

Anglicisms: Towards defining their concept and typology



Aleš Klégr (Charles University, Prague)

ABSTRACT

Although Anglicisms¹ have been the subject of research for quite some time now, their definition in the literature sometimes tends to be somewhat inexplicit, and there are points of disagreement, especially regarding their classification and the distinction between their types. This paper advocates a uniform, consistent approach to defining loans (Anglicisms) and their typology in terms of an interplay between three criterial features which are transferred in, and thereby constitute, (lexical) borrowing: concept, model, and form. Their combination results in seven feature patterns or loan types (both mono- and bilingual), which the paper correlates and compares with standard categories of Anglicisms found in the literature and illustrates using examples from Czech.

KEYWORDS

Anglicisms, criterial features, Czech examples, feature-based loan types, hybrid variants, traditional categories

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.14712/18059635.2023.2.1>

1 INTRODUCTION

The intention of the study is to outline a conceptual approach to describing Anglicisms. The driving idea behind the proposal is that if there is to be consensus on the categorization of Anglicisms, their description needs to be explicit, objective and consistent as much as possible by choosing and applying suitable criteria. The article starts with a brief list of the most common categories of Anglicisms found in the literature and then suggests one way of systematizing the description of loans. The description is based on three features defining loans/Anglicisms whose configurations resolve into several possible loan types.

Next the article correlates the proposed types of loans with the traditional categories of Anglicisms taking into account both mono- and bilingual loans. Although the approach aspires to be universally applicable, the illustrative examples are drawn from Czech and it is up to researchers on Anglicisms in other languages to check the validity of this claim.

1 It may be of interest to note that while in some sources (such as the Wikipedia entry on Anglicisms; <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglicism>) the word Anglicism is not capitalized, in serious academic dictionaries such as *Cambridge Dictionary* (<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/anglicism>) or *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries* (https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/american_english/anglicism), to name but a few, and in linguistic monographs (cf. Pulcini 2023) it is spelt with a capital "A".



2 THE CURRENT SITUATION IN THE CLASSIFICATION OF ANGLICISMS

It is not the purpose of this article to make an exhaustive overview of all the different categories of Anglicisms that have been proposed in the literature on this topic. Instead the terminology employed by GLAD is chosen as a representative sample. GLAD (Global Anglicisms Database Network, <https://www.nhh.no/en/research-centres/global-anglicism-database-network/>) is an international body whose worthy purpose is to collect Anglicisms in both European and non-European languages and investigate linguistic and cultural Anglicization world-wide. In an article introducing GLAD (Gottlieb et al. 2018), the section on the identification of Anglicisms moves away from Görlach's (2003: 1) purely form-based and too narrow definition of an Anglicism ("A word or idiom that is recognizably English in its form (spelling, pronunciation, morphology, or at least one of the three), but is accepted as an item in the vocabulary of the receptor language.") to adopt Gottlieb's (2005: 163) broader definition ("any individual or systemic language feature adapted or adopted from English, or inspired (...) by English models, used in intralingual communication in a language other than English").

In a section on the current state of classification of Anglicisms the authors distinguish the following categories of Anglicisms: (1) **unadapted borrowings** (simple, complex, multiple-word expressions or MWEs, abbreviations) coined in English (or in the Anglosphere); (2) **adapted borrowings** (coined in English but subject to orthographic/morphological adaptation in the recipient language, RL henceforth); (3) **English proper names turned generic names**, e.g. Danish *plimsoller* < English (British MP) Samuel *Plimsoll* (1824–98)²; (4) **semantic loans** (domestic words or assimilated loans adopting an English sense); (5) **loan translations** (unit-for-unit translations of English compounds, multi-word units or phraseological units); (6) **hybrids** (domestic compounds with at least one English component or one English productive affix); (7) **pseudo-Anglicisms** (instead of a general description the authors give three subgroups: (a) clippings, i.e. shortened English words as in *parking* < English 'parking lot', present in a number of European languages, (b) re-semanticizations, i.e. domestic sense for English words, as in German *handy* 'mobile phone' or Polish *handicap* 'an advantage imposed on a competitor', or (c) domestic combinations of English elements as evidenced by Japanese *akuhara* 'alcohol harassment'); (8) **phono-semantic matchings** (unit-for-unit translations in which the English elements are matched with phonetically and semantically similar pre-existent domestic elements, e.g. German *Was gibt's?* < English 'What gives?'). The authors mention several other forms of potential English influence which, however, are not immediately relevant to our goal.

