

On Adaptation Of English Nominal Compounds In The Serbian Language With Reference To Word-Formation Types

Radić Ninoslava

Faculty of Law,
University in East Sarajevo

Petrović Tanja

Faculty of Transport and Traffic Engineering,
University in East Sarajevo

Abstract: *Overwhelming technological and cultural dominance of English-speaking countries on the global scale has resulted in intense borrowing of English lexemes, most notably nominal compounds, into the Serbian language. Since English and Serbian, as typologically different languages, employ different techniques in enriching their respective lexicons, the question arises as to which mechanisms in the Serbian language are used in the process of adaptation of English nominal compounds. The analysis, which is carried out on a corpus of 827 anglicisms adapted from English nominal compound models, showed that the Serbian language relies mostly on phonological and morphological adaptation of English lexemes and building semi-compounds than on other word-formation types. The choice of mechanisms used in adaptation of English compound models in Serbian is determined by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors.*

Keywords: *adaptation, derivation, english nominal compounds, linguistic/extralinguistic factors, semi-compounds.*

I. Introduction

Owing to the global dominance of the English language in many aspects of human activities, national languages across the world have been receiving a growing influx of English lexemes, the Serbian language being no exception. Since compounding is one of the most productive word-formation processes in English, many of the words borrowed into Serbian belong to the category of compounds. Furthermore, as words are borrowed into a language mainly for the purpose of naming a novel concept, vast majority of borrowed compounds are nouns. Serbian language, on the other hand, due to its typological features, is not too inclined to compounding, relying on derivation instead. The aim of this paper is to examine the word-formation mechanisms the Serbian language employs when borrowing compound nouns from English.

II. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework supporting our analysis lies within the language contact theory (as pioneered by Weinreich and Haugen, and further developed by Filipović (1986; 1990), Bugarski (1996) and others, which attempts to explain linguistic phenomena occurring as a result of interaction between speakers of different languages.

Borrowing, as one of the results of the language contact, is a process where a linguistic element from the donor language (L_D), which is referred to as model, is transferred into the recipient language (L_R) where it becomes replica. The transferred element undergoes the process of adaptation (at phonological/orthographic, morphological, syntactic and pragmatic level), during which it tends to retain some of the features of the L_D , which may result in interference – the importation of features of L_D into L_R . (Haugen: 1972, p. 82).

As language contact is never purely a linguistic phenomenon, but fundamentally a social one¹, social circumstances surrounding borrowing will largely determine which elements of language will be borrowed and to what extent. The distinction, to which Bloomfield pointed out in his seminal book *Language*, between cultural and intimate borrowing remains widely accepted to this day. Intimate borrowing „occurs when two languages are spoken in what is topographically and politically a single community“ (1933: p. 461). Cultural borrowing,

¹ One must bear in mind at all times that, as Weinreich (1953: 1) puts it, it is the language-using individuals, not the languages themselves, who are the „locus of contact“.

on the other hand, comes as a result of spread of ideas, things and habits (cultural diffusion) from one „culturally superior“ community to another. Therefore, cultural borrowing „shows us what one nation has taught another“ (Ibid., p. 458).

Since English and Serbs never constituted single community², contacts between the English language and the Serbian language fall into the category of cultural borrowing. Under such circumstances, linguistic elements borrowed almost exclusively are words. Furthermore, as the English language and culture are perceived as „superior“ and dominant to the Serbian language and culture, the linguistic influence is typically exerted in one direction only, i.e. from English to Serbian. Therefore, the cultural contacts between English and Serbian result mainly in the Serbian language adopting lexical elements from English. Hence, word borrowed from English, as the donor language, and adapted in the linguistic system of another language (in this case Serbian), as the recipient language, is referred to as anglicism.

