occurred in the 19th century. Whereas earlier neologisms relied on the direct structural links to classical languages, more recent formations were increasingly created by speakers with insufficient knowledge of Greek or Latin. These speakers began coining new words based solely on the existing neoclassical formations already attested in their language.

The case study presented by **Sandra Birzer** (University of Bamberg) analyzes the productivity of the Latinate suffix *-ist(a)* in Slavic noun formation, focusing on Polish, Russian, and Serbian. While Russian and Polish use only the variants *-ist* and *-ista* respectively, Serbian accepts both forms, e.g., *pijanista* vs. *pijanist* ‘pianist’ (Klajn 2005). The analysis is synchronic and draws on data from web corpora to capture everyday usage, which allows a more accurate estimation of linguistic productivity. The study pursues two interrelated objectives: evaluating the suffix’s degree of integration across the three branches of Slavic and addressing the competition between the Serbian variants. The research identifies a three-stage developmental pathway for the suffix’s integration. The first stage involves borrowed internationalisms, such as the Russian *ideal-ist*, representing ‘matter replication’ (Sakel 2007). The second stage consists of language-internal formations using borrowed bases, such as the Russian *futbol-ist* ‘football player’. The final stage comprises formations with native Slavic bases, such as the Russian *očerk-ist* ‘essayist’. The findings reveal that while Russian and Polish have successfully reached the third stage of nativization, the Serbian suffix still remains limited to borrowed bases. Regarding the affix rivalry in Serbian, Birzer argues that though *-ista* formations currently dominate in both type and token frequency, there is a divergent trend for recent English borrowings, such as *sajentist* ‘scientist’ or *sajklist* ‘cyclist’, which occur exclusively with the *-ist* variant. The study concludes by exploring whether the patterns observed in Russian, Polish, and Serbian can be analyzed as a case of ‘allogenuous exaptation’ (Gardani 2016), with the suffix

initially assuming a specialized function as a loan marker and then losing this status when fully integrated into the native lexicon.

The talk by **Anthoula Revithiadou** (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), **Ilias Mittas** (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), and **Giorgos Markopoulos** (University of the Aegean) was dedicated to the encoding of morphological nativeness in Greek through the lens of loanword assimilation. Historically, linguistic analyses recognized a binary distinction in Greek: loanwords were either treated as unassimilated, indeclinable forms (e.g., *tanks*) or as fully assimilated words integrated into the Greek inflectional system (e.g., *lórð-os*). The research identifies a previously undocumented intermediate pattern where established unassimilated forms, such as *tíktok*, coexist with emergent assimilated variants like *tíktók-i*. This phenomenon provides a unique opportunity to observe the real-time dynamics of morphological integration and the specific criteria speakers use to determine a word's status within their grammar. The investigation reveals that while morphosemantic factors—such as whether a referent is human—influence adaptation, the primary driver for integration is inflection class productivity. Specifically, the study finds that the highly productive neuter *-i* class readily accepts new loanwords, whereas other neuter classes, such as *-o*, are systematically excluded. This leads to the conclusion that Greek speakers do not rely on phonotactic gatekeeping to encode nativeness (e.g., the presence of word-final *k* in *tíktok*, which is illicit in Greek phonotactics, does not trigger phonological adaptation). Instead, nativeness is encoded through the selection of productive morphological classes. Furthermore, the analysis establishes a link between the productivity of an inflection class and stress predictability. The research shows that speakers prefer to channel foreign roots into classes with predictable stress patterns, such as the *-i* class, where nouns are systematically stressed on the penultimate syllable. By prioritizing these stable, productive patterns, speakers facilitate the integration of foreign lexical items into the native grammatical structure. The study concludes that morphological nativeness in Greek is defined more by the alignment with productive inflectional regularities than by the rigid adherence to native phonological constraints.

The two concluding talks of the workshop formed one thematic block, dedicated to the problem of competing Latinate and native nominalizations in different European languages. **Gianina Iordăchioaia** (University of Graz) and **Sergei Monakhov**