In a recent tentative internal update of GLAD terminology the definitions of some of the categories were slightly reformulated: **adapted borrowing** (a direct loanword, adapted at one or more of the three levels, graphical, phonological, morphological);

2 In fact, the common noun *plimsolls* goes back to the 19th century in English, and so it is a standard direct loanword rather than a generic name; the connection with Samuel Plimsoll appears to be only indirect, probably through a 'Plimsoll line'.



loan translation (an exact or inexact translation or half-translation of a polymorphic foreign model, whether a single word or a multi-word unit with possible structural deviation), **hybrid** (a half-English and half-RL expression coined in the RL with no discoverable model in English), **semantic loan** (an RL lexeme having borrowed an ‘extra’ sense from its English counterpart), **pseudo-Anglicism** or made-up English (an English-looking word which in English is not used in that form or is used with a radically different meaning), **phono-semantic matching** (a neologism that preserves both the approximate meaning and sound of the (English) etymon by using established elements in the RL).

For the most part these categories draw on Betz’s (1949, 1959) classification of borrowing (and partly on Haugen 1950, and Weinreich 1953 [1963]). Betz’s types of lexical borrowing are reflected in Pulcini et al. (2006: 6; or Pulcini 2023: 53), who likewise distinguish two main groups: (i) direct borrowings subdivided into loanwords (non-adapted and adapted), false and hybrid borrowings, and (ii) indirect borrowings subsuming semantic loans and calques which include loan translations, loan renditions and loan creations (Betz calls the groups ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ borrowings respectively).

3 CRITERIA FOR DISTINGUISHING LOAN CATEGORIES

Probably the greatest problem in determining Anglicisms and their types is the lack of shared definite and uniform criteria underlying their description. A careful look at the established categories and their definitions shows that there are recurrent references to several (inevitable and logical) descriptive criteria which, however, are sometimes only implied and mostly not applied systematically. To bring these criteria or features to the fore, it is useful to start with the kind of borrowings on which there is general agreement as they are something of a prototype for Anglicisms. They are called direct, sometimes “quotation”, loanwords as they are transferred unchanged directly from English (e.g. *chatbot*, *bossing*, *influencer*, *start-up*, *notebook*, or *web*). They are a convenient starting point in that they naturally concentrate in them everything that lexical borrowing can possibly involve, i.e. everything that can be borrowed from another language through words.

By adopting the words such as *chatbot* or *influencer* the recipient language “borrows” (a) a concept (a particular sense) occurring in English, (b) a particular word that conveys the concept/sense (and may serve as a model or blueprint for forming words in the recipient language), and (c) a graphic/phonetic form peculiar to English. Another crucial point which descriptions of Anglicisms in the literature reveal is that for a lexical item to be considered an Anglicism, it does not need to exhibit all three of these features: it may display only two but it definitely must have at least one of them. Combinations of the three features form several patterns; technically, the potential patterns are combinations of 1 to 3 elements from the set a, b, c. This translates into the following definition of Anglicisms: an Anglicism is a lexical item in the RL’s vocabulary that (a) realizes a concept borrowed from English, (b) exhibits an English form (graphical, phonological), or (c) is an actual English word or its RL



copy (for which it provides a model), or (d) is any combination of (a) to (c), while it is sufficient for the word's status of Anglicism to exhibit at least one of these constitutive features.

3.1 FEATURES DISTINGUISHING LOAN CATEGORIES

If true that any one of the three features (i.e. concept/sense, word/model and form) and their combinations may account for a loan, then it follows that Anglicisms may in principle come in seven types (see Table 1). Before attempting to assign these presumed types of loans to the existing denominative labels for Anglicisms, it is necessary to specify how each of the three features is conceived of in the following discussion of the feature-pattern types of loan:

Concept/sense — a concept (a signified) may be expressed by different word classes, typically nouns, but also adjectives, verbs, adverbs, etc. By borrowing a concept is meant its transfer to the recipient language in the word class it has in the source language (the particular word, as the signifier or as the model which stands at the beginning of the transfer). By contrast, the transposition of a concept into another word class in the recipient language, i.e. conversion (of noun into verb, etc.), is a different process, taking place in the RL, and so distinct from borrowing proper and should not be counted as a direct concept loan. With polysemous words typically only one specific sense is transferred. Any deviation in the RL from the sense the word has in English is by default an internal change, the result of a word-formation process in the RL and not an act of borrowing. All such shifts constitute neologisms arising within the RL rather than concept/sense borrowing. It is tempting to argue that since language is primarily about meaning, concept/sense borrowing is the strongest feature of the three. However, the adoption of English words may not be motivated by the need to express novel concepts/senses. Actually, Czech and other languages have frequently, and for various reasons, borrowed English words expressing concepts for which they already have their own words, e.g. *cash* — *hotovost*, *grab* — *úchop*, *level* — *úroveň*, *outfit* — *oblečení*, *oděv*, *paperback* — *brožovaná kniha*, *random* — *náhodný*, *libovolný* (cf. Onysko and Winter-Froemel 2011, on necessary and luxury, or catachrestic and non-catachrestic, loans). Such cases do not, strictly speaking, count as concept/sense borrowing. The reason for their borrowing is their English form; the loans are often pragmatically motivated, and used not just to introduce variety, but also because they are associated with prestige and novelty, and thought to be stylistically or otherwise more suitable to some kinds of discourse.

Model/word — the feature denotes either a specific English word (or MWE) directly adopted by RL speakers or an English word or expression that serves as a blueprint to be copied in the RL through matching it (its components) by domestic elements (words or morphemes regarded as standard, or dictionary, equivalents). For example, *citizen* and *scientist* are translated as 'občan' and 'vědec' respectively, and so the novel concept of 'citizen scientist' borrowed from English is expressed in Czech by translating the model verbatim by its component equivalents as *občanský vědec*. With single-word models (and occasionally multi-word models) used with

a specific meaning in English the standard RL equivalents translating them assume this new meaning as well. Sometimes the English models are difficult to match with standard equivalents and the resultant rendition may depart from them to a varying degree. In a more abstract sense English words and their combinations may provide ‘structural blueprints’, i.e. word-formation and syntactic patterns borrowed from English and copied by RL speakers to produce RL words by analogy.

Form — borrowing an English form means using an English orthography (spelling) and/or English phonetic form (pronunciation) in the RL. This is the case with direct loanwords in which the features ‘(English) model/word’ and ‘(English) form’ overlap. However, there are RL words which are deliberately spelt using English orthography (cf. *Coolna*, a respelt Czech word *kůlna*, shed), or pronounced with English pronunciation (typically to attract attention, for facetious reasons, etc.). That is why it is useful to separate ‘(English) form’ from ‘(English) model-word’ even though in direct loans they coincide. If the written (or spoken) form of the loan is in keeping with English usage, it is said to be unadapted. If the form is altered (intentionally or unintentionally) in accordance with the RL norm of spelling and pronunciation, it is said to be adapted. This adapted/unadapted distinction, however, is not without problems. The written form of English words is difficult to maintain in different writing systems and also different kinds of alphabet. When it comes to spoken form, it may be difficult to draw the line between the unadapted and adapted form of a loan due to the interference between the phonological systems of the RL and English (especially with less competent non-native speakers of English). The phonological adaptation of Anglicisms in Czech is described by Duběda (2018) as being governed by two prevailing principles, phonological approximation (systematic substitution with Czech phonemes) and the tendency to spelling pronunciation.

3.2 RELATING HYPOTHESIZED TYPES OF LOAN TO CATEGORIES OF ANGLICISMS

If the initial assumption about the three features constituting the essence of a loan is correct, then the seven types shown in Table 1 theoretically cover all the possibilities there are (or at least the fundamental ones, given that language is not ruled by theory) and encompass all the categories of loans/Anglicisms found in the consulted literature. As was mentioned above, most categories of Anglicisms can be traced to classical general taxonomies of borrowing (Betz 1949, 1959, Haugen 1950, and Weinreich 1953); that is why they will also be referred to. It is important to note that feature analysis of loans cannot offer the type of hierarchies and subdivisions found in classical loan typologies, although it is possible that even feature-based types may further diversify if additional properties and factors allowing a finer description are identified.





	types of loan (Anglicism)	features borrowed from English		
		concept/sense	model/word	form
1.	concept-model-form loan	+	+	+
2.	concept-model loan	+	+	-
3.	model-form loan	-	+	+
4.	concept-form loan	+	-	+
5.	concept loan	+	-	-
6.	model loan	-	+	-
7.	form loan	-	-	+

TABLE 1: Hypothesized types of loan (Anglicism) based on feature patterns

(1) **Concept-model-form loans**, the quintessential type of Anglicisms, include both unadapted and adapted loans/Anglicisms. They are called *Lehnwörter* (and together with *Fremdwörter* subsumed under *äusseres Lehngut*) by Betz (1959), or loanwords by Haugen and Weinreich. Pulcini et al. (2012: 6) and Pulcini (2023: 53) call them direct loanwords. The crucial point regarding this type is where the distinction is drawn between adaptation (i.e. adjustment of the loan to the morphological, graphical and phonological properties of the RL without altering its original meaning, e.g. ‘to stream’ > *streamovat*, ‘cool’ > *coolový*, or ‘business’ > *byznys*, speaker > *spíkr*) on the one hand and neologisation (i.e. application of a word-formation process to a loan which in effect produces a loan-based RL word with an altered or an entirely new sense, e.g. the colloquial or slang expressions such as *hobík* for ‘hobby or amateur sportsman’, *notas* for ‘notebook’, *hambáč* for ‘hamburger’) on the other. Neologisation and semantic change are associated with different types of loan. Also, due to formal adaptation the connection between the English etymon and the corresponding loanword may over a time become tenuous (cf. *biftek* from ‘beefsteak’), and this weakening may result in a change in meaning (e.g. *biftek* has semantically diversified to mean ‘a thick slice of meat’ in Czech, which allows expressions such as *vepřový/křutí biftek*, literally ‘pork/turkey beefsteak’).

(2) **Concept-model loans** include cases where the English form is replaced by an RL form, in other words the English model is translated unit-for-unit using (standard) RL equivalents. This type is well known in the literature. Betz speaks of *Lehnübersetzung* and *Lehnübertragung* (subcategories of *inneres Lehngut*) which Weinreich and others call loan translation and loan rendition (the difference between them is in the closeness of translation: renditions are loose translations). They are also called lexical calques (white collar > *bílý límeček*, Generation X/Y/Z/Alpha > *generace X/Y/Z/alfa*). Weinreich stresses that it is frequently accompanied by semantic extension of the native elements. Indeed, the concept-model type also covers another type closely related to loan translations: semantic loans (*Lehnbedeutung* by Betz, others call them semantic calques, e.g. [computer] mouse > *myš*). Although Betz and Weinreich distinguish between these two, Haugen uses the term loan shifts for both (but acknowledges the use of the terms loan translations and semantic loans). Pulcini et al. have adopted the terms calque (for loan translation, rendition and creation) and semantic loan. Although both loan translations and semantic loans share the same features



(i.e. concept and model), they differ in that semantic loans not only translate, but also expand the meaning of the domestic element (by adding a new sense from English), while with loan translations this is not the case. However, there are many instances of intersecting loan translations and semantic loans (cf. carbon footprint > *uhlíková stopa*, clean energy > *čistá energie*, where *stopa* and *čistá*, but not *uhlíkový* and *energie*, acquire a new meaning in Czech). There is yet another type of Anglicisms, so-called phono-semantic matching, which corresponds to the concept-model loan and which may be considered a special case of (imitative) loan rendition. The RL elements translating the English model are selected for their phonetic (and semantic) similarity with the English elements, although they may not be standard, close equivalents (e.g. the English IT slang term ‘lamer’, for an inept computer user, rendered as *lama* in Czech, meaning ‘llama’, but also ‘silly person’).

(3) **Model-form loans** can be interpreted in two ways: (i) the English word provides a model on the analogy of which new words are formed in the RL that do not exist in English; (ii) the borrowed English word expresses a concept which already exists in the RL and so no (new) concept is borrowed, only a more attractive, prestigious form e.g. *level*, *top*, *smart*, *leasovat*, *promotovat*, *spíkr*, *lídr* or *fighter* (see the notion of luxury or non-catachrestic loans discussed by Onysko and Winter-Froemel 2011). In either case meaning/concept is not the (primary) reason for borrowing.

The first subtype is frequently represented by morphologically complex (often bilingual) lexemes whose one part is shared by a large set of words based on a widely used English model, e.g. *e-book*, *e-shop*, which motivated the Czech neologism *e-babyland* or hybrid *e-words* such as *e-pivo* (‘e-beer’), *e-obuv* (‘e-footwear’) or *e-stredovek.cz* (‘e-Middle Ages’). Similarly the borrowing of the combining form *-aholic* through such model words as *workaholic*, *shopaholic* has generated hybrid Czech words like *romoholik* (‘fan of the singer-musician Roman Holý’) or *alzaholik* (‘e-shop addict’). The same strategy is followed in other hybrids: the English models *ecosystem*, *ecotourism* inspired words like *ekokoza*, ‘eco-goat’ (‘goat breeding family business and e-shop’), *ekovláček* (‘eco-train’), *eko blázinec* (‘eco-uproar’) or *ekoprůser* (‘eco-mess’). Neither of these subtypes is mentioned in the literature as a category of Anglicisms on its own. Creation of a new Czech word based on an English model and form (but without a counterpart in English) relates the first subtype to a category known in the literature as false Anglicisms or pseudo-Anglicisms. The second subtype, “luxury” loans, is usually subsumed under direct loanwords.