It is generally understood (Katamba: 2005, Plag: 2003, Bauer: 1983 et al.) that there are three main types of word-formation processes in English language: composition, derivation (affixation and suffixation) and conversion. While being perhaps the most controversial word-formation type in terms of linguistic analysis, composition is, at the same time, the most productive type (Plag: 2003, p. 132). Compounds are the epitome of language creativity, the perfect compromise between two conflicting but constant needs in humans – to communicate a message effectively, on the one hand, and to economize with the speech activity, on the other hand. Thus, the general discourse function of compounds is, as Plag succinctly puts it, to “squeeze complex concepts into very short expressions” (2003: p. 151), a function compounds perform successfully, which is why they are ubiquitous in the English language.

Such proliferation of compounding in the English language is possible owing largely to its typological properties, which are assessed by two parameters: the degree of synthesis³ (has to do with the number of morphemes per word) and the treatment of morphological boundaries (has to do with the transparency of morphological boundaries between the morphemes within a grammatical word) (Aikhenvald: 2007, p.8). In terms of transparency of word-internal boundaries, the English language includes features of all three types (isolating, agglutinating and fusional), whereas in terms of degree of synthesis, it is closer to analytic than synthetic languages. The Serbian language, conversely, is a more typical representative of its group. As other Slavic languages it is highly fusional, having no clear boundaries between the stem and the bound morphemes, with semantically and grammatically distinct features usually being merged into a single bound form. With respect to degree of synthesis, it is a synthetic language, as it has an abundant inventory of derivational morphemes. Therefore, in enriching their lexicon, analytic and synthetic languages employ different techniques: while synthetic languages, such as Serbian, rely on internal structure of their grammatical words, analytic languages, such as English, employ syntactic devices (Aikhenvald: 2007, p. 10).

We mentioned earlier in passing that the compounding is one of the most controversial word-formation types in English. Despite the large body of literature dealing with the question of what a compound is and what it is not (Adams, Marchand, Bauer, Plag, Katamba&Stonham, Selkirk, DiSciullo et al.), we still do not have one universally accepted definition of compound. With respect to typological differences between languages, a universal cross-linguistic definition of a compound is hardly possible. Hence, many authors have abandoned the effort to define compound and have moved on to try to identify the universally accepted criteria for determining what compound is. In the English language the effort to define compounding is centered around two main issues: how to define word and how to distinguish compounds from phrases. In this paper we shall adopt definition offered by Bauer which states that a compound may be defined as “a lexeme containing two or more potential stems that has not subsequently been subjected to a derivational process” (1983: p. 29).

Let us leave the issue of word-formation processes for a moment to raise another question: why are words borrowed in the first place?⁴ Setting aside the distinction between linguistic and extralinguistic factors in borrowing, or the causalities of lexical borrowing identified as either need or prestige, we will cite Carling et al. who maintain that „the fundamental principle of borrowing is that as soon as a new concept is introduced into the material or immaterial sphere, then a designation for this new concept is needed.“ (2019, p. 2). Since nouns perform the function of naming a thing, a concept or an idea, they obviously comprise gigantic proportion of the borrowed lexical material. For this reason, we too shall narrow our analysis of adaptation of English compounds to the word category of nouns.

² Except in few restricted cases of Serbian immigrant communities in the USA or Australia.

³ The distinction between analytical and synthetic languages can be understood as a continuum rather than a dichotomy (Aikhenvald: 2007, p. 7) since a given language may fall anywhere on the analytic – synthetic – polysynthetic scale. Furthermore, the degree of synthesis or analysis of a language can be calculated by dividing the number of morphemes in a sentence or a text by the number of words – the so called morpheme per word index (Greenberg: 1954.).

⁴ Bugarski (1995: p. 73) insists that theoretically or mathematically speaking, there are no reasons for any given language to borrow from other languages, as every language is perfectly capable of creating all the new words it may ever need out its own resources.

Since compounds account for a huge portion of the English lexicon, many of them find their way into the Serbian language. Having in mind what we said earlier about Serbian not being too prone to compounding, the question is raised as to techniques it uses in adopting English compounds, which have been entering the Serbian lexicon at a startling pace. So, what other word-formation types does the Serbian language have at its disposal to deal with the challenge of adopting English nominal compounds?

Besides compounding, there are three other word-formation types: derivation (prefixation or suffixation) which is, as we established earlier, highly productive:

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|----|-------------------------|
| do | – | | ,n | (Engl. business letter) |
| nat | – | pis | ,n | (Engl. inscription) |
| is | – | stem (Engl. write) | ,n | (Engl. printed text) |
| pre | – | | ,n | (Engl. copy) |

Figure 1: Example of prefixation in the Serbian language

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|----------|------------------|
| | – | ac, n | (Engl. writer) |
| pis | – | ar, n | (Engl. clerk) |
| stem (Engl. write) | – | mo, n | (Engl. letter) |
| | – | men, adj | (Engl. literate) |

Figure 2: Example of suffixation in the Serbian language⁵

conversion (creation of a new word from the existing word of a different word class), which is a word-formation process far less productive than derivation and takes place within a language rather than cross-linguistically, i.e. it is not used in adaptation of models from the donor language;

and “combined word-formation” (Stanojčić-Popović: 1992, p. 125), in which prefix and suffix are added to the stem at the same time, hence also referred to as prefixal-suffixal derivation:

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|-------------|---|----------|---------------|
| do | – | vrat | – | ak | dovratak, n |
| (prefix) | | stem (door) | | (suffix) | door-frame, n |

Figure 3: Example of suffixal-prefixal derivation in Serbian

In the process of forming a replica from a compound model, however, a receiving language is not limited to word-formation types. As free morphemes which comprise an English compound and grammatical relations between them often remain obscure to monolingual speakers of Serbian who take part in the adaptation process, model may be perceived and treated as a simple lexeme and adapted only phonologically/orthographically and morphologically: Engl. weekend – Sr. vikend, Engl. folklore – Sr. folklor, Engl. evergreen – Sr. evergrin, Engl. milkshake – Sr. milkšejk, Engl. babysitter – Sr. bejbisiter. Anglicisms adapted in this way are often referred to as obvious anglicisms (Prčić: 2005. p. 121), as they have been evidently transposed or fused into Serbian without any attempt to be translated.

Formation of replica can also take place beyond lexical level, i.e. at the phrasal level: Engl. fishing rod – štap za pecanje (lit. rod for fishing), Engl. headhunter – Sr. lovac na glave (lit. hunter for heads), Engl. public relations – Sr. odnosi sa javnošću (lit. relations with public), Engl. pillow talk – Sr. šaputanje na jastuku (lit. whispering on the pillow), where the Serbian phrase reflects at the surface the underlying grammatical relations, which exist between constituents of the English compound. Nominal phrases are particularly suitable for conveying meaning of complex concepts and ideas denoted by an English nominal compound. For the reasons of language economy, nevertheless, adaptation of compound models as phrases is rarely resorted to.

As for the compounding, we established earlier that, for the reason of its typological properties, the Serbian language rarely utilizes this type of word-formation process in the adaptation of the English compounds. However, this is true only for some types of compounds. In fact, there are several distinct construction types under the label of compound in the Serbian language,⁶ some of which are, as we will see, more suitable for adaptation of the English nominal compound models than others.

The understanding of the nature of composition in the Serbian language has changed significantly in the 20th century⁷. Modern definition, proposed by Klajn (2002: p.23), defines compound as a single lexical, morphological and semantic unit composed of a word and a stem or two or more stems. This resulted in a new classification of compound types, which is based on the word-formation processes involved in its construction:

- 1) compounds proper, sometimes referred to as the traditional Serbian compounds (consisting of a stem and a word joined into a single lexeme by a linking vowel): *bratoubojstvo, kućepazitelj*
- 2) suffixal compounds (consisting of a stem and a word derived by suffixation): *ženomrzac, častohlepan*
- 3) prefixal compounds (consisting of a stem derived by prefixation and a word) *omalovažiti*

⁵ Examples are adapted from Stanojčić-Popović (1992: p. 124)

⁶ For more on compounding in Serbian see: Babić: 2002; Klajn: 2002; Barić: 1997; Stanojčić-Popović 1992.

⁷ For more on shifts in understanding the nature of composition in the Serbian linguistics see Radić 2022.

4) reduced phrases (Sr. sraslice – comprising – conjoined words bearing all the inflectional markers which appear in a corresponding syntactic phrase) *zlurad = zlu rad*,

5) semi-compounds (comprising two words, joined by a hyphen in writing, where the first word does not receive inflectional markers for either case or number): *jež-frizura, krompir-čorba*.

Semi-compounds, unlike other compound types, are not native to the Serbian language. They developed historically as a means of adaptation of compound loans from other languages: first Turkish⁸, later German, and more recently English.

To summarize, the Serbian language has an array of mechanisms to choose from when dealing with the issue of adaptation of English compounds: simple lexemes, prefixation, affixation, combined word-formation, compounding and syntactic phrases. The aim of this paper is to examine which of these are most often used in adaptation of English compound nouns.

Having in mind linguistic factors (productivity of various word-formation types in loan adaptation in general) and extralinguistic factors (urgent need to adapt an ever-increasing number of anglicisms and the fact that using English words has become a matter of prestige) which are involved in adaptation of anglicisms, we can assume that English nominal compounds will mostly adapt by means of transcription (phonological/morphological adaptation), derivation and building of semi-compounds.

III. Corpus And Methodology

The analysis of linguistic levels and word-formation types in the Serbian language which are used to adapt English nominal compounds was carried out on a corpus of 827 anglicisms from the category of nouns. The corpus was compiled specifically for this purpose from the Serbian dictionaries of loanwords (Klajn-Šipka: 2008, Prčić, Vasić, Nejgebauer: 2001, Otašević: 2008 and Prčić et al.: 2021). The anglicisms were extracted and annotated manually. Neo-classical compounds, eponyms and acronyms were not included in the corpus, as they are almost exclusively adapted by means of transcription, so their analysis would not contribute to understanding of the processes involved in adaptation of English nominal compounds.

Unidirectional quantitative contrastive analysis between English and Serbian is conducted in search of not all semantic equivalents (possible translation) of an English model, but only those equivalents which entered the Serbian language as the replica of a given model. Since the analysis is carried out predominantly at the lexical level (and only partially at the phrasal level), and is focused on the surface of the expression, rather than on the underlying relations between its elements, structural linguistic model is deemed more convenient.

IV. Results And Discussion

The analysis of the anglicisms adapted from the English nominal compounds in the Serbian language showed that the overwhelming majority of models, nearly half of them (412, which makes 49.75% of the corpus) adapted as simple words by means of transcription (i.e. phonological/ortographic and morphological adaptation). Second largest group are semi-compounds with 204 replicas in the corpus. The analysis confirmed our assumption concerning the scarcity of compounds proper, which comprise meager 1.44% of the anglicisms. Replicas formed by means of derivation, contrary to our assumptions, make up rather insignificant portion of the corpus (only 3.38%). The Table 1 below shows word-formation processes in the Serbian language which are used in adaptation of the English models, and their productivity expressed in percentages.

