**REVIEW ARTICLE**

# DO THEY HAVE *AUTOSCOOTERS* IN POLAND?
# INVESTIGATING ANGLICISMS

MARCIN PTASZYŃSKI AND MARCIN KILARSKI

*Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań*

In this paper we are concerned with two recent studies on anglicisms in European languages, both edited by Manfred Görlach. The dictionary (*A dictionary of European anglicisms. A usage dictionary of anglicisms in sixteen European languages*) (Görlach 2001) and the bibliography (*An annotated bibliography of European anglicisms*) (Görlach 2002) constitute the first two volumes in a three-volume series.[1] By way of an introduction, we begin with an overview of the dictionary (henceforth *DEA*) and the bibliography. This is followed by a more detailed discussion of the principles behind and the structure of the dictionary.

*DEA* consists of the following parts: a foreword by R.W. Burchfield, acknowledgements, a list of contributors and a list of abbreviations and symbols (pp. vii-xiv), followed by an introduction (pp. xv-xxvi) and the dictionary entries (pp. 1-352). In the introduction the Editor presents the scope of the dictionary and the structure of the entries. *DEA* is the first comparative treatment of this kind, and covers the following languages: Germanic (German, Dutch, Norwegian and Icelandic), Romance (French, Spanish, Italian and Romanian), Slavic (Polish, Russian, Bulgarian and Croatian) and four other languages (Finnish, Hungarian, Greek and Albanian). Such a selection allows an analysis of several contrasts, including those between "purist vs. open speech communities, Western vs. Eastern countries, regional comparisons (Scandinavia, the Balkans), and the impact of mediating languages (French and German in particular)." (p. xv).

---

[1] The title of the last volume is not indicated in the dictionary. It has been announced elsewhere as *English in Europe – a volume of national studies* (cf. Görlach 1997), while the bibliography contains the entry *English words abroad: Lexical loans in European languages*, which presumably refers to the same study. At the same time, the bibliography is referred to in *DEA* as *Annotated Bibliography of Anglicisms* (p. xviii).

The section "Aims and restrictions" deals with the period covered in *DEA*, and the resulting problems involving the exclusion of more recent loanwords. *DEA* aims at the "documentation of the lexical input of English into European languages up to the early 1990s" (p. xvi), and particularly loanwords borrowed in the period 1945-1995. Further restrictions are placed by the method of data collection: style and currency values given in the entries are based on collaborators' and informants' judgements rather than on text corpora. The following section "Data collection" gives a brief account of the procedure used in the compilation of the dictionary. The number of headwords is here given as around 1500 (p. xvii).

An overview of the structure of the entries is given in the section "The compilation of the entries", together with a brief discussion of criteria regarding the inclusion of loanwords. A more detailed account of the structure of entries is given in the final section "Using this dictionary". The inclusion of a headword is dictated by whether "it is recognizably English in form" (p. xviii). This results in the exclusion of internationalisms and "many words from other languages transmitted through English (*avocado, anorak*)" (p. xviii). Other problematic cases are also mentioned, e.g., proper names and specialized terminology. With respect to the latter, the Editor acknowledges that "it is impossible to state with any degree of precision why some items are included and others are not." (p. xix).

The lemma is accompanied by a part of speech label and definitions, following *The concise Oxford dictionary of current English*. Around 25% of entries include a summary paragraph and a grid which illustrate the history and distribution of a given loanword. The grid contains squares for all the 16 languages, which roughly translates into four parts of Europe: North West, South West, North East and South East. The presence and degree of shading is meant to indicate whether the loanword is fully accepted, restricted or lacking in a given language. The main part of the entry consists of language data. This includes the sigil, spelling, pronunciation, inflection (gender and plural), time of frequent or accepted usage and the route of transmission. This is followed by the degree of acceptance and usage restrictions specified for each meaning present, and finally, the presence of native equivalents influenced by English, and derivatives in the borrowing language. The introduction is complemented with a map (p. xxvi) which shows the distribution of the 16 languages.

*DEA* is an extremely valuable source: the large amount of data compiled allows a range of analyses of the influence of English on the 16 European languages. Its merits include also the first detailed treatment of anglicisms in Icelandic, which have largely been a no-man's-land in Icelandic lexicography.[2] It is hoped that the second edition of the dictionary will be published in electronic form.

The other volume reviewed here, *An annotated bibliography of European anglicisms*, begins with a list of contributors (pp. vii-viii) and an introduction (pp. ix-xi). The bibliographic entries are divided into two parts: "General problems in language contact and studies of more than one language" (pp. 1-24), followed by "Studies devoted to anglicisms in individual languages" (pp. 25-250). The volume is complemented with indexes of topics and words (pp. 251-257).

The introduction gives an overview of the criteria used to select references and the structure of the bibliography. While extensive bibliographies of anglicisms appear, e.g., in the volumes edited by Filipović (1982) and Viereck and Bald (1986), and in the *Anglizismen-Wörterbuch* (Carstensen and Busse 1993-1996), as the Editor remarks, "there has never been a comprehensive bibliography devoted to anglicisms" (p. ix). As regards the period covered, while the bibliography is meant to be "as up-to-date as possible" (p. x), only a few studies have been included from after 1995 (these are given in appendixes, as in the Norwegian section). The following studies have been included in the bibliography: dictionaries of anglicisms; dictionaries of the languages included in *DEA*; studies of anglicisms in the languages concerned, including works dealing with particular aspects of English influence, e.g., morphology, social and cultural influence, and corpus-oriented studies. In contrast, the bibliography has largely excluded studies of individual anglicisms (with exceptions, e.g., for Polish) and unpublished works (with some exceptions, e.g., for Norwegian). In addition, omitted are studies dealing with other language contact situations, e.g., Quebec French and Puerto Rican Spanish; brief articles in newspapers and magazines and encyclopaedic entries; studies in languages less accessible to the general reader; as well as other studies dealing with related disciplines, e.g., etymology, language contact and cultural history.

Turning to the structure of the bibliography, Part I contains general studies dealing with language contact and borrowings, as well as studies concerned with English influence on more than one language. Included are such classic studies as Clyne (1975), Filipović (1982), Haugen (1950), Viereck and Bald (1986), and Weinreich (1953). Part II includes sections on the following languages: Albanian, Bulgarian, Croatian (and (Serbo-)Croatian), Danish,[3] Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Icelandic, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Romanian, Russian and finally Spanish, together with Catalan. The differences in the number of references reflect the different amount of research on a particular language – cf. French (246) and German (143) as opposed to Albanian (2) and Finnish (6). Quite extensive sections have been provided for Spanish (139), Polish (100), Italian (93) and – perhaps surprisingly – Romanian (116). Bibliographic entries are numbered consecutively for each language section. Selected entries include also descriptions dealing with content together with "evaluative remarks" (p. x) on their value.

---

[2]  Note examples of loanwords which only appear in Icelandic, e.g., **meika það** 'make it', **nött / nutcase / nuts** 'nut(s) / nutcase'.

[3]  While Danish is not included in *DEA*, a list of references for Danish appears in the bibliography.

In the following we would like to give a few illustrative examples of the studies included in the Polish and Scandinavian sections of the bibliography. The Danish section contains 24 references, with 13 studies by Knud Sørensen, including his standard 1973 work and the 1997 dictionary, as well as the recent studies by Davidsen-Nielsen, Hansen and Jarvad (1999) and Preisler (1999). 27 references are given for Icelandic,[4] and a total of 55 for Norwegian. These include the classic Haugen (1969), Jespersen (1902) and Stene (1945), together with the valuable study by Graedler (1998) and the dictionary of anglicisms by Graedler and Johansson (1997). And finally, among the 100 studies dealing with anglicisms in Polish, we find the comprehensive studies by Fisiak (1962) and Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1994, 1995).

As regards the selection of references, a certain lack of balance can be felt in terms of the size of some sections. While there is a rich tradition of studies on anglicisms in Danish, comparable with that on Norwegian, only 24 references appear for Danish. This seems unusually small compared with the section on Polish (100 entries), which is perhaps expanded by a large number of brief papers dealing with individual anglicisms. In this context, it is unfortunate to claim that "there was not enough evidence available on other languages (such as Swedish, Czech, or Portuguese) to justify a separate section on these languages" (p. x). Considering the scope of the bibliography, one could suggest a number of possible additions. For example, while several references are given for Einar Haugen, these are the only studies dealing with the influence of English on the immigrant languages in the United States. Other shorter studies could have well been included, e.g., Dodge (1898) on Danish or Flom (1902) on Norwegian.

On the formal side, the references are clearly presented and formatted consistently. However, we miss a name index, which would facilitate searching for authors that have dealt with more than one language. The use of full first names is inconsistent; e.g., both full and abbreviated first names are used in the Norwegian section, while the Polish section uses abbreviated names throughout. The double entry for Weinreich's 1953 (the 1953 New York edition and the 1970 Mouton edition) is unnecessary.

The bibliography presents us with a large number of references dealing with the influence of English on several European languages. These are especially valuable in the case of less researched languages. However, one cannot escape doubts as to the value of the whole enterprise. The bibliography suffers from the same flaws as other printed bibliographies. Published in 2002, it already fails to cover the period after 1995, and the substantial amount of recent research on English influence. A wide range of sources are now available, from specialized online bibliographies and library catalogues to full-text databases. Accordingly, the bibliography should rather be made available online. The readers would then benefit from up-to-date information, while the compiler would profit from the possibility to continuously update the bibliography.

Apart from the merits described earlier in this paper, the dictionary seems to have a few weaker points, as well. Problems that appear within the entries are chiefly of two kinds: flaws resulting from inconsistency and real mistakes. There are fewer examples of the former type, i.e. cases that are not mistakes per se but rather inexactitudes, indicating perhaps the imperfect co-ordination in the dictionary making. Additionally, there appear general problems which pertain to the whole dictionary. The description that follows includes a list of examples of these three types of problems. In most cases it appears in a tabularized form, where the particular problem is outlined and, if and where applicable, a solution to it is suggested.

The description of the problems is structured along the following lines: first come the general problems concerning the organizational aspect of the dictionary, then the imperfections found in the additional material accompanying the entries. Finally, the problems that appear in the entries themselves are outlined. These have been classified along the systematic levels of language, i.e. spelling, pronunciation, inflection, and semantics, and appear in the following order: first inconsistencies, then actual mistakes.

The examples of all types of problems outlined below are only a selection of all the instances found. The passages investigated for the purpose of this paper include the introduction to the dictionary, as well as pages 1-44 and 195-215, i.e. those covering the letters A, B, M, and N. The language data analysed includes chiefly the data for Polish. German, Norwegian and Icelandic data were subjected to a rudimentary investigation. Data for other languages are only occasionally commented upon.

## 1. General

Problems concerning the whole dictionary

### 1.1. Inaccurate ordering of the entries

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| JAB | (all) | The entry appears between JACKPOT and JAIL | The entry should be placed as the first one under this letter |

### 1.2. Unclear and inaccurate information in the attached map

The following problems appear with regard to the attached map of the languages covered in the dictionary (p. xxvi):

---

[4] The paper by Eiríksson (1982) should also be included as the volume edited by Filipović in which it appears is listed in Part I.