(4) **Concept-form loans** are another type which has not been terminologically singled out in the literature as a special category. Although the loan is an English word and the concept is borrowed from English, the concept is actually expressed by a different word in English (i.e. the English form used in Czech and the word conveying the concept in English do not correspond), for example *step* (for ‘tap dancing’), *stop* (for ‘hitch-hiking’), *sprayer* (for ‘graffitist, tagger’) or *mixér* (for ‘blender’)³. Such

3 There is a kitchen utensil called ‘(food) mixer’ in English; however it corresponds to the Czech *hnětač* or *kuchyňský robot*. Blenders cut with sharp blades, mixers knead dough, beat



cases are assessed as resemantization of the English form. In other cases the form of the loan, although ultimately related to an actual underlying English word (“ghost” model), has been changed, e.g. by shortening the English original (such as the Czech *basket* metonymically standing for the game ‘basketball’, or the much-quoted German *Handy* derived from the first word in ‘hand-held mobile phone’, or *happy end* instead of the correct English ‘happy ending’, though this particular phrase may have arisen quite independently of the English expression which is usually unknown to English learners, simply by combining ‘happy’ and ‘The End’ which used to appear in big letters on the screen at the end of films. Also these concept-form loans are usually subsumed under false Anglicisms (see below).

(5) **Concept loans** come into existence when the English expression realizing the concept is difficult or impossible to translate into the RL verbatim. The way the concept is rendered in the RL is reminiscent of the method of oblique translation termed modulation by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), i.e. a variation on the meaning from a different perspective. The result is a cognitive equivalent. This type is traditionally called loan creations (Weinreich, Pulcini et al.). Betz’s term is *Lehnschöpfung*, while Haugen (1950: 220) deems that these creations “are not strictly loans at all” although it is clearly a transfer of the concept. Examples of concept loans in Czech based on English are, for example, *roztleskávačka* (‘cheerleader’, rendered in Czech as a ‘girl clapping her hands to stir up the spectators’), *zástupný znak* (‘wildcard’, translated as ‘substitute character’), *našeptávač* (‘autocomplete’, changed to mean ‘whisperer’ in Czech), and *odpírač vojenské služby* (‘conscientious objector’, reinterpreted as a ‘person refusing to do military service’).

(6) **Model loans** are remarked on in connection with pattern replication (Matras 2009) and subsume borrowings of patterns at the word-formation and (morpho-) syntactic levels; the word-formation pattern loans are responsible for the spread of combining-form compounds in Czech. The latter include, for example, the change of word order within noun phrases in Czech (a postmodifier changing to a premodifier): *O2 aréna* (formerly *Sazka aréna*) or *Langhans Galerie* instead of the regular *Aréna O2/Sazka* and *Galerie Langhans*, still found in other names, such as *Centrum Langhans* or *Ateliér Langhans*. An example of a domestic lexical item following an English model is the Czech abbreviation *Z5*. Pronounced it stands for “z+pět” (i.e. ‘back’) and is formed on analogy with English abbreviations such as *W8* (wait), *M2* (me too), or *znite* (tonight), typical of Internet slang and text messaging. Words or names like *Z5* and *Sazka aréna* are obviously Czech neologisms inspired by English but the fact that they rely neither on an English concept, nor an English form sets them apart from all the other loan types. While word-order neologisms are often called syntactic Anglicisms, for cases like *Z5* there does not seem to be an established term (they could be described as ‘pattern loans’).

eggs and whip cream (see <https://www.google.cz/search?q=difference+between+blender+and+food+mixer>).



(7) **Form loans** are words related to English only through their English form which, factually, does not copy an English concept/sense or an existing English word (as a model). As this would amount to inventing a new English word, such loans in the strictest sense are bound to be rare, cf. *beer spa* (a Czech take on a wellness center combined with beer consumption). A marginal subgroup of such items is formed by the orthographic Anglicization of Czech words, e.g. the restaurant *Coolna* < *kůlna*, ('shed'), the musical group *Yatchmen* < *Ječmeni* ('barley-boys') or a Czech brand of cat wet food pouches *Shelma* < *šelma* ('carnivore'). The most common type of form loans in Czech, however, are bilingual neologisms in which the English form is subject to a Czech word-formation process, frequently derivation (e.g. the English 'tennis' producing *tenista*, 'tennis player', *tenistka*, 'female tennis player', *tenisák*, 'tennis ball', *tenisky*, 'tennis shoes', etc.), resulting in creations for which there is no immediate English model word to name the concept.

It should be stressed that all these cases represent RL neologisms based on English forms, direct Anglicisms. This relates form loans to other types of extreme loans with an English form, namely type 3 (model-form) and type 4 (concept-form), both of which are likewise neologisms formed by Czech speakers. In the classifications of Anglicisms they are usually collapsed into one group and referred to variously, secondary Anglicisms, false Anglicisms, pseudo-Anglicisms, *Scheinenlehnung*, etc. The neologisation performed by RL speakers — which appears to be the hallmark of false Anglicisms⁴ — may also consist in creating a new meaning while retaining the original form (sometimes called resemantization — see type 4 loans above) or creating a new form (e.g. by shortening the original English term, such as *parking* for a *parking lot* — see type 4 again) or combining English morphemes/words in a novel way, such as *beer spa* (interestingly, *babybox*, usually referred to as 'baby hatch' in English, could be one such case or it may be an example of resemantization, since the word does exist in English, but means something else). Another quite common type of neologisation is the creative use of English combining forms (see type 3 above). As might be expected, there are some curious cases (curious from native English speakers' perspective), such as the word *raut* (formerly *rout*) used in the sense of 'reception, banquet' in Czech. The word *rout* does come from English (OED defines it under sense 9 as "a fashionable gathering or assembly, a large evening party or reception, much in vogue in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries"), but has been long obsolete and out of use and hence technically it is a historical loan.

4 For the sake of completeness, if we accept that a false Anglicism is an RL neologism based on a (direct) Anglicism and that indirect loans, loan translations and semantic loans, are likewise Anglicisms, then even an RL neologism based on a loan translation or a semantic loan may be called a false Anglicism. It is admittedly an extreme type of false Anglicism which exhibits none of the three features that are posited for a loanword: an English concept, model or form. For instance, the Czech semantic loan (*počítačový*) *virus* translating the English term '(computer) virus' has given rise to the verbs *zavirovat* ('to infect with a virus') and *odvirovat* ('to remove a virus from'), neither of which has an equivalent in English, and in that sense they are false Anglicisms.



	traditional categories	feature-based loan types
1.	direct loan	concept-model-form loan
2.	loan translation/rendition (lexical calque)	concept-model loan
3.	semantic loan (semantic calque)	concept-model loan
4.	phono-semantic matching	concept-model loan
5.	loan creation	concept loan
6.	syntactic loan	model loan
7.	false or secondary loan	form loan model-form loan concept-form loan

TABLE 2: Relation between traditional categories of Anglicisms and feature-based types of loan

Table 2 summarizes the relation between the most widespread traditional labels for Anglicisms and the feature pattern types 1 to 7 that we believe constitute and define these traditional categories. By explicitly stating the features that underlie each of the traditional categories we hope to specify them unambiguously (without relying on mere examples or vague descriptions) and at the same time to show that some of these traditional categories are typologically heterogeneous and in what sense (e.g. false Anglicisms), while others overlap, i.e. are basically the same (loan translations and semantic loans).

3.3 HYBRID VARIANTS OF ANGLICISMS

The picture of loan feature patterns is not complete without bilingual or hybrid loans. Typically, in traditional classifications, hybrids are viewed as an independent type and placed with outer/direct loans (cf. Betz, Pulcini et al.), but on closer examination the situation is more complex than that. Table 1 shows that the patterns of loan features are either monolingual with the English form (types 1, 3, 4, and 7), or monolingual with the Czech form (types 2, 5, and 6). In principle, however, there is no logical reason why these monolingual types of loan, whether their form is English or Czech, could not be expanded to bilingual loans, given that the essence of the loan (its defining feature pattern) will not be changed. The only proviso is that the loanword is morphemically complex (i.e. a derivative, compound, or multi-word expression) to allow for two different forms.

If this premise is correct (the addition of another form does not alter the criterial features of the loan), it would mean that there are bilingual variants of all types of loans: bilingual direct loans, bilingual loan translations and semantic loans, bilingual loan creations and bilingual false loans. A survey of samples of hybrid Anglicisms and pseudo-Anglicisms (Klégr and Bozděchová 2022, Bozděchová and Klégr 2022) largely supports this claim. However, a look at the table also shows that the addition of a second form element results in overlapping patterns, namely types 1 and 2, types 3 and 6, and types 4 and 5. Comparison of the overlapping patterns reveals, though, that they do remain different owing to the character of and difference between the underlying monolingual patterns. The distinctions are best shown by examples. For easy orientation, the bilingual types of loans are identified

	types of loan (Anglicism)	features			
		E-concept/sense	E-model	E-form	C-form
1.	concept-model-form loan	+	+	+	+
2.	concept-model loan	+	+	+	+
3.	model-form loan	-	+	+	+
4.	concept-form loan	+	-	+	+
5.	concept loan	+	-	+	+
6.	model loan	-	+	+	+
7.	form loan	-	-	+	+

TABLE 3: Monolingual feature patterns (light grey) expanded to bilingual types of loans with an additional form element (dark grey); E stands for English, C for Czech

by the traditional labels and in brackets by the number of the respective feature pattern as given in Tables 1 and 3.

Bilingual direct loans (type 1, concept-model-form loan) become bilingual typically in the case of verbs and adjectives, less often also nouns, to which Czech derivational (stem-forming) suffixes are added to make them usable with the inflectional paradigms of the RL (morphological adaptation), e.g., ‘to chat’ > *chat-ovat*, ‘downhill’ > *downhill-ový*, and ‘creative’ > *kreativ-ec*.

