

Linguistic Essence of the Process of Borrowing: French and English Language in Contact

Bila Ievgeniia Sergiivna

English language Department

National University "Odesa Maritime Academy", Odesa, Ukraine

*Correspondence Author

Bondarenko Ievheniia Volodymyrivna

English language Department

National University "Odesa Maritime Academy", Odesa, Ukraine

Maslova Svitlana Yakivna

Philology Department

Odesa National Maritime University, Odesa, Ukraine

Abstract

The research presents linguistic aspects of the process of French borrowing, its main extralinguistic reasons and key stages, and other French borrowings that were adopted into the English language in the course of its development. Particular attention is paid to the definitions of borrowing as a lexicological phenomenon offered on account of various scholars and based on several lexicographic resources. The article also focuses on numerous French borrowings in contemporary English, their grammatical and structural nature. The suggested classification of the distinguished linguistic units is given after a Spanish linguist Capuz. The article includes the general outline on the subject of borrowings, various aspects of loan classifications. The core part of the research was the typology of linguistic borrowings, like formal, morphological, semantic, lexical, syntactic, phraseological, and pragmatic borrowings. The authors analyzed the most important periods in history, like Old English, Middle English, and Modern English. All periods can be characterized through means of typical for them words. In the course of analysis, the following types of French borrowings have been established: formal, morphological, semantic, lexical, syntactic, and phraseological. The English vocabulary stock was compiled from different semantic fields and historical periods, starting from the Old up to Present Day English.

Keywords: borrowing, classification, French, historical periods, the English language

Cite as: Sergiivna, B. I., Volodymyrivna, B. I. , & Yakivna, M. S. (2020). Linguistic Essence of the Process of Borrowing: French and English Language in Contact. *Arab World English Journal: Special Issue on English in Ukrainian Context*. 294-306.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt3.24>

Introduction

If anyone ever asked a question to name a single essential language feature that would be valid for every language, the possible answer could be: an alteration. Lexical or grammatical changes emerging within any language happen at different rapidity and intensity in its continuous development. Some languages are characterized by numerous changes and are easily visible. Others have some alterations, but they are less discernible, as there are not so many. That's why some transformations are distinct, and others are more subtle. However, something that is definitely when we speak about any language development is that *the change* is always present there, making any language a living being.

There are many ways of enriching any language by new lexical units and grammatical structures. It is a well-known fact that language lexicon can be broadened through numerous morphological processes, like compounding, affixation, incorporation, conversion, back derivation, an internal modification, or reduplication. Apart from strictly morphological processes, there are so-called word-manufacturing processes. Among them, we distinguish clipping, blending, acronymization. It is worth mentioning that borrowing has always been very productive in the course of English language development. Considering the peculiarities of the English language borrowing process, we will conclude that over centuries many quite different languages influenced the English language, some of them just a little. Others wielded a considerable impact on its lexicon. For example, beginning from its earliest times, the languages that significantly affected English were Latin, Greek, Celtic, Scandinavian, and French.

The French language, like all other world languages, has its essential characteristic features, like special word-order, lexical stock, and pronunciation. Among the lexicon, some areas are more developed than others. They are the areas of cuisine, army, and law. Other lexical fields, however, cannot be treated as more deficient because the number of cases is impressive too. It is important to stress that both lexical areas are continually developing, and any lexical unit can serve as a source for enriching other language vocabularies.

In the twentieth century, other languages, like Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, German, or Russian, also contributed to enriching the English lexicon. Besides, one cannot but stress that there are no limits to borrowing lexical items from other languages. Every language may benefit from another language vocabulary stock. Some languages serve more as sources for others; however, some languages are almost addicted to such loans. Linguists believe that there are over 120 different languages that contributed over centuries to the enrichment of the English vocabulary stock. Among them, many other well-known languages as mentioned above. Some, however, are somewhat exotic, as exemplified by Crystal (1995), as Tswana, Tibetan, Xhosa, or Zulu. But the two main language-contributors to the English vocabulary stock, to our minds, are Latin and French.

The process of borrowing can be realized in two ways: through oral speech (by immediate communicative contacts between people) and written speech (by indirect language interaction through documents, books, etc.). Oral borrowing took place chiefly in the early periods of history, whereas in recent times, written borrowing gained importance. Words borrowed orally (e.g., L. inch, mill, street) are usually short, and they undergo considerable changes in the act of adoption.

Written borrowings (e.g., Fr. *communiqué*, *belles-lettres*, *naïveté*) preserve their spelling and some peculiarities of their sound form; their adaptation is a long and laborious process.

The core aim of the linguistic investigation conducted for the present research is to present illustrative exemplars of French loans adopted into English over time.

All French borrowings were analyzed as far as the lexical components are concerned. Some exemplary paradigms were also given additional information through definition in Present-Day English and the etymological note, confirming their French origin.

Every research triggers some theoretical as well as practical values. This investigation of the semantic nature reveals that French has always been a great source of borrowings. Each period in history brought some valuable loans into English.

The theoretical part of the thesis provided a systematized outline of the issues concerning borrowings as a lexicon enriching process. What is more, the historical account of the loans also gives information as to the reasons for such procedures. For example, the Norman Conquest brought vocabulary connected with war, administration, and law, whereas the technological revolution enriched the tongue into words from the areas of technology, science, and medicine.

The practical aspects of the present thesis are of both scientific as well as educational. The data and findings can be used for educational purposes at schools. The results can also be utilized for further linguistic procedures.

Literature Review

Interest in studying the problem of borrowings was observed only at the end of the 19th century. The basis for new research was to reorganize the thousand-year-old traditions of the synthesis of language theories from modern cultural and linguistic ideas. More than one generation of scientists devoted their works to this problem, calling the same phenomena (the result of the process of borrowings) in different ways (borrowings, foreign words, or loan words).

The process of *borrowing* has been defined by Hock & Joseph (2009) as: “an adoption of individual words or even large sets of vocabulary items from another language or dialect” (p. 241) which, as said by them, is a “very common result of linguistic contact.” Fromkin, Rodman & Hyams (2002) unanimously stated: “a borrowing occurs when one language adds a word or a morpheme from another language to its own lexicon.” (p. 512) Moreover, the authors maintain: “pronunciation of the borrowed item is often altered to fit the phonological rules of the borrowing language.” (p. 512) McArthur (1992) wrote: borrowing is taking “a word or phrase from one language into another, or from one variety of a language into another.” (p.141) In a word, the abstract noun *borrowing* refers to speakers adopting words from a source language into their native language. “Loan” and “borrowing” are, of course, metaphors because there is no literal lending process. There is no transfer from one language to another and no “returning” words to the source language. There are also many definitions of *borrowing* as a particular linguistic unit, which is the results from this process. For example, the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2005) defines the notion of borrowing as: “a word [...] taken from [...] another language and used in their own.”

(p.1734) Moreover, Graddol (2000) writes that one may discuss the process of borrowing if “language A uses and ends up absorbing a linguistic item or feature which was a part of language B, and which language A did not have” (p.33).

What is the most crucial from all the above-mentioned definitions is the fact that one language is receiving a lexical unit while the other one serves as a donor. An interesting detail is included in the second part of the definition presented by McArthur (1992) above, who states that borrowing can also occur between different variants of the same language. For example, it can be a loan word from Australian English or American English into British English.

As language borrowing is too complicated, then the question arises, what are the reasons for this process? To our minds, the grounds are manifold. There is a necessity for adopting concepts along with the terms identifying them, as various cultures blend. These are items that are not presented in the recipient language. Therefore it is less complicated to adopt the concept rather than trying to formulate a new term. Frequently, there are cases when there is a need to present some specific ideas or objects, like the ones from fauna and flora.

As there are many reasons for the process of borrowing in general. Hence, there are also different types of adopted words according to the degree of their assimilation into the recipient language. For instance, Hughes (2000) proposes four kinds of borrowings:

(1) Guest words – words, which remain their original meaning, orthography, and pronunciation. For example, the Italian word “diva” was adopted into English as “diva.”

(2) Foreign words – words that are only partially assimilated to the recipient language though sometimes are challenging to be recognized as borrowings.

(3) Loan words – words incorporated into the recipient language to a great extent so it is almost impossible to identify them as borrowings, like the words “street” or “bishop.” Such loan words virtually become native words and sometimes are mistreated as ones.

(4) Calques – words called loan translations, as they involve rendition from one language to another, like “world view” translated literally from German “Weltanschauung.” By the way, the terms (“a guest word,” “a foreign word,” and “a loan word”) constitute examples of calques themselves, as they are translated literally from German words “Gastwort,” “Fremdwort” and “Lehnwort.”

Consistent with many scholars, the process of borrowing is usually divided into two types according to the nature of the very process: direct and indirect. The former deals with a lexical unit, which serves as a native word for the language from which the borrowing takes place. The latter one, on the other hand, already exists as a loan word in the language from which the borrowing occurs. Fromkin (2002) explains the mentioned notion of a native word as “one which history or etymology can be traced back to the earliest known stages of the language” (pp. 504-505). For example, let us take the word “feast,” which can be easily traced back to the Latin form “festum.” However, the word was borrowed into English from French. So, it can serve as an example of direct borrowing from French, but at the same time, it is also an example of indirect borrowing from Latin.

In other words, direct borrowing happens when one language adopts a word from a foreign language in a straight line, like an English “omelette,” which has been taken over from French without any large phonological or orthographical changes. On the contrary, indirect borrowing happens when a lexical unit is borrowed from the source language to another language, as a direct borrowing. Then, the same item is re-borrowed yet to another language and further even to another language, this time, however, as an indirect borrowing. It is worth mentioning that the process of indirect borrowing is unlimited in terms of the number of languages, which can adopt it. The said lexical unit can be re-borrowed many times, but only the adoption form of the source language can be called a direct one. Finally, adopting the item each time to another language, some orthographical and phonological adjustments can be made to fit it into the recipient language.

Methodology

This research aims at investigating the French borrowings appearing in the English lexicon from the Old English period to the present days. It comprises the analysis of those borrowings and an examination of their level of integration into the lexis of Modern English (from a phonological and morphosyntactic and lexical point of view).

The first step of our analysis was to distinguish the main types of assimilation according to the structure. They are phonetic, grammatical, and morphological. Phonetic assimilation is the process of adjusting the phonetic form of the borrowed word to the sound system of the recipient language. Words that are not assimilated phonetically retain their foreign pronunciation. Grammatical assimilation is the conformation of a borrowed word to the morphological or grammatical standards of the receiving language.

The second step was to distinguish the main types of assimilation according to the meaning. They are semantic borrowings, lexical borrowings, and syntactic borrowings.

Data Collection Procedure

In the frame of lexicological findings, some scholars maintain that the term “borrowing” is highly under-defined. For example, Stražny (2005) claims: the term “borrowing” is, in some ways, an unfortunate metaphor ... (p. 620). Why would such a hypothesis ever arise? The author explains that neither the source language is ever asked if it wishes to lend its vocabulary stock to another language, nor the recipient language ever repays them in any way. Therefore, the author believes that the term is quite ambiguous and unfortunate.

Over half a century earlier, another great scholar, Jespersen (1964), wrote: linguistic “borrowing” is nothing but imitation (p. 208).

The idea is that any form of lexical borrowing happens when two languages come into contact. In that case, very often, people show at least a substantial degree of bilingualism. In other words, they have some knowledge of both the source language and a borrowing language. To make a word become a loan, the borrowing language has to gain something new from the source language. It usually occurs when there is a gap in the vocabulary stock. If not, the language would be able to survive on its lexical stock. Stražny (2005) constitutes a borrowing frequently implies

itself “for either reasons of necessity or reasons of prestige” (p. 621). The reason for both *necessity* and *prestige* are in much detail described below.

Reason of Necessity

Communication seems to be the essential aspect of human life. We communicate with one another at various levels, on different subjects, and in multiple places and under other circumstances. Sometimes we come across a new, unknown concept that we cannot express in our mother tongue, as such ideas do not exist in our conceptual world, in our mind, in our culture. Still, the necessity to put it into familiar words is extreme. That’s why we borrow terms, words, and other names of new ideas from other languages and incorporates them into our native language so that the act of communication is preserved. What is of vital importance is the objectivity and not subjectivity we should rely on in borrowing.

Ever since the Middle English began, various social and intellectual barricades disappeared, so new borrowings could freely enter the English language. These were mostly lexemes connected with discoveries on the grounds of science and technology. When traveling became famous, also words relating to sea travel, navy as well as foreign words of fauna and flora of the countries visited, came into English. Stražny (2005) offers an illustrative example of the necessity of the borrowing of the word “kangaroo”:

The English word, kangaroo, was borrowed into English from the Australian Aboriginal language Guugu Yimithirr when Captain Cook and his crew were making repairs to their ship on the northeast coast of Australia, and none of the crew ever learned to speak Guugu Yimithirr. Most probably, the word was brought into English after one of the crew pointed at an animal and was told by one of the local Aboriginals that the animal concerned was a “kangaroo.” In fact, the Guugu Yimithirr word gangguru refers specifically to the large black kangaroo. (p. 621)

Reason of Prestige

In the history of the English language, in the post-Conquest period, it was treated as inferior to the French language, which was the language of wealth, educated members of upper society. After the Norman Conquest in 1066, the French language became the official language in England. Some scholars believe that it was even stigmatized – definitely, it was seen as a lower language spoken mostly by artisans, peasants, and ordinary workers. On the other hand, French was the language of the nobility and the court. The first French borrowings were terms connected with war, fare, court, law, soldiers, army, crown, country, piece, justice, office, government, parliament, and state. Hence, it must have had a significant influence on English. French, therefore, perceived as a higher or prestige language, was the language to imitate, as Brinton and Arnovick (2006) elucidate. There was almost no end to the French words that continued to pour into English up to the 16th century: chair, table, furniture, dinner, supper, soup, jelly, sausage, to fry, to boil, joy, pleasure, delight, comfort, dress, color, flower, fruit, desire, castle, mention, beauty. Now in modern lexicology, the situation of two languages existing side by side is called a diglossic context. Hock (1991) maintains the two-fold division into the inherited ancient tongue and the vernacular form of the borrowing tongue. The explanation the author offers states: “this special coexistence

between ancient prestige language and modern “vernacular” is now commonly referred to as diglossia” (p. 620).

Why would people use importance as a motivator to use borrowed lexemes rather than the native ones, if they exist? There are two types of distinction that can be identified: the individual prestige and the collective one. The former deals with the speaker’s personal and individual choice to utilize a particular word. Some people prefer to use borrowed lexemes as they sound more prestigious, hence more advanced. The latter one, on the other hand, seems to be more complicated as it involves the overall desire to enrich the lexicon of the native language, which the speaker may perceive as too vernacular. The words from a more prestigious language will always be transferred into the language that is seen as less prominent. The other way round process appears improbable.

Adoption vs. Adaptation as Key Stages of the Process of Borrowing

Any language, which borrows lexical units from other ones, may face a problem of integrating the new words into its lexical stock. Scholars identified two significant procedures that can be applied to the cases in question. These are two language strategies known as adaptation (also called complete nativization) and adoption.

What is the difference between these two at first sight similar notions? When a lexical unit is adopted, the words are imported with all the features of the source language, and they are not modified in any way. Diverge peculiarities of phonological, morphological, and grammatical nature remains within the borrowed lexical units, hence enter the recipient language, too.

Similarly to the adopted word, also in the case of adaptation, borrowed lexical units are incorporated into the borrowing language as well as its linguistic system. The assimilation of such words occurs on various levels of linguistic nature: among them numerous changes in phonetics, orthography, or morphology. Stražny (2005) brings to light an example of “croissant,” the pronunciