

## SOME PROBLEMS IN STUDYING THE ENGLISH ELEMENTS IN THE MAIN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES\*

RUDOLF FILIPOVIĆ  
*University of Zagreb*

1. It would be unsatisfactory to attempt in a paper of 35 to 40 minutes an account of something as complex as the English element in European languages. It is also too early to sum up our project<sup>1</sup> since the final study is still being written.

So what I decided to do when Prof. Zandvoort asked me to read a paper on my work on the infiltration of English into the languages of Europe is the following:

a) As an introduction, I want to give the objectives and the aims of the project, the main principles I worked out for the project workers which represent the theory the project is based on.

b) Then in the main part of the paper (its title suggests it clearly) I want to put forward for discussion some problems in such a study of the contacts of languages such as English and other European languages, some of which are so different from English in their structure.

c) As a conclusion I will not present a summary of the discussion under b), but try to collate some final results and the planned products of the project.

2. The results of my project will first appear in a monograph under the general title of *The English element in the main European languages* which will represent a synthesis of separate monographs by my postgraduate students, each analysing one of the fourteen languages chosen. The data from the fourteen languages will be processed on an IBM 360 computer and we hope to find some general features of the English element common to each individual

\* Paper read at the Triennial Conference of IAUPE in Istanbul, September 1 - 7, 1971.

<sup>1</sup> The research project the English Element in the Main European Languages is supported by the Council for Scientific Research of the Republic of Croatia whose help I gratefully acknowledge.



language of the fourteen, which could be considered to some extent universals.

In addition I have been compiling a *Dictionary of anglicisms in the main European languages* arranged alphabetically by their form in the giving language, i.e. English. This dictionary will show the path of borrowing of each English loan-word and its adaptation in the fourteen receiving languages on three levels: phonological, morphological and semantic. The forms in the fourteen languages will be indexed at the end.

The *Monograph* and the *Dictionary* form a unit and complement each other; the first gives the theory and its application to the languages under consideration, the second gives the corpus of all English loan-words in each of the fourteen languages under study, their fate and behaviour during the process of integration into the receiving language.

3. Although the original aim of the project was a synthesis presenting the English element in some European languages, I organized the work on the project on two levels: a) theoretical, which would discuss the principles of linguistic borrowing and would prepare the research workers for their actual work; and b) practical, which would represent the application of these principles to the linguistic contacts between English and various European languages.

Most of the theoretical work was done by myself and discussed in a course of lectures at our postgraduate school of linguistics under the title *Principles of linguistic borrowing*<sup>2</sup>, and printed in various publications both in English<sup>3</sup> and Serbo-Croatian<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The course was divided into three parts: a) *Introduction* — a historical survey; b) *Theory* — bilingualism and linguistic borrowing; c) *Application* — phonological aspect, morphological aspect, semantic aspect, lexical aspect.

<sup>3</sup> Filipović, R. 1958. "The phonetic compromise", *Studia Romanica et Anglicana Zagradiensia*. (SRAZ) 5. 77 - 88; — 1959. "Consonantal innovations in the phonological system as a consequence of linguistic borrowing", *SRAZ* 7. 39 - 62; — 1960. "Phonemic importation", *SRAZ* 9/10. 177 - 189; — 1960. *The phonemic analysis of English loan-words in Croatian*. Zagreb. 137 pp.; — 1967. "Compromise replica and phonemic importation". *To Honor Roman Jakobson*. The Hague: Mouton. 662 - 666; — 1969. "Semantic extension changes in adaptation of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian". *SRAZ* 25/26. 109 - 119.

<sup>4</sup> Filipović, R. 1965. "Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja I - Fonološki aspekt" (Principles of linguistic borrowing I — Phonological Aspect). *Filološki pregled*. III. 1/2. 117 - 131; — 1966. "Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja II — Morfološki aspekt" (Principles of linguistic borrowing II — Morphological Aspect). *Filološki pregled*. IV. 1/2. 1 - 16; — 1967. "Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja III - Semantički aspekt" (Principles of linguistic borrowing III — Semantic Aspect). *Filološki pregled*. I/IV. 83 - 94; — 1967. "Jezici u kontaktu i jezično posudjivanje" (Languages in contact and linguistic borrowing). *Suvremena lingvistika*. 27 - 89; — 1971. *Kontakti jezika u teoriji i praksi* (Language contacts in theory and practice). Zagreb. XXX + 186.

The analytical work was done first by myself when preparing my theoretical discussion of the principles, and then by my students — undergraduates in linguistic seminars while writing their degree essays and postgraduates in the form of MA theses in linguistics, all under my supervision<sup>5</sup>.

4. We have been examining the English element in four groups of European languages: Slavonic, Germanic, Romance, and Finno-Ugrian. In each of the four groups we have studied a limited but representative number of languages. In the Slavonic group we have examined the English element in Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, Macedonian, and Russian; in the Germanic group: German, Dutch, Swedish, and Norwegian; in the Romance group: French, Italian, Spanish, and Romanian; in the Finno-Ugrian group: Finnish and Hungarian.

In deciding which languages to study for the project I have followed some definite principles. In some cases it was the importance of the language in the family of European languages and in its own group. This principle applies to the majority of languages chosen in the Germanic, Romance, and Finno-Ugrian groups. In the Slavonic group, however, my choice depended partly on other principles. While Russian and Serbo-Croatian are as good representatives of their group as the chosen languages are of the other three groups, Slovene and Macedonian were added as they offer features that may be of some interest in the final linguistic survey of the results achieved by this study: the former still possesses some ancient linguistic categories (i.e. the dual) that have died out in other Slavonic languages, and the latter is the youngest in its group, as its history dates back only as far as 1945, when it was officially accepted as an independent language and fully established and described linguistically<sup>6</sup>. As such it is very interesting for us as it shows the process of

<sup>5</sup> Riffer-Maček, D. 1963. "Engleski element u standardnom hrvatskosrpskom jeziku u doba njegovog stvaranja na području Hrvatske (1832 - 1850)" (English element in standard Serbo-Croatian at the time of its formation on Croatian territory 1832 - 1850). Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Vidas-Velčić, I. 1965. "Engleski element u hrvatskosrpskom sportskom vokabularu" (English element in Serbo-Croatian sports vocabulary). Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Kobersky, E. 1965. "English Element in Finnish and Hungarian". Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Kesio-Hotko, B. 1968. "Engleski element u ruskom jeziku" (English element in Russian). Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Trojanović-Vio, D. 1970. "Engleski element u francuskom jeziku" (English element in French). Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Dworski, T. 1970. "Engleski element u njemačkom jeziku" (English element in German). Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Prebeg-Vilke, M. 1970. "Engleski element u hrvatskosrpskom tehničkom vokabularu" (English element in Serbo-Croatian technical vocabulary). Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Vrban, M. 1970. "Engleski element u italijanskom jeziku" (English element in Italian). Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University; Gajšt, D. 1971. "English element in Slovene". Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Zagreb University.

<sup>6</sup> Lunt, H. G. 1952. *Grammar of the Macedonian literary language*. Skopje.



linguistic borrowing and the result of languages in contact on a strictly synchronic level.

In some cases my choice in other groups was guided by the presence of some linguistic feature I was interested in and wanted to discuss as a separate item. Swedish and Norwegian were chosen because they are tone languages, among other reasons. One feature I was particularly interested in was stress adaptation in tone languages, i.e. what happens to the expiratory stress of an English word when it is integrated into the phonological system of a borrowing language with a musical accent, like Serbo-Croatian, Swedish, and Norwegian.

5. Up until now we have analysed eight languages out of the fourteen and my postgraduate students have written nine theses<sup>7</sup>, while the work on the others is in progress. These MA theses are mainly general studies based on the programme and principles I prepared for my students and the project; most of them examine the English element in a particular language with the aim of contributing to the final products of the project: the monograph and the dictionary. Among them there are some that discuss the English element in some special fields within a language under examination, as e.g. the English element in sports terminology<sup>8</sup>, in technical terminology<sup>9</sup>, etc.

Although a number of studies of English infiltration into individual European languages have appeared in several countries, we could not use them directly in our analytical work except as useful raw material to be further worked out and analysed from our point of view. Most of them have been and will be invaluable sources for our work on the lexical level. Here I would like to acknowledge the help of some monographs or articles, printed in the last fifty years or so<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See Note 5.

<sup>8</sup> Vidas-Velčić, I. 1965. "Engleski element u hrvatskosrpskom sportskom vokabularu".

<sup>9</sup> Prebeg-Vilke, M. 1970. "Engleski element u hrvatskosrpskom tehničkom vokabularu".

<sup>10</sup> For German: Stiven, A. B. 1936. "Englands Einfluß auf den deutschen Wortschatz" (Diss. Marburg); Carstensen, B. 1966. "Englische Einflüsse auf die deutsche Sprache nach 1945". Heidelberg; For Dutch: de Vooy, C. G. N. "Hoe zijn Anglicismen te beschouwen?" *De Nieuwe Taalgids VII*. 124 - 31, 161 - 81, 225 - 37; de Hoog, W. 1902 - 3. *Studien over de Nederlandsche en Engelsche Taal*. Dordrecht; Zandvoort, R. W. 1964. *English in the Netherlands*. Groningen; For Norwegian: Stene, A. 1940. *English loan-words in modern Norwegian*. London-Oslo; Haugen, E. 1953. *The Norwegian language in America I - II*. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press; For French: Barbier, P. 1921, 1923. "English influence on the French vocabulary". *S. P. E.* Tract No. VII. 41; *S. P. E.*, Tract No. XIII, 28; Bonnaffé, E. 1920. *Dictionnaire étymologique et historique des anglicismes*. Paris; Behrens, D. 1927. "Über englisches Sprachgut im Französischen", *Giessener Beiträge zur rom. Phil. IV*. Zusatzheft; Mackenzie, F. 1939. *Les relations de l'Angleterre et de la France d'après le vocabulaire I*. Paris; Ullmann, S.

