

# Are There Semantic False Anglicisms?

*Alexandra Bagasheva*

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” (Bulgaria)

*Alexandra Bagasheva. ARE THERE SEMANTIC FALSE ANGLICISMS?*

**Abstract.** The article focuses on the nature of semantic developments in lexical borrowing (replication), proposing the discarding of the concept of false-Xicization in semantic adaptations of lexical replicas. Semantic shifting is recognized as an unavoidable, natural mechanism at the very heart of the process of lexical replication at the level of the individual bilingual user who carries over the replication. The life cycle of this neologism is not different in any way from native neologisms created by the mechanisms of semantic change or word formation. It is further hypothesized that the semantic development of a neological lexical replica in a receptor language expands and maintains an interlingual radial network of senses in the same manner that new senses do in the case of native radial networks of polysemous lexemes to the exception of conceptual metaphor-driven new senses, which is an exclusively intralingual mechanism. In that sense it can be claimed that interlingual semantic developments are no different than intralingual such processes, which leads to the possibility of doing away with the concept of false-Xicization.

**Keywords:** semantic shifts, lexical replication, false-anglicisation, interlingual radial networks.

*Александра Багашева. СЪЩЕСТВУВАТ ЛИ СЕМАНТИЧНО ПОГРЕШНИ АНГЛИЦИЗМИ?*

**Резюме.** В статията се разглеждат някои основни въпроси в полето на семантичните процеси, настъпващи при заемането на лексикални единици. Предлага се хипотезата за излишеството на понятието „фалшив англицизъм“, тъй като залегналите в дефиницията на понятието условия за разпознаването му всъщност описват естествения процес на лексикално заемане. Изказва се становището, че механизмите и процесите на вътрешно езикова семантична промяна, с изключение на концептуална метафора като мотивираща сила в развитието на нови смисли при полисемни лексикални единици, са същите като тези при междуезиковото лексикално заемане (репликиране). Жизненият цикъл на роден неологизъм, създаден чрез семантична промяна или чрез процесите на словообразуване, е идентичен с този на заета (репликирана) лексикална единица.

**Ключови думи:** семантични промени, лексикално заемане, фалшиви англицизми, междуезикови радиални мрежи.

## Conceptual Research /Концептуално изследване

### Introduction

The study of lexical borrowing as the most natural product of cultural and linguistic contact has a venerable history. The field is not without its thorny issues and controversies, some of which remain open to debate (For overviews of the study of borrowing and the contemporary situation see Hoffer 2002; Treffers-Daller 2010 and Zenner and Kristiansen 2014). Various scales and hierarchies of borrowability, different typologies of borrowing and an array of adaptation processes have been described (see Haspelmath 2009). Yet, the recognition of false loan-words (not to be confused with false friends, which are defined as words or expressions that have a similar form to ones in a person's native language, but a different meaning), or the process of false-Xcization, is a recent development (see Furiassi 2010). In what follows the justification and utility of this concept in the analyses of borrowings is reviewed, questioned and refuted as unwarranted.

### Background and framing of the discussion

In weak contact settings, such as is the case between English and Bulgarian, where contact with English is usually indirect, remote and asymmetrical, one language exercises greater influence and functions as a rich resource for borrowing. The English language started diffusing world-wide at a hitherto unknown rate in the second half of the twentieth century (Crystal 2003), including its much wider diffusion in Bulgaria (see Krumova-Cvetkova et al. (2013) on the influence of English on Bulgarian). This diffusion takes place at two different levels: a macro- and a microlevel. On the macrolevel, English is more and more widely used as a language of (international) business and scholarly communication. On the micro-level, English is influencing Bulgarian (and not only), most notably by means of providing material for lexical borrowing (see Krumova-Cvetkova et al. (2013), but also for semantic and morphostructural borrowing. The latter two will not be discussed here, as they both require entirely different approaches (see Bagasheva 2016 and Bagasheva and Renner 2015) and deserve independent research of their own. The discussion here is restricted to lexical borrowing, and more specifically to the issue of the (im)possibility for discerning between necessarily and naturally occurring semantic shifting in interlingual lexical replication and what has been identified as false-anglicization.

