The final results of our project The English Element in European Languages are going to be presented in two works. The first is a monograph giving a synthesis of the results achieved in the analysis of the adaptation of Anglicisms in more than twenty European languages. The second is an ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF ANGLICISMS IN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES (in preparation) listing and discussing all English words collected in the Project corpus that occur in any (or all) of the European languages selected for the Project according to our specific criteria (cf. Filipović 1974). The first question that arises from the title of the second work is how to justify the label 'etymological' added to the usual title of dictionaries of Anglicisms.

To answer this question we propose to discuss briefly the principles on which our ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY is based and how they are applied in it, and to examine whether the pattern of our ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY agrees completely or partially with the criteria given by Yakov Malkiel for an etymological dictionary in his tentative typology for etymological dictionaries (cf. Filipović 1983, Malkiel 1976). Therefore, in this paper we want to

(a) show how much our ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY differs from general dictionaries of -isms which are not labelled etymological, such as the DICCIONARIO DE ANGLICISMOS by Alfaro;

(b) to demonstrate how we have analyzed and built up biographies of Anglicisms in our ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY;

(c) to illustrate the theoretical notion of language contact (cf. Filipović 1977) on which the biographies of Anglicisms are based; and

(d) to justify the label 'etymological'.

To show how our ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY differs from other dictionaries of -isms (Anglicisms, Gallicisms, Germanisms etc.) we will present its distinctive traits which make it an original work:

(a) Time depth. It is based on material analyzed synchronically. We only go into diachrony when we want to explain a present-day feature by referring to stages in the not too distant past.

(b) Consequently its direction or projection is the modern period of European languages and present-day English.

(c) Organization of the corpus. There is one general entry for each English word, followed by all forms of an
Anglicism in the borrowing languages, arranged in alphabetical order (up to 24 individual entries).

(d) The structuring of individual entries corresponds to our analysis of Anglicisms in the monograph volume No.6 in the Project. An entry must be complete in itself. The order of levels on which the analysis is carried out is traditional: phonological, morphological, semantic.

The following is a detailed description of the ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY:

(a) Twenty-four European languages are covered: Albanian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Hungarian, Icelandic, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Modern Greek, Norwegian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, Slovene, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish.

(b) Each general entry begins with an English word, which is the source of Anglicisms. It includes pronunciation, part of speech, gender, and meanings given in WEBSTER'S THIRD (W3) or, exceptionally, CONCISE OXFORD (COD) dictionaries.

(c) Individual entries are structured so that the English word is followed by the borrowing languages (marked with symbols) in which it is used as an Anglicism;

(d) After each symbol for a borrowing language all variant forms of the Anglicism are cited;

(e) Each Anglicism is analyzed on three different levels;

(f) These levels are marked by symbols (phonological F, morphological M, and semantic S);

(g) Four parts of speech are marked by: sb, vb, adj, adv;

(h) Two kinds of adaptation are recorded:

(1) 'Primary' (marked by I.) denoting the changes an English word (a model) passes through until it reaches the form of an Anglicism (a replica), and

(2) 'Secondary' (marked by II.) denoting the changes an Anglicism undergoes in the borrowing language after it has been completely integrated into the borrowing language system, behaving like a native word.

(i) The formation of the phonological form of an Anglicism is denoted by four indices, a, b, c or d (illustrated by entries E₁ to E₄), depending on whether it follows the pronunciation of the English model, its spelling, both pronunciation and spelling, or is modified by an intermediary language.

\[
E₁: \text{team} /\text{ti:m}/, \text{sb-n (6)}
\]

\[
\text{SC tim}^a \text{ I. /tfm/} \ldots
\]
(j) Adaptation on the phonological level - or 'transphonemization' (cf. Filipović 1981b) - appears in three types marked by an index added to the phonetic transcription, as illustrated in entries E₂ to E⁷ below.

(1) The first type, which is called 'zero transphonemization', is the replacement of English phonemes by the borrowing-language phonemes whose description corresponds to the description of the English phonemes. Zero transphonemization is marked \( F₀ \).