Two authors must be quoted on this occasion: one, Prof. Stephen Ullmann, encouraged me at the very beginning of my work some 20 years ago both in personal contacts and by his own interest and work in this field<sup>11</sup>. The other is Prof. R. W. Zandvoort, whose interest in my work was a good stimulus to carry on. In his paper "English Linguistic Infiltration in Europe"<sup>12</sup> read at the 10th Congress of the International Federation for Modern Languages and Literatures in 1966, Prof. Zandvoort pointed out that the Council of Europe was not interested in sponsoring such research as English infiltration in the languages of Europe<sup>13</sup> and then drew attention to my report<sup>14</sup> on research in progress. A year later Prof. Zandvoort mentioned in his article "The Present State of English Studies"<sup>15</sup> "an inquiry on foot — the study of the infiltration of contemporary English into the languages of Europe" and referred to my project and to my first report about it and pointed out my own University — the University of Zagreb — as one of the centres where this investigation was carried on.

6. The problem of the English element in European languages was not entirely new and untouched when I conceived my project in the fifties. The scope of the previous studies was limited in number of languages and also in the linguistic objectives or results that the authors were aiming at. Four Western languages: French, German, Dutch, and Italian drew Prof. Stephen Ullmann's attention from the point of view of English influence under three main headings: a) structural influence, b) lexical influence, c) calques (translations and adaptations)<sup>16</sup>.

1947. "Anglicisms in French", *PMLA* 4; Etiamble. 1964. *Parlez-vous français?* Paris; For Italian: Graf, A. 1911. *L'Anglomania e l'influsso inglese nel secolo XVIII*. Turin; Monelli, P. 1933. *Bárbaro Dominio*. Milan; Klajn, I. 1971. *Uticaji engleskog jezika u italijanskom* (English influence in Italian). Beograd; For Hungarian: Országh, László. 1968. "The life and death of English words in the Hungarian language". *The New Hungarian Quarterly* 31. 180 - 188; For Spanish: Alfaro, R. J. 1948. *El Anglicismo en el Español Contemporáneo*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo; Pfändler, O. 1954. "Wortschatz der Sportsprache Spaniens". *Romanica Helvetica* 47.

<sup>11</sup> Ullmann, S. 1940. *Europe's debt to the English language*. London; — 1942. "Types and patterns of English influence on the languages of Western Europe". *Modern Languages*. 1 - 10.

<sup>12</sup> Zandvoort, R. W. 1967. "English linguistic infiltration in Europe". *Revue des langues vivantes — Tijdschrift voor levende talen* 4. 339 - 346.

<sup>13</sup> Page 346, note 2.

<sup>14</sup> Filipović, R. 1966. "The English element in the main European languages" *SRAZ* 21/22. 103 - 112.

<sup>15</sup> Zandvoort, R. W. 1968. "The present state of English studies". *IAUPE, Bulletin*. 3 - 7.

<sup>16</sup> Ullmann, S. 1942. "Types and patterns of English influence on the languages of Western Europe".



Illustrations, small in number, were taken from the then restricted literature about English influence on French (Barbier, Bounaffé), on German (Stiven), on Dutch (de Vooy), and on Italian (Migliorini). Prof. Ullmann's article has the aim of serving as a framework for a true synthesis of the expansion of English in the Occident. It intends "to give a preliminary sketch as a more ambitious undertaking would be distinctly premature", so the author only wants "to form an idea of the field to be explored, of the range and depth of English penetration abroad, of the channels along which it spreads, and of the manifold shapes it can take".

At that time it was even possible to question whether it is worth our while to study English influence in western Europe, and whether our investigations are likely to yield more than a confirmation of the fact that "football, club, whisky, and bridge" have, in some form or another, found their way into the vocabulary of most civilized languages<sup>17</sup>.

The aim of my project was much more ambitious: I presumed that my investigation of English loan-words in European languages would not only add to our knowledge of the part English played in forming the vocabulary of various languages but also could make it possible to further develop general principles and so enhance the theory of languages in contact. In order to give as many contributions as possible we have been working on all levels that seemed to yield new results.

7. In this paper I decided to speak about one major problem on each level: 1) stress on the phonological level, 2) aspect on the morphological level, 3) changes in semantic extension on the semantic level, and 4) technical vocabularies on the lexical level. I shall mention others only in passing.

Before I proceed with the discussion of these four major problems of my work I want to define a few fundamental principles my work on the project was based on, and which we have to agree upon if we want to understand each other. They are: the origin and sources of loan-words; their path into the receiving language; the definition and identification of loan-words.

8. It was observed a long time ago that a number of words from Oriental, Indian, and other exotic languages were borrowed by most European languages from English. They have received the English stress and their phonetic structure has been adapted to the English system. These modifications made them more like English words. The spelling has been adapted too. Sometimes even their semantic content has changed. English served as an intermediary.

The same feature is repeated in the process of the transfer of English words into a number of European languages. Sometimes English words are not borrowed directly from the language of origin (English), but by the intermediary

<sup>17</sup> *Ib.*, page 2 and note 1.

of another language, mainly German and French. Though the words treated in our corpus do in some sense originate in English, the immediate source has often been German or French or even some other intermediary language. It is not, however, always possible to trace the path by which an English word went into some European language. This problem is more important than it seems because in some stages of our study the fact that an English word infiltrated through an intermediary language can influence the form it takes in the receiving language. This applies to all levels we are carrying out our research on.

When we deal with the source of English loan-words in European languages our interest can be attached to another question: which English is the source — British or American English? This can be relevant to at least two levels of our investigation: phonological and lexical.

The third question that can be linked with the other two is whether the borrowing was done through the written or oral medium.

9. English loan-words in European languages cannot be properly discussed before we know their origin and development. This is often the case with our analysis on the semantic level where no other theoretical approach or principle can help. In some cases we find that a word behaved one way in one group of languages and another way in another group.

It seems to me that the only satisfactory way of dealing with the question of origin and intermediaries in such problematic cases would be through considering a general European pool of words to which all European languages including English have contributed as well as drawn out some words in the course of time.

This question becomes even more relevant for the investigation of the phonological form of English loan-words in some European languages if we combine it (and very often we have to) with the question of which medium, written or oral, a loan-word has gone through. Some languages show a substantial difference between the shape of a loan-word which was formed through written contact and that formed through oral contact.

Here is one example of how an English loan-word in Serbo-Croatian changes its phonological form depending on the way it entered the receiving language. The word *boss* was accepted twice: first through a written medium from British English, as *bos*; then through an oral medium (brought to Yugoslavia by our workers who returned from the United States) from US English, as *bas*. It can also be said that the above example illustrates two ways in which nations and languages can get into contact. The first is a result of cultural borrowing and the second of intimate borrowing (to use Bloomfield's terms)<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> Bloomfield, L. 1933. "Cultural Borrowing", "Intimate Borrowing", In: *Language*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 444 - 475.



10. This can be linked with the fourth question which ought to be mentioned at least if not discussed here: what we mean by a European language. Should we cover only the country (or countries) in Europe in which it is spoken as a mother tongue by the whole community, or should we examine the effect English has had on a European language spoken by immigrant members of a community in an English speaking country (U.S.A., Australia, New Zealand)? A good example of differences that occur in such cases can be seen in two monographs which discuss the English influence on Norwegian. One of them (Aasta Stene's) deals with English influence on Norwegian in Norway<sup>19</sup> and the other (Einar Haugen's) describes Norwegian in the U.S. under the influence of American English<sup>20</sup>.

Nearly all the languages under consideration in my project could be studied on these two levels, and it is quite certain that some useful results would be achieved in such an analysis. At present to simplify the problem and to make my study more coherent all my research has been based on the English element that can be traced in European languages as spoken and used in their respective European native countries. I believe, however, that a similar study which would cover European languages spoken as immigrant languages in English speaking countries (U.S.A., Australia, New Zealand, etc.) ought to be done. It would certainly confirm another general linguistic statement about languages in contact: that they are affected more closely if the bilingual speakers are under constant and direct pressure of the lending language.

11. In my attempt to define the status of foreign words in a language I applied a phonological criterion, which seems to be one of the most reliable means of distinguishing foreign words from other words in a language<sup>21</sup>. According to the degree of adaptation, assimilation, and integration of a word into the system of the borrowing language three main groups emerge: 1) *Foreign words* which remain unassimilated. Such words preserve all the phonological features of the lending language which are fundamentally different from the phonological features of the receiving language. Here belong foreign personal and geographical names. Their use is very restricted as there are usually very few people who would use them (i.e. who would switch the code) in the normal way of speaking. 2) *Foreign loans* are borrowed words in a receiving language which have started (but have not yet finished) their adaptation and assimilation. They still preserve some phonological features which represent a phonetic compromise of some degree within the receiving language. The position of stress and distribution of phonemes are the commonest such

<sup>19</sup> Stene, A. 1940. *English loan-words in modern Norwegian*.

<sup>20</sup> Haugen, E. 1953. *The Norwegian language in America*. I - II.

<sup>21</sup> Filipović, R. 1960. *The phonemic analysis of English loan-words in Croatian*.

features. 3) *Loan-words* are those borrowed words which in the course of phonological adaptation by means of substitutions have been completely integrated into the phonological system of the receiving language and do not show any foreign element at all.

These principles have already been generally accepted and seem to be quite suitable in the classification not only on the phonological level but also on the morphological. However, we cannot always apply them, as we have accepted some new principles in qualifying non-native linguistic features in the borrowing language. Some foreign elements that loan-words can keep unchanged are qualified as innovations in the system or contributions of the lending language to the system of the borrowing language.

Criteria for determining the status of a loan-word other than phonological have been put forward and accepted. So now some borrowed words that according to the phonological criteria would be classified as foreign-loans have become loan-words completely integrated into the system of the borrowing language, and are consequently considered as integral parts of its vocabulary. Thousands of users of *lifts* in European countries where this means of transport exists and is named by the English word consider it an everyday word of their mother tongue, in spite of the final consonantal group *-ft* which does not conform to the distribution of consonantal phonemes in some receiving languages and qualifies the word as a foreign-loan by one of my above-mentioned phonological criteria. Frequent everyday use of the word by a great number of people and accepted innovations in the system have made this word equal to other native words and the present status of such words is legalized by linguistic processes.