Bilingual loan translations/renditions (type 2, concept-model loan) are “half” translations, i.e. one part of the English model is translated by a standard Czech equivalent, the other part is the original English component, both of which are roots or stems. This makes them different from bilingual direct loans using Czech derivational affixes as a means of morphological adaptation to conform to the morphological system of the RL. Examples: *čínský snooker* (‘Chinese snooker’), *internet věcí* (‘internet of things’), *feeder prut* (‘feeder rod’), *emailový účet* (‘email account’); an example of loan rendition is *spinning s nízkou zátěží* (‘low-intensity spinning’).

Bilingual semantic loans (type 2, concept-model loan) are actually a special case of loan translations, the only difference being that the Czech element both translates and acquires a new sense borrowed from English, e.g. *místnost*, ‘room’ (the new sense in *chatovací místnost*, ‘chatroom’, is ‘a site on the internet’), *platforma*, ‘platform’ (the new sense in *cloudová platforma*, ‘cloud platform’, is ‘a suite of cloud computing services’). Both *místnost* and *platforma* can be used in these new senses on their own. Quite often the fact that the RL equivalent is used in a borrowed meaning is missed or ignored and the distinction and boundary between loan translations and semantic loans are blurred.

Also other types whose bilingual patterns overlap can be teased apart on closer scrutiny:



Bilingual syntactic loans (type 6, model loan) whose claim to English origin is based on a purely abstract feature, such as word order, are clearly indifferent to whether they are realized only by Czech words or bilingually, cf. *kapr párty*, ‘carp party’, a type of pre-Christmas social gathering (bilingual variants of syntactic loans may presumably be subsumed under false Anglicisms). The overlapping type 3 (model-form loan) has already been shown above to exist in bilingual variants (*ekokoza*, *e-pivo*, *eSranda*). Unlike syntactic loans, bilingual forms of type 3 depend on concrete words (word families such as *-holic* words, *e*-words, *i*-words, *eco*-words, etc.).

Bilingual loan creations (type 5, concept loan), i.e. oblique rendering of an English concept, is technically possible (i.e. there is nothing to prevent it in principle), but since these creations are resorted to because the English model word is difficult to translate (and therefore is replaced with an alternative RL concept), the use of an English element alongside an RL element here will be rare. The overlapping bilingual type 4 (concept-form loan), with the same features, on the other hand, does appear profusely in bilingual variants, both with Czech derivational affixes and roots/stems: *stepování* (‘tap-dancing’), *steapařský*, *stepovačí* (‘relating to tap dancing’), *steapařské boty* (‘tap shoes’), *stopování* (‘hitchhiking’), *stopař* (‘hitchhiker’). The English bases ‘step’ and ‘stop’ are not used in these senses in English, a phenomenon known as resemanticization (which is not to be expected in hybrid loan creations), and that is why type 4 belongs with the following group of hybrid pseudo-Anglicisms.

Bilingual false loans, like monolingual false loans, i.e. **pseudo-Anglicisms**, appear to embrace three feature-pattern types: type 7 (form loans), type 3 (model-form loans), and type 4 (concept-form loans). All three share the English form either without a corresponding English concept, or without an English model word, or both. Types 3 and 4, although their bilingual variants overlap with types 6 (syntactic loans) and 5 (loan creations) respectively (see above), are shown to be distinct from them and at the same time quite common as bilingual loans. In fact, form loans (type 7) as false loans (pseudo-Anglicisms) appear to be far more common in their bilingual (see *tenista*, *tenistka*, *tenisák*, *tenisky* above) rather than monolingual variant (*Coolna*). Typically the English form (base) is subject to a word-formation process in Czech (e.g. derivation, compounding) to produce a neologism for which there is no corresponding English word/model of the same meaning, e.g. *piknikoviště* (‘a place for picnics’), *genderovanost* (‘gender representativeness’), *softkomouš* (‘soft communist’, a supporter of Social Democrats), or *youtublbl* (‘YouTube idiot’, a coarse, lame type of youtuber).

Unlike the traditional taxonomies of borrowing/Anglicisms which define hybrids as a separate group only in terms of bilinguality without specifying their relation to other types of loan (at best placing them under direct loans, cf. Pulcini et al.), the feature-pattern approach makes it possible to assign them as variants to all the monolingual categories of loans. Non-hybrid categories of loans and their hybrid variants share all their features with the exception of the latter having an additional other-language element. Apparently this does not cause a logical contradiction and disqual-

ify hybrids from realizing these categories, only in some of them the occurrence of a bilingual variant is less likely (cf., type 5 concept loans or loan creations).



