New Words and Linguistic Purism

Innsbruck, 25th-26th October 2018

Book of Abstracts

Organizing Committee: ten Hacken, Pius (chair)
                          Koliopoulou, Maria
                          Aufinger, Sara
                          Rebosio, Laura
                          Reiter, Sandra

Edited by: Rebosio, Laura

universität
innsbruck

Institut für
Translationswissenschaft

Thursday 25 October

Friday 26 October

Thursday 25 October

Pius ten Hacken
Norms, New Words and Empirical Reality

For a long time, the study of language and in particular the study of words was linked to the development of an optimized state of the language that could be maintained as an ideal ever after. This was the ideology behind language academies such as the *Académie Française* (founded 1635) and Johnson's (1755) dictionary. With the emergence of historical-comparative linguistics in the 19th century and even more with structuralism as pursued in North America in the 20th century, many linguists adopted the non-evaluative description of actual language as an ideal, cf. Hall (1960). This led to an opposition between linguists and the general public that is observed, for instance, in the public discussion of dictionaries as described in Morton (1994). The general public wants a dictionary to be a norm and treats it as such, whereas lexicographers see their task as describing language in actual use.

Chomsky's (1965) insight that the underlying notion of language is the competence realized in the mind of the speaker led to a further shift. Whereas competence, realized in a speaker, and performance, realized in utterances and texts, are empirical entities, named languages, e.g. English, are not. Thus, determining whether a word is a word of English is not an empirical question. This consequence of the introduction of the concepts of *competence* and *performance* was first formulated by Chomsky (1976). Linguists and lexicographers who take corpora as the basis for linguistic research and lexicographic practice often reject it.

We therefore have three contrasting perspectives. The general public is interested in norms and wants to know which words are correct and acceptable in a language. Linguists and lexicographers interested in the description of a language as it is really used assume that, as far as norms exist, they are determined by usage. Mentalist linguists accept that competence is the underlying nature of language and deny the possibility of a norm-free description of named languages. In many ways, it is easier to reconcile the general public's interest in norms with with mentalist linguistics than with the view that usage determines norms.

Against this background, I will consider the emergence of new words. In general, new words are the result of naming and naming is triggered by the need to find a name for a new concept. In the mentalist perspective, new words do not emerge as part of a named language, but are first of all created by a speaker as part of their mental lexicon. The decision whether a word is part of English is not empirical, because English is not empirical. It can only be based on authority. This authority provides a norm.

New words are typically either the products of word formation or borrowings. Whether assigning a new sense to a word also creates a new word is more controversial. Whether a new word has come into existence is not an empirical question, but this does not mean that the question cannot be answered. In the general public, the most common method for verifying whether a word exists or has a specific sense is to consult a dictionary. This is an appeal to authority. Whether the word is in the dictionary depends on a decision by lexicographers. Lexicographers generally transfer this authority to their corpus, e.g. McLeod (1986). However, as shown by ten Hacken (2009), a corpus cannot be used to

exonerate the lexicographer. In order to use a corpus as a basis for determining whether a word exists, decisions have to be taken about the composition of the reference corpus and the interpretation of individual occurrences in the corpus that can only be taken by speakers on the basis of their competence.

References

Chomsky, Noam (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1976), 'On the Biological Basis of Language Capacities', in Rieber, Robert W. (ed.), *The Neuropsychology of Language: Essays in Honor of Eric Lenneberg*, New York: Plenum, pp. 1-24.

ten Hacken, Pius (2009), 'What is a Dictionary? A View from Chomskyan Linguistics', *International Journal of Lexicography* 22: 399-421.

Hall, Robert A. (1960), *Linguistics and Your Language*, Garden City (NY): Doubleday.

Johnson, Samuel (1755), *A Dictionary of the English Language*, London: Knapton, Longman, etc.

McLeod, William T. (1986), 'Foreword', in Hanks, Patrick (ed.), *Collins Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd edition*, London/Glasgow: Collins

Morton, Herbert C. (1994), *The Story of Webster's Third: Philip Gove's Controversial Dictionary and Its Critics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sara Aufinger
The Gendering of Job Titles in French and German

France is well known for its active language policy. Even if changing attitudes may have been noted in the last twenty years, French language policy is one of the most cited ones for its severity. For a translator it is particularly interesting to see, if and how language policy affects translation.

I illustrate this complex of problems in the context of a rather current discussion in the field of language policy, namely the gender debate. Despite all efforts of feminist linguistics in the past decades, gendered language use is still not self-evident in any language. In various countries the levels of interest and action for more justice in language differ strongly from each other. In part, problems as well as suitable solutions depend of the language system itself. In my analysis I concentrate on my working languages German and French in their major language centres Germany and France.

The expression of gender in language can neither in francophone nor in German-speaking countries be seen as successfully solved. Still, French and German are very similar in their gender structure, as both are grammatically gendered languages. Nouns of these languages have a certain gender, for example the genderless English word *sun* has in these languages an article assigning it clearly to one gender: In French it is <u>*le*</u> *soleil* (masculine) and in German <u>*die*</u> *Sonne* (feminine). Furthermore, one should not forget about the interaction between gender and sex, as the grammatical gender may influence the real world perception.

In my analysis I examine job titles like *professeur, ministre, auteur* and *chef*. When talking about an authoress in French, besides the form *auteur,* there exists the form *auteure.* Though the added -*e* can be seen, but not heard in spoken language, for which reason there are also the variants *autrice* and *femme auteur*. How does one decide which of these forms is to be preferred? Another example comes from a more political context, where the variants of the titles *Madame <u>le</u> ministre* and *Madame la ministre* keep to be lively debated. The debate is no longer only linguistic or political, as Jean Paul Gaultier sent a clear statement from the fashion world by creating in 2017 the perfume *Scandal* and the corresponding advertising character *Madame <u>la</u> ministre.*

It should be pointed out that the recommendations for the use of gendered language made in France by the *Académie française* differ very strongly from the ones in Germany made by the prestigious dictionary publisher *Duden*. When it comes down to word formation, the situation in German is often much easier. Job titles can be gendered by simply adding the syllable -*in,* whereby the words *Professor<u>in</u>, Autor<u>in</u>, Minister<u>in</u>* und *Chef<u>in</u>* can easily be formed. Whereas French tends to use 'unisex' job titles – and in the case of the *ministre* even with a masculine article –, in German we find different forms referring to men and women. One may argue that the greater acceptance of such feminine word forms in German is due to the regularity of the process.

If we now look at the gender debate from a translator's perspective a number of questions arise. Do attitudes towards gender-neutral language and the policy which stands behind it influence the work of language professionals? How should a translator decide, when coming across the words *professeur* or *auteur* without further context? What does it mean for the recipient of a translation, if information is added or disappears due to the gender

structure of a language? Are there any recommendations from official language institutions and which developments can we expect in future? In my contribution I will show how the answers to these questions affect the work of a professional translator.

Rachel Poulin & Juliette Burger
The Frequency of English Borrowings in Quebec and Hexagonal Journalistic French: A Comparative Study

Due to the widely-held belief that English is threatening the French language, French speakers from Quebec are purportedly more reluctant to integrate loanwords into their dialect than speakers from France (Walsh, 2014). In this study, we investigate this claim by comparing the overall frequencies of anglicisms in French and Quebec newspaper publications. This project follows the methodology of Chesley & Baayen (2010) who examine the entrenchment of lexical borrowings into Hexagonal French from 1989-2006. We extend the scope of that study by comparing relative frequencies and degree of entrenchment of anglicisms in contemporary French and Quebec varieties. Here, we define entrenchment as the increase in frequency between time one and time two. We adopt a strict definition of borrowing: a word that never appears in *Le Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé* and is not morphologically adapted to French (Chesley & Baayen, 2010).

We examine two different journalistic corpora from the French newspaper *Le Figaro* and the Quebec newspaper *La Presse* both of which are comprised of roughly 2.6 million words. The first half of the *Le Figaro* corpus consists of archived articles from 2008 (time one), while the second half was collected from 2017 (time two). This process was repeated with the *La Presse* archives to mirror the *Le Figaro* corpus. This ten-year gap is adequate to determine any change to the degree of entrenchment of the English borrowings between these time periods (Chesley & Baayen, 2010). After compiling the corpora, we manually searched for anglicisms using a list of 100 n-grams that frequently occur in English (such as 'ck', 'ed', 'ing', 'wit', 'ight', 'ough' etc.). We then determined the frequencies of each English borrowing at time one and time two in each corpus to compare overall frequencies and determine entrenchment.

Results reflect that anglicisms are infrequent (0.037% of the entire corpus), and that the majority of these borrowings are ephemeral, as only 2.169% of the borrowings became entrenched at time two (Poplack & Dion, 2012). Overall, the Quebec corpus had fewer borrowings (0.032%) than the French corpus. Additional findings reflect that 65% of borrowings in *La Presse* were flagged (with either italics or quotation marks) while only 10% were in the *Le Figaro* corpus. This suggests that Quebec French speakers are more conscious of their use of English borrowings. These results support the claim that Quebec French speakers are more conservative than Hexagonal French speakers (Walsh, 2014; Vincent, 2015). However, as both corpora reported similar frequencies of borrowings in 2017, contemporary Quebec French speakers may be becoming less conservative in their use of anglicisms. As newspaper articles undergo editorial scrutiny aimed at a wide readership, the borrowings found in these corpora can be assumed to be well-integrated into the readers' standardized speech (Grant-Russell & Beaudet,1999). Additionally, the increased rate of influence of English via social media and recent technology has allowed for more virtual language contact, and thus, lexical borrowings (Stojičić, 2004). This is evident in the higher frequencies that occur in France, despite there being no direct contact with English, in comparison to Quebec which has been described as a situation of "intense, long-term contact" (Poplack et al., 2006). Therefore, current data on these borrowings are indispensable if we are to understand how the degree of integration of English loanwords differ in these varieties.

References

Chesley, P., & Baayen, R. (2010). Predicting new words from newer words: Lexical borrowingsin French. *Linguistics*, 48(6), 1343-1374. doi:10.1515/LING.2010.043

Grant-Russell, Pamela and Beaudet, Céline. (1999). Lexical borrowings from French in written Quebec English. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 6(2), 17-33.

Poplack, S., JA Walker, and R. Malcolmson. (2006). An English "Like no Other"? Language Contact and Change in Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics-Revue Canadienne De Linguistique*, 51(2), 185-185.

Poplack, S., & Dion, N. (2012). Myths and facts about loanword development. *Language Variation and Change*, 24(3), 279-315. doi:10.1017/S095439451200018X

Stojičić, V. (2004). Sociolinguistic stimuli to development of the english lexicon – language contact and social need. *FACTA UNIVERSITATIS - Linguistics and Literature*, 3(11), 29-36.

Vincent, N. (2015). Perception dans les journaux français de la lutte québécoise aux anglicismes. *J. Ennis, W. Remysen & S. Schwarze (éds.), Les idéologies linguistiques dans la presse écrite, Circula: revue d'idéologies linguistiques.*

Walsh, O. (2014). 'Les anglicismes polluent la langue française'. Purist attitudes in France and Quebec. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 24(3), 423-449.

Tinatin Margalitadze
Dictionary of Barbarisms: The Georgian Case

In May 2017, the Lexicographic Centre at Tbilisi State University, one of the centres of lexicographic activity in Georgia, posted the *Online Dictionary of Barbarisms* on the Internet (www.barbarisms.ge), which contains over 1200 words and expressions of Russian and English origin.

The vocabulary of the Georgian language describes with a chronicler's precision the history of the Georgian people and its relations with other nations and languages. These historic contacts are reflected as words of Arab, Persian and Turkish origin in modern Georgian vocabulary. Two centuries of Georgia's existence within the Russian Empire and later within the Soviet Union resulted in the voluminous Dictionary of Foreign Words, which mainly describes and explains foreign words introduced in the Georgian vocabulary either from the Russian language, or from European languages via Russian. From that period the Georgian language also inherited hundreds of barbarisms of Russian origin.

Thus, Georgian is traditionally quite an 'open' language, freely borrowing words from other languages. Despite the fact, the developments taking place in the Georgian language in recent years have caused considerable irritation, anger and even concern among the Georgian public and academic circles. This time, the processes taking place in the Georgian language are connected with the English language and its overwhelming influence. The Internet and modern information and communications technologies; growing international contacts as a result of the years of regained independence; the free market economy, new entrepreneurial and legal relations; revolutionary advancements almost in every field of science and technology were linked with the formation of new concepts, with new terms which have naturally inundated the Georgian language directly via English.

The English words borrowed into the Georgian vocabulary gradually took form of a kind of avalanche, engulfing tens of Georgian words on a daily basis: დისემინაცია - *diseminatsia* (Eng. dissemination), აროგანტული - *arogantuli* (Eng. arrogant), დაქენსელება - *dakenseleba* (Eng. to cancel), პრირეკვიზიტი - *prirekviziti* (Eng. prerequisite), ალარმირება - *alarmireba* (Eng. to alarm), ოვერლაპი - *overlapi* (Eng. to overlap), ბულით ფოინთები - *bulit pointebi* (Eng. bullet points), პატერნი - *paterni* (Eng. pattern), and so on. The cases when English words were borrowed with their several, polysemous meanings became more frequent, often leading to much confusion and misunderstanding. New terms were introduced into the Georgian vocabulary mainly by means of transliteration: პრეციპიტაცია - *pretsipitatsia* (Eng. precipitation), შაპერონი - *shaperoni* (Eng. chaperone), *ქემოატრაქტანტი* - (Eng. chemoattractant), ტრანზიციული მუტაცია - *tranzitsiuli mutatsia* (transitional mutation), რეზიდუალური სტრესის პატერნი - *rezidualuri stresis paterni* (Eng. residual stress pattern) and so on.

For me, as a representative of English-Georgian lexicography and the editor of the *Comprehensive English-Georgian dictionary* (Margalitadze *et al*, 2010), it was interesting to observe and analyse the processes taking place in Georgian due to the influence of English (Margalitadze, 2017). Certainly, post-colonial mentality is playing its role in the processes which are currently underway in the Georgian language. However, the in-depth research into the subject has revealed that one of the reasons of the influx of English words are the new methods of teaching foreign languages, spread to the schools and higher-

education institutions of Georgia, which greatly diminished the role of translation and reduced the practice of using native language and bilingual dictionaries in the process of teaching foreign languages (Margalitadze & Meladze, 2016). 'It is genuinely puzzling how methods which explicitly condemn the use of the native language in the classroom, effectively banning bilingual dictionaries, could ever have been considered beneficial in the teaching and learning of foreign languages' (Adamska-Sałaciak, 2014).

Another reason, from my point of view, is neglect of lexicography in Georgia during the last 10 – 15 years (Williams, 2016) which eventually led to the shortage of academic dictionaries, including terminological dictionaries.

This issue is connected with the problem of descriptivism and prescriptivism in lexicography. Should a lexicographer only observe a language and describe it as it is, or should he/she also prescribe what is correct? Vrbinc, Farina, and Vrbinc give interesting summary of different views on this issue in their recent work (2018). It is important to note that issues of normativity and social acceptability in educated circles for borrowings have a completely different significance for a language like Georgian, used mostly by native speakers within a single country, as compared to English, a global lingua franca whose stability is ensured by its world status. Lexicographers need to be aware of the cultural considerations of individual languages when they address the treatment of borrowings.

It was under these very circumstances that the Dictionary of Barbarisms was created as a provisional measure intended to stop the above-mentioned chaotic processes.
While the public most likely does not fully understand the many reasons for the influx of the barbarisms that anger it, the widespread interest in maintaining the Georgian vocabulary makes this new dictionary quite socially relevant and popular.

References
Adamska-Sałaciak, A. (2014). Bilingual Lexicography: Translation Dictionaries. *International Handbook of Modern Lexis and Lexicography DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-45369-4_6-1 #* Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Margalitadze, T. (editor-in-chief), Meladze, G. *et al*. (2010). '*A Comprehensive English-Georgian Online Dictionary*'. Lexicographic Centre, Tbilisi State University. Tbilisi. www.dict.ge

Margalitadze, T. & Meladze, G. (2016). Importance of the Issue of Partial Equivalence for Bilingual Lexicography and Language Teaching. *Proceedings of the XVII EURALEX International Congress: Lexicography and Linguistic Diversity.* Tbilisi: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. http://euralex.org/category/publications/euralex-2016/

Margalitadze, T. (2017). Does Georgian Language Need Anglicization? *Matsne.* Tbilisi : Georgian National Academy of Sciences, pp. 166 – 180 (In Georgian).

Vrbinc, A., Farina, D., & Vrbinc, M. (to appear 2018). Objectivity, Prescription, Harmlessness, and Drudgery: Reflections of Lexicographers in Slovenia. *Lexikos,* 28.

Williams, G. (2016). In Praise of lexicography, and Lexicographers. *Proceedings of the XVII EURALEX International Congress: Lexicography and Linguistic Diversity.* Tbilisi: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University.
http://euralex.org/category/publications/euralex-2016/

Carla Marello (Keynote)
New Words and New Forms of Linguistic Purism in the XXI Century: The Italian Debate

Unlike its sister Romance languages French and Spanish, it has often been noticed that modern day Italian is not particularly bothered by the influx of foreign (mainly English) words. One reason for this, according to some scholars, is that standard Italian as such does not stir up linguistic identity for many, rather, many speakers prefer to identify with their region's 'dialetto', if they master it. In my presentation, I will discuss above all neologisms of foreign origin

a) collected since 2000, by Adamo and Della Valle (2003, 2006, 2008) and other authors in special books or websites (such as ONLI);
b) registered in dictionaries and/or
c) brought to the attention of the Accademia della Crusca (new words pointed out http://www.accademiadellacrusca.it/it/lingua-italiana/parole-nuove/parole-piu-segnalate).

The response to the use of these neologisms by Accademia della Crusca through its Presidents are commented in Sgroi (2017) and you can read answers by Academicians and staff at
http://www.accademiadellacrusca.it/it/lingua-italiana/consulenza-linguistica/domande-risposte.

Among the 725 answers more than 66 are labelled with the keyword "anglicismo", 24 with "francesismo", 4 with "ispanismo". There are questions about which word might be used instead of a foreign one, but many questions are about acceptability of words derived from foreign basis, as for example *masterare/masterizzare*, referred to the role of the game master, *stalkare, stalkerare* or *stalkerizzare* and a lot more about the gender of foreign loans when used in Italian (*il/la flûte, il/la font, il/la emoticon*), and about which article to use (*il or lo jihadista?*).

To oppose this widespread ambivalence towards English neologisms in Italian speakers and newspapers, a group of scholars known as INCIPIT (formed by Michele Cortelazzo, Paolo D'Achille, Valeria Della Valle, Jean-Luc Egger, Claudio Giovanardi, Claudio Marazzini, Alessio Petralli, Luca Serianni, Annamaria Testa) decided to campaign against acritical acceptance of 'forestierismi incipienti' i-e. foreign words which are just entering Italian. INCIPIT group remarks that these words were used not only in the news media but also in Italian governmental decrees. You can read all the ten press releases by the group at http://www.accademiadellacrusca.it/it/search/apachesolr_search/INCIPIT.

They emphasize that the use of foreign (above all English) terminology is not only a problem for the Italian language but also, importantly, a hindrance to communication for many for whom these foreign words are entirely opaque. Examples cited by the group are *caregiver, stepchild adoption, spending review, jobs act, whistleblower, voluntary disclosure, flat tax* for which they suggest respectively *assistente familiare, adozione del figlio del partner, revisione della spesa pubblica, legge sul lavoro, allertatore civico, collaborazione volontaria, tassa forfettaria*.

References

Giovanni Adamo - Valeria Della Valle (2003) *Neologismi quotidiani. Un dizionario a cavallo del millennio (1998-2003)* Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki, 2003.

Giovanni Adamo - Valeria Della Valle (2006) *Parole nuove. Un dizionario di neologismi dai giornali*, Milano, Sperling & Kupfer, 2005.

Giovanni Adamo - Valeria Della Valle (2008), *Il Vocabolario Treccani. Neologismi. Parole nuove dai giornali*, Roma, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, (edizione speciale per le librerie, Roma 2009).

Claudio Giovanardi, Elisa De Roberto (2016), *L'italiano e le lingue degli altri*, Gruppo editoriale L'Espresso, Roma.

Claudio Marazzini, Alessio Petralli (a cura di) (2015), *L'italiano e le lingue romanze di fronte agli anglicismi*, Firenze GoWare & Accademia della Crusca.

ONLI: Banca dati dell'Osservatorio neologico della lingua italiana, coordinatori G. Adamo - V. Della Valle, Istituto per il Lessico Intellettuale Europeo e Storia delle Idee (ILIESI), CNR Roma, http://www.iliesi.cnr.it/ONLI/indice.php.

Salvatore C. Sgroi (2017) L'Accademia della Crusca (1949-2015) davanti ai "doni stranieri" in Salvatore C. Sgroi *Maestri della linguistica italiana* Edizioni dell'Orso 2017 pp. 73-106.

Maria Koliopoulou
Term Formation: New Words and Borrowings

This study investigates terms from a linguistic, more specifically from a morphological point of view and focuses on the strategies applied for the formation of terms. Specifically, the study examines two of the most frequent formation strategies cross-linguistically, i.e. the creation of new words and the direct or adapted borrowing of terms (cf. Sager 1990: 82, 1997; Pritchard 2006: 269-270; Baker 2011: 23-44; Munday 2012: 86-89; Arntz et al. 2014: 117-125; Bozděchová, 2015: 2255-2258).

Regarding the selection of the one or the other strategy, one should consider the term formation principles, as defined by ISO 704 (2009). Moreover, it should be also taken into consideration that there are different language cultures and consequently preferences with regard to the selection of one of the two strategies. There are, for instance, language cultures with a clear tendency to prefer the use of the native language supporting the creation of a new words, contrary to more tolerant language attitudes, which allow the adoption of terminological concept through borrowing. However, more tolerant language attitudes do not exclude various efforts to develop an autochthonous terminology, which mostly leads to the existence of doublets. In such a case, two different strategies of term formation are retrieved leading to alternative or competing terms and finally to an unstable terminology.

This study concentrates on the comparison of these term formation strategies as applied in Greek and German. The selection of the two languages is not arbitrary. Greek and German display certain morphological similarities. They are synthetic languages with a rich fusional morphological system, specifically as far as the word formations processes are concerned. From a terminological point of view, German and Greek tend to borrow many terms from English or French. Moreover, Greek is a donor language for many European languages taking into consideration the Greek neoclassical elements (stems, prefixes or suffixes) participating in the formation of mostly scientific and to a less extent of legal or technical terms. In this respect, this paper investigates the word formation network built between the languages mentioned above.

Main aim of the paper is to detect the preference of the selected languages to the one or the other term formation strategy and additionaly to explore if it is influenced by specific types of terminological domain or if it can be considered as a general preference within the specific language. Contrasting German and Greek, a further research question is related to the extent of correspondence of the selected term formation strategies in equivalent terms.

Another aspect considered in this study is related to the translation of terms. Term formation is initially part of the work delivered by terminologists, terminographers as well as domain specialists. Their work is related both to the primary naming of a new concept in a given source language and to secondary term formation in a target language. Since the increasing terminological needs cannot be practically covered in all languages by terminologists, terminographers or domain specialists, translators and interpreters are sometimes dealing with cases of zero equivalence. In such case, they assume a terminological role and form a new concept name. A contrastive analysis of terms in two morphologically comparable languages like German and Greek supports the naming work of translators and interpreters, especially those working on less terminologically developed languages. In this respect, this study offer useful insights supporting the naming work of

translators and interpreters, especially those working on less terminologically developed languages.

References
Arntz, Reiner, Picht, Heribert & Schmitz, Klaus-Dirk. 2014. *Einführung in die Terminologiearbeit*. 7. vollständig überarbeitete und aktualisierte Aufl. Hildesheim: Olms.

Baker, Mona. 2011. *In Other Words. A coursebook on translation*. 2nd ed. London & New York: Routledge.

Bozděchová, Ivana. 2015. Word-formation and technical languages. In Müller, Peter O., Ohnheiser, Ingeborg, Olsen, Susan & Rainer, Franz (eds.), *An International Word-Formation Handbook of the Languages of Europe*. Vol. 3, 2251-2266. Berlin: de Gruyter.

ISO 704. 2009. *Terminology work – Principles and methods*. Geneva: ISO

Munday, Jeremy. 2012. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications*, 3rd ed. London, New York: Routledge.

Pritchard, Boris. 2006. Some Lexical Aspects of Translating Specialised Texts. In Gotti, Maurizio & Šarčević, Susan (eds.), *Insights into Specialized Translation*, 261-288. Bern: Peter Lang.

Sager, Juan C. 1990. *A practical course in terminology processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sager, Juan C. 1997. Term formation. In Wright, Sue Ellen & Budin, Gerhard (eds.), *Handbook of Terminology Management*. Vol. 1, 25-41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Angeliki Efthymiou

Borrowed Affixes, Loan Translations and Derivational Neologisms in the Verbal Domain of Modern Greek: The Role of the Features [+learned] and [-learned]

Modern Greek (MGr) has a wealth of verb-deriving processes. MGr verbs can be formed by means of suffixation, prefixation, parasynthesis or conversion:

(1) a. *kathar-ízo* 'to clean'   (*katharós* 'clean')
      b. *iper-fortóno* 'to overload'   (*fortóno* 'to load')
      c. *ek-θron-ízo* 'dethrone'   (*θrónos* 'throne')
      d. *glossolog(ó)* 'perform the activity of a linguist'   (*glossológos* 'linguist')

The above-mentioned verb-forming processes generally differ in terms of morphological productivity. In Modern Greek, the functional potential of affixal derivation is considerably higher than that of parasynthesis or conversion. It is also notable that in contemporary Greek the domain of affixal derivation seems to be expanded, mainly via grammaticalization (e.g. the suffixization of AG *poiô* 'to make/do', the prefixization of *kutso-* 'lame'), and via borrowing (e.g. the intensifying prefix *kara-* 'very', from the Turkish adjective *kara* 'black', the suffix *-aro* from the Italian *-are*) (Efthymiou 2017; see also Dimela & Melissaropoulou 2009, Manolessou & Ralli 2015):

(2) a. *aplo-pió* 'to simplify'   (*aplós* 'simple')
      b. *kutso-tróo* 'to eat slowly, from time to time'   (*tróo* 'to eat slowly)
      c. *kara-drépome* 'to be extremely ashamed'   (*drépome* 'to be ashamed')
      d. *stre-sáro* 'to stress'   (*stres* 'stress')

As a consequence, new verb-forming elements enter in competition with older Modern Greek verb- orming affixes (cf. Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1986, Efthymiou, Fragaki & Markos 2012).

This study examines a) verb-forming affixes which Greek borrowed from other languages, b) verb- orming elements which are related to the introduction of loan words in Greek and c) verb-forming elements which are related to the introduction of neologisms with evaluative meaning in Greek:

a) e.g. the suffix *-áro* the prefix *kara-*:

3) a. *zum-áro* 'to zoom'
     b. *kara-gustáro* 'to fancy extremely'

b) e.g. the affixoid *-pió* and the prefixes *ek-* and *en-*:

4) a. *gramatiko-pió* 'grammaticalize'
     b. *ek-viomixan-íz-o* 'to industrialize' (cf. also French *industrialiser*)
     c. *en-iδat-ón-o* 'to hydrate' (cf. also French *hydrater*)

c) e.g. the prefixoids *psilo-* 'slim', *kutso-* 'lame, gimpy' and *psefto-* 'false':

5) a. *psilo-δagóno* 'to bite slightly'
     b. *kutso-tróo* 'to eat slowly, from time to time'
     c. *psefto-djavázo* 'to study half-heartedly, from time to time'

We argue that the preference for certain elements rather than others can be predicted by appealing to sociolinguistic factors. Sociolinguistically, the suffix *-áro* typically occurs in informal or spoken speech and shows preference for non-native bases (e.g. *tsekáro* 'to check', base: *tsek* 'check'), while the suffixoid *-pió* and the prefixes *apo-*, *ek-* and *en-* are frequently used in [+learned] verbs which are loan translations of English or French verbs (see Anastassiadis-Symeonidis 1986, Ralli 2005, Efthymiou 2015, Efthymiou, Fragaki & Markos 2012). On the other hand, the prefix *kara-* is used in highly informal register and derives [-learned] words with negative connotations. These observations accord with Anastassiadis-Symeonidis (2010), who claims that borrowing constitutes a safe way for Greek to introduce finer distinctions on a pragmatic level. For the [+learned], the official, Greek employs suffixes of Greek origin, while for the [–learned], suffixes borrowed from other languages.

Regarding the register properties of *psilo-*, *kutso-* and *psefto-*, which are all relatively new verb- forming elements in the history of Greek, it can be observed that they typically occur in informal or spoken speech. This observation correlates with previous studies on Modern Greek evaluative morphemes, which show that prefixoids typically have a colloquial usage, while prepositional prefixes may be either stylistically unrestricted or they may have a scientific usage (Efthymiou 2017). Moreover, it provides support for suggesting that like borrowing, prefixization constitutes a way for Greek to introduce distinctions on a pragmatic level.

References

Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 1986. On the nature and productivity of the forming element *-pió. Studies in Greek Linguistics 1985*:49-70. [In Greek]

Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, A. 2010. Pourquoi une langue emprunte-t-elle des suffixes? L'exemple du grec et du latin. *Meta* 55(1): 147-157.

Dimela, E. & Melissaropoulou, D. 2009. On prefix like adverbs in Modern Greek. *Patras Working Paper in Linguistics* 1: 72-94.

Efthymiou, A., Fragaki, G. & Markos, A. 2012. Exploring the productivity of -pió in Modern Greek: A corpus-based study. In Z. Gavriilidou, A. Efthymiou, E. Thomadaki & P. Kambakis- ougiouklis (eds), *Selected papers of the 10th International Conference of Greek Linguistics*. Available at: http://www.icgl. gr.

Efthymiou, A. 2015. Modern Greek parasynthetic verbs: A hierarchical relationship between prefixes and suffixes. In. S. Manova (ed.), *Affix ordering across languages and frameworks*. N. York: Oxford University Press, 82-107.

Efthymiou, A. 2017. Intensification and deintensification in Modern Greek verbs. *Lexis-Journal in English Lexicology* 10. Online since 30 September 2017, URL:http://lexis.revues.org/1089.

Manolessou, I. & Ralli, A. 2015. From Ancient Greek to Modern Greek, in P. Muller, I. Onheiser, S. Olsen, Susan & F. Rainer (eds), *Word-Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, vol 3, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2041–2061.

Ralli, A. 2005. *Morphology*. Athens: Patakis. [In Greek].

Ingie Zakaria
Translating English into English: The Social Nuances of English Borrowing in *Zaat*

1. Introduction

1.1. Postcolonialism and English Borrowing

Thanks to British colonialism, English spread into parts of the world where it had never ventured before the British Empire gained the necessary momentum to expand beyond the Isles. Once there, it was either imposed upon the indigenous populations or otherwise adopted by them. Egypt is an example of the latter; as a country which had repeatedly been the target of multiple invaders, it had been known to quite readily adopt the language of the new intruders. The justification for this phenomenon covers several potential reasons ranging from the linguistic adaptation being a survival mechanism to having developed an acute sense of inferiority in the face of the invader, motivated by the fact that such invasions invariably occurred at times when the country was at its weakest compared even to the most undeveloped external forces, let alone one of such formidable power as the British Empire at the height of its colonialist career.

1.2. Key Definitions

The use of borrowing, defined here as the conscious use of idiolectally- or dialectally-borrowed English or French terms in contexts where the Arabic term is both expected and available, is a sociolinguistic marker commonly found in some postcolonial speech communities where the colonial language is inserted in a random manner to signal a more superior socioeconomic background. This is based on the fact that, unlike government-run free education, where curricula are taught in the local language, private education, which is costly and rather exclusive, runs English, French, or German CLIL programs. In the case of idiolectally-borrowed terms, the loanword is not uniformly used across the speech community, but rather constitutes a personal choice to use this specific word in this specific context to replace an existing Arabic term. As for dialectally-borrowed terms, a larger speech community chooses to borrow the term to replace an existing Arabic term, and the consensus leads to a natural borrowing process similar to that in other languages.

2. Statement of the Problem

This paper addresses the problems involved in the translation of English borrowing in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic texts (ECA), whether it is an idiolectal or dialectal feature, into English, which leads to the loss of the sociolinguistic nuances intended by the Source Text (SL), since the process essentially involves translating English into English. Hence, the borrowed term in question gets lost in the natural flow of the Target Language (TL) and ceases to indicate the intended purpose.

3. Data

3.1. Data Collection

The data used in the study is extracted from *Zaat*, a 1992 novel by Sonallah Ibrahim, which chronicles the life of its eponymous lower-middle class protagonist in the second half of the twentieth century, at a time where she and her husband are attempting, along with most

of their acquaintances, to hang on to the coattails of the slightly more affluent middle class. Ibrahim observes one of the common properties of the middle class, which was, in turn, adopted from the more affluent classes: the tendency to use English borrowing extensively throughout their speech. The process is, therefore, a form of sociolinguistic trickle-down effect, passed on from the higher socioeconomic classes to their inferior neighbors as a marker of superior education and affluence. The data collection process involved extracting all instances of English borrowing in the SL and comparing them to the translated text, which was first published in 2001.

3.2. Data Analysis

The study is part of a larger study on the cognitive analysis of the translation of culture-specific terms from Arabic into English; it utilizes a frame semantic model based on Rojo (2002 a& b) tailored to fit the SL and a wider range of data. It is based on the hypothesis that each term is referenced by several semantic frames and sub-frames, and that translatability, defined as the ability of the TL to convey the same level of knowledge conveyed by the SL, depends on the range of semantic frames deemed transferable into the TL. Hence, the frame references of each term (classified as *social*, *perceptual*, *generic*, *situational*, and *textual*), are listed and compared to those of their TL counterparts.

4. Results

The analysis shows that, in most cases, the TL text renders the borrowed terms into comically mispronounced versions of the English terms, which is not an explicit property of the SL, although it may be construed from the socioeconomic background of the characters and their expected lack of fluency in English. In some cases, however, the translation process blends the borrowed terms into the TL text, which blocks the SL *social* frame and therefore the TL reader's chance of understanding the social nuances of the SL text.

Janet DeCesaris
**New Words, Linguistic Purisim, and Criteria for Dictionary Inclusion:
The Catalan Case**

Within the Romance languages, Catalan presents an interesting case of the interaction between incorporation of new words and the need to maintain and represent a standard language in an Academy-sponsored dictionary, within a context of a minoritized language. In this paper we will discuss a few of the main issues that have attracted the attention of researchers on Catalan neology and relate them to the nature of dictionary-making, as a way of explaining why so many new words in Catalan have been recorded in the past 25 years.

Catalan speakers in Spain all also speak Spanish, and although many, especially older, speakers have been educated at school primarily in Spanish, many have also been educated primarily in Catalan due to the government's language policy in public schools. Given the importance of Spanish in the world generally and its predominant role in Spain and demographics in Catalan-speaking areas, the influence of Spanish on Catalan grammar and lexis is significant. In terms of lexis, it is fair to say that the flow of borrowings from Spanish to spoken Catalan is both strong and constant over time. The Catalan language academy (the *Secció filològica* of the *Institut d'Estudis Catalans*), as a means to ensure language maintenance, has traditionally taken a conservative attitude towards incorporating borrowings from Spanish into the standard language as represented in the *Institut*'s dictionary. This policy towards borrowings, while not surprising given the sociolinguistic situation in Catalan-speaking regions, results in increased differentiation of the spoken language from the written language, which is regularly edited to conform as closely as possible to the *Institut's* standard.

Close examination of neologisms in written Catalan shows that borrowing from Spanish, or English, is not the only means of creating lexical items in the language. According to data reported in several projects carried out by the *Observatori de Neologia* (Cabré, Domènech & Estopa (2014); Freixa, Bernal, & Cabré (2015); among others), which for decades has been recording neologisms using standard language dictionaries as its point of reference, many neologisms documented in the press involve native word formation processes, particularly prefixation (1890 "new words") and neoclassical compounding (1506 "new words") (Cabré, Domènech & Estopa (eds.) 2014:27), which have always proven to be somewhat problematic in terms of grammatical description (we note that the author of the first standard grammar of Catalan, Pompeu Fabra, grouped prefixation with compounding, as opposed to suffixation, whereas most grammars of Romance languages group prefixation with suffixation together, as opposed to compounding). The number of prefixed "new words" involves 52 prefixes, and over 200 different neoclassical elements are found in the neologisms recorded. Given the importance of these word formation processes as sources of neologisms, and the role of the standard language dictionary in the detection and study of neologisms in the language, we must look at the dictionary representation of prefixes and at how dictionaries try to account for productive word formation in order to obtain a fuller understanding of the situation. All dictionaries, and not just those of Catalan, have difficulty in accounting for productive word formation, and many lexicographers would argue that it is not the role of a dictionary to explain word formation; rather, it is the role of the dictionary to represent what is known to occur. Nevertheless, one wonders if the high number of "new" prefixed words and "new" neoclassical compounds is more a result of dictionary-making as opposed to a specific

trend in word formation in the language. In that sense, we will compare the *Institut*'s dictionary with other large-scale dictionaries of Romance languages to see if a more satisfactory representation of productive word formation is available.

References

Cabré, M. Teresa; Domènech Bagaria, Ona; Estopa, Rosa. (eds). 2014. *Mots nous en català / New words in Catalan: Una panoràmica geolectal / A diatopic view* (IVITRA Research in Linguistics and Literature). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Freixa, Judit; Bernal, Elisenda; Cabré, M. Teresa (eds.). 2015. *La neologia lèxica catalana.* Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans. Secció Filològica.

Institut d'Estudis Catalans. *Diccionari de la llengua catalana.* 2nd edition, 2007. Consulted online: https://mdlc.iec.cat/index.html.

Observatori de Neologia (ed.). 2016. *Mots d'avui, mots de demà*. Barcelona: IULA & Documenta Universitaria.

Friday 26 October

Angela Ralli (Keynote)
**Loan Verb Acceptability and Integration in Greek
from Typologically Different Languages**

In this presentation, I deal with loan verbs in a language-contact situation involving Greek as recipient and English, Romance and Turkish as donor. More particularly, I discuss the techniques that make verbs of different languages to be accommodated in a non-uniform way within the same linguistic system, and try to provide an explanation for this divergence. To this end, I argue that an interplay of both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors constrains and determines the degree of acceptability and the specific shape of the form of these loans in the recipient language. On the one hand, I show that bilingualism and profound knowledge of the dominant language, which usually leads to heavy borrowing (Thomason 2001, Matras 2009), may also be the cause of a more elaborate accommodation of loans with an extensive use of native integrating elements (Enrique- rias 2010). On the other hand, phonological and structural (in)compatibility between the languages in contact (Myers-Scotton 2002, Field 2002) may inhibit transfer leading to the adoption or rejection of specific integrating elements, as for instance, the use of an affixal integrator or that of a light verb (Ralli 2016). With respect to the linguistic factor, attention will be brought to the role of typological (in)compatibility between the donor (analytical English, semi-analytical Romance, agglutinative Turkish) and the recipient (fusional Greek) into accommodating loan verbs. For the purposes of this talk, the principal evidence is drawn from the spontaneous speech of speakers of several Greek varieties, both dialectal, found in Greece, and heritage, as spoken in North America. The data consist of material that has been collected within the framework of various projects on Greek dialects and Greek immigration consisting of recordings of narratives of about 300 hours. They are also complemented with a number of certain written sources dating from the last century: see, among others, Dawkins (1916) for Cappadocian, Papadopoulos (1958) for Pontic, Karanastasis (1997) for Grekanico, Ralli (2017) for Lesbian, Seaman (1972) for American Greek, Maniakas (1991) for Canadian Greek.

Selected references
Dawkins, R. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enrique-Arias, Andrés. 2010. On language contact as an inhibitor of language change: the Spanish of Catalan bilinguals in Majorca. In A. Breitbarth, Ch. Lucas, S. Wattsy and D. Willis (eds.), *Continuity and change in grammar*, 97-118. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Field, Fredric. 2002. *Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Karanastasis, A. 1997. *Grammatiki ton ellinikon idiomaton tis Kato Italias* [Grammar of the Greek dialects of Southern Italy]. Athens: Academy ofAthens.

Maniakas, Th. 1991. *The ethnolinguistic reality of Montreal Greeks*. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Montreal.

Matras, Y. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Language contact: bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Papadopoulos, A. 1958. Istorikon leksikon tis pontikis dialektu [Historical lexicon of the Pontic dialect]. Athens: Mirtidis.

Ralli, A. 2016. Strategies and patterns of loan verb integration in Modern Greek varieties. In A. Ralli (ed.), *Contact Morphology in Modern Greek Dialects*, 73-109. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.

Ralli, A. 2017. *Dictionary of the Asia Minor Dialects of Kydonies, Moschonisia and the Dialect of North-eastern Lesbos* (in Greek). Athens: Foundation of Historical Studies.

Seaman, D. 1972. *Modern Greek and American English in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Thomason, S. 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Renáta Panocová
The Adaptation of Anglicisms in Contemporary Standard Slovak

Internationalization and globalization are phenomena which can be observed in the dynamic development of a number of languages. Perhaps the most obvious example of linguistic internationalization is an increasing use of English borrowings in many languages at approximately the same time.

The extensive spread of anglicisms in the last decades can be viewed from at least two perspectives. On one hand, earlier attempts to arrive at a common international use of artificial languages as a means of communication were not successful. This means that internationalization of languages on the basis of English seems a natural alternative. On the other hand, this situation immediately raises concerns about the possible effects on other national languages.

In Slovakia, the language teaching/learning policy changed radically after the social and political changes in 1989. English has been included into curricula in primary and secondary education as a compulsory component. Similar to speakers in other countries, users of Slovak also face the problem of keeping an optimal balance between the current trend to accept English as an international means of communication and keeping the influence of English on Slovak in control (Dolník, 2010: 64-65). In making a decision, linguistic authorities such as Dolník (2010: 65), Považaj (1995: 196-197) and others recommend applying the principle of function. This means that only words for which Slovak does not have an appropriate equivalent should be borrowed.

There are Slovak users (not only linguists) who are strongly against borrowings and especially anglicisms. Some consider them a serious threat to Slovak as a national language which is part of Slovak identity. Other users are keen to use English words in their Slovak. Then many Slovak speakers are confused as to what is acceptable and *Jazykovedný ústav Ľudovíta Štúra Slovenskej akadémie vied* (JÚĽŠ SAV, Ľudovít Štúr Institute of Linguistics of the Slovak Academy of Science) has set up a linguistic guidance service to answer questions about correct use https://jazykovaporadna.sme.sk/. There is a database of the questions and answers which can be searched by key words or browsed in alphabetical order.

In my analysis I focus on the queries concerning anglicisms. Preliminary results suggest that there are different attitudes to anglicisms depending on the stage of their adaptation. For instance, English words *like, liker* used in internet communication have been borrowed in Slovak to meet the need to name a new concept concisely, by one word. At present the borrowings are used in their orthographically adapted form *lajk, lajker.* Other derivatives were almost immediately created and used, for example *lajkovať* 'like$_V$', *olajkovať* 'give a like$_V$', *nelajkovať* 'not give a like', *lajkovanie* 'like$_N$', *lajkovaný* 'liked$_{ADJ}$'. It is interesting to observe that the adapted base is available for further derivation of verbs, deverbal nouns and adjectives. This demonstrates the degree of integration into the morphological system of Slovak. The linguistic guidance also explains that despite the fact that these words have not yet been lexicograpically processed, they are part of standard Slovak vocabulary.

In contrast, the borrowing *workshop* is labelled as a slang expression in the KSSJ (2003). However, this word started to be used more frequently in a specialized context. This use is lexicograpically reflected in the SCJ (2005). At present, *workshop* is a part of standard

Slovak word stock but it is not orthographically adapted. On the basis of the final consonant it was assigned a masculine gender and is declined according to the declension pattern of inanimate masculine nouns illustrated by *dub* 'oak'. The two anglicisms show differences in the degree of integration in standard Slovak. Whereas *lajk* is considered stylistically neutral, *workshop* belongs to specialized vocabulary. The latter has not undergone orthographic adaptation.

On the basis of a more detailed analysis I intend to present how different attitudes to anglicisms in Slovak reflect the stage of their adaptation process and explain criteria used by the JÚĽŠ SAV in their lexicographic practice.

References

Dolník, Juraj (2010), *Teória spisovného jazyka* [Theory of standard language]. Bratislava: VEDA.