- The sigil for Croatian (Cr) is situated in the territory of Yugoslavia. Moreover, the territory of Croatia itself is presented together with that of Slovenia, with no border marked between the two states;
- The Czech Republic and Slovakia appear together as one state, i.e. Czechoslovakia. This might indicate that the map was prepared as early as before 1993. This assumption seems to be even more probable if one notices that neither Bosnia and Herzegovina nor the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are marked on the map (both countries became independent in 1994);
- The border between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic is not marked.

None of the above issues affect seriously the understanding of the dictionary. Still, they are all instances of providing either inaccurate or significantly outdated information.

### 1.3. Absence of bibliography despite references to other works

References to various publications appear in the dictionary, although no bibliography is attached in the volume, e.g.,

- Carstensen and Busse (1993-1995) – p. xvi,
- *Annotated Bibliography of Anglicisms* (*ABASEL*) – p. xviii, (see fn. 1 above)
- *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (9th ed, 1995) – p. xviii,
- *The Shorter Oxford Dictionary* (1993) – p. xviii,
- *The Barnhart Dictionary of English Etymology* (1988) – p. xviii,
- Busse (1996) – p. 295, inside the entry for SONNYBOY.

### 1.4. Highly restricted information on the sources of the borrowings

With the exception of German and Polish data, no information appears that would specify the sources of the borrowings, i.e. the procedure applied in their collection. Even in the case of these two languages the reader is not presented with exhaustive information. The relevant section on data collection, provided in the introduction (pp. xvii-xviii), mentions the fact that the loanwords in German were collected by the editor himself from "various sources – dictionaries, newspaper texts and items that came to my mind or were suggested by colleagues and students" and that the list that came out as the result of this process was not established "on the basis of a corpus or a specific source". In the case of the data for Polish, the reader knows only that they were provided by the editor of the Polish section, without specifying any sources. No correspondent information for other languages appears in the section mentioned here, which concentrates on the procedure of processing the data rather than collecting them.

### 1.5. Unclear or absent statistical information

Two pieces of significant statistical information are either unclear or absent from the dictionary. First, the number of entries is only roughly estimated and solely on the basis of two languages. The editor gives an estimation of the number of collected items for German, i.e. about 1200. This collection was later supplemented with Polish items, which extended the inventory to some 1500 items (p. xvii). Nothing is known about how the data for the other 14 languages influenced this number. Secondly, *DEA* does not contain any statistical data concerning the amount of words per every lexical category, or the types of loanwords included. The presence of all such information in a dictionary of this type is strongly recommended, since it gives the reader valuable insight into the nature of language borrowing.

### 1.6. Unclear information on the status of the borrowings

Although the status that the given borrowing might have in the particular language has been defined in the relevant section in the introduction (p. xxiv), one of the proposed categories, "0", seems to be rather unclear. For loanwords with the 0 status the following definition is provided: "the word is known mainly to bilinguals and is felt to be English (e.g. weekend in German)." Three problematic issues can be raised here:

- What criteria are to be applied in specifying someone as a bilingual person? In other words, what is the minimum knowledge of English that a bilingual person must possess? Unfortunately, no answer to these questions is to be found in the dictionary.
- How popular should the given English word be among bilinguals in order to be classified as a borrowing and thus assigned a relevant set of data within the entry? The obvious problem with bilinguals here is that, given their fair command of English, they know thousands of English words, which they can use to a greater or lesser extent indiscriminately even when they speak their native language. Certainly, only some of these words can be classified as Anglicisms in a given language. The question is: which ones? The dictionary, unfortunately, does not provide any information on the criteria of assigning the 0 status to particular lexemes.
- Given the above two problems, what, in practice, is the difference between the 0 status and the lack of language data for a given word? The question seems to be rather significant, since all sets of language data provided for the words that have the 0 status consist solely of the status marker.

### 1.7. Questionable transparency

The language data appears as a single paragraph consisting of run-on text, with the information on individual languages introduced by a sigil in bold type, preceded by a space. The data should be tabularized to increase transparency.

### 1.8. Entries absent from the dictionary

Several examples can be given of well-established anglicisms which should also appear in the dictionary, e.g., No *splendid isolation, stream of consciousness.*

### 1.9. Incorrect spelling (outside the entries)

| Page | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| xi | Po | Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld | Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld |

### Problems concerning particular entries

### 1.10. Occasional problems with formatting

### 1.10.1. Regular font used instead of italics

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MASTER KEY | Du | baassluitel | *baassluitel* |

### 1.10.2. Information appearing as subscript in block capitals instead of regular text in small letters

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MINIBASKET | Po | (1 tech$_{SPORT}$) | (1 tech sport) |

### 1.10.3 Unclear entry due to incorrect formatting

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MULCH (V) | Po | → z.-v. | ? → *zmulczować*.-v. perf. |

### 1.11. Use of non-defined abbreviations

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| NO PROBLEM | Ic | *excl.* | The abbreviation is not defined in the list of abbreviations or anywhere else in the dictionary, which may make it difficult to state what it stands for. It is also unclear why the abbreviation appears in italics. It should be either defined or absent from the dictionary. |

### 1.12. Presence of two contradictory sets of language data within the same entry

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AFRO- | Po | Two contradictory sets of language data appear in the entry: 1. Po afro [afro] N [U] end20c (2 coll) 2. Po (0) | One of the sets, presumably the second one, should be deleted. |

## 2. Extralinguistic components of the entry

### Problems concerning the definition

### 2.1. Doubtful accuracy

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| BACKGAMMON | (all) | 'a game for two played on a board' | The definition is too general. According to it, backgammon can be any board game for two. |
| BACKLASH | No | 'an excessive or marked adverse reaction' | The definition is too general. The borrowed lexeme's senses ('backlash on a fishing net', 'political backlash'), more specific in their nature, can hardly be deduced from the present definition. |