12: On the *phonological level*, while studying how the phonological structure of an English loan-word has been formed in various European languages, I have observed several features of a general, theoretical nature, common to all languages under consideration. Some of these features can be called, I believe, universals of linguistic borrowing. Naturally, my investigation confirmed a previously stated theoretical principle that the basic factor determining the structure of an English loan-word is the phonological system of the receiving language. This means that an English loan-word is made up of the phonemes which exist in the receiving language. This process of substituting the phonemes of the receiving language for English phonemes is called in my study *transphonemization*.

However, this is not the only way, although it is very common, of adapting and integrating a foreign word into the phonological system of the receiving language.

In my analysis of the process of adaptation an English loan-word goes through (from the stage of a foreign word to the stage of complete integration



into the system of the receiving language when we call it a loan-word), my interest was focused on three features: 1) inventory of phonemes, 2) their distribution, 3) stress. The first feature presents a problem of what we call *phonemic importation*, the second of *phonemic redistribution* and the third of the *type of stress* we meet with in the receiving language and how it relates to stress in English.

13. Phonemic importation and phonemic redistribution are two forms of structural effects of linguistic borrowing in phonology<sup>22</sup>. The problem is whether they should be considered part of what we call *phonetic compromise* or *compromise replica*<sup>23</sup>, which can be expected to disappear in the course of adaptation and integration, or innovations in the phonological systems of receiving languages both in inventory of phonemes and their distribution.

My investigation of the first problem, *phonemic importation*, has proved: a) that it is restricted to a limited number of phonemes, b) that it is not completely free and uncontrolled but phonetically conditioned, c) that there are several conditions under which it is performed, which complements and further develops the general principle put forward by Jakobson<sup>24</sup> and Martinet<sup>25</sup>.

My research answers two basic questions: 1) how it is possible for some phonemes to be taken over and not replaced by the native phonemes of the borrowing language as is the case with so many other phonemes, 2) whether there is any structural reason for the penetration of some foreign phonemes into the phonemic system of the borrowing language or whether this is influenced from outside.

The second problem, *phonemic redistribution*, suggests that we need not wait for the transition stage of phonetic compromise to disappear, as it very often does not tend to do so. We accept it as an innovation and an extension of the phonological system on the level of distribution of phonemes under the influence of linguistic borrowing, and add this feature to the general description of the loan-word.

14. *Stress*, the third I focused my interest on, is probably an even more difficult problem in studying the English element in European languages. From the point of view of general linguistic theory perhaps the most interesting aspect of the "transfer" of words from one language into another lies in the tracing of what happens to sounds as they pass between languages with

<sup>22</sup> Filipović, R. 1959. "Consonantal innovations in the phonological system as a consequence of linguistic borrowing". 39 - 62; — 1960. "Phonemic importation". 177 - 189.

<sup>23</sup> Filipović, R. 1958. "The phonetic compromise"; — 1967. "Compromise replica and phonemic importation".

<sup>24</sup> "La langue n'accepte les éléments de structure étrangers que quand ils correspondent à ses tendances de développement".

<sup>25</sup> "On note peu de résistance à l'adoption lorsque le trait nouveau correspond à une case vide du système".

different types of stress, and where the giving language lacks, but the receiving language has, musical stress, which I call accent.

The languages I have chosen for consideration and close analysis fall into two groups according to the nature of their stress: pure stress languages and tone languages<sup>26</sup>.

English belongs to the category of stress languages in which the location of strong stress in words of more than one syllable is an integral part of the pronunciation of words. French belongs to the category of stress languages in which strong stresses are used in sentences but do not have fixed position in particular words. This difference has not, however, caused any difficulty or any major problem in the adaptation of English loan-words to the French system of stress. We have noticed that English words in the process of integration behave in the same way as the native French words, i.e. they follow the same rules. Serbo-Croatian, however, differs from both English and French as it belongs to a third category of stress languages in which the use of *special types of stress* is an integral part of the pronunciation of words.

This brings us to another distinction between languages we have studied: the distinction of stress languages from tone languages. Serbo-Croatian belongs to both; so do the other two languages I quoted above: Swedish and Norwegian. Apart from stress which plays an important part in the phonetic structure of words in all stress languages including Swedish, Norwegian, and Serbo-Croatian, in tone languages voice-pitches are used for the purpose of distinguishing words.

As English does not belong to the group of tone languages and has a stress of a different nature it is quite obvious that an English word when transferred into a tone language will present some interesting forms of adaptation and some real problems to the analyzer of this feature. The problem arises of how an English word with an expiratory stress characterized by only one basic attribute *intensity* can be reassigned to a tone stress, accent, with three attributes: *intensity*, *melody*, and *quantity*. This problem arises in its gravest form when we study the phonology of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian, whose accent has all three attributes. The last two, melody and quantity, have both phonological<sup>27</sup> and morphological value<sup>28</sup>.

15. The first thing we have considered in our analysis of stress is its position. We identify it with the first attribute of stress, *intensity*. The languages

<sup>26</sup> Jones, D. 1950. *The phoneme: Its nature and use*. Cambridge: Heffer. 136 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Phonological value: päs = dog — pās = belt (· = short, falling; ^ = long, falling) pāra = steam — pāra = money (· = short, falling; ' = short, rising).

<sup>28</sup> Morphological value: Rūsā = of the Russian (Sing. Genit.) — (· = short, falling); Rūsā = of the Russian (Plur. Genit.) — ^ = long, falling; rādi! = work! (Imperative) — (' = long, rising); rādi = he works (Present tense) — (^ = long, falling).



we have examined do not present any problem on this level. Very often the position is changed following the stress rules in receiving languages. Variants appear in some cases as the result of the phonetic compromise. Some speakers will stick to the original position of stress in a foreign word for some time; the others will try to conform it with the place of stress in their mother tongue, finally reaching the required position of stress in native words.

However, this feature may cause some changes in the phonological form of an English loan-word in some receiving languages. Sometimes the problem is how to make up the pronunciation of an English loan-word in a receiving language which differs from English in the function of stress in making up the phonetic structure of words of more than one syllable. The quality of unstressed sounds in English is different from that in many European languages. Consequently, when an English word is transferred into a receiving language where stress has not got such a decisive influence on the phonetic structure of words we find a considerable change of phonetic structure in which English unstressed sounds, weak and reduced, will be replaced by full sounds corresponding to the phonological system of the receiving language. This change quite often follows spelling pronunciation reflecting the early English pronunciation when stress did not have such an influence and when unstressed sounds were pronounced similarly to their equivalents in some European languages<sup>28</sup>.

16. The other two attributes of accent in tone languages, *melody* and *quantity*, are a major problem in the study of accent in English loan-words in tone languages. A careful study of accent in English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian, a language which makes a rather extensive use of all three attributes of accent, failed to present any system that English loan-words would follow in their adaptation on the level of accent.

I tried to apply two principles to establish some linguistic system which English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian would follow when there are reassigned quantity and tone. The first investigation was based on the principles of quality: I wanted to see whether the reassignment of quantity and tone had followed the open and closed quality of English vowels. In the second I tried to apply the principle of quantity: I wanted to see whether the reassigned Serbo-Croatian quantity and tone had followed the quantity of English sounds<sup>29</sup>.

Both experiments failed to give any reliable results and it remains to be further investigated which linguistic or non-linguistic principles govern the reassignment of accentuation in loan-words when passing from a non-tone language into a tone language.

<sup>28</sup> E. g. E 'ba:men > *barman*; E 'li:de > *lider*; E pe'dzame > *pidzama*; E ken'teins > *kontejner*; etc.

<sup>29</sup> Filipović, R. 1960. *The phonemic analysis of English loan-words in Croatian*. 60 - 89.

However, my investigation of accent of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian has resulted into some theoretical points: 1) the transformation of the English expiratory stress (characterized by one attribute — *intensity*) into the Serbo-Croatian accent (with three attributes — *intensity, melody, quantity*) does not violate the basic rules of the Serbo-Croatian accent; 2) the phonetic compromise so common during the process of phonological adaptation of foreign words in many languages occurs in some words on the level of accent too but it only affects the position of the accent and never the other two features: melody and quantity; 3) there are no innovations in the phonological system on the level of accent; 4) variants of the place of accent are not due to the differences in the systems of the two languages in contact; they may be due to some extralinguistic features which remain to be further studied; 5) deviations from the two suggested principles for the reassignment of the accent may depend on extralinguistic features. The apparent exceptions can be related to the fact that they have been introduced into Serbo-Croatian at different periods of time, in different ways, and in various districts of the Serbo-Croatian-speaking area which is linguistically heterogeneous; to German or some other language intermediary, or to other systemic factors.

17. On the *morphological level* our special interest is attached to two features: the category of gender in nouns and the category of aspect in verbs. In both cases English is a language which presents some major problems as it differs from the majority of European languages a) by having natural gender versus grammatical in other languages under consideration, and b) by having no category of aspect (at least in its surface structure, as has been stated on several occasions<sup>31</sup>, while the existence of aspect in the deep structure has not yet been finally confirmed).

The former presents only some minor difficulties; the latter, however, can be a major problem as it threatens to interfere with the main morphological principle in languages in contact, the impenetrability of the morphological system of languages. I propose to deal with the former only briefly, as it is the latter that is of more theoretical interest.

In their passing into European languages, English substantives have to adapt their natural gender to the system of grammatical gender of the receiving languages; they have to be reassigned to one of the three (or two) grammatical genders<sup>32</sup>. Our interest is attached to various factors that govern the assignment of gender. Here we see that the majority of English loan-words can be assigned to masculine gender as in most languages there

<sup>31</sup> Zandvoort, R. W. 1962. "Is aspect an English verbal category", *Gothenburg Studies in English* 15. 1 - 20.

<sup>32</sup> Filipović, R. 1961. "The morphological adaptation of English loan-words in Serbo-Croat". *SRAZ* 11. 91 - 103.



is a strong "masculine tendency". The second feature of theoretical interest on this level is contamination which is responsible for the assignment of feminine gender to some words in a few languages. However, this is not always accepted with full confidence as here again we can see some influence of intermediary languages (e.g. German on Serbo-Croatian).

18. The category of aspect is a linguistic feature typical for Slavonic languages. Here again our interest is attached to a category which the lending language lacks and some borrowing languages possess. In Slavonic languages there are two kinds of verbs: a) those that mark aspect by means of a prefix for the perfective aspect; b) biaspectual verbs, those that use the same form for both aspects. The second group is smaller and would seem to be disappearing except that foreign words tend to go into it. English verbal loan-words after they have been adapted and integrated into the morphological system of a Slavonic receiving language have not yet at that stage determined their aspect. Some of them belong to 1) a biaspectual group (denoting two aspects, perfective and imperfective); 2) a group possessing only perfective aspect; 3) a group possessing only imperfective aspect<sup>33</sup>.

Some verbs belonging to the biaspectual group can also make perfective

|    |                               |                              |
|----|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 33 | 1) <i>Biaspectual group</i>   |                              |
|    | <i>English word</i>           | — <i>Serbo-Croatian verb</i> |
|    | bluff                         | blefirati                    |
|    | macadamize                    | makadamizirati               |
|    | test                          | testirati                    |
|    | dock                          | dokovati                     |
|    | lob                           | lobovati                     |
|    | handicap                      | hendikepirati                |
|    | lynch                         | linčovati                    |
|    | interview                     | intervjuirati                |
|    | etc.                          |                              |
|    | 2) <i>Perfective aspect</i>   |                              |
|    | <i>English word</i>           | — <i>Serbo-Croatian verb</i> |
|    | groggy                        | grogirati                    |
|    | start                         | startati                     |
|    | knockout                      | nokautirati                  |
|    | etc.                          |                              |
|    | 3) <i>Imperfective aspect</i> |                              |
|    | <i>English word</i>           | — <i>Serbo-Croatian verb</i> |
|    | sprint                        | sprintati                    |
|    | train                         | trenirati                    |
|    | box                           | boksati                      |
|    | mix                           | miksati                      |
|    | dribble                       | driblati                     |
|    | picnic                        | piknikovati                  |
|    | strike                        | štrajkati                    |
|    | etc.                          |                              |

forms by means of a prefix, like the majority of Serbo-Croatian native verbs.

This also applies to Group Three whose verbs can become perfective if they are given right prefix.

The biaspectual category seems to us very interesting as it is likely to influence the trend in Slavonic languages, particularly in Serbo-Croatian<sup>34</sup>. The group of biaspectual verbs in Serbo-Croatian is not only originally small but also tends to be further reduced. By the influx of English verbal loans this group is growing and could ultimately influence the development of the whole system.

The pressure of English verbal loans in this category is supported by a number of international words — europeisms, developed from Latin, which do not indicate aspect and are also classed among biaspectual verbs.

Of course, there is another possible development. English verbal loans can indicate aspect in the same way as in native words: by using a proper prefix. If this tendency prevails then there is a good chance for the biaspectual group to disappear; every verb previously belonging to this group could determine aspect by means of prefixes. This would also be an indirect impact on the development of the verbal system of a receiving language under the influence of linguistic borrowing.

19. The *semantic aspect* of our research was based on the theoretical approach of some leading authorities in the field (Einar Haugen<sup>35</sup>, Uriel Weinreich<sup>36</sup>, Louis Deroy<sup>37</sup>, Thomas E. Hope<sup>38</sup>, Leo Pap<sup>39</sup>, Stephen Ullmann<sup>40</sup> and others) and in my study I have followed the old principle and built up some new ones of the semantic adaptation of English loan-words so that they can be applied in all the studies in the project<sup>41</sup>. The work done for the MA theses has proved these principles good and applicable on the semantic level for the aims of our project.

The generally accepted five-member scale: a) Changes in semantic extension; b) Ellipsis; c) Place-name, proper noun to substantive (appellative);

<sup>34</sup> Filipović, R. 1968. "Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja II — Morfološki aspekt"

<sup>35</sup> Haugen, E. 1950. "The analysis of linguistic borrowing". *Language* 26. 210 - 231; 1953. *The Norwegian language in America*.

<sup>36</sup> Weinreich, U. 1953. *Language in contact*. Ser. Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York.

<sup>37</sup> Deroy, L. 1956. *L'emprunt linguistique*. Paris.

<sup>38</sup> Hope, E. T. 1960. "The analysis of semantic borrowing". *Essays Presented to C. M. Girdlestone*. Newcastle. 125 - 141.

<sup>39</sup> Pap, L. 1949. *Portugese-American speech*. New York.

<sup>40</sup> Ullmann, S. 1962. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

<sup>41</sup> Filipović, R. 1967. "Principi lingvističkog posudjivanja III — Semantički aspekt", 83 - 94.



d) "Pejoration" and Euphemism; e) Metaphor, has been confirmed in the majority of languages examined, and we have found illustrative examples of changes of meaning in languages in contact. In the process of integration a loan-word often undergoes not only one but two or even three changes before its meaning is finally fixed in the receiving language.

Leaving aside all other features of semantic adaptation which are covered in our project, I will discuss only one stage of the change of meaning: changes in semantic extension. Here we have three degrees: a) Zero extension; b) Restriction of meaning; c) Expansion of meaning.

The first degree occurs quite often as a great number of English words after they have been integrated into the system of the receiving language keep their original meaning unchanged. This is often the case with words denoting food and drinks and other everyday commodities.