(University of Graz) presented a large-scale corpus study of three competing nominalization patterns in German: (i) Latinate *ion*-formations (e.g., *Dekoration*), (ii) native *ung*-formations (e.g., *Dekorierung*), and (iii) native nominal infinitives (e.g., *Dekorieren*). Taking into account that both native derivations require the Latinate verbalizer *-ier-* and building on Grimshaw’s (1990) distinction between the so-called Argument Structure Nominals (ArgStrN) and Result Nominals (ResN), the authors hypothesize that along the continuum of verbal event structure preservation in nominals, *ion*-nouns are closest to the result reading pole, nominal infinitives are closest to the argument-structure reading pole, with *ung*-nouns falling somewhere in between and competing with the former two for respective interpretations. In many cases, nominalizations can be ambiguous between the two readings, which is why Iordăchioaia and Monakhov, first, estimate the probabilities of the respective classes of nouns to appear (i) with inflectional or prepositional genitive phrases and (ii) in plural and second, use the log-odds ratio of these two probabilities as a formal diagnostics of the nouns’ ArgStrN-hood and ResN-hood. Positive values of the ratio indicate that the nouns are, on average, more likely to be encountered with genitive phrases than in plural form and hence, preserve much of the verbal event structure. Negative values of the ratio, by contrast, show that the nouns are more likely to be used in plural than with genitive phrases and hence, have drifted far way from the ArgStrN-reading pole. Using frequency counts of 4,390 *-ion*-, *-ung* and infinitive nominalizations extracted from the German *deTenTen23* corpus (Sketch Engine) and Bayesian hierarchical modelling approach, the authors compare the ArgStrN-properties of three groups of competing nominalizations: (i) *ion*-, *ung*-, and infinitive nominalizations built from the same verb root (e.g., *dekor-*); (ii) *ung*- and infinitive nominalizations derived from Germanic verbs that do not show *ion*-nominals and contain no *-ier-* verbalizer (e.g., *Abbildung / Abbilden* ‘depiction’); and (iii) *ung*- and infinitive nominalizations derived from verbs that do not show *ion*-nominals but contain *-ier-* (e.g., *Jodieren / Jodierung / *Jod(is)ation* ‘iodization’). Comparing these three groups of families allows to separately estimate two effects: (i) the rivalry effect induced by the presence / absence of *ion*-noun and (ii) the structure effect, induced by the presence / absence of the verbalizer *-ier-*. The results show that items with *-ier-*, both infinitives and *ung*-nouns, indeed appear more ArgStrN-like than their counterparts

without the verbalizer. Further on, Iordăchioaia and Monakhov observe that within the pair of *ung*-nominalization classes with verbalizer, those nouns for which there is no attested *ion*-counterpart behave more ResN-like than those that have this counterpart. This finding suggests that *ung*- and *ion*-nominalizations compete for the ResN reading, and when the possibility of using an *ion*-noun is missing, the respective *ung*-noun has to take on its functions.

The workshop concluded with a talk by **Marko Simonović** (University of Graz), **Predrag Kovačević** (University of Novi Sad), **Joeri Vinke** (University of Graz), and **Petra Mišmaš** (University of Nova Gorica) on Latinate nominalizations in Germanic and Slavic languages. The authors investigate the specific behavior of Latinate nouns ending in *-ion* in competition with native deverbal nominalizations in Dutch and Western South Slavic (WSS) languages (Slovenian and Bosnian / Croatian / Montenegrin / Serbian). A key feature of these languages, which distinguishes them from English, is that native nominalizations here preserve an obligatory overt verbalizing morpheme required in Latinate verbs but absent in Latinate nominalizations. For instance, the Dutch *conserv-er-en* has two corresponding forms: native *conserv-er-ing* and Latinate *conservatie*. Similarly, in WSS, there are two competing nouns associated with the verb *konzerv-ira-ti*: *konzerv-ira-nje* and *konzervacija*. The focus of the investigation is on how these morphological differences affect the verbality of the resulting nouns. While Dutch and WSS share the requirement for verbalizing morphemes, they differ in their treatment of the infinitive; in Dutch, the nominalized infinitive can function as a noun and take genitive arguments, whereas in WSS, the infinitive cannot be nominalized, leading to a system where every Latinate verb derives a native nominalization in *-nje*. The study draws on corpus data to track the frequency of plural and genitive-marked forms. Following syntactic literature, the authors hypothesize that plural marking indicates a simpler, less verbal structure, while the presence of genitive complements signals a more complex verbal structure (Grimshaw 1990). The findings consistently support the hypothesis that Latinate nominalizations carry less verbal structure than their native counterparts. In Dutch, 42 % of native nominalizations are followed by a genitive (*van*) complement, compared to only 29 % of Latinate forms. This pattern is mirrored in Slovenian, where the numbers are 48 % for native forms and 29 % for Latinate ones. Conversely, the data

regarding pluralization—a marker of noun-like behavior—show the opposite trend. In Dutch, Latinate forms are pluralized at a rate of 7 % compared to 4 % for native forms. In Slovenian, the contrast is even starker: Latinate nominalizations are pluralized in 13 % of cases, while native *-nje* forms are almost never pluralized, appearing at a rate of only 0.5 %. Ultimately, these results suggest that the absence of verbal morphology in Latinate nominalizations facilitates their transition into pure nouns. Native nominalizations, by retaining the verbalizing morpheme, remain anchored to their verbal origins, favoring event-based structures that require arguments. This distinction highlights a fundamental link between the internal morphological makeup of a word and its subsequent syntactic behavior across different European language families.

In sum, the workshop *Native vs. Borrowed Word Formation in Synchrony and Diachrony* offered a comprehensive and theoretically informed exploration of morphological borrowing in many languages and domains. Across the individual contributions, several thematic clusters emerged. First, talks on loan-based verb formation revealed how borrowed roots interact with native verbal systems, often triggering internal restructuring rather than simple copying. Second, studies of nominalization and affix rivalry showed that borrowed morphology participates in paradigmatic relations and affects the behavior of native formations. Third, research on hybrid word formation highlighted degrees of morphological integration and the importance of structural criteria over etymology. Finally, multiple studies converged on a usage-based notion of morphological nativeness, grounded in productivity, predictability, and speaker perception. Taken together, the workshop demonstrated that the study of native and borrowed word formation provides crucial insights into morphological structure, change, and variation, and that borrowing is best understood as an integral part of grammatical systems rather than as a peripheral phenomenon.

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis. 2014. Roots don't take complements. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(3-4): 287–297.
- Anttila, Arto. 2002. Morphologically conditioned phonological alternations. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20(1). 1–42.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by itself*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Bar-Ilan, Laly & Ruth A. Berman. 2007. Developing register differentiation: the Latinate-Germanic divide in English. *Linguistics* 45(1). 1–35.
- Berman, Ruth A. 1978. *Modern Hebrew structure*. Tel Aviv: University Publishing Projects.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2012. *Universals in comparative morphology: Suppletion, superlatives and the structure of words*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Creemers, Ava, Jan Don & Paula Fenger. 2015. Stress-sensitivity and flexibility as a consequence of morphological structure. In Thuy Bui & Deniz Özyıldız (eds.), *NELS 45: proceedings of the 45th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 165–178. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
- Dell, Francois & Elisabeth O. Selkirk. 1978. On a morphologically governed vowel alternation in French. S. Keyser (ed.), *Recent transformational studies in European languages*, 1–51. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Don, Jan, Petra Sleeman & Thom Westveer. 2015. Three types of suffixes in French. In Björn Köhnlén & Jenny Audring (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 32. 33–47.
- Embick, David & Alec Marantz. 2008. Architecture and blocking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(1). 1–53.
- Gardani, Francesco. 2016. Allogenuous exaptation. In Muriel Norde & Freek Van de Velde (eds.), *Exaptation and language change*, 227–260. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gardani, Francesco, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds.). 2015. *Borrowed morphology*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Grestenberger, Laura. 2023. The diachrony of verbalizers in Indo-European: Where does *v* come from? *Journal of Historical Syntax* 7(6–19). 1–40.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 2014. On the identity of roots. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(3–4). 225–276.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Andrea Sims. 2013. *Understanding morphology*. Routledge.
- Inkelas, Sharon, Orhan Orgun & Cheryl Zoll. 1997. The implications of lexical exceptions for the nature of grammar. In John J. McCarthy (ed.), *Optimality Theory in Phonology: A Reader*, 542–551. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Itō, Junko & Armin Mester. 1995. Japanese phonology. In John A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, 817–838. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jurģec, Peter. 2010. Disjunctive lexical stratification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41(1). 149–161.
- Klajn, Ivan. 2005. *Gramatika srpskog jezika* [Grammar of the Serbian language]. Belgrade.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel (eds.). 2007. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mattes, Veronika. 2018. *Derivationsmorphologie und Wortarten im Erstspracherwerb des Deutschen: Mit einem Fokus auf dem Schuleintrittsalter*. Habilitation thesis, University of Graz.
- Monakhov, Sergei, Holger Diessel & Brisca Balthes. 2025. Learn what is detectable, detect what is useful: acquisition of German plural as a classification problem. *Cognition* 266. 106292.
- Newell, Heather. 2021. Deriving level 1 / level 2 affix classes in English: Floating vowels, cyclic syntax. *Acta Linguistica Academica* 68(1–2). 31–76.
- Pat-El, Na’ama. 2013. Contact or inheritance? Criteria for distinguishing internal and external change in genetically related languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2). 313–328.
- Robbeets, Martine. 2015. Common denominal verbalizers in the Transeurasian languages: borrowed or inherited? In Francesco Gardani, Peter Arkadiev & Nino Amiridze (eds.), *Borrowed morphology*, 137–154. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Roberts, Ian. 2021. *Diachronic syntax*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 15–30. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Tyler, Andrea & William Nagy. 1989. The acquisition of English derivational morphology. *Journal of Memory and Language* 27. 649–667.
- Uchihara, Hiroto & Juana Mendoza Ruiz. 2022. Minimality, maximality and perfect prosodic word in Alcozauca Mixtec. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 40(2). 599–649.
- Walkden, George, Juhani Klemola & Thomas Rainsford. 2023. An overview of contact-induced morphosyntactic changes in early English. In Sara M. Pons-Sanz & Louise Sylvester (eds.), *Medieval English in a Multilingual Context: Current Methodologies and Approaches*, 239–277. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Wiese, Richard. 2009. The grammar and typology of plural noun inflection in varieties of German. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 12(2). 137–173.
- Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *A typology of verbal borrowings*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Sergei Monakhov
University of Graz
Universitätsplatz 3
A–8010 Graz, Austria
sergei.monakhov@uni-graz.at



This is an open access publication. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution CC-BY 4.0 license. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>