## 2.2. Idem per idem

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| BATCH | (all) | 4 (*cp¹*) 'using or dealt with in batches, not as a continuous flow' | Idem per idem: (BATCH ... batches); probably due to importing from *COD* only the definition of a secondary sense of the headword. |

## 2.3. Unintelligibility due to incorrect stylistics

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| BANDWAGON | (all) | 'a wagon used to carry' | The definition is unintelligible due to the following mistakes in grammar and stylistics: <br> – use of a chiefly transitive verb ('carry') without a complement <br> – ambiguity of the verb 'use' followed by 'to' and an infinitive <br> Suggestion: 'a wagon used for carrying the band in a parade' (*Collins English Dictionary*) |

## 2.4. Spelling mistakes

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ALL-ROUND | (all) | 'versatile, qualified, on skilful in many respects' | 'versatile, qualified, or skilful in many respects' |

Problems concerning the grid

## 2.5. Presence of language data despite their absence claimed in the grid

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACID ROCK | Sp, Rm, Bg, Fi | The black field, indicating "that the word is not part of the language[s] concerned" (p. xx), appears in the grid whereas sets of language data for these languages are present in the entry. | The field should be shaded/white, or the language data should be absent. |
| BABY | Ic, Po, Cr, Al | Cf. above. | The field should be shaded/white, or the language data should be absent. The case is especially unfortunate, since the entry appears in the introduction as the example entry. |

## 2.6. Contradiction between the grid and the data in the summary paragraph

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| BABYDOLL | Po | The field is shaded, which "indicates that the word is in restricted use" (p. xx), while the summary paragraph says: "for social and political reasons it was never found in Romanian, Russian, Polish ...". Moreover, there is a set of data for Polish. | The field should be black and the language data absent, or the data in the summary paragraph should be changed. |

Problems concerning the summary paragraph

## 2.7. Presence of sets of language data despite their absence claimed in the summary paragraph

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACTION | Po | The lexeme was borrowed form Latin, which is stated in the present language data for Polish. At the same time, the summary paragraph says: "The Latin-derived word is ... not covered here". | The data in the summary paragraph should be changed, or the language data should be absent. |

## 2.8. Absence of language data inadequately justified in the summary paragraph

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AUTOSCOOTER | Po | The summary paragraph says: "[i]ts limited distribution reflects the absence of this type of fairground ride from fun fairs in many countries". Accordingly, the absence of language data for Polish should be explained by the absence of the referent in Poland. However, this type of fairground is fairly popular in Poland. | The passage in question should be revised, or there should be language data for Polish. |

## 2.9. Simplistic/inaccurate description of the entry

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| MACKINTOSH | (all) | "the computer firm for unknown reasons also chose the name to refer to their system ..." | The phrase "for unknown reasons" does not seem to reflect accurately the state of affairs. |

## 3. Spelling

### 3.1. Inconsistent capitalisation

#### 3.1.1. Capitalisation of German lexemes

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACE, ADAPTOR/ ADAPTER | Ge | *As, adapter* | The capitalisation should be consistent, i.e., the lexemes being nouns, they should be capitalised. Cf. the problem described below. |
| ABSORBER, ABSTRACT, ACCOUNTANT, ACID, [...] | Ge | No information on the spelling of these lexemes appears, which indicates that it is identical with that of the entries, i.e. non-capitalised. | All the lexemes being nouns, they should be capitalised, if the potential reader is not a speaker of German. |

#### 3.1.2. Absence of information on decapitalisation of Norwegian lexemes

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AFRO-, AIREDALE (TERRIER) | No | No information on the spelling of the lexemes appears, which indicates that it is identical with that of the entries, i.e. capitalised. | The lexemes should be decapitalised, i.e. the relevant information (*afro-*; *airedaleterrier*) should appear in the entry. |

### 3.2. Information on different/variant spelling of the lexeme

#### 3.2.1. Absence of information on the lexeme's different spelling

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AIR-CONDITIONER | No | No information on the spelling of the lexeme appears, which indicates that it is identical with that of the entry. | The lexeme spells differently, i.e. without the hyphen (*airconditioner*), which should be mentioned in the entry. |

### 3.2.2. Absence of information on the lexeme's variant spelling

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AFTER-SKI | No | Cf. 3.2.1 above. | The lexeme additionally has variant spellings (*after skiing, afterskiing*), which should be mentioned in the entry. |
| ABSTRACT | Po | Cf. 3.2.1 above. | The lexeme additionally has a variant spelling (*abstrakt*), which should be mentioned in the entry. |

### 3.2.3. Presence of the lexeme's different spelling alone

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| BACKHAND | Po | *bekhend* | The lexeme appears also with the English spelling, which should be mentioned in the entry (<=E>). |

### 3.3. Incorrect spelling

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AMERICAN FOOT-BALL | Po | *amerykański futboll/ futball* | *amerykański futbol/ foot-ball*; besides, the opposite word order (*futbol/ football amerykański*) is preferred |
| MOUNTAIN BIKE | Po | rower gòrski | *rower górski* |
| NO COMMENTS | Po | bez komentrza | *bez komentarza* |

## 4. Pronunciation

### 4.1. Coordination of the phonetic transcription across languages

The dictionary seems to fail to acknowledge differences between the sounds of the investigated languages. It provides a "uniform" transcription for all languages, where some differences in the place and manner of articulation between seemingly similar sounds get lost. To mention just two examples:

- <r> is not realised in the same way in German and Polish. Still, the same symbol ([r]) appears for both languages. Interestingly, although the realization is similar in German and French, the symbol for the latter ([ʀ]) appears in the transcriptions provided in the dictionary.
- [e] and [o] are absent from the inventory of Polish sounds, but the symbols appear in the transcription. The "corresponding" Polish sounds are [ɛ] and [ɔ], respectively. Both are part of IPA, but do not appear in the transcription of Polish lexemes in the dictionary. In the cases described below the symbols have been substituted appropriately.

Moreover, not only do the phonetic inventories of the investigated languages differ from one another, but they are also different from English. Thus, in cases where the dictionary states that the pronunciation of a given lexeme in, for example, Polish is not different from the way the lexeme is pronounced in English ([=E]), it appears to disregard completely the differences between the phonetic inventories of both languages.

A viable alternative to the way adopted in the dictionary would perhaps be to use the whole wealth of symbols that the IPA offers in order to describe cross-linguistic differences in phonetics a bit more accurately.

### 4.2. Predictability of pronunciation and the question of the potential reader

Since the dictionary makes it explicit that "if pronunciation is predictable from the spelling no pronunciation guide is given" (p. xix), one feels tempted to ask who the potential reader of the work should be. Obtaining an answer to this question is vital insofar as it may alter one's view on the adopted tactics of providing the transcription. Unfortunately, such an answer is not to be found in the dictionary.

A logical division of the potential readership could be into native speakers of the particular language covered in the dictionary and others, including non-native speakers of this language. Naturally, all of them should have a sufficient command of English to be able to read the dictionary at all. On the basis of this division it might be assumed that the "predictable" pronunciation is predictable for all native and some non-native speakers of the given language, and unpredictable for everyone else. In accord with this assumption two problems appearing in the dictionary might be differentiated, each of which is outlined below. Both problems, however, cast some doubt on the applied division and raise again the question of the potential readership.

### 4.2.1. Redundant transcription for pronunciation predictable for native speakers

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| MARLIN, MASS MEDIA, NELSON, MESS | Po | [-ar-], [-edia], [-on], [mesa] | Apart from the fact that the transcription of the first three lexemes is incomplete (cf. 4.4.), it is redundant for both native and non-native speakers of Polish, as the pronunciation is predictable from spelling. The transcription of the fourth lexeme is complete, but predictable, as well. |

### 4.2.2. Absence of transcription for pronunciation unpredictable for native speakers

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| ADVANTAGE, MAINSTREAM | Po | – – | The pronunciation of these lexemes is not predictable for those speakers of Polish whose command of English is insufficient to deduce it; both lexemes have to a considerable degree retained the English pronunciation but the appropriate symbol ([=E]) does not appear. Cf. the Croatian data for MAINSTREAM, where, although the situation is the same as in Polish, a complete transcription is given. |
| BABY | Po | – | Although most native speakers of Polish know the pronunciation of this lexeme ([bɛjbi]), it is not predictable from spelling. |

The case is further complicated by the fact that predicting the pronunciation from spelling on the basis of the fairly foolproof correspondence between spelling and pronunciation in Polish would render not only an inadequate sequence of sounds, but also one that would make the lexeme a homophone with the Polish word *baby* (= 'old women', N pl.)

### 4.3. Incomplete transcription

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| BEHAVIOURISM | Ge | [eː/ei] | Transcription of the whole lexeme, not just of one vowel, should be provided. Moreover, it is difficult to establish which of the vowels the transcription pertains to. |

### 4.4. Absence of information on the lexeme's variant pronunciation

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AUTOTRAINING, MUSTANG | Po | [autotreinink], [mustank] | The <ng> and <nk> clusters are pronounced in Polish as [ŋg] and [ŋk]; thus, the pronunciation [autotrɛjɲiŋk] and [mustaŋk] should be provided. |
| BADMINTON | Po | [betminton] | The lexeme additionally has a variant pronunciation [badmintɔn], which should be mentioned in the entry. |

## 4.5. Inconsistent transcription of related entries (compounds)

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MATCH, MATCHBOX | Po | –, [metʃ-] | The transcription of the base word (*match*) is provided only in the language data for the compound (*match-box*), where it appears incomplete (cf. 4.4.). It should be given in both cases, and in its full version. |

## 4.6. Unclear transcription of hybrids

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| BEAT GENERA-TION | Ge | [biːt+Ge] | The transcription of this borrowing is unclear due to the presence of both IPA symbols and graphemes. Incidentally, apart from "+", the other two graphemic symbols appear in the IPA, as well, but certainly do not constitute the transcription of the German <Generation>. Since the graphemes in question indicate that the pronunciation of the second part of the hybrid is German, either the complete transcription should be provided, or the graphemic sequence <Ge+> should appear outside the brackets to prevent misunderstanding. Moreover, the present problem is further compounded by the one discussed in 4.2. |

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MAILING LIST, MATCHBALL | No | [=E+Nw] | The pronunciation of these borrowings can only be guessed at. Apart from the problem described above, the transcription provided does not make it clear where the Norwegian pronunciation begins. The complete transcription of the lexemes in question should be provided. |

## 4.7. Stress marking

### 4.7.1. Inconsistent stress marking across languages (presence/absence)

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ABSORBER, ABSTRACT, AEROBICS, [...] | Po | [apsorber], [abstrakt], [aerobik], | No stress markers appear for these or any other borrowings into Polish. Apparently, it is assumed that the stress in Polish always falls on the penultimate syllable. This assumption here is, however, unacceptable for the following reasons: <br> - it is not stated explicitly anywhere in the dictionary, <br> - it is not foolproof, especially in the cases of borrowings. <br> Moreover, the present problem is further compounded by the one discussed in 4.2. |
| ACTION, AEROBICS, [...] | Ic | [axsjoun], [eːroupɪk], | The same problem as with Polish (see above), i.e. no stress markers are provided for borrowings into Icelandic. Here the assumption is that the stress |

always falls on the first syllable. Nevertheless, it is not made explicit in the dictionary. Again, the problem is combined with the one discussed in 4.2.