4 CONCLUSION

The experiment to define Anglicisms in terms of three defining features and their combinations has revealed several things. Firstly, it shows that by arranging these features into combinations of one up to three features it is possible to arrive at seven different patterns representing seven potential types of Anglicisms. In general, as might be expected, some of the pattern types are easy to identify in lists of Anglicisms, while others are more difficult to find, presumably because, although theoretically possible, the actual need and the necessary circumstances for them to occur are limited. It is also clear that the three features, although laying the groundwork for distinguishing different categories of Anglicisms, do not necessarily exhaust the range of factors that may be at play and influence the outcome of borrowing (cf. neologisation).

The next step was an attempt to correlate these seven pattern types with the actual categories distinguished in GLAD terminology and elsewhere. For the most part, it was not difficult to connect some of the pattern types with established categories. Quite importantly, though, it appears that some of the feature-pattern types do not seem to have a specific name, and several of them are subsumed under one traditional label. Especially these cases indicate that a feature-pattern approach could help to introduce finer distinctions in the classification of Anglicisms, perhaps even suggest new (sub)groups and become a useful tool in correctly assigning items to their respective categories.

After dealing with monolingual feature patterns, attention was turned to Anglicisms involving both English and Czech components, i.e. bilingual or hybrid Anglicisms. It appears that hybrid Anglicisms are largely understudied and that they are a source of some disagreement. Since any word to be considered a loan/Anglicisms must contain one to three of the features (in whatever combination) and since none of the features is incompatible with bilingual borrowing, it seemed logical to take the seven monolingual patterns and expanded them by the other-language element, i.e. to make them bilingual. This has two consequences: it amounts to distinguishing potentially seven instead of one type of hybrids (in contrast to what we usually find in the traditional classifications), and, second, it implies that hybrids are not a separate category but form subgroups of the respective monolingual categories. These two claims are arguably supported by evidence (i.e. instances of these hybrid types can be found in lists of Anglicisms), but of course they need to be further tested and verified.

Hopefully the feature-pattern approach could make it easier to find one's way in the maze of different labels and descriptions of Anglicisms, allow for finer distinctions and help determine which labels denote the same and which something different. Obviously, the approach is not a magic formula but it could be a step in the right direction.



REFERENCES

- Betz, W. (1949) *Deutsch und Lateinisch: die Lehnbildungen der althochdeutschen Benediktinerregel*. Bonn: H. Bouvier u. Co.
- Betz, W. (1959) Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen im Vor- und Frühdeutschen. In: Maurer, F. and F. Stroh (eds) *Deutsche Wortgeschichte*, vol. 1, 2nd ed., 127–147. Berlin: Schmidt.
- Bozděchová, I. and A. Klégr (2022) Pseudo-Anglicisms in Czech. Between borrowing and neology. In: Martí Solano, R. and P. Ruano San Segundo (eds) *Anglicisms and Corpus Linguistics*, 137–157. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Duběda, T. (2018) Fonologická adaptace anglicismů v kvantitativním pohledu. *Naše řeč* 101/5, 245–267.
- Görlach, M. (2003) *English Words Abroad*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gottlieb, H. (2005) Anglicisms and translation. In: Anderman, G. and M. Rogers (eds) *In and Out of English: For Better or Worse*, 161–184. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gottlieb, H., G. Andersen, U. Busse, E. Mańczak-Wohlfeld, E. Peterson and V. Pulcini (2018) Introducing and developing GLAD — The Global Anglicism Database Network. *The ESSE Messenger* 27/2, Winter 2018, 4–19.
- Haugen, E. (1950) The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. *Language* 26, 210–231.
- Klégr, A. and I. Bozděchová (2022) Hybrids — a redundant category of anglicisms? Hybrids in Czech texts. *Espaces Linguistiques* 4, 1–21.
- Matras, Y. (2009/2020) *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- OED, *Oxford English Dictionary* (2021) Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at <https://oed.com/> [last accessed 18/05/2023].
- Onysko, A. and E. Winter-Froemel (2011) Necessary loans — luxury loans? Exploring the pragmatic dimension of borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 1550–1567.
- Pulcini, V. (2023) *The Influence of English on Italian. Lexical and Cultural Features*. Chicago/Vancouver: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Pulcini, V., C. Furiassi and F. Rodríguez González (2012) The lexical influence of English on European languages, In: Furiassi, C., V. Pulcini and F. Rodríguez González (eds) *The Anglicization of European Lexis*, 1–24. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vinay, J.-P. and J. Darbelnet (1958/1995) *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Weinreich, U. (1953) *Languages in contact*. New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York.

Aleš Klégr

Faculty of Arts, Charles University
 nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1
 ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7760-6631
 ales.klegr@ff.cuni.cz