The second degree — restriction of meaning — is not less common as it begins with specialization from a general to a technical sense. The meaning of a borrowed word is restricted by reducing the number of senses from several in this general use of the word to one in the technical field. The change which the word goes through is characterized by the increase of the "intention" of its meaning and by the reduction of the "extension" of its meaning, i.e. the reduction of the number of senses.

The third kind of semantic change — expansion of meaning — represents a change which takes place during the transfer of the word from one system into another. The "intention" of the meaning has been reduced by loosening the precise meaning it had in the giving language and an opportunity has been created to increase the "extension" of its meaning: this was achieved by a new linguistic and social milieu. So the word expands its range.

All these features have been well established in our languages and every word in our corpus will be labelled in this way before it is finally classified in the *Dictionary*.

In the course of the analysis of changes in semantic extension I have come across a few new types.

20. After having analysed several examples of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian from the point of changes in semantic extension I have established a new division of this item. I started with a three-member one: a) zero extension, b) restriction, c) expansion, but I added the results of my analysis and developed it into a five member scale by further subdividing restriction and expansion into 2a) restriction of meaning in general, i.e. the loss of some senses; 2b) changes of meaning within the established one sense after restriction had taken place; 3a) expansion of meaning in general, i.e. acquiring new senses; 3b) changes of meaning within senses acquired after expansion. This new scheme

developed when I analysed English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian<sup>42</sup>. The same analysis is carried on now in other languages of the project and we expect to confirm my results in other languages.

21. *Lexical level*. As I have mentioned before, the majority of analytic studies done in this field focus their interest on the English influence on the vocabulary of the language under study. If there is a synthetical attempt its aim would be the same: to study the English element in the vocabulary of several languages chosen for particular reasons. Each chapter on a respective language appears to be analytic in a way since it detects and emphasizes a specific indebtedness, particular to the respective nation and separating it from other peoples. After this analytic approach which shows where the chosen languages differ, comes a synthetic appreciation which indicates where they agree and tries to trace the evolution of English expansion in the part where the examined languages are spoken.

It is quite obvious from what I have written and said here today about my work on this project that this was not my primary aim and objective. The whole project was planned to discuss many more problems than these: they have been analysed on four levels: phonological, morphological, semantic and lexical. On each level our study aimed at tracing importations and innovations in the systems of the respective languages under the influence of linguistic borrowing from English.

Apart from the general corpus of English loan-words in European languages which make the basic core of the material under study, there is a huge category of calques and hybrids; translations of compounds, derivatives, and phrases, revivals of obsolete meanings; popular etymology, English influence in the make-up of Latin and new-Latin coinages and juxtapositions.

We meet with some real problems when we have to discuss and analyse: a) borrowed items composed of English elements which are not themselves English expressions (*best-runner, happy-end, air-condition*); b) borrowed items which show a vitality outside English which they have never achieved within it (*covert-coat*); c) borrowed suffixes which are productive in one group of languages and dead or even dropped off in another (cf. *-ing* which in French is not only used and kept in English loan-words, but is productive in native words, while in Serbo-Croatian it is dropped in English loan-words although there is no systemic reason for this).

22. Another kind of problem we have to discuss is the English element in technical vocabularies and terminologies in several European languages. In some fields of technical sciences in which the United States and Great Britain

<sup>42</sup> Filipović, R. 1968. "Semantic extension changes in adaptation of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian". *SRAZ* 25/26. 109 - 119.



are leading countries, the English element is so strong that it seriously affects the native contribution to it. It is even more interesting to see that there is hardly any effort to adapt these technical terminologies to the native system of the respective receiving language. It should be considered as a transition stage, something like a set of compromise replicas which will sooner or later follow the general trend of adaptation and integration. One of the proofs is that sports terminology developed in a similar way. It has gradually lost English elements as receiving languages substituted their native words or loan-translations for quite a number of technical sports terms. The reason why a similar process in modern technical terminology is much slower is that technicians know English and tend to keep original English technical terms unchanged or very little adapted.

23. *Conclusion.* The first conclusion we can draw from our analysis is that the languages we have examined differ: a) in the extent of adoption of English elements, b) in the degree of adaptation to the receiving language. The other results of our work will be seen in two books: a monograph and a dictionary.

The *Monograph* will show which linguistic features of borrowing are common to all and which only to some languages, and whether the features that only some languages have in common are connected with their genetic relatedness or not. This will support or disprove the existence of some universals in languages in contact and linguistic borrowing.

In the *Dictionary* every English word that has been transferred into no matter how many (one or all) European languages will be recorded and discussed briefly on all four levels. Even its spelling will be analysed to show how it is related to its source form in English. From the *Dictionary* it will also be seen which languages have accepted the word.

I believe that my paper has given you a clear picture of what are the aims and objectives of my project and what kind of problems and questions we had to deal with. To see whether we have found the solution for all the problems and the answers for all the questions I am afraid you will have to wait until you read the monograph *The English element in the main European languages* and consult *The Dictionary of anglicisms in the main European languages*. What I hope to have done satisfactorily in this paper is at least to ask the right questions and point out real problems.