Table 1: Word-formation processes in Serbian used in adaptation of English nominal compounds

| WORD-FORMS | SUBTYPE | EXAMPLE | Σ | % |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--|-----|-------|
| SIMPLE | | ajlajner, bekgraund, čizkejk, hoverkraft, pejskar, saundtrek | 412 | 49.81 |
| DERIVATIVES | prefixal derivatives | doigravanje, suzakup | 27 | 3.26 |
| | suffixal derivatives | filmadžija, košarka, tenisica, zvoncare | | |
| | suff-pref derivatives | potiskivač, produžetak, glasnogovornik | | |
| COMPOUNDS | copounds proper | vremeplov, parkometar, novogovor, dvoklik, neboder | 12 | 1.45 |
| | suffixal comp. | tjelohranitelj | | |
| | semi-compounds | art-direktor, blister-pakovanje, fan-klub, koktel-haljina | 204 | 24.66 |

⁸ Turkish empire ruled over much of the Balkans for almost five centuries, thus clearing the way for many Turkish words into the Serbian language. (Milanović: 2002). Compounding is a highly productive word-formation type in Turkish, prominent feature of Turkish compounds being the absence of a linking vowel.

| | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|--|------------|-------------|
| PHRASES | noun + noun _{nom} | firma kćerka, bombaš samoubica | 172 | 20.43 |
| | noun + noun _{gen} | donosioci odluka, zona komfora | | |
| | noun + noun _{instr} | upravljanje rizikom, trgovina ljudima | | |
| | adj + noun | bijela kragna, krajnji korisnik, medeni mjesec | | |
| | noun + prep + noun | balzam za usne, hokej na travi, učenje na daljinu, puter od kikirikija | | |
| TOTAL | | | 827 | 100% |

1.1 Simple words

Simple words are, by far, the most frequent word-type in the corpus. In the Serbian language simple words are defined as the words which cannot be divided further into smaller independent meaningful or morphological units, i.e. words which are not motivated by other words. (Stanojčić-Popović 1995: p. 123).

As free morphemes, which comprise an English compound, and grammatical relations between them often remain obscure to the speakers of Serbian, compound model is perceived and treated as a simple lexeme. Replicas from our corpus which fall into the category of simple words are, in fact, the so called „obvious anglicisms“ – English lexemes which have only undergone phonological/ortographical and morphological adaptation, so that they can have grammatical endings attached to them (Prčić: 2005. p. 121). Such anglicisms in our corpus are: Sr. barmen < Engl. barman, Sr. četrum < Engl. chatroom, Sr. dedlajn < Engl. deadline, Sr. kornflejks < engl. cornflakes, Sr. noutbuk < Engl. notebook, Sr. rensomver < Engl. ransomware, Sr. songrajter < Engl. song-writer, Sr. stejkholder < Engl. stakeholder, Sr. trenčkot < Engl. trench coat, Sr. ziplajn < Engl. zip-line and many others.

Small number of models are adapted into Serbian by having one element of a compound deleted: Engl. comic strip > Sr. strip, Engl. combine-harvester > Sr. kombajn, Engl. drug dealer > Sr. dealer, Engl. jigsaw puzzle > Sr. puzle.

1.2 Derivatives

Despite being the most productive word-formation type in the Serbian language, derivation of words by means of adding either prefixes or suffixes (or combination of the two) is used only sporadically. Mere 27 replicas belong to the category of derivatives, which makes up insignificant portion of 3.26% of our corpus. E.g. Engl. coloring book > Sr. bojanka, Engl. tennis shoe > Sr. tenisica, Engl. bell-bottoms > Sr. zvoncare. Moreover, some of the replicas from this group are semantic loans – a type of translation loans in which, under the influence of a donor language, the existing word from a recipient language is given a new meaning (Turk: 1998, p. 519): Engl. soap-opera > Sr. sapunica, Engl. overtime > Sr. produžetak, Engl. whistle-blower > Sr. zviždač, Engl. workshop > Sr. radionica.

In light of this, the question arises as to why the most productive process in the Serbian language is used so frugally in adapting nominal compounds from English. The answer should be sought after in both linguistic and extralinguistic circumstances surrounding borrowing.