### 4.7.2. Inconsistent stress marking within one language (presence/absence)

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AA, ABSORBER | Ge | [aːaː] [apsǫrba] | The stress marking should be consistent, i.e. stress should be marked in all cases. |

### 4.7.3. Use of non-defined suprasegmental markers

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MAIL | No | [ˮmeile/ˮmæile] | The symbol " “ ", which denotes Norwegian accent 2, should be specified in the list of symbols. |

### 4.8. Inconsistent marking of voicing assimilation in Polish

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ABSORBER, NEWFOUNDLAND, ABSTRACT | Po | [apsorbɛr] [novofuntlanttʃik] [abstrakt] | The marking of voicing assimilation should be consistent, i.e. the lexemes should be transcribed as either [apsɔrbɛr], [nɔvɔfuntlantʃik], and [apstrakt], or [absɔrbɛr], [nɔvɔfundlantʃik] and [abstrakt], respectively. |

### 4.9. Incorrect phoneme in the transcription of Polish lexemes

| Entry | Language | Is | Problem / Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ARIZONA, MEETING, NYLONS | Po | [arizoni], [mitink], [niloni] | The lack of [ɨ] in the transcription present in *DEA* is especially misleading, when the sound appears alongside [i] in the same words. Since the distinction between the two sounds is phonemic in Polish, the lexemes should be transcribed as [arizɨni], [mitink] and [nilɔnɨ], respectively. |
| MIX (v) MULCH | Po | [miksovatɕ], [multʃovat'] | [miksɔvatɕ], [mulʧɔvatɕ]; problem: [tɕ] or [t'] instead of [tɕ] |
| MAHOGANY | Po | [mahon] | [maxɔɲ]; problem: [h] instead of [x] |
| MAHOGANY, NEWS | Po | [mahon], [njusi] | [maxɔɲ], problem: [n] instead of [ɲ] [ɲusi]; problem: [nj] instead of [ɲ] |
| MAXWELL | Po | [-ue-] | [makswɛl]; problem: [u] instead of [w]; besides, cf. 4.4. |
| MERCERIZE | Po | [mercerizcja] | [mɛrtsɛrizatsja] problem: [c] instead of [ts]; besides: a phoneme is missing (the first [a]) |
| MANAGER | Po | [menʤer] | [mɛnaʤɛr] problem: a phoneme is missing (the first [a]) |

## 4.10. Absence of long consonants in the transcription of Norwegian lexemes

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| NIPPLE | No | [nipel] | [nipːel] |

## 4.11. Questionable transcription of Polish lexemes

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MARINES | Po | [marines] | The more English-like pronunciation of the lexeme, namely [marins] is rather more popular than the one provided in *DEA*. |

## 4.12. Stress marking

### 4.12.1. Primary stress marked twice

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MUSTANG | No | [mustaŋ] | [mustaŋ] |

### 4.12.2. Primary stress marked as secondary (with a single underline)

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MICKEY MOUSE | No | [mikemuːs] | [mikemuːs] |

### 4.12.3. Stress marked on the graphemic realization

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MERCERIZE | Rs | *merserisatsiya* | *merserisatsiya* Moreover, the lexeme being a derivative, no phonological information should be provided (cf. 5.5.) |

## 5. Inflection

### 5.1. Plural marking

#### 5.1.1. Inconsistent marking of plural forms across languages

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ABSORBER | Ge, No, Po | The plural markers are provided for German and Norwegian but not for Polish. | The plural markers should be provided for all languages. |
| ACRE | Ge, No, Ic, Po | The plural markers are provided for Norwegian and Icelandic but not for German and Polish. | Cf. above. |
| AFRO- | Ge, No, Pl | The plural marker is (wrongly?) provided for Polish but not for German and Norwegian. | Cf. above. |
| BEST-SELLER | Ge, No, Po | The plural markers are provided for German but not for Norwegian and Polish. | Cf. above. |
| MAILBOX | Ge, Ic | The plural marker is provided for German but not for Icelandic. | Cf. above. |

#### 5.1.2. Absence of plural markers for individual endings in Polish

Information on the plural forms of nouns borrowed by Polish appears only as:

- pl. (=plural), in the cases where the borrowing exists only in plural, e.g. BERMUDAS/BERMUDA SHORTS (*bermudy*),
- uninfl. in the cases where the borrowing is uninflected for plural, e.g. MILORD (*milord*),
- [U] in the case where the lexeme is an uncountable noun, e.g. APPEASEMENT (*appeasement*); in some cases the noun is wrongly classified as uncountable in Polish, e.g. BAND (*band*, pl. *bandy*),

Plural markers are absent in all cases where the borrowed noun does have an ending, e.g. ABSORBER, ABSTRACT, ACRE ... (*absorber*, pl. *absorbery*; *abstract/ abstrakt*, pl. *abstrakty*; *akr*, pl. *akry*, respectively). Assignment of the particular plu-

ral ending is to some extent predictable in Polish on the basis of the given noun's gender, but this rule is far from foolproof. Thus, our suggestion is that plural markers should be provided for all nouns.

### 5.1.3. Predictability of depluralization in Polish lexemes

Depluralization of the English loanword, which has occurred in the case of some Polish lexemes, e.g. BEATLE (*bitels/beatles*), is not marked in any way in the dictionary but taken for granted. Perhaps not a serious problem, but the presence of an appropriate label would enhance the informative value of the dictionary, especially that depluralization is not easily predictable.