(2) The second type, which is called 'compromise transphonemization', is the replacement of English phonemes by borrowing-language phonemes which are different in degree of opening (with vowels) or in place of articulation (with consonants), but whose manner of articulation is the same. Compromise transphonemization is marked \( F₁ \).

(3) The third type, which is called 'free transphonemization', is the replacement of English phonemes by borrowing-language phonemes which are not even partial articulatory equivalents. This type of transphonemization is based on orthography or on extralinguistic factors. It is marked \( F₂ \).

E₂: bard /baːd/, sb-m (3)
    SC bard \( b \) I. /bərd/ ...

E₃: interview /ˈɪntəvjuː/, sb-n (3)
    SC intervju \( c \) I. /intərvjʊ/ ...

E₄: bluff /blʌf/, sb-n (4)
    SC blef \( d(Ge) \) I. /blɛf/ ...

(k) Adaptation of the citation form on the morphological level - or 'transmorphemization' (cf. Filipović 1980) - appears in three forms marked by an index added to the symbol of the part of speech, as illustrated in entries E₈ to E₁₀ below.

(1) The first form is called 'zero transmorphemization'. It occurs when a model is taken over by the borrowing language as a free morpheme. Zero transmorphemization is

E₅: jeep /dʒiːp/, sb-n (2)
    SC dʒip \( a \) I. /dʒɪp \( F₀ \)/ ...

E₆: lift /lɪft/, sb-n (23)
    SC lift \( b \) I. /lɪft \( F₁ \)/ ...

E₇: swing /swɪŋ/, sb-n (10)
    SC swing \( b \) I. /swɪŋ \( F₂ \)/ ...


(2) The second form of transmorphemization is called 'compromise transmorphemization'. It occurs when a loan keeps a final bound morpheme that does not conform to the borrowing language's morphological system. Compromise transmorphemization is marked $M_0$.

(3) The third form of transmorphemization is called 'complete transmorphemization'. It occurs when an English bound morpheme is replaced by a borrowing-language bound morpheme with the same function. Complete transmorphemization is marked $M_2$.

\[ E_6: \quad \text{bridge} /brɪdʒ/, \text{sb-n (1)} \]
\[ \text{SC bridʒ} \quad \text{I.} \quad /brɪdʒ/ \quad \text{F}_1, \text{I. sb}^0 \]

\[ E_9: \quad \text{farmer} /'fəmər/, \text{sb-m (5)} \]
\[ \text{SC farmer}^b \quad \text{I.} \quad /færər/ \quad \text{F}_2, \text{I. sb}^1 \]

\[ E_{10}: \quad \text{boxer} /'boksə/, \text{sb-m (1)} \]
\[ \text{SC boksəc} \quad \text{I.} \quad /bɔksə/ \quad \text{F}_1, \text{II. sb}^2 \]

Since there is a substantial difference between the category of gender in English and the majority of European languages, gender of nouns is marked by $m$, $f$ and $n$, following the symbol for substantive, both on the Anglicisms and on the English originals.

The citation form of verb Anglicisms (in most languages: the infinitive) usually shows morphological adaptation, being derived from an English uninflected stem (previously phonologically adapted) by adding a verb suffix and an infinitive formant (see entry $E_{11}$ below). Some European languages have a category of verbal aspect which can be morphologically marked to distinguish 'perfective' and 'imperfective' aspect. In some instances aspect is unmarked but determined by the context. Such verbs are called 'biaspectual' verbs and are marked in the ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY by $A_2$; while verbs which distinguish perfective from imperfective aspect are marked by $A_1$ (see entry $E_{12}$ below).