The main linguistic factors which contribute to English models being fused into Serbian concern shortness of expression and existence of simple and flexible rules for combining words into compounds. Put simply, the English lexicon has huge number of short (monosyllable or two-syllable) words, which, even after being combined into compounds, still result in a relatively short lexeme expressing a complex notion⁹: *ski-pass*, *golf-club*, *sex-bomb*, *feeze-frame*, *foot-fault*, *nood look* etc. Taking over English model and adapting it only phonologically and morphologically results in having lexemes of reasonable length (in Serbian, replica will receive inflectional markers) without investing too much effort in its creation.

This brings us to extralinguistic factors governing adaptation process. Adapting English compound model into replica by means of derivation requires linguistic knowledge and, more importantly, fair amount of creativity. And even if these requirements are met and a new word is coined, there are no guarantees that it will be accepted by the speech community, as is the case with e.g. Engl. handout > Sr. izručak/hendaut, Engl. bypass > Sr. premosnica/bajpas, Engl. chatroom – Sr. pričaoonica/četrum, Engl. play-off > Sr. doigravanje/plejof etc. Indeed, chances that replica which was adapted by translation or derivation will be accepted have significantly lessened since using English words has become not only a necessity but a matter of prestige. Furthermore, the process of adaptation has become a race against time, the one which Serbian normativists are losing. This is yet

⁹ Short is good from the point of view of language economy.

another reason why the Serbian language community (which is becoming increasingly bilingual) resorts to taking over English words.

1.3 Compounds

As was predicted by our hypothesis, traditional compounding types are scarcely used in adapting English models. There are only 12 compounds in the corpus, most of them adapted into Serbian decades ago: Engl. skyscraper > Sr. neboder, Engl. spokesperson > Sr. glasnogovornik, Engl. bodyguard > Sr. tjelohranitelj. Semi-compounds, on the contrary, are the second most productive word-formation type with 204 cases, which make up one quarter of all replicas in the corpus.

So, what are the reasons behind the productivity of semi-compounds in adaptation of English compound nominals? Semi-compounds found in our corpus can be divided into two types: those made up of anglicisms which have been earlier adopted in Serbian as simple lexemes: *biznis-klasa*, *boks-meč*, *safari-park*, *šoping-mol*, *koktel-bar* etc., and semi-compounds whose one (usually first) element is English word and another element is either Serbian word or, more often, adapted anglicism: *art-film*, *big-bend*, *ček-lista*, *sparing-partner*, *snek-bar*, *rol-model*, *tribjut-bend* (the so-called hybrid compounds). The most prominent feature of Serbian semi-compounds which distinguishes them from other compound types is the fact that they are made up of two words, rather than a stem and a word. This makes it easier to fill the first slot with an English word. More importantly, the first elements in Serbian compounds is not subject to any morphological changes (does not receive inflection markers for case, number, gender) as Serbian words normally are. This facilitates immensely the adaptation process, as inflectional markers are added to part of the compound which has earlier already been adapted in Serbian. Semi-compounds thus represent a kind of compromise between the need to name the new thing, idea or concept, the need to use English word (which has become more fashionable) and the need to adjust new word to the morphological system of the Serbian language.

Another reason for high productivity of semi-compounds in formation of replicas from English nominal compound models concerns their inner structure. The relationship between elements of a semi-compound is based on hyponymy – inner structure which is characteristic of endocentric nominal compounds: *call-centre* is a kind of centre (where calls are taken), *skate-park* is a kind of park (where skateboard is ridden), *cocktail-dress* is a type of dress etc., and that very same structure is reflected in Serbian semi-compounds. Furthermore, since semi-compounds are virtually the only type of compounds in the Serbian language which are endocentric, they are well suited for adaptation of English compounds of the same structure.