Discussing lexical meaning from a cross-linguistic perspective or contact-related perspective inevitably runs in the *gavagai* problem postulated by Quine (1960). Meaning discrimination and comprehension is difficult and analytically challenging. The problem is further aggravated in interlingual settings and contact-induced lexical development. Meaning has always been the most elusive component of language and of linguistic analysis. Almost anything can be expressed in language (see Cruse, 2000 on the "infinite expressive capacity of language"). The resources for

this come from language as a complex, emergent, adaptive (sign) system (Frank, 2015). There are numerous alternatives available for mapping content with linguistic form. Language users are free to choose the best presentational design, driven by the most easily activated cognitive models and their immediate communicative needs. The choices encompass all language resources in the minds of bi/multilingual speakers (including the vocabularies of all the languages of which a speaker has a considerable mastery). This is exactly the mechanism of initial lexical replication (borrowing) at the microlevel – choosing a mapping from a language different from the one of the immediate community. From that moment onwards, the borrowed (replicated) element starts its life as a standard target language nonce-formation or neologism (Ahmad 2000, Schmid 2008 and references therein). The widely discussed issue in the literature on borrowing is the question of recognizing false anglicisms (or other isms, depending on the source language). An accepted definition of a false anglicism is a lexical unit composed of elements which are identical or quasi-identical to morphemes or splinters of English, which is not institutionalized in English, or has listeme status with different meanings in English than the ones in the receptor language (inflectional elements are disregarded. For discussions of the process of false-anglicization see Furiassi 2010; Bagasheva and Renner 2015; Renner and Fernández-Domínguez 2015; among others). The border between semantic adaptation (a naturally expected process in lexical replication) and false-anglicization seems a thin and slippery one.

Lexical meaning is probably notorious for the relevant phenomena appear to be highly idiosyncratic and there seems not to be a generally agreed upon and conclusive methodological solution to the problems, including the one of delimiting the field of inquiry. Admittedly, “[t]he days are long gone when lexis was thought of as an unruly chaos, a prison, [which] contains only the **lawless**, and [where] the only thing the inmates have in common is their **lawlessness**” (Di Sciullo and Williams 1987: 3; emphasis added). Lexicology, including lexical typology, has witnessed unprecedented development in the last decades. According to Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2008) lexical typology is inextricably related with studying contact-induced innovations of lexica. “The lexicons of most languages show different layers of origin with many words coming from “outside” – as direct loans, loan translations, etc. A particularly interesting aspect of historical lexical typology is the search for cross-linguistically recurrent patterns in contact-induced lexicalization and lexical change, e.g., differences in borrowability among the different parts of the lexicon and the corresponding processes in the integration of new words, or patterns of lexical acculturation (i.e., how lexica adjust to new objects and concepts)” (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2008: 6).

Yet, from a crosslinguistic perspective, as well as from the point of view of contact linguistics, a number of issues are still open to controversies and even to definitional problems: (i) the problem of the relevance of the organization of the different senses of a polysemous lexeme at the level of the individual linguistic

systems (source and target language); (ii) the problem of how speakers gain access to the relevant borrowed sense from a cognitive viewpoint and how different sense modulations are situationally evoked by the same form in different communicative contexts; (iii) how are cultural conceptualizations (Sharifian 2017) reconciled in contact situations and lexical replication; (iv) are the processes of conceptual metaphor and metonymy active, provided source and target relations are violated when a replica is used in a receptor language; (v) what is the role of lexical (de)motivation in lexical replication?, etc.

Narrowing the research area, in what follows within the broad array of intriguing questions, the focus is restricted to the following research questions: a) is the semantic fate of catachrestic and non-catachrestic borrowings the same?; b) where does semantic adaptation end and false anglicization begin?; and c) is metaphor a frequent mechanism accounting for semantic shifts in lexical replication?

### *The hypotheses*

It is a platitude to acknowledge that neology via borrowing necessarily involves loanword integration (with assimilation, adaptation and nativization used as synonyms in the vast and growing literature). Whichever term we choose to use, it is bound to designate processes by which a borrowed word is changed from the source language form in order to acquire features that conform to the ‘soul’ of the target (recipient) language and the mechanisms of semantic shift which are inevitably involved in the replication of any source language element. The greater the genetic, areal and structural distance between the two languages in contact, the greater diversity of adaptation processes is expected. In the case of English and Bulgarian at least the following dissimilarities between source and target language have to be taken into account (with the data on Bulgarian extracted from various grammar books and textbooks and assumed to be generally shared knowledge among specialists):

- 1) the two languages are members of different groups within the same family;
- 2) there is no evidence for history of parallel development;
- 3) the two languages use different orthographic systems, based on different principles;
- 4) there are major phonological dissimilarities between the two languages;
- 5) obligatory gender and desinence agreement in Bulgarian;
- 6) part of speech membership marked on words in Bulgarian;
- 7) perfective vs. imperfective forms of lexical verbs in Bulgarian;
- 8) heavy prefixation in the verbal system in Bulgarian, with both word-formational and inflectional functions;
- 9) paucity of subordinative root nominal compounding in Bulgarian;
- 10) status of conversion (disregarding its interpretation as transflection in Slavic languages Körtvélyessy (2016) and blending as novel and mostly irregular word-formation processes in Bulgarian (Stamenov 2015);

- 11) multiple, suffixal diminution of all parts of speech in Bulgarian;
- 12) lack of phrasal verbs in Bulgarian; etc.

Acknowledging that all of these can potentially condition semantic shifts in the process of adaptation of borrowings, it seems that the specific research questions to be asked are: Where does semantic adaptation stop and semantic change begin or how false are resemanticised anglicisms? Is there any difference in the processes of semantic change of domestic and loan words or of catachrestic vs. non-catachrestic loans?

Answering these questions runs into a number of methodological caveats stemming from the preferred stance on the following: i) nature of lexical and semantic typology; ii) applicability of methods of cross-linguistic research on semantics; iii) an analyst's stance on semantic generality as opposed to polysemy; iv) the understanding of what meaning is, i.e., the presence or lack of an adequate insight into descriptive meanings to compare and contrast. If we assume that lexical meaning of a single lexical item is use-potential<sup>1</sup> as Zlatev (2003) suggests or that lexical items are conceptualizing prompts to be interpreted as points of entry into encyclopedic networks of domains and frames as Evans (2006, 2009) defines lexical meanings, then we may end up with a working hypothesis for studying semantic adaptations and shifts in borrowing and discard the very notion of false-Xicization or preserve the latter only for cases in which the meaning is preserved in the receptor language but the form has changed (either through ellipsis or some other

---

<sup>1</sup> An anonymous reviewer noted that other linguists before Zlatev (2003) also discuss meaning as use and recommended that they be included. It should be emphasized that meaning as use potential is not coterminous with usage-based accounts of language structure and linguistic knowledge, nor with any contextual theory of lexical meaning (be it of polysemous or non-polysemous lexical items. If we discuss usage-based theories of language, where knowledge of a language is based in knowledge of actual usage and generalizations made over usage events, then admittedly the number of scholars holding this opinion is impressive (e.g., Langacker 1987, 1991; Croft 1991; Givón 1995; Barlow and Kemmer 2000; Tomasello 2003; Goldberg 2006; Bybee 2010, to mention but a few). However, within the field of semantics, due to the contentions of territory between semantics and pragmatics, and the holistic approaches of Cognitive Linguistics, the view of lexical meaning as usage-potential is not that old. To the best of our knowledge in the specialized literature on semantics, Frawley (1992) expounds on ideas of lexical meaning as use (pp. 36–44). If reference is required to contextualism and pragmatics, then the references would be countless. However, meaning as usage-potential is a specific model of meaning. In Zlatev's understanding of meaning as use-potential, meaning is "non-reificational and effectively dissolves the opposition "lexical sense" vs. "contextual interpretation" (Zlatev 2003: 448). The essence of this model can be gleaned from Zlatev's elaboration of this concept "linguistic knowledge can be characterized as a mapping between a "phonological pole" and a "semantic pole". However, the semantic pole does not consist of a "conceptualization", but of a situation (type), which can be either real or virtual, and constitutes a humanly significant, in part linguistically construed aspect of reality, not an objective, language-independent state of affairs. Situations can be partially analyzed into semantic categories, which are epigenetic in the sense that they are primed by language-independent, sensorimotor categories, but are developmentally shaped into language specific categories" (Zlatev 2003, pp. 455–456).

detectable mechanism). Further, it is assumed here that lexical items can for ease of analysis be approached as “form-meaning complexes with (relatively) stable and discrete semantic properties” (Cruse 1986: 49). As will be revealed below, these discrete semantic properties constitute a radial network, where contextually possible interpretations are represented as identifiable senses and lexical replication leads to motivated extensions of these radial networks.

Replication names the natural independent life of a source language model [construction] in the form of a replica in a recipient language (Filipovič 1974, Alexieva 2008) in all instances of what has traditionally been dubbed borrowing (Haugen 1950). The newly appearing construction, if it is at the lexical level, does not inherit any significant semantic features from the source language. The replica does not introduce the syntagmatic potential, collocational preferences or paradigmatic opposite and associative relations of the source language construction that is copied in replication processes. In that sense, we can claim that what is replicated is the form and the relevant sense is necessarily shifted, if nothing more, at least co-textually and contextually modulated. Replicated lexical items (form-meaning pairings) and replicated semantic units (where meaning only has been transferred, e.g., calquing) are claimed to be initially non-transparent or unanalyzable for the users in a receptor language (Alexieva 2008). Usually a single, context specific sense or semantic unit from the semantic matrix of a source language lexeme is transferred into the co-text and context of the target language as the transference is accomplished by a bilingual speaker opting for this cognitive solution to a communicative need. Admittedly, it is not the result of an unmotivated whim but results from pressures and constraints from various factors and processes unfolding on many time-scales. If we try to make guesses as to the likelihood of stabilisation of the meaning of non-catachrestic borrowings (basing these predictions on the criteria described for the success of native words (Metcalf 2002) or borrowed words (Claude, Miller and Pagel 2017) we can hypothesize that the development of a lexical loan of any kind (both catachrestic and non-catachrestic borrowings) within a language depends on the following i) ease of production; ii) degree of potential confusion with already existing forms; iii) ease of learning/acquisition; iv) suitability to fulfil communicative needs; v) specificity of the lexical representation, or conceptual structures (degree of delicacy of schematization in relation to the concept); and vi) potential to fulfil a marked sociolinguistic role. These factors are taken to interact with one another and have varying strengths of influence on individual linguistic elements. Thus, an element might not be optimal on one level but if it serves an important enough function on another it would still be successful. An element with a foreign flare, difficult to produce will still be diffused if it serves an important semantic, interactional, or sociolinguistic function.

Bearing all that in mind, it is methodologically safest to claim that the semantic development of a lexical loan in a receptor language is correlated by a radial net-

work of sense relations based on family resemblances with at least one lexical unit in the source language, where *lexical unit* is defined in accordance with Cruse's (1986) circumscription of meaning peculiarities as "form-meaning complexes with (relatively) stable and discrete semantic properties" (Cruse 1986: 49), with an identifiable meaning component from the set of semantic properties called a *sense*. In other words, the concept of the radial network of senses (as defined for polysemous lexemes in the cognitive linguistics framework, e.g., Dirven and Verspoor 2004) can be applied in the context of interlingual replication. The radial network can be explained as a natural occurrence, if we adopt Zlatev's (2003) understanding of meaning as use-potential and Evans's (2006; 2009) definition of lexical items as prompts for entry into encyclopedic conceptual networks. From this standpoint the lexical or semantic replica appears in a specific context as a situationally well-delineated lexical unit and goes along its path of semantic development in the receptor language unimpeded by any semantic constraints from the source language original. Thus, semantic adaptation never stops. If meaning is use-potential (Zlatev 2003), a replica is by definition expected to live its own life – different collocations, different networks of paradigmatic semantic relations; different intrasystemic semantic affinities will naturally develop in the receptor language. The moment a new sense of a lexical unit is born, unattested in the source language, many scholars recognise divergence between source language and receptor language and speak of a false anglicism (Furiassi 2010; Bagasheva and Renner 2015; Renner and Fernández-Domínguez 2015; etc.). This, however, amounts to violating the natural course of events in the development of any replicated lexical item in any language (at least from the point of view of the bilingual mind that introduces the replica in the receptor language).

Leaving aside the issue of the clash between semantic adaptation and false anglicisation for a moment, we need to check whether English replicas in Bulgarian follow the processes of semantic adaptation described in the literature. Filipovič (1968) classifies processes of semantic adaptation of English loanwords in Serbo-Croatian into the following categories: 1) changes in semantic extension; 2) ellipsis; 3) commonalisation; 4) pejoration and euphemism and 5) metaphor.

Within 1) we have a) zero adaptation; b<sub>1</sub>) expansion in number of senses; b<sub>2</sub>) expansion of meaning within the same area; c<sub>1</sub>) restriction in number of senses (reduction in Alexieva 2008) and c<sub>2</sub>) restriction of meaning within the same area (narrowing in Alexieva 2008). Metaphor is mentioned (Filipovič 1968) as legitimate process of semantic adaptation, but in the subsequent discussion no example or commentary on the process is offered. This categorization is based on the assumptions that when a lexical replica appears in a receptor language it carries with it all the specific semantic features of the lexeme from the source language and the assumption of meaning as a descriptively exhaustible list of features. However, it is only pertinent to ask whether semantic variation involves a number of different lexical senses being taken over by the receptor language all at once, or whether it is

rather a matter of a single contextual interpretation, associated with different facets and active zones of a concept employed in the different contexts of the source and receptor languages.

Before answering, which necessarily implies making a theoretical commitment, let us look at the language facts. The argument developed here is based on the analysis of the semantic development of 120 replicas in the Bulgarian language that have been identified as false anglicisms (both formal and semantics), i.e., have been marked as deviating from their English etymons in the two dictionaries of neologisms (Pernishka, Blagoeva and Kolkovska 2001, 2010). Their interpretations have been crosschecked in accounts of their status in scientific publications on the topic (e.g., Alexieva 2002, 2008; Krumova-Cvetkova et al. 2003, etc.). A random sample from these serves here as illustration of the argument developed. Even though these items have been recognized as false anglicisms in the relevant literature, in our opinion, they are actually exemplars of the prototypical semantic shifts that naturally and unavoidably occur in lexical replication, irrespective of the nature of the loan (be it catachrestic or non-catachrestic).

As the set of randomly chosen examples of lexical items displaying prototypical semantic shift (e.g., бeбeфoн (bebefon); блeйд (bleyd); бoди (bodi); бpънч (brânch); дaнcинг (dancing); джинси (dzhinsi); дилинг (diling); дог (dog); (ekshân) кeкc (keks); килъp (kilâr); (miting); мoбинг (mobing); пaмпepc (pampers); пeнкилep (penkiler); флипep (flipper); чeйндж (cheyndzh); шoпинг (shopping); etc.) illustrates, almost all involve varying features or degrees of adaptation (as enumerated above), which comes to show that formal adaptations are as inevitable as semantic ones.

As already indicated, the obvious fact uniting all these lexical replicas is that they involve resemanticization (i.e., semantic shifting). Resemanticization comes in the following disguises or mechanisms of semantic change (initially recognized in Bagasheva and Renner 2015, as mechanisms for the creation of false-anglicisms):

- I. narrowing: e.g., *bronzing* (Eng. ‘sun tanning’ > Bulg. ‘sunless tanning’), *šorti* (Eng. ‘shorts’ > Bulg. ‘activewear shorts’);
- II. generification (commonalisation): e.g., *pampers* (Eng. ‘Pampers-brand diaper’ > Bulg. ‘disposable diaper’);
- III. widening: *penkiler* (Eng. painkiller ‘a drug or a medicine for relieving pain’ > Bulg. jack-of-all trades);
- IV. amelioration: *fleym* (Eng. ‘hateful email’ > Bulg. ‘a heated forum discussion involving personal attacks’);
- V. specialization: *kilur* (Eng. ‘a person who commits murder’ > Bulg. ‘a paid assassin or a hitman’); *shoping* (Eng. ‘buying necessary provisions (all sorts of items)’ > Bulg. ‘window-shopping or visiting malls to spend time or buy clothes, luxuries, etc.’);
- VI. pejoration: *mobbing* (Eng. ‘gathering of large crowds/groups of people’ > Bulg. ‘attack someone; exercise psychological torture’);

VII. metonymy: e.g., *metalik* – a car with such a colour; *stretch* (Eng. ‘affording high elasticity’ > Bulg. ‘high-elasticity fabric’), *flipper* (Eng. ‘player-control plastic bat’ > Bulg. ‘pinball machine’ > game of pinball).

Note should be added here of the significant role of ellipsis in resemanticization. The loss of functional motivation might arise from choosing the most salient component in the context of borrowing (i.e., contextual borrowing), from structural mismatches between source and receptor language (atypicality of root compounding in Bulgarian, etc.), or simply what we recognise an elliptical borrowing such as *kâmping*, *parking* or *dansing* might have been encountered as elliptical in the SL in a particular usage event. Ellipsis is a natural usage event and contributes significantly to semantic adaptation.

Resemanticization is the most natural process in lexical replication, which can be explained away with the loss of motivation in interlanguage replication. Alexieva (2008) accepts lack of transparency (semantic and morphological) and systemic unmotivatedness as partial explanations for the semantic discrepancy between English etymons and their Bulgarian replicas. It is assumed that when a lexical item is copied (Alexieva’s preferred term), it enters the receptor language with a specific unmotivated sense from which on the basis of the standard mechanisms of semantic change (metaphor, amelioration, pejoration, degradation, widening and narrowing of meaning) it could develop senses that have not arisen in the source language. This development is guided by the predominance of specific word-formation families in the target language (sometimes even via folk etymology, e.g., *bebefon* on analogy with *telephone*).

While the latter explanation, based on analogy as a powerful mechanism of language functioning, sounds convincing, unmotivatedness and lack of transparency cannot be as easily accepted. By definition a replica is motivated<sup>2</sup>: by conceptual need, by prestige considerations, by sociocultural factors, by bilingual attempts at economy, etc., but most importantly by a pairing of a concept intended to be communicated and a suitable form for encoding this concept, which ultimately amounts to the traditional understanding of ontological motivation as opposed to arbitrariness. Besides, in the mind of the user, who initially introduces the replica, the intended sense in the receptor language is cognitively and linguistically motivated. This excludes opaqueness and unmotivatedness as plausible explanations for resemanticization. The explanation might lie in the uniquely human ability for metonymic processing of language. Gibbs insists that processing metonymic lan-

---

<sup>2</sup> Motivation of lexical meaning is a very broad concept, which besides the traditional understanding of ontological motivation (which accounts for onomatopoeia and has been reinterpreted as the principle of ontological iconicity in language), includes, also, at least the following: perception, emotion, action, bodily experience, culture, and social/communicative interaction (see Radden and Panther 2004, Lehman 2007 and Panther and Radden 2011). It is here assumed that “a motivational process is guided by language-independent factors, in particular cognition” (Panther and Radden, 2011: 10).

guage, such as *Paris has dropped hemlines this year*, is different from metonymic processing of language which is a general cognitive strategy for filling out “gaps by inferring some rich source of information from the simple mention of some salient part of that knowledge” (Gibbs 1999: 69). Fully subscribing to this claim, it is here suggested that the semantic development of a lexical replica is driven by metonymic processing of language and contiguity relations within a frame, so that the semantic divergence between source language original and receptor language replica is not dramatic. In the mind of the bilingual speaker replicating a lexical unit contiguity within a frame is crucial for choosing the specific sense, its active zone and perspectivizing focus for successful communicative use of a replicated neologism. These contiguity relations are further strengthened by facetization or contextual modulation, which occurs naturally in intralingual semantic development of lexical items.

So, going back to the question of possible differences between processes and mechanisms of semantic change of domestic and replicated lexical items the answer has to be in the negative, to the exception of metaphor, which seems to be restricted to intralingual processes of semantic change. A mechanism of adaptation conspicuously not attested in the dataset analysed (120 instances recognized as false Anglicisms, involving both formal adaptations and semantic shifts of various types, but interpreted here as units in naturally developing interlingual semantic networks) appears to be metaphor, despite its recognition as a mechanism of semantic adaptation (Filipovič 1974, Alexieva 2008). Metaphor research, including cognitive linguistics and neural accounts, as well as the embodiment thesis (see e.g., Gibbs 2005; Lakoff 2008; Lakoff and Johnson 1999), leads us to suggest that it is difficult for interlingual domain-mapping to occur. Metaphors are conceptual (i.e., mental) operations which surface in human language and which enable speakers to structure, construe and communicate about abstract areas of knowledge and experience in more concrete experiential terms (see e.g., Lakoff and Johnson 2003). Molecular (i.e., complex) metaphors are made up of clusters of primary metaphors (Grady 2005) based on recurring correlations between fundamental dimensions of experience which start accumulating in childhood. We thus hypothesize that the conditions of familiarity and concreteness of source domains and of developmental strengthening of metaphoric counterpart connections make interlingual metaphoric mapping in lexical neology highly unlikely.

As for possible differences in the semantic fate of catachrestic and non-catachrestic loans, the initial expectation was that X-phemisation<sup>3</sup>, amelioration and pejoration would be more frequent with non-catachrestic loans, which have manner-related pragmatic effects, while the remaining mechanism of semantic change, to the exception of conceptual metaphor, would be more frequent with

---

<sup>3</sup> X-phemisation is used here as a cover term encompassing orthophemisms, euphemisms and dysphemisms.

catachrestic loans. The hypothesis did not bear out. Non-catachrestic loans undergo specialization in the majority of cases. Apart from that, no other significant differences in the semantic development of catachrestic and non-catachrestic loans were noted.

### **Concluding remarks**

With the answers to the three research questions provided, we can summarize that loanword integration necessarily involves semantic change and via the powerful mechanism of analogy it frequently leads to parallel developments in native and borrowed lexemes. Adopting Winter-Froemel's (2008) conformity criteria leads to the recognition of a continuum from direct replication through resemanticization (or false-Xicization) to semantic loaning, all of which are more or less arbitrary terms, partitioning for analytical purposes an otherwise natural process. The creation of linguistic differences between the source and recipient languages, rather than their greater linguistic homogenization, as a result of processes related to lexical borrowing is interpreted by Dunn (2008) as the borrowability paradox. According to this author semantic, formal, cultural and „creative“ factors are involved in producing linguistic differences. The paradox amounts to the fact that linguistic globalization is often at the same time linguistic fragmentation, which has the somewhat unexpected consequence of leading to a more complex and varied linguistic landscape in which various interlingual phenomena replicate intralingual ones. The claim that false-Xicization is unjustified and unnecessary might be an issue of methodological preferences, although further empirically-informed corroboration might be sought in contrastive analyses of the semantic fate of genuine and false anglicisms in Bulgarian. The hypothesis of interlingual lexical replication constituting the expansion of interlanguage radial networks, however, is entirely empirically verifiable and these are profitable venues of future research, including various combinations of languages in contact.

### **Bibliography**

- Ahmad, K. (2000). Neologisms, Nonces and Word Formation. – In: Heid, U., Evert, S., Lehmann, E., and Rohrer, C. (Eds.). *The 9th Euralex International Congress* (8–12 August 2000, Munich.), Vol II, Universitat Stuttgart, Munich, pp. 711–730.
- Alexieva, N. (2008). How and Why are Anglicisms often Lexically Different from their English Etymons? – In: Fischer, R. and H. Pulaczewska (Eds.), *Anglicisms in Europe. Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, pp. 42–51.
- Alexieva, N. (2002). Bulgarian. – In: Görlach, M. (Ed.) *English in Europe*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 241–260.

- Bagasheva, A. (2016). On  $[N_1N_2]$  constructions in Bulgarian and word-formation. – In: Livia Körtvélyessy, L., P. Štekauer, and S. Valera (Eds.). *Word-Formation across Languages*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, pp. 1–28.
- Bagasheva, A. and Renner, V. (2015). False Anglicisms in French and Bulgarian. – In: *Contrastive Linguistics*, Vol. XL No. 3, pp. 77–89.
- Barlow, M. and S. Kemmer. (Eds.). (2000). *Usage Based Models of Language*. CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Calude, A., Miller, S., and Pagel, M. (2017). Modelling loanword success – a sociolinguistic quantitative study of Māori loanwords in New Zealand English. – In: *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2017-0010>, accessed 10 November 2020.
- Croft, W. (1991). *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Information*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Cruse, A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Cruse, A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Crystal, D. (2003) (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Di Sciullo, A. and Williams, E. (1987). *On the definition of word* [Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 14]. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Dirven, R. and Verspoor, M. (2004) (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). *Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Dunn, J. (2008). Face Control, Electronic Soap and the Four-Storey Cottage with a Jacuzzi: Anglicisation, Globalisation and the Creation of Linguistic Difference. – In: Fischer, R. and H. Pulaczewska (Eds.). *Anglicisms in Europe. Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, pp. 52–69.
- Evans, V. (2006). Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models and Meaning-Construction. – In: *Cognitive Linguistics*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 491–534.
- Evans, V. (2009). *How words mean: Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models and Meaning Construction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Evans, N. (2010). Semantic Typology. – In: Song, J. (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 504–533.
- Filipovič, R. (1968). Semantic extension changes in adaptation of English loan-words in Serbo-Croatian. – In: *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*, Vol. 25–26, pp. 109–119.
- Frank, R. (2015). A complex adaptive systems approach to language, cultural schemas and serial metonymy: Charting the cognitive innovations of ‘fingers’ and ‘claws’ in Basque. – In: in Díaz-Vera, J. (Ed.). *Metaphor and Metonymy across Time and Cultures. Perspectives on the Sociohistorical Linguistics of Figurative Language*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, pp. 65–95.
- Frawley, W. (1992). *Linguistic Semantics*. Routledge, London.
- Furiassi, Ch. (2010). *False Anglicisms in Italian*. Polimetrica, Monza, Italy.
- Gibbs, R. (2005). *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Gibbs, R. (1999). Speaking and thinking with metonymy. – In: Panther, K.-U. and Radden, G. (Eds.). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 61–76.
- Givón, T. (1979). *On Understanding Grammar*. Academic Press, New York.
- Goldberg, A. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalisations in Language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Grady, J. (2005). Primary metaphors as inputs to conceptual integration. – In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 37, pp. 1595–1614.
- Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. – In: Haspelmath, M. and Tadmor, U. (Eds.). *Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin/Boston, pp. 35–54.
- Haugen, E. (1950). The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. – In: *Language*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 211–231.
- Hoffer, B. (2002). Language Borrowing and Language Diffusion: an Overview. – In: *Intercultural Communication Studies*, Vol. XI No. 4, pp. 1–37.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (2008). Approaching lexical typology. – In: Vanhove, M. (Ed.). *From Polysemy to Semantic Change: Towards a typology of lexical semantic associations*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 3–52.
- Körtvélyessy, L. (2016). Word-formation in Slavic languages. – In: *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 455–501.
- Lakoff, G. (2008). “The neural theory of metaphor. – In: Gibbs, R. (Ed.). *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 17–38.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. Basic Books, New York.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (2003) (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Vol. I. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Langacker, R. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Vol. II. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Lehman, Ch. (2007). Motivation in Language. Attempt at a systematization. – In: Gallmann, P., Lehmann, Ch. and Lühr, R. (Eds.). *Sprachliche Variation. Zur Interdependenz von Inhalt und Ausdruck*. G. Narr (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik, 502), Tübingen, pp. 100–135.
- Metcalf, A. (2002). *Predicting New Words. The Secrets of Their Success*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston /New York.
- Panther, K-U and Radden, G. (2011). Introduction. – In: Panther, K-U. and Radden, G. (Eds.). *Motivation in Grammar and the Lexicon*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 1–26.
- Quine, W. (1960). *Word and Object*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Radden, G. and Panther, K-U. (Eds.) (2004). *Studies in Linguistic Motivation (Cognitive Linguistics Research 28)*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York.
- Renner, V. and Fernández-Domínguez, J. (2015). False Anglicization in the Romance languages: A contrastive analysis of French, Spanish and Italian. – In: Furiassi, C. and Gottlieb, H. (Eds.). *Pseudo-English: Studies on False Anglicisms in Europe*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin/Boston, pp. 147–157.

- Schmid, H-J. (2008). New Words in the Mind: Concept-formation and Entrenchment of Neologisms. – In: *Anglia* Vol. 126 No. 1, pp. 1–36.
- Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural Linguistics. Cultural conceptualisations and language* [Cognitive Linguistic Studies in Cultural Contexts, 8]. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Stamenov, Ch. (2015). Borrowing word-formation: -ing suffixation and blending in Bulgarian. – In: *Contrastive Linguistics*, Vol. XL No. 3, pp. 163–197.
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a Language: A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Treffers-Daller, J. (2010). Borrowing. – In: Fried, M., Östman, J.-O. and Verschueren, J. (Eds.). *Variation and change: pragmatic perspectives. Handbook of pragmatics highlights* (6). John Benjamins, Amsterdam /Philadelphia, pp. 17–35.
- Winter-Froemel, E. (2008). Studying loanwords and loanword integration: Two criteria of conformity. – In: *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics* Vol. 14, pp. 156–176.
- Zenner, E. and Kristiansen, G. (2014). *New Perspectives on Lexical Borrowing: Onomasiological, Methodological and Phraseological Innovations [Language Contact and Bilingualism [LCB], 7]*. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin/Boston.
- Zlatev, J. (2003). Polysemy or generality? – In: H. Cuyckens, H., Dirven, R. and Taylor, J. (Eds.). *Cognitive Approaches to Lexical Semantics*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, pp. 423–447.
- Крумова-Цветкова, Л., Благоева, Д., Колковска, С., Пернишка, Е., Божилова, М. (2013). *Българска лексикология и фразеология*. Т. 1. Българска лексикология. София: Академично издателство „Марин Дринов“. (Krumova-Tsvetkova, L., Blagoeva, D., Kolkovska, S., Pernishka, E. and Bozhilova, M. (2013), *Bâlgarska leksikologiya i frazeologiya*. Т. 1. Bâlgarska leksikologiya. Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo „Marin Drinov“.)
- Пернишка, Е., Благоева, Д. и Колковска, С. (2010). *Речник на новите думи в българския език*. София: Наука и изкуство. (Pernishka, E., Blagoeva, D. and Kolkovska, S. (2010), *Rechnik na novite dumi v bulgarskiya ezik*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.)
- Пернишка, Е., Благоева, Д. и Колковска, С. (2001). *Речник на новите думи и значения в българския език*. София: Наука и изкуство. (Pernishka, E., Blagoeva, D. and Kolkovska, S. 2001. *Rechnik na novite dumi i znacheniya v bulgarskiya ezik*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.)

Доц. д-р Александра Багашева

a.bagasheva@uni-sofia.bg

Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски“  
бул. „Цар Освободител“ 15, София 1504, България

Assoc. Prof. Alexandra Bagasheva, PhD

a.bagasheva@uni-sofia.bg

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”  
15 Tzar Osvoboditel Blvd., Sofia 1504, Bulgaria