\[ E_{11}: \quad \text{box} /bɔks/, \text{vt (2), vi (1)} \]
\[ \text{SC boks-a-ti} \ldots, \text{I. vt/i}^2 \]
\[ (a = \text{verb suffix} \quad \text{ti = infinitive formant}) \]

\[ E_{12}: \quad \text{bluff} \ldots \]
\[ \text{SC blef-ir-ati} \ldots, \text{I. vt/i}^2 \]
\[ (\text{biaspectual: imperfective/perfective}) \]
Adjectives go through both kinds of adaptation. Only a few English adjectives are transferred into the borrowing language through primary adaptation. Being transmorphemized only partially, they preserve all morphological characteristics of English adjectives (cf. Filipović 1981a). All other adjective Anglicisms are completely transmorphemized in secondary adaptation. In them an Anglicism (phonologically adapted) is used as a stem to which an adjective suffix of the borrowing language is added.3

The analysis of semantic adaptation (cf. Filipovic 1968) is based on W3 and on Hope's (1960) three-part pattern of semantic extension to which we have added two new categories of restriction and expansion of meaning, i.e. in number and in field.4 We do not quote the restricted meaning of an Anglicism, but refer the reader to the number of the individual meaning shown in W3. When we deal with extension of meaning in secondary adaptation, the new acquired meaning is given. The following changes of meaning are marked, as illustrated in entries E_{13} to E_{17} below.

1. 'Zero extension', denoting that there is no change of meaning during the transfer of a model into a replica, is marked $S_0$.

2. 'Restriction in number', representing specialization from several senses to one or two, is marked $S_{1n}$ and 'restriction in field' $S_{1f}$. These symbols are followed by a number sign (#...) which corresponds to the definition number in W3.

3. 'Expansion of meaning in number', representing generalization from one to more senses, is marked $S_{2n}$ and 'expansion in field' $S_{2f}$.

- **E_{13}:** bridge /brɪdʒ/, sb-n (1)
  SC bridʒ$^a$ I. /brɪdʒ 1/, I. sb$^0$-m, I. $S_0$

- **E_{14}:** folklore /ˈfɔːklɔːr/, sb-n (3)
  SC folklɔr$^b$ I. /fəklɔr 2/, I. sb$^0$-m, I. $S_{1n}$
  (#1.)

- **E_{15}:** pantry /ˈpæntri/, sb-n (2)
  SC pentri$^a$ I. /pæntri 1/, I. sb$^0$-m, I. $S_{1f}$
  (#1, a pantry only on a boat)
There are three additional elements in the ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY:

(1) an introduction in which the theory and method used in the compilation are explained;

(2) an explanatory key printed at the bottom of each pair of pages serving as a guide to the user;

(3) an index containing all variant forms of Anglicisms, arranged in alphabetic order. Each variant is followed by the abbreviation of the borrowing language to which it belongs and the source (the English entry word) under which it is listed.

In conclusion, it can be stated that a dictionary of -isms may be labelled 'etymological' even if it does not give historical etymologies, such as the DICTIONNAIRE ETYMOLOGIQUE by Bonnaffé, of English words which are sources of Anglicisms. Since it provides for each recorded Anglicism the synchronic source in English and a detailed linguistic analysis on three levels, the ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY meets some of the criteria given in Malkiel's tentative typology of etymological dictionaries and is thus rightly labelled.

Notes

1 In this paper -isms is used to represent any group of loan-words in a language in contact with another, e.g. from English: Anglicisms, from French: Gallicisms, from German: Germanisms, from Slavonic languages: Slavicisms, from several foreign languages: foreignisms, from various regions: regionalisms, etc.

2 Cf. Filipović (1982) and other publications of the Project. The ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF ANGLICISMS IN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES is projected as Volume 7.

3 There are three adjectival suffixes in Serbo-Croatian:
   (1) -ski, as in barski, from English bar;
   (2) -ov, as in bardov, from English bard;
   (3) -an, as in folkloran, from English folklore.
Hope:
changes in semantic extension
(1) zero extension
(2) restriction of meaning
(3) expansion of meaning

Filipović:
changes in semantic extension
(1) zero extension
(2) restriction of meaning
   (a) in number
   (b) in field
(3) expansion of meaning
   (a) in number
   (b) in field
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