1.4 Phrases

In the process of adaptation of English nominal compounds the Serbian language may go well beyond lexical domain. Nominal phrases¹⁰ make up 20.43% of replicas in our corpus. This is entirely consistent with typological characteristics of the Serbian language which, due to its morphological/grammatical properties, imposes heavy restrictions on rules governing formation of compounds. Nominal phrases from our corpus can be divided into several groups, depending on the word class of its first element: noun + noun_{nom}: *bombaš samoubica*, *kćerka firma*; noun + noun_{gen}: *donosioci odluka*, *oslikavanje tijela*, *protok novca*; noun + noun_{inst}: *trgovina ljudima*, *upravljanje rizikom*; adj + noun: *garažna rasprodaja*, *mrtva lopta*, *izlazna anketa*; noun + prep + noun: *udarac sa gola*, *sjaj za usne*, *grupa za pritisak*, *poremećaj u ishrani*.

Serbian noun phrases are, in fact, loan translation or calques¹¹ of English models. Despite their semantic precision and transparency, noun phrases are not widely accepted by the Serbian speech community because of their length. They often coexist with or are replaced by „a shorter, more economical and less cumbersome“ English word (Silaški: 2009, p. 5), which results in synonymy of anglicisms in the Serbian language. Thus many of the anglicisms mentioned in the previous paragraph have their semantic counterparts made by other word-formation processes: *sjaj za usne* / *lipglos* (Engl. lip gloss), *izlazna anketa* / *egzitol* (Engl. exit poll), *protok novca* / *kešflou* (Engl. cash flow), *oslikavanje tijela* / *bodipejnting* (Engl. body-painting) along with many others found in our corpus: Engl. lifestyle > Sr. *lajfstajl* / *stil života*, Engl. pace car > sr. *pejskar* / *predvodni automobil*, Engl. treadmill > Sr. *tredmil* / *traka za trčanje*, Engl. melting pot > Sr. *meltingpot* / *kotao za taljenje* etc.

¹⁰ Noun phrase, often referred to as nominal syntagm or syntactic phrase (Katamba: 1993, p. 306) or syntagm is a structure consisting of more than two words which functions in a sentence as subject, object or prepositional object. It differs from clauses in that relations between elements are not of subject–predicate type (Crystal: 1985, p. 235).

¹¹ loan translation or calque is a complex word or phrase created by literally translating elements from source language into receiving language (Prčić: 2005, p. 179).

V. CONCLUSION

Despite its name linguistic borrowing is not exclusively a linguistic phenomenon. Many social factors surrounding borrowing also determine which elements from the source language will be borrowed, to what extent and how they will adapt in the receiving language.

Overwhelming technological and cultural dominance of English-speaking countries on the global scale has resulted in intense borrowing of English lexemes, most notably nominal compounds, into Serbian. This research indicates that the mechanisms which the Serbian language uses in adapting English nominal compounds are determined by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

Linguistic factors concern primarily typological features of the source and the receiving language which affects the inventory of word-formation types in a given language and their productivity. Serbian, unlike English, is not prone to compounding, but in enriching its vocabulary relies heavily on derivation. However, in the process of adaptation of English nominal compounds, derivation is the least used word-formation type. The largest portion of our corpus account for anglicisms adapted by means of phonological/graphological and morphological adaptation of the English lexeme. The main linguistic reasons for this type of adaptation are the shortness of expression, i.e. language economy and small amount of effort required for adaptation, while the extralinguistic reasons concern the prestige of using an English word and necessity to speed up the adaptation process.

While traditional Serbian compounds (compounds proper) comprise only tiny fraction of our corpus (1.45%), another type of compounds (semi-compounds), which developed historically primarily for the purpose of adapting compounds borrowed from other languages (Turkish, German and more recently English), have proven remarkably productive. The reason for their high productivity lies in the fact that they are relatively short, easily built and that their specific structure represents a kind of compromise between the need to adjust replica to the morphological system of the Serbian language and the need to use „more prestigious“ English word.

Adaptation of English nominal compounds goes beyond lexical level too as 20.43% of the replicas fall into the category of noun phrases. Many of the instances from the corpus, however, due to their length, have their synonyms in the form of either semi-compound or adapted English word, which yet again demonstrates clearly the importance of both linguistic and extralinguistic factors in the process of adaptation of English nominal compounds into Serbian.

References

- [1]. R. Filipović, *Teorija jezika u kontaktu: Uvod u lingvistiku jezičkih dodira* (JAZU, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1986).
- [2]. R. Filipović, *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo, razvoj, značenje* (JAZU, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1990).
- [3]. R. Bugarski, *Lingvistika u primeni* (Čigoja štampa, Beograd 1996).
- [4]. E. Haugen, The analysis of linguistic borrowing, in A. Dill (Ed.) *The Ecology of Language* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1975) 79-109.
- [5]. U. Weinreich, *The ecology of language: findings and problems* (Mouton publishers 1968).
- [6]. L. Bloomfield, *Language* (London 1933).
- [7]. F. Katamba, *English words: structure, history, usage* (Routledge 2005).
- [8]. I. Plag, *Word-formation in English* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
- [9]. L. Bauer, *English word-formation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983).
- [10]. A. Aikhenvald, Typological distinctions in word-formation, in T. shopen (Ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description: volume III grammatical categories and the Lexicon* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [11]. V. Adams, *An introduction to modern English word-formation*, (Longman, 1973).
- [12]. H. Marchand, *The categories and types of present-day English word-formation* (University of Alabama Press, 1966).
- [13]. F. Katamba and J. Stonham, *Morphology* (Palgrave Macmillan 2006).
- [14]. E. Selkirk, *The syntax of words*, (The MIT Press, 1982).
- [15]. A. Di Sciullo and E. Williams, *On the definition of word* (The MIT Press, 1987).
- [16]. R. Bugarski, *Uvod u opštu lingvistiku* (Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1995).
- [17]. G. Carling, S. Cronhamn, R. Farren, E. Aliyev, J. Frid, The causality of borrowing: Lexical loans in Eurasian languages. PLoS ONE 14(10): e0223588. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223588>
- [18]. Ž. Stanojčić i Lj. Popović, *Gramatika srpskoga jezika* (Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1992).
- [19]. T. Prčić, *Engleski u srpskom*, (Novi Sad, Zmaj, 2005).

- [20]. S. Babić, *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskome književnome jeziku* (HAZU, Zagreb, 2002).
- [21]. I. Klajn, *Tvorba reči u savremenom srpskom jeziku: prvi deo: prefiksacija i slaganje* (Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 2003).
- [22]. E. Barić, *Priručna gramatika hrvatskog književnog jezika* (Zagreb, Školska knjiga).
- [23]. N. Radić, O promjenama u tumačenju tvorbenog načina slaganja riječi u srpskoj lingvistici 19. i 20. vijeka. *proc. Primenjena lingvistika* 23, (101-118). [https://dpls-
alas.rs/pdf/Primenjena%20lingvistika_23_2022.pdf](https://dpls-
alas.rs/pdf/Primenjena%20lingvistika_23_2022.pdf)
- [24]. Milanović, *Kratka istorija srpskog književnog jezika*, (Zavod za udžbenike, Beograd, 2010).
- [25]. Klajn, M. Šipka, *Veliki rečnik stranih reči i izraza* (Prometej, Novi Sad, 2008).
- [26]. T. Prčić, V. Vasić, G. Nejgebauer, *Rečnik novijih anglicizama* (Zmaj, Novi Sad, 2001).
- [27]. Đ. Otašević, *Rečnik novih reči* (Alma, Beograd, 2008).
- [28]. T. Prčić et al., *Srpski rečnik novijih anglicizama* (Filozofski fakultet Novi Sad, 2021)
- [29]. M. Turk, Semantičke posuđenice – jedan oblik prevedenica u *Filologija* 30-31 (Zagreb, 1998).