

ENGLISH WORDS IN EUROPEAN MOUTHS AND MINDS*

R. FILIPOVIĆ

1. The results of investigations carried out in my project *The English Element in European Languages*¹ will be presented in two works: The first is a monograph, under the same title, in which I try to show which linguistic features of borrowing are common to all and which to only some languages. One of my aims in the monograph is to discover the universals and regularities in linguistic borrowing and to determine whether the features that only some languages have in common are connected with the genetic relatedness of the languages or not. This should support or disprove the existence of some general principles for languages in contact and for linguistic borrowing. The second work is a *Dictionary of Anglicisms in European Languages* in which all English words (collected in the corpus) that have been transferred into no matter how many (one or all) of the European languages chosen for the corpus, are recorded and discussed on three levels - phonological, morphological and semantic.

2. The aim of our study requires a highly representative corpus, but the set of borrowing languages could not remain open and undefined. In order to narrow the set of borrowing languages, we have restricted the corpus without making the results lose their universal validity.² We have defined several criteria, and in applying them we have managed to restrict the number of borrowing languages to about twenty:

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| A - Albanian | N - Norwegian |
| Da - Danish | P - Polish |
| D - Dutch | R - Romanian |
| Fi - Finnish | Ru - Russian |
| F - French | SC - Serbo-Croatian |
| G - German | S - Slovak |
| H - Hungarian | Sl - Slovene |
| I - Italian | Sp - Spanish |
| L - Lithuanian | Sw - Swedish |
| M - Macedonian | T - Turkish |
| MG - Modern Greek | |

First we restricted the corpus on a geographical basis and limited it to the European continent, a decision which seems very favorable since it has cultural as well as geographical continuity. A corpus composed of European languages provides sufficient variety in linguistic systems to allow testing certain phenomena on quite different receiving-language structures.

In spite of this restriction the corpus is still very extensive in terms of the number of languages. Since the representativeness of a corpus for loan-word studies depends not on the number of languages included, but on the variety of their systems and structures, we went on reducing the number of languages in the corpus without reducing its representativeness.³

The basic criterion in the process of reduction is this: a language qualifies for inclusion if at any level of its structure it possesses a category not found in English, or lacks one that English has. If the same category exists in both languages the lender (English) and the borrower (language x) then the language x is a candidate for inclusion if the category in language x is different from that in English.

So in our analysis of English loan-words in European languages special attention was paid to systemic and structural differences between English and a given European language, since these are the main areas in which linguistic interference arises in the course of adaptation of loan words and of their integration into the system of the borrowing language.

Although the above criterion seems rather all-embracing, it is by no means the only one, and would not be sufficient by itself.

We have applied several other criteria in order to justify the reduction of the number of languages in the corpus. A language is included if it is the most typical (e.g. Italian) or the least typical lan-

guage in its group (e.g. Romanian). A language can be qualified for inclusion by the criterion of intensity and length of contact (e.g. French). Another criterion is the recency of a language standardization, the so-called criterion of youth (e.g. Macedonian and Albanian). Another basic criterion is that a language qualifies for inclusion if it is the only representative of its group in Europe (e.g. Turkish). But neither is this criterion applied completely automatically. Before being applied it was further refined, i.e. a language is included in the corpus if it occurs in two countries under different conditions (e.g. Hungarian). In one country it is the official language and in another it is not. Some languages were not included due to negative criteria, one of which is the special linguistic conditions in which certain European languages exist, e.g. Basque, Welsh and Irish.

3. The course of adaptation of loan-words depends on the path of borrowing, either: (a) direct, or (b) via an intermediary language. In both situations, there are two possible media: oral and written. In the oral medium the phonological form of the loan will be under the influence of the English pronunciation (e.g. E *browning* > SC *brauning*). The written medium makes it depend on the spelling of the English word (e.g. E *cowboy* > SC *kovboj*).

A large number of Anglicisms show parallel forms, which in many cases can be explained by the difference between the English spelling and pronunciation:

E.g. E *browning* > SC *brauning*
 brovning
 broving

In the written medium of borrowing, variations appear: either the original English spelling is kept or a form is adapted according to the borrowing-language orthographic system:

E.g. E *cowboy* > SC *cowboy*
 kovboj

In oral borrowing, two variants of English may be involved: British and American. This too results in parallel forms of a word:

E.g. E *boss* > Br → SC *bos*
 US → SC *bas*

4. There are anglicisms in European languages whose etymology cannot be determined with certainty without taking into consideration the function

of the influence of an intermediary language. When we try to establish the path borrowed words have taken from English to the receiving language, finding the intermediary can help solve problems on some levels. We have examined the role of intermediary languages in the process of the transfer of words from a lending language to a borrowing language and found it very useful in explaining the adaptation of loan-words:

E.g. E *double* → G → SC *debl*
 cup → G → SC *kep*
 flirt → G → SC *flert*

We do not accept the view-point which requires re-classifying and rechristening all English borrowings that went through an intermediary. We propose accepting as Anglicisms, regardless of their path, all those words which can be determined to have English as their language of origin or to denote an object or a concept of English origin:

E.g. E *strike* > G *Streik* > SC *štrajk*

Some linguists consider the SC form *štrajk* as a German loan-word since it has gone through German and accepted the German initial cluster /štr/.

We even consider that Anglicisms can include pseudo-Anglicisms which have been formed within the receiving language out of elements of English origin.

5. On the basis of these principles we started compiling the Dictionary. Four parts of speech have been analysed: substantives, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. The analysis of each loan-word was carried out on three levels: phonological, morphological, and semantic.

a) PHONOLOGICAL LEVEL.⁴ In creating their phonological form, English loan-words follow one of five paths of adaptation. They can establish their pronunciation:

1) according to the pronunciation of the English word:

E *browning* - SC *brauning*
 cowboy - SC *kauboj*
 football - Sp *fútbol*
 safe - R *sejf*
 whiskey - R *víski*

2) according to the spelling of the English word:

E *dumpling* - G *Dumpling* /dumpliŋ/
 jersey - Sp *jersey* /xerséi/
 trolley - R *trolléj*

E *tunnel* - SC *tunel*
scout - F *scout* /skut/

3) following only partly the pronunciation of the English word:

E *deeptank* - R *diptank*
night-club - Sp *night-club* /náitklub/
tubeless - SC *tjubles*
sweater - Sp *suéter*

4) following only partly the spelling of the English word:

E *brush-breaker* - R *brúšbreker*
cross-country - F /krɔskuntri/

5) according to the pronunciation of the word in an intermediary language:

E *bluff* - R *blef*
double - SC *debl*
cup - SC *kep*
flirt - SC *flert*
lunch - R *lenč*
rugby - I /'rɛgbi/

Loan words for which we cannot state the pronunciation, not even with the help of informants, are qualified as so called "*written material*".

b) MORPHOLOGICAL LEVEL.⁵ The first task of our analysis on this level was to fix the way in which the citation form for each of the four parts of speech was established. Then other grammatical categories typical for a part of speech were analysed.

SUBSTANTIVES. In forming the citation form of substantives four possibilities appeared:

1) The form of the loan-word is identical to the form of the English word:

$$L-W = E-W$$

E *bridge* - Sp *bridge*
jumper - G *jumper*
lift - SC *lift*
spray - G *Spray*

2) The loan-word has a form of a compromise replica. English suffixes (-er, -ist, -ing) can be kept:

$$L-W = E-W + E_{\text{suffixes}}$$

E *boxer* - SC *boks -er*
container - F *contain -er*
doping - Sp *dop -ing*
training - SC *tren -ing*

3) The loan-word has an integrated form in which English suffixes are

nativized (adapted) and look like native suffixes:

$L-W = E-W + E - L_x$ suffixes

E *imperialism* - *imperialisme*
imperialismo

puritanism - *puritanizam*
Puritanismus

- 4) The loan-word has an integrated form in which English suffixes are replaced by native ones:

$L-W = E-W + L_x$ suffixes

E *boxer* - F *boxeur*
SC *boksač*
Sp *boxeador*

Gender is one of the grammatical categories that was given a special treatment since a word passing from English into a European language usually changes the nature of gender: a natural gender is turned into a grammatical one. In determining the gender of English loan-words the masculine tendency

E *box*, n. - I *box*, m.
cheque, n. - Sp *cheque*, m.
lift, n. - SC *lift*, m.
lock-out, n. - G *Lockout*, m.
poker, n. - R *poker*, m.

is followed in the majority of European languages unless the sex prevents it, i.e. sex can assign them to a feminine gender:

E *girl* - I *girl*, f.
SC *gerl(a)* f.
stewardess - SC *stjuardesa*, f.

A limited number of English loan-words are assigned to feminine gender as a result of a contamination between the loan-words and a native term of similar meaning:

E *cap* - R *kepka* (→ *šljapa*)
jungle - SC *džungla* (→ *šuma*)
tornado - F *la tornade* (→ *la tempête*)

Some substantives whose citation form has been adapted by means of borrowing-language suffix can be assigned to neuter gender:

E *bluff*, n. - SC *blef -iranje*, n.

Number. Although the transfer of bound morphemes seems to be extremely rare (as URIEL WEINRICH stated in his book *Languages in Contact*), some languages do show the transfer of the English plural morpheme *-s*. Since there are two more possibilities for the plural, partial and complete adaptation of the plural form, we have marked all the plural forms that

differ from the regular plural ending of the borrowing language:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| E <i>barmen</i> | - | F <i>barmen, barmans</i> |
| <i>cheques</i> | - | G <i>Schecke, Schecks</i> |
| <i>covergirls</i> | - | G <i>Covergirls</i> |
| <i>cringles</i> | - | R <i>Kringel's</i> |
| <i>films</i> | - | I <i>i film, i filmi, i films</i> |
| | | Sp <i>films, filmes</i> |
| <i>liftboys</i> | - | SC <i>liftboys, liftbojsi, liftboji</i> |

ADJECTIVES can occur in two forms: either the citation form is morphologically unadapted and represents a compromise replica on the morphological level:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|------------------|
| E <i>groggy</i> | - | F <i>groggy</i> |
| | | SC <i>groggi</i> |
| | | Sp <i>groggy</i> |
| <i>fit</i> | - | SC <i>fit</i> |
| | | Sp <i>fit</i> |

or the citation form is adapted by adding one of the adjectival suffixes of the borrowing language to the English stem (previously phonologically adapted):

| | | |
|------------------|---|---------------------|
| E <i>ballad</i> | - | SC <i>baladski</i> |
| <i>boxer</i> | | G <i>boxerisch</i> |
| <i>folk-lore</i> | - | SC <i>folkloran</i> |
| <i>football</i> | - | R <i>futbal'nyj</i> |

Comparison follows the above division: in the former case it is periphrastic; in the latter it follows the system of the borrowing language. ADVERBS follow the pattern of adjectives with two possible forms:

(1) unadapted.

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--------------------|
| E <i>all right</i> | - | G <i>all right</i> |
| <i>non stop</i> | - | SC <i>non-stop</i> |

and (2) adapted by means of a suffix from the borrowing language:

| | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|
| E <i>snob</i> | - | SC <i>snob-ov-ski</i> |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|

VERBS. The citation form, in most languages the infinitive, is formed by means of the standard infinitive endings of the borrowing language:

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------|
| E <i>check</i> | - | G <i>check -en</i> |
| <i>film</i> | - | I <i>film -are</i> |
| | | Sp <i>film -ar</i> |
| <i>flash</i> | - | F <i>flash -er</i> |

In a number of languages the infinitive ending is not the only formant added to the English stem:

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|
| E <i>bluff</i> | - | SC <i>blef -ira -ti</i> |
| <i>box</i> | - | Sp <i>box -e -ar</i> |
| <i>boycott</i> | - | R <i>bojkot -irovat'</i> |

There are several infinitive non-derivential suffixes causing variations even in one and the same verb:

E *box* - SC *boks -a -ti, boks -ova -ti, boks-
-ira-ti*
camp - G *camp -en, camp -ier -en*

In languages where the citation form of a verb is not the infinitive (like Macedonian) we have quoted the form used in the borrowing language (e.g. the present tense) which is formed in the same way by means of suffixes and endings.

In Slavonic languages the verbal aspect of the loan-word is indicated. Here two possibilities appear:

- (a) The verbal aspect is not morphologically marked; in this case the verb is classified among bi-aspectual verbs, and its aspect can be determined in the context:

E *block* - R *blokirovat'*
bluff - SC *blefirati*

- (b) The verbal aspect of the loan-words is marked in the derivational procedure typical for native verbs:

E *box* - SC imp. *boksati*
 perf. *izboksati*

c) SEMANTIC LEVEL.⁶ Since the Dictionary is organized by English items (i.e. the Dictionary item is an English word followed by its loan-word equivalents on three levels in all European languages involved), the semantic level in the dictionary covers only semantic adaptation of loan-words. The analysis of adaptation follows the already established five-member scale used by STEPHEN ULLMANN, T.E. HOPE and others when they analysed the change of meaning. Our investigation of English loan-words has shown, however, that the first member of the scale, called "changes in semantic extension", can be further subdivided on the basis of the additional changes the meaning of a loan-word can go through after the word has been integrated into the system of the borrowing language.

Apart from examining and marking changes in semantic extension, we have recorded two more elements of the scale: ellipsis and pejoration.

The whole analysis of the semantic level is based on Webster's Third Edition. So when an item is analysed, the changes are marked with formulas in which the numerals and small letters refer to Webster's numerals and letters used in the division of the meaning of a word. In this way a lot of space is saved, and the analysis leans on one of the standard dictionaries which contains a great majority of the English sources of

the loan-words examined in the etymological Dictionary.

1. CHANGES IN SEMANTIC EXTENSION are recorded in three forms: (a) as Zero extension; (b) as Restriction of meaning; (c) as Expansion of meaning.

a) *Zero extension*: the loan-word shows no change of meaning regardless of the number of senses recorded in Webster:

| | | |
|--------------------|---|----------------------|
| E <i>ping pong</i> | - | F <i>ping-pong</i> |
| <i>trolley-bus</i> | - | R <i>trollejbuss</i> |
| | | SC <i>trolejbus</i> |
| <i>water-polo</i> | - | Sp <i>water-polo</i> |
| <i>whiskey</i> | - | SC <i>viski</i> |

This is marked with numerals referring to Webster and it is evident that one, two or more senses are kept in the loan-word without any change:

E *bungalow* - 1 (2 → 1,2)

b) *Restriction of meaning* of a loan-word can be performed in two ways:

(1) the number of senses can be reduced,

E *corner* - SC (8 → 1f)

or (2) the sphere of meaning can be restricted:

E *pantry* - G (2 → 2.)

This is also marked with numerals and letters referring to Webster to show which senses of an English word have been transferred to the loan-word and which have not.

c) *Expansion of meaning* is also carried out in two directions:

(1) in the number of senses,

E *nylon* - SC *najlon* = 1. *nylon*
2. *plastics*

and (2) in the sphere of meaning:

E *corner* - SC *korner* = 1a. *corner kick*
1b. *space over the goal-line*

In the former case (1) the word acquires a completely new sense. This is illustrated with a sentence from the borrowing language which is translated into English. In this way the newly acquired meaning is given its English equivalent. The latter case (2) represents a new feature in the change of meaning. The sense of the loan-word which resulted from the restriction of meaning of an English source word can have its sphere expanded.

2. ELLIPSIS. Quite a number of English loan-words are transferred into European languages in their elliptical forms. They are recorded under

the full form of the English source word:

| | | |
|-------------------------|------|-----------------|
| E <i>basket-ball</i> | - I | <i>basket</i> |
| <i>cross country</i> | - F | <i>cross</i> |
| <i>sparring partner</i> | - R | <i>sparring</i> |
| <i>tonic water</i> | - SC | <i>tonik</i> |

3. PEJORATION. This interesting semantic feature, depending on various extralinguistic and socio-linguistic factors, is discussed in a separate chapter in the monograph. Here in the Dictionary it is marked and illustrated with a sentence from the borrowing language and its translation into English:

| | | |
|---------------|------|--|
| E <i>lady</i> | - R | <i>ledi (in pejorative sense, a haughty woman)</i> |
| <i>nylon</i> | - SC | <i>najlon plaža (the part of the beach reserved for nudists)</i> |
| | | <i>SC najlon hotel (ill-reputed hotel)</i> |

d) OTHER CASES. In addition to the results of the analysis of loan-words on three levels, the Dictionary includes the following features which relate to the area of languages in contact: (a) loan-translations; (b) semantic loans; (c) hybrids; (d) pseudo-anglicisms, and (e) abbreviated forms of loan-words.

e) CONCLUSION. In the way described above, the Dictionary not only illustrates how the form and meaning of English words were shaped in continental mouths and minds, but also proves that English, apart from having been a great borrower, has also been a very generous lender.

Rudolf Filipović
Institute of Linguistics
Faculty of Philosophy
Zagreb University
41000 Zagreb
3, Bure Salaja
Yugoslavia

NOTES

- * Paper read at the LAGB/SLE Conference, Nottingham, April 1975.
- ¹ R. FILIPOVIĆ, "The English Element in the Main European Languages", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagradiensia* 21-22, Zagreb, 1966, pp.103-112.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Some Problems in Studying the English Element in the Main European Languages", *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, IV, no. 1/2, Poznań, 1972, pp. 141-158.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Some Problems in Studying the English Element in the Main European Languages", *English Studies Today* 5, Istanbul, 1973, pp. 25-52.
- ² R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Prilog metodi proučavanja anglicizama u evropskim jezicima" (A Contribution to the Method of Studying Anglicisms in European Languages), *Suvremena lingvistika*, 7-8, Zagreb, 1973, pp. 3-10.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, "A Contribution to the Method of Studying Anglicisms in European Languages", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagradiensia*, 37, Zagreb, 1974, pp.135-148.
- ³ R. FILIPOVIĆ, "A Contribution to the Method of Studying Anglicisms in European Languages", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagradiensia*, 37, Zagreb, 1974, pp.135-148.
- ⁴ The principles on the basis of which the analysis on the phonological level was carried out were discussed in the following studies:
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, "The Phonetic Compromise", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagradiensia*, no. 5, Zagreb, 1958, pp.77-88.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Consonantal Innovations in the Phonological System as a Consequence of Linguistic Borrowing", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagradiensia*, no. 7, Zagreb, 1969, pp.39-62.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Phonemic Importation", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagradiensia*, no. 9-10, Zagreb, 1960, pp.177-189.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Compromise Replica and Phonemic Importation", *To Honor Roman Jakobson, Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, Mouton, The Hague, Paris, 1967, pp.662-666.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, *The Phonemic Analysis of English Loan-Words in Croatian*, Zagreb, 1960, p.137.
- R. FILIPOVIĆ, *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi* (Language Contact in Theory and Practice), Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1971: a) Fono-loški aspekt (Phonological Aspect), pp.112-123.
- ⁵ R. FILIPOVIĆ, "The Morphological Adaptation of English Loan-Words in Serbo-Croat", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagradiensia*, no.11, Zagreb, 1961, pp.91-103.

R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja II: Morfoloski aspekt" (Principles of Linguistic Borrowing II: The Morphological Aspect), *Filološki pregled*, I-IV, Beograd, 1966, pp.1-16.

R. FILIPOVIĆ, *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi* (Language Contact in Theory and Practice), Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1971, 142 pp. See: Morfološki aspekt (Morphological Aspect), pp.124-134.

- ⁶ R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Semantic Extension Changes in Adaptation of English Loan-Words in Serbo-Croatian", *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabien-sia*, 25-26, Zagreb, 1968, pp.109-119.

R. FILIPOVIĆ, "Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja III: Semantički aspekt" (Principles of linguistic borrowing III: Semantic aspect), *Filološki pregled*, I-IV, Beograd, 1967, pp.83-89.

R. FILIPOVIĆ, *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi* (Language Contact in Theory and Practice), Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1971, 142 pp., See: c) Semantički aspekt (Semantic aspect), pp.124-142.