### 5.2. Absence of information on gender

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AUTOREPEAT, | No | ~, | M, |
| AUTOREVERSE | | – | M, |

### 5.3. Presence of suffix alone

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be / Problem |
|---|---|---|---|
| BEHAVIOURISM | Ge | *-ismus* | *Behaviourismus*; The information provided, apart from being incomplete, is also misleading: the suffix, if attached to the English lexeme, would render a non-existent word (**Behaviourismismus*). |

### 5.4. Presence of derivatives alone

In some cases the grammatical category of the provided lexeme in the given language is different from the category the entry belongs to. However, no appropriate label (→) is present, and neither is the category specified.

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MERCERIZE | Po | *merceryzacja* | → *merceryzacja*, n. |

### 5.5. Non-existent derivation assumed

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| BESSEMER- | Po | [besemerovate]; no other information on this clearly non-existent lexeme appears, except for an arrow marking it as a derivative of the entry | ? |

### 5.6. Presence of category markers for derivatives

According to description of the entry present in the introduction, derivatives are "accompanied by part of speech label, but no further data [is given]" (p. xxv). However, derivatives appear with gender, e.g., all but one derivatives in *mercerize*. Incidentally, in the case of this borrowing, no category markers for the derivatives listed below appear in the dictionary.

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MERCERIZE | Ge | *Merzerisation* F | *Merzerisation*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Ge | *Merzerisierung* F | *Merzerisierung*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Ic | *merceriserun* F | *merceriserun*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Fr | *mercerisage* M | *mercerisage*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Fr | *merceriseuse* F | *merceriseuse*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Rm | *mercerizare* F | *mercerizare*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Rs | *merserisatsiya* F | *merserisatsiya*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Po | *merceryzacja* F | *merceryzacja*, n. |
| MERCERIZE | Cr | *mercerizacija* F | *mercerizacija*, n. |

## 5.7. Repetition of category markers in the language data

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MINT (*adj.*) | Ge | adj. | – |

## 5.8. Absence of any information on inflection

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ANTIDUMPING | Ge | – | N [U] |

## 5.9. Questionable gender assignment

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| MEMORY | Po | N | The preferred gender is F. |

## 6. Semantics and usage

## 6.1. Absence of language data

## 6.1.1. Direct loans from English

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACID HOUSE | Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided. |
| AHOY | Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided, especially that this borrowing has been present in Polish for a fairly long time. |
| ALE | Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided, even if the status of this borrowing is Ø, i.e. the lexeme is used only with reference to Anglo-Saxon context. |
| ALL RIGHT | Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided, even if the status of this borrowing is 0, i.e. the lexeme is known only to bilinguals. |
| AUDITING | No, Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *audit* in Norwegian and *audyt* in Polish. |
| BLENDER | No | – | The relevant language data should be provided. |
| BLUSH | No | – | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *blusher*. |

## 6.1.2. Semantic loans and loan translations from English

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACID | Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *kwas*. |
| AIRLINE | Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *linie lotnicze*. |
| BALLPOINT (PEN) | Po | – | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *pióro kulkowe*. |

## 6.1.3. Loans from other languages

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ABSENTEEISM | No | – | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *absentisme* (₅La). |

| Entry | Language | Is | | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ACE | Po | – | | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *as* (*serwisowy*) ($_5$La). |
| ARRANGEMENT | Po | – | | The relevant language data should be provided, with the lexeme realized as *aranżacja* (? $_5$Fr). |

## 6.2. Marking of the degree of acceptance

### 6.2.1. Inconsistent marking across languages (presence/absence)

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AA | Ge, No, Po | The marker is present for German and Norwegian but not for Polish ((3), (3), –, respectively). | The appropriate marker should be provided in all cases. |

### 6.2.2. Use of non-defined markers

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| BANKING | Po | (O) | The marker provided here is not defined in the dictionary. The problem might be due to an error in formatting. Suggestion: (0) |

## 6.3. Information on equivalents (native equivalents, semantic loans and loan translations)

For the sake of brevity, native equivalents of English loanwords, as well as the cases where the English lexeme has been borrowed as a semantic loan or loan translation, have been conflated into one category of *equivalents*. The reasons for this are the following:

- all three kinds of equivalents stand in opposition to the direct loan from English, which is recognized in the dictionary by the presence of appropriate symbols (equations),
- the distinction the dictionary makes between the kinds of equivalents in question is not always consistent,

- it may be difficult to specify how "native" a given native equivalent is; it may well be a semantic, or even direct, loan from another language that was borrowed long before the time span specified in the dictionary.

### 6.3.1. Absence of information on equivalents

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ABSORBER | No | – | The relevant equivalent (*absorbator*) should be provided. |
| ADVANTAGE | Po | – | The relevant equivalent (*przewaga*) should be provided. |
| AIR HOSTESS | Po | – | The relevant equivalent (*stewardessa*) should be provided. Interestingly, this equivalent, also an Anglicism, is provided for other languages, namely: Dutch, Romanian, Russian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Albanian. |
| BARKEEPER | Po | – | The relevant equivalent (*barman*) should be provided. This case is similar to the one described above, as the equivalent is also a borrowing form English and also appears in the data for other languages. |
| MICKEY MOUSE | Po | – | The relevant equivalent (*Myszka Miki*) should be provided, especially that it is incomparably more popular than the direct loan. |
| NEW WAVE | Po | – | The relevant equivalent (*nowa fala*) should be provided, along with its derivative (→ *nowofalowy*, adj.). |