Považaj, Matej (1995), 'Z diskusie' [From a discussion]. In: Spisovná slovenčina a jazyková kultúra. Materiály z konferencie konanej v Budmericiach 27. – 29. októbra 1994. Red. J. Doruľa. Bratislava: Veda 1995, pp. 60 – 63.

KSSJ (2003), *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka* [Concise dictionary of Slovak], 4th ed., Kačala, J., Pisárčiková, M. & Považaj, M. (eds.), Bratislava: Veda.

SCJ (2005), *Slovník cudzích slov (akademický)* [A dictionary of foreign words (academic)], Bratislava: SPN Mladé letá.

Jocelyne Daems, Eline Zenner, Dirk Geeraerts & Dirk Speelman
Purisms and Borrowings in Pluricentric Languages; Lexical Convergence Between Belgian Dutch and Netherlandic Dutch

Background
Having more than one national variety, Dutch is considered a pluricentric language (Clyne 1992). Its two main varieties are Netherlandic Dutch in the Netherlands and Belgian Dutch in Flanders, which knew quite different standardization processes. Most notably, in Flanders, where French was at that time the prestigious variety, used as sole language of communication in public life, standardisation developed more slowly than in the Netherlands. In the 1960s, the need for a Belgian Dutch standard language grew following increasing emancipation of the Dutch language (Geeraerts et al. 1999). Aiming for a uniform supranational Standard Dutch, convergence with the (long established) Netherlandic Dutch norm was at this point promoted at the expense of a separate Belgian Dutch standard (Geeraerts 2003). This exonormative orientation led to strong language planning efforts to replace the many French loanwords that characterized the Belgian Dutch dialects but not the Netherlandic Dutch standard. At the same time, increasing supremacy of the Anglo-American culture was noted, leading to the introduction of English loanwords into both Belgian Dutch and Netherlandic Dutch (Zenner et al. 2012).

Goal
This paper sets out to empirically test to what extent the purist reactions against French and adoptive tendencies towards English loanwords have influenced the degree of uniformity between both regions. Methodologically, we aim to present a variationist onomasiologial approach that aims to tackle which parameters influence higher or lower uniformity between the regions. Theoretically, we aim to discuss our findings against the broader background of research on destandardization and demotization in Europe.

Method
Taking an onomasiological approach, we study a set of concepts and compare their different lexicalization options. Focusing on lexical uniformity, we calculate the differences in lexicalization preferences for a given concept in the two regions (Geeraerts et al. 1999). For example, Table 1 shows the concept TOETSENBORD '(computer) keyboard', which can be lexicalized by *keyboard, klavier* and *toetsenbord*. The degree of uniformity between the two Dutch varieties is measured in terms of overlapping lexicalization preferences, summing the smallest relative value for each term: (2+7+46) = 55%.

toetsenbord	Neth.Dutch	%	Belg.Dutch	%
keyboard	9	2	43	4
klavier	29	7	541	50
toetsenbord	364	91	502	46

Table 1 - Lexicalization preferences for TOETSENBORD

Data and results
We apply this method to two datasets, together consisting of more than 1.5M tokens. First, we focus on uniformity levels for 20 traffic concepts (e.g. AFRIT 'exit') in three points in time (1950s, 1970s, 2000s) and in two registers (High and Low) for both regions. Second, we look at 24 IT concepts (e.g. BEELDSCHERM '(computer) screen'), also in two registers

(High and Low), but only in the 2000s. In this dataset, the influence of English in particular is apparent, allowing us to focus on which Anglicisms are most successful in Dutch. In the first dataset, we expect a decline in French terms to coincide with a converging trend, which is most noticeable in the High register.

Discussion
After discussing some shortcomings of the method, we will reveal how borrowings from one source language can be strongly resisted while words from another can be warmly welcomed in the same region in the same period, which in this case can be explained against the background of an encompassing normative language planning account aimed at convergence between two varieties of a pluricentric language.

References

Clyne, Michael. 1992. *Pluricentric languages : differing norms in different nations*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Geeraerts, Dirk. 2003. "Cultural models and linguistic standardization." In *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought. Ideology, Metaphors and Meanings*, eds. René Dirven, Frank Roslyn, and Martin Pütz. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter, p. 25–68.

Geeraerts, Dirk, and Stefan Grondelaers. 2000. "Purism and fashion. French influence on Belgian and Netherlandic Dutch." *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 13: 53–68.

Geeraerts, Dirk, Stefan Grondelaers, and Dirk Speelman. 1999. *Convergentie en divergentie in de Nederlandse woordenschat. Een onderzoek naar kleding- en voetbaltermen*. Amsterdam: Meertens Instituut.

Zenner, Eline, Dirk Speelmand, and Dirk Geeraerts. 2012. "Cognitive Sociolinguistics meets loanword research: Measuring variation in the success of anglicisms in Dutch." *Cognitive Linguistics* 23(4): 749–792.

Barbara Nowosielska
A Corpus-Based Analysis of Abstract Deverbal Action Nouns in *-ation* **with Names of States as Derivational Bases**

This paper presents the results of a pilot study anchored in the field of contemporary English word-formation which aims at preparing ground for a more comprehensive research in this domain. The purpose of the present study is to observe the regularities governing the use and formation of mostly novel abstract nominalizations ending in *-ation* with names of political states as derivational bases.

In a synchronic perspective, English *Nomina Actionis* are marked by means of a few different suffixes (Aronoff 1976; Bauer 2003). In this project, I will be interested only in the suffix *-ation* (or any of its spelling variants: *-ization*, *-tion*, *-ion*, *-ition* or *-ution*). From among all the suffixes that form *Nomina Actionis*, *-ation* participates in the formation of the majority of novel *Nomina Actionis*, thus constituting the most productive suffix in this group (Bauer 2006). This in turn indicates that the respective morphological process is a living one. As for derivational bases, I have used proper names designating names of political states, taken from the list of 193 names of current UN members (http://www.un.org/). The list of derivational bases has been supplemented with customary derivational bases associated with certain names of states, such as *Sino-* for China. Several related names, such as *Balkanization* and *Europeanization* have not been considered here, as they do not pass the entrance test for names of political states. However, a great number of instances of *Americanization*, which, technically, is derived from a continent name, have been recorded in the results, whenever it could be inferred from context that a given instance of *Americanization* refers to the United States and not the whole American continent. The source of language data is the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (COCA) (Davies 2008), specifically, its written genres. First, I have retrieved all the formations with the elements **ization*, **isation* and **fication*, which are the three possible endings of English *Nomina Actionis* with names of states. Second, I have manually tidied the initial results of the search in order to obtain a list of derivations with names of states. Compiling an exhaustive list of short and morphologically manageable names which would be capable of attracting the suffix *-ation* proved to be ineffective, due to the fact that the list would have to comprise every possible spelling variant of the potential morphological bases, including even the erroneously spelled ones. The search period covers the years 1990-2015.

We shall see that a significant percentage of state names (search items) have not so far been recorded with this suffix in COCA. Nominalizations ending in *-ation* that I have retrieved from COCA have been divided into three groups. The first one consists of a wide variety of hapax legomena, the second is a 'middle-frequency' group of formations, while the third one is composed of numerous instances of *Americanization*. All relevant figures will be provided in the presentation. My observations concerning the relatively frequent use of hapax legomena in specialist texts shed light on the issue of English speakers' attitudes toward novel morphologically and semantically complex words created in accordance with English word-formation rules. What is more, the search results suggest that, in specialist texts, no morphological or phonological constraints stand in the way of forming *-ation* nominalizations with names of states (consider, for instance *Venezuelaniaztion* or *Saudiization*). Other issues to be dealt with include indicating the most frequent contexts in which novel nominalizations occur, as well as establishing constructional patterns, as understood in Construction Grammar (Goldberg 2006) or in

Pattern Grammar (Hunston and Francis 1999). A closer look at the contexts of novel nominalizations shall unveil some interesting ideological meanings that the complex words under discussion convey, concerning, for example, the issues of imperialism and globalization.

I believe that a detailed analysis of lexico-syntactic patterns hosting key nominalizations will provide us with new insights into the use and formation of the nominalizations discussed, relevant to non-native speakers of English who encounter difficulties with complex words when writing specialist texts in English. In addition to that, the analysis of contexts in which novel nominalizations occur may prove useful in terms of discourse analysis, as it reveals several ideological meanings conveyed by means of key nominalizations. For native speakers of English, word-formation processes are mostly intuitive. A closer look at how they form new nominalizations with names of states may help us understand what native speakers consider natural in terms of word-formation.

References:
Aronoff, Mark. 1976. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 1). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Bauer, Laurie. 2003. *Introducing Linguistic Morphology* (2nd revised edition). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bauer, Laurie. 2006. *Morphological Productivity* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, Mark. (2008-) *The Corpus of Contemporary American English: 450 million words, 1990-present*. Available online at http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/.

Goldberg, Adele. 2006. *Constructions at Work*: *The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Hunston, Susan and Gill Francis. 1999. *Pattern Grammar: A Corpus-driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English* (Studies in Corpus Linguistics). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Irene Fally
Verbal Neologisms in Italian – Incorporation and Acceptance of Verbs Linked to Information Technology

The incorporation of English terminology into other languages is the cause for an ongoing debate in Romance linguistics (Bombi 2009; Jansen 2005) and has led to controversy among language authorities and purists (Académie française 2017; Academia della Crusca 2002; Rancati 2010). How acceptable a word is deemed by linguistic authorities usually depends on the linguistic strategy employed for creating it (cf. Di Peso n.d.). In the case of the Romance languages, multiple linguistic strategies for the incorporation of new words can be identified. In the area of verb formation, they can be described as a continuum between two opposing poles: On the one extreme, English verbs are incorporated and morphologically adapted to the target language (cf. 1a). On the other extreme, new verbs, which are semantically close to the original, but morphologically based on the target language, are created, as exemplified in (1b).

> (1)   a. *to format*   *> formattare* (It)
>   b. *to scan*   *> numériser* (F)

The situation is, however, seldom as straightforward as in (1a). Oftentimes a language does not limit itself to the application of one of the strategies. In French, for example, in addition to (1b), the verb *scanner* equally exists. Similarly, in Italian, several of these linguistic strategies can be applied to the same base. The incorporation of English *to scan* into Italian is an excellent example of an English base leading to multiple morphological realizations. Instead of directly incorporating the English verb and morphologically adapting it, the English noun *scanner* is used as a base for conversion and derivation, as can be seen in (2). Based on the word formation rules of Italian, the act of using a scanner can be expressed in three morphologically different verbs, all derived from the same base:

> (2)   a. *scanner*   *+ -izzare*   *> scannerizzare*
>   b. *scanner*   *+ -are*   *> scannerare*
>   c. *scan(ner)*   *+ -are*   *> scannare*

In addition to these three verb forms the Academia della Crusca (2002) also offers other (more) acceptable verbs to express 'to make a scan' (cf. also Di Peso n.d.). Just like in the French example in (1b), these verbs are not derived from an English base, but are related to the Italian noun *scansione* 'a scan', which is derived from the verb *scandire* (cf. 3).

> (3)   a. *scansione*   *+ -are*   *> scansionare*
>   b. *scansione*   *+ -ire*   *> scansire*

Following the assumption that the phenomenon illustrated above is not only limited to the verb 'to scan', the aim of this paper is twofold. On the one hand, this study aims at identifying which linguistic strategies are most employed in Italian. On the other hand, based on a corpus analysis, it shall be determined to what extent the verbs resulting from these different processes are actually used.

The results of a preliminary corpus analysis of the Italian equivalents of the verb *to scan* suggest that despite the morphological well-formedness of the Italian-based verbs and their acceptance by prescriptive authorities, they are not used with the same frequencies as their

English-based counterparts. I therefore examine the hypothesis that for pragmatic reasons like clarity and predictability, the verbs that are closer to the English originals are most frequently used, irrespective of the register and the degree of formality of the texts they occur in. In order to test this hypothesis, a collection of verbs has been compiled on the basis of several Italian terminology glossaries for information technologies (Bernardo, Pedone, and Re 2003; Gucchierato and Rossi 2013) and two collections of neologisms ("Onli: Banca Dati Dell'Osservatorio Neologico Della Lingua Italiana" 2017; Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana 2018). These verbs used in IT are classified along the continuum of linguistic strategies mentioned above. This classification does not only give a quantifiable account of the linguistic strategies most employed, but also reveals instances where two different strategies are applied to the same base. In a second step, a corpus analysis is conducted in order to determine which verbs are more employed in cases where the same base is used with two different linguistic strategies. To this end, materials from the FrWaC and ItWaC corpora (Baroni et al. 2009) are analyzed. This study thus contributes to answer the questions of what kind of neologisms are accepted in Italian and of why, despite increasing linguistic purism, neologisms closer to English verbs are preferred over others.

References

Academia della Crusca. 2002. "Scannare / scannerizzare / scansionare | Accademia della Crusca."

Accademia della Crusca on-line. October 4, 2002. http://www.accademiadellacrusca.it/it/lingua-italiana/consulenza-linguistica/domande-risposte/scannare-scannerizzare-scansionare. Accessed May 19, 2018.

Académie française. 2017. "Dire, Ne Pas Dire – Néologismes & Anglicismes." http://www.academie-francaise.fr/dire-ne-pas-dire/neologismes-anglicismes. Accessed July 28, 2017.

Baroni, Marco, Silvia Bernardini, Adriano Ferraresi, and Eros Zanchetta. 2009. "The WaCky Wide Web: A Collection of Very Large Linguistically Processed Web-Crawled Corpora." *Journal of Language Resources and Evaluation* 43 (3): 209–26.

Bernardo, A., M. Pedone, and C. Re. 2003. "Glossario Dei Termini Informatici Più Comuni." In *La Patente Europea Del Computer*. Bulgarini. http://www.artec.unirc.it/pac/glossario.pdf.

Bombi, Raffaella. 2009. *La linguistica del contatto: tipologie di anglicismi nell'italiano contemporaneo e riflessi metalinguistici*. 2nd ed. Roma: Il calamo.

Di Peso, Mauro. n.d. "E' più corretto usare sia nel linguaggio parlato, sia in quello scritto la parola 'scansire' rispetto all'anglofona 'scannerizzare' per descrivere il processo di lettura ottica che avviene tramite scanner di un documento (testo o foto)? | Treccani, il portale del sapere." Treccani Vocabolario on-line. Accessed March 14, 2018. http://www.treccani.it/magazine/lingua_italiana/domande_e_risposte/grammatica/grammatica_093.html.

Gucchierato, Claudio, and Mario Rossi. 2013. "Glossario Di Informatica & Internet." 2013.

http://www.maurorossi.net/glossario/. Accessed May 19, 2018.

Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana. 2018. "Neologismi | Treccani." Treccani Il portale del sapere. 2018.
http://www.treccani.it/magazine/lingua_italiana/neologismi/searchNeologismi.jsp.
Accessed May 19, 2018.

Jansen, Silke. 2005. *Sprachliches Lehngut im "world wide web": Neologismen in der französischen und spanischen Internetterminologie*. Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik; 484. Tübingen: Narr.

"Onli: Banca Dati Dell'Osservatorio Neologico Della Lingua Italiana." 2017.
http://www.iliesi.cnr.it/ONLI/BD.php. Accessed May 19, 2018.

Paoli, Matilde. 2015. "Cosa si fa, oggi, con lo scanner? | Accademia della Crusca." *Accademia della Crusca on-line* (blog). May 4, 2015. http://www.accademiadellacrusca.it/it/lingua-italiana/consulenza-linguistica/domande-risposte/cosa-si-fa-oggi-scanner.

Rancati, Luigi. 2010. "Scioglilingua - Basic English." CORRIERE DELLA SERA.it - F*orum - Scioglilingua* (blog). January 23, 2010. http://forum.corriere.it/scioglilingua/23-01-2010/basic-english-1457480.html. Accessed May 19, 2018.

Annette Klosa-Kückelhaus & Sascha Wolfer
Considerations on the Acceptance of German Neologisms from the 1990s

"To what extent are borrowings resisted more strongly than new words resulting from the application of word formation rules?" This question in the call for papers for the international conference "New Words and Linguistic Purism" (Innsbruck, 25-26 October, 2018) presupposes that the acceptance of borrowings is higher than the acceptance of new words resulting from the application of word formation rules. In our paper, we would like to test this hypothesis for German neologisms, also raising the question of how to operationalize "acceptance". As possible indicators for acceptance of a neologism in German, theoretically criteria such as the following could be taken into account:

1. Increasing overall frequency
2. Distribution in many different text types
3. Usage in many different discourses
4. Initially used markings for neologisms are abandoned quickly:
   o Pragmatic markers:
   - Quotation marks are deleted
   - Hedge words (e.g., sogenannte 'so called') are not used anymore
   - Distancing phrases (e.g., wie man heute sagt 'as we say today') are given up
   o Grammatical criteria:
   - Gender of nouns is stable
   - Full conjugational paradigm for verbs is developed
   o Criteria of word formation:
   - Neologism is first and second component in an increasing number of noun compounds
   - Borrowed neologism is combined with indigene lexemes in word formation products

Taking these criteria into account, we should be able to measure significant differences for example in the increasing overall frequency or in how quickly the above mentioned markers for neologisms are abandoned, if the acceptance of borrowings is higher than the acceptance of new words resulting from the application of word formation rules. But are the given criteria truly indicators for acceptance of lexemes, for example, is increasing frequency effectively related with acceptance? Should we not rather interview speakers of German to learn how acceptable one neologism is in comparison to another?

In our paper, we would like to present the first step of our research to find an answer to our questions. First, we focus on a restricted subset of the German lexicon: we choose a number of neologisms from the 1990s fully described in the "Neologismenwörterbuch" at the Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim (see www.owid.de/wb/neo/start.html; see also Klosa/Lüngen 2018, Steffens 2017, al-Wadi 2017). These neologisms are equally both products of word formation in German (e.g., Blitzeis 'black ice', Schaltfläche 'button') and borrowings from other languages (e.g., Booklet 'booklet' from engl. booklet, Ciabatta 'Italian white bread' from Italian ciabatta) with a similar overall frequency development. We will examine the usage of the chosen neologisms in detail as to their use of pragmatic markers, discussing the results in our paper. In a second phase we plan to extend our analyses on more of the criteria mentioned above and will carry out interviews in a field test to collect speakers' opinions on the acceptance of the analyzed neologisms. In this

way, we will be able to compare the data gathered from corpora to ratings and evaluations from German speakers.

References

Klosa, Annette/Lüngen, Harald (2018): *New German Words: Detection and Description*. In: EURALEX 2018 Proceedings.

Steffens, Doris (2017): *Vom Print- zum Onlinewörterbuch – Zur Erfassung, Beschreibung und Präsentation von Neologismen am IDS*. In: Dąbrowska-Burkhardt, Jarochna/Eichinger, Ludwig M./Itakura, Uta (Hg.): Deutsch: lokal – regional – global. Tübingen: Narr, pp. 281-294. (Studien zur Deutschen Sprache 77).

Al-Wadi, Doris (2017): *Begegnungen mit neuen Wörtern: Zu lexikografischen Praktiken im Neologismenwörterbuch des IDS*. In: Dąbrowska-Burkhardt, Jarochna/Eichinger, Ludwig M./Itakura, Uta (Hg.): Deutsch: lokal – regional – global. Tübingen: Narr, pp. 173-186. (Studien zur Deutschen Sprache 77).

Enn Veldi
New Words and Linguistic Purism in Estonian Bilingual Dictionaries

Estonian is a lesser used language of Europe with about one million speakers, which belongs to the Finnic group of Finno-Ugric languages. The vocabulary of Estonian is remarkably heterogeneous; historically the native element has been under pressure from the influence of German, Swedish, and Russian. There is a smaller number of Baltic borrowings; however, Estonian shares many German and Russian borrowings with Latvian. Recent decades have witnessed the addition of large numbers of English and a smaller number of Finnish loans. As a result, contemporary Estonian has a large proportion of foreign vocabulary, which is a challenge for maintaining a balance between the native and the foreign element. The Estonian language planners and their supporters have made great efforts to increase the proportion of the native vocabulary, especially by suggesting native equivalents for foreign words. For example, the onomatopoeic verb *säutsuma* 'to tweet' and the noun *säuts* 'a tweet' are now used also metaphorically to denote the terms associated with Twitter. This activity has been more successful in the field of specialized terminology, where pairs of native and foreign terms often exist side by side, but many examples can be found in general vocabulary as well. The language planners also promote the use of native vocabulary and try to resist foreign influence by providing usage recommendations and pointing out those translation loans that are unnecessary. The theoretical aspects of Estonian language planning stem mainly from the work of Valter Tauli (1968), Henn Saari, and Tiiu Erelt (2007). A recent overview of the history of Estonian language planning from the perspective of monolingual lexicography can be found in Raadik and Tuulik (2018). For example, various word-formation strategies have been suggested. In order to reduce the number of words with the verb suffix *-eeri-* as in *boikoteerima* 'to boycott', a shorter variant *boikottima* 'to boycott' can be used without the suffix. The shorter verb can be interpreted either as conversion from the noun *boikott* 'boycott', a word-formation process recommended by the language planners, or back-formation from the verb *boikoteerima* 'to boycott' (the latter view is supported by Kasik 2015: 103). Recent work in language planning has resulted in the publication of a prescriptive dictionary of new words in the 21st century, which includes an overview of the word-formation patterns in new words (Raadik 2017).

The present study will focus on the analysis of lexicographic practice with regard to linguistic purism in the major English-Estonian and Estonian-English dictionaries. The method used is comparison of the lexicographic treatment of purism in bilingual dictionaries with that found in standard monolingual dictionaries of Estonian. On the one hand, the analysis is carried out from the perspective of word-formation patterns, such as affixation, compounding, and conversion, and, on the other hand, with regard to selected lexical items and pairs of native and foreign terms. The purpose of the study is to determine to what extent the guided usage found in monolingual dictionaries is followed in the compilation of bilingual dictionaries. Preliminary results show that the lexicographic practice reveals considerable asymmetry between English-Estonian and Estonian-English dictionaries. While the English-Estonian dictionaries follow the recommendations of language planners rather closely in the Estonian part of the dictionary, Estonian-English dictionaries show much more freedom in this respect. For example, the latter omit less used native synonyms for foreign terms and provide also some entries that are regarded undesirable by language planners.

References

Erelt, Tiiu. (2007). *Terminiõpetus*. Tartu. Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus. ('Terminology')

Kasik, Reet. (2015). *Sõnamoodustus*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus. ('Word-formation')

Raadik, Maire. (2017). *Uudissõnu uue aastatuhande algusest.* Tallinn: Tänapäev. ('New words since the beginning of the millennium')

Raadik, Maire and Maria Tuulik. (2018). 'Native vs. Borrowed Material as Approached By Estonian Language Planning Practitioners: The Experience of the Dictionary of Standard Estonian'. *International Journal of Lexicography.* Vol. 31, No. 2, 151−166.

Tauli, Valter. (1968). *Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Pertti Hietaranta
Anglicised Finnish – Don't Worry, Be Happy?

English is school pupils' number one choice for their first foreign language in Finnish schools, and English films, subtitled in Finnish, have been the most popular foreign films for a long time: the 25 most popular foreign films in Finland since 1970 are all English-language films. In Finnish academia, English is the language of publication for a clear majority of scholarly works.

It is therefore little wonder that phenomena related to or born out of English-speaking cultures are thriving in Finland, where multilingualism at least in the form of bilingualism has a long history. For some 600 years, Finland was part of the kingdom of Sweden, which goes a long way towards explaining why Swedish is still an official language in the country. From the beginning of the 19th century, Finland was part of Russia for another 100 years or so, which also left its marks on Finnish culture.

Against this background, I propose to look in this paper at the specific impact of English-based loanwords on Finnish culture through the effect English is having by spawning changes in the vocabulary of the Finnish language (cf. e.g. Leppänen and Nikula 2007) and in Finnish syntax and morphology.

I seek to argue for two tenets here. First, I suggest that, despite the obvious changes in Finnish, especially through the addition of English-based loanwords, there is no reason to panic. Finnish culture – assuming there is an entity we can somehow agree to define as Finnish culture – and Finnish language are not going to disappear and are not even going to the dogs. That is, there is no need and no justification for linguistic or cultural purism. Secondly, especially from the perspective of translation, it still makes good sense to monitor linguistic and cultural developments and occasionally even make a special effort to create a domestic equivalent to a foreign language based loanword rather than acquiesce to an indiscriminate use of (at best) domesticated forms of words or phrases.

That loanwords as such will not make Finnish deteriorate in any essential respect(s) is simply due to the fact that, as far as we know, languages have always acquired additions to their vocabularies from other languages (cf. e.g. Haspelmath and Tadmor 2009). Thus, in Finnish too, a great number of the most common modern-day words and even longer expressions have their origins outside Finnish (cf. e.g. *tuoli* 'chair' < Swedish *stol*; *auto* 'car' < English *automobile*, Latin *auto*; *kahvi* 'coffee'< Arabic قَهْوة).

That it nevertheless makes sense not to adopt a laissez-faire attitude towards loanwords with regard to language policy and language planning, in particular, is a claim which is equally supported by facts. For one thing, planning by definition entails systematicity, which in turn implies rules – which make also linguistic phenomena (more) predictable and (more) homogeneous, keeping thus variation at bay to a nontrivial extent and thereby contributing to a reduced risk of misunderstanding.

For another, while words which share some outward similarities from language to language may make translation somewhat more straightforward in certain cases (cf. e.g. *globalisation*, *ecology*, *photography* and their equivalents in other languages), it is also true that the development of national languages is greatly dependent on and influenced by conscious efforts to generate domestic terminologies in different fields of life. Hence, it

makes sense to try to monitor how well a loan fits a language system in terms of phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax and do something about the matter if there are appear problems with the domestication of a manifestly foreign item.

As examples of specific approaches to monitoring loanword treatment and attitudes to loanwords in Finnish from a variety of viewpoints (inflection, spelling, pronunciation, attitudes etc.), one can mention, for example, the activities of the *Institute for the Languages of Finland* (http://www.kielitoimistonohjepankki.fi/haku/lainasanat) and the *National Survey on the English Language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes* (Leppänen et al. 2011).

The Finnish government also set up in 1979 a special committee on official language, whose 1982 white paper specifically mentions the issue of "improving the language used by authorities" so that laypersons would also be able to understand the decisions made – which intrinsically relates to the use or non-use of words and longer expressions of foreign origin and thus, in part, to the issue of loanwords as well.

References

Haspelmath, Martin and Tadmor, Uri (eds.) 2009. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Leppänen, Sirpa and Nikula, Tarja. 2007. "Diverse uses of English in Finnish society: Discourse-pragmatic insights into media, educational and business contexts." *Multilingua* 26: 333 – 380.