## 6.3.2. Inconsistent distribution of information on equivalents across languages

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AIR-CONDITIONER, AIR-CONDITION-ING | Ge, No, Po | In the case of Norwegian the equivalent appears for both lexemes, in Polish for neither, and in German only for the second lexeme, whereas no data appears for the first one. | The relevant equivalents should be provided for all languages in question. The case of Polish is clear, since equivalents exists for both borrowings (*klimatyzacja* for both). The case of German is rather more complex, as there is no data for the first lexeme. Since, however, the meanings of both lexemes are identical as far as their borrowing into German goes, the relevant equivalent (*Klimaanlage*) should be provided in both sets of data. |
| AIR-CONDITIONED | Ge, Po | The equivalent appears only for the German lexeme. | Since the relevant equivalent exists in both languages (*vollklimatisiert* and *klimatyzowany*), it should be provided in the language data for both languages. |

## 6.3.3. Presence of information on equivalents alone

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| AIRMAIL | Po | – < trsl *poczta lotnicza* | The direct loan exists in Polish, even if its status is (1 tech). Therefore, the data should be completed with the appropriate information. |

## 6.3.4. Absence of information on equivalents which are borrowings from other languages

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| APARTMENT | Po | (₅Fr) | The relevant equivalent (*apartament*) should be provided. Cf. the data for German, Dutch, Norwegian, Italian, Bulgarian, Albanian, and Greek, where the equivalent, previously borrowed from French, appears. |

## 6.4. Absence of information on the source language for borrowings from other languages

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACTION FILM | Po | (5) | The source language should be specified. |

## 6.5. Presence of an incorrect equivalent

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| BEACH VOLLEY-BALL | Po | *koszykówka plażowa* | *siatkówka plażowa* |

## 6.6. Questionable marking of the degree of acceptance

| Entry | Language | Is | Should be |
|---|---|---|---|
| ACRE | Po | (3) | The word is used to refer only to the Anglo-Saxon context, hence the marker should be (Ø). Cf. MILORD, where the status of the lexeme is the same but is marked appropriately |
| AUTOREVERSE | Po | (1 tech jour) | The word is fairly popular in Poland among all users of personal and car ste- |

reos. Hence the status of the lexeme should rather be marked as (2), or maybe even as (3), since the Polish spelling (*autorewers*) is much more popular than the English one, and the pronunciation has been adapted as well.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| BANJO | Po | (1 tech) | The musical instrument denoted by the lexeme has been widely known in Poland for a long time. Therefore, the lexeme's status should be marked as (2) or (3). |

The presence of the above-mentioned problems is certainly disadvantageous to the work. Nevertheless, it is understandable, as it may stem from the fact that the dictionary is a pioneering work. In the process of its creation its authors had no earlier works of this kind to draw upon, and therewith no insight into the potential flaws that might have been avoided. Secondly, the making of the dictionary required co-operation between a large body of co-editors, data collectors, people responsible for processing the data, etc. In such a situation it is hardly possible to imagine ideal co-ordination of the whole work. Both factors inevitably affect the quality of the final product of the long and difficult process of making this dictionary.

## REFERENCES

Carstensen, B. and U. Busse. 1993-1996. *Anglizismen-Wörterbuch: der Einfluss des Englischen auf den deutschen Wortschatz nach 1945*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Clyne, M. 1975. *Forschungsbericht Sprachkontakt. Untersuchungsergebnisse und praktische Probleme*. (Monographien Linguistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft 18.) Kronberg: Scriptor.

Davidsen-Nielsen, N., E. Hansen and P. Jarvad. (eds.). 1999. *Engelsk eller ikke engelsk? That is the question. Engelsk inflydelse på dansk*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Dodge, D.K. 1898. "The gender of English loan words in Danish". *Americana-Germanica* 2. 27-32.

Eiríksson, E. 1982. "English loanwords in Icelandic: Aspects of morphology". In R. Filipović (ed.). 266-300.

Filipović, R. (ed.). 1982. *The English element in European languages*. Vol. 2: *Reports and studies*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb.

Fisiak, J. 1962. Zapożyczenia angielskie w języku polskim; analiza interferencji leksykalnej. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Łódź.]

Flom, G.T. 1902. "English elements in Norse dialects of Utica, Wisconsin". *Dialect Notes* 2, 4. 257-268.

Görlach, M. 1997. "Usage in the *Usage dictionary of anglicisms in selected European languages*". *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 31. 67-77.

Görlach, M. (ed.). 2001. *A dictionary of European anglicisms. A usage dictionary of anglicisms in sixteen European languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Görlach, M. (ed.). 2002. *An annotated bibliography of European anglicisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graedler, A.-L. 1998. *Morphological, semantic, and functional aspects of English lexical borrowings in Norwegian*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Graedler, A.-L. and S. Johansson. 1997. *Anglisismeordboka. Engelske lånord i norsk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Haugen, E. 1950. "The analysis of linguistic borrowing". *Language* 26. 210-231.

Haugen, E. 1969. *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. (2nd edition.) Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.

Jespersen, O. 1902. "Engelsk og nordisk: En afhandling om låneord". *Nordisk Tidskrift för Vetenskap, Konst och Industri*. 500-514.

Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. 1994. *Angielskie elementy leksykalne w języku polskim*. Kraków: Universitas.

Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. 1995. *Tendencje rozwojowe współczesnych zapożyczeń angielskich w języku polskim*. Kraków: UJ.

Preisler, B. 1999. *Danskerne og det engelske sprog*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Sørensen, K. 1973. *Engelske lån i dansk*. (Dansk Sprognævns Skrifter 8.) Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Sørensen, K. 1997. *A dictionary of Anglicisms in Danish*. (Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter 18.) Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Stene, A. 1945. *English loan-words in Modern Norwegian: A study of linguistic borrowing in the process*. London – Oslo: OUP – Tanum Forlag.

Thompson, D. (ed.). 1995. *The concise Oxford dictionary of current English*. (9th edition.) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Viereck, W. and W.-D. Bald. (eds.). 1986. *English in contact with other languages. Studies in honour of Broder Carstensen on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in contact: findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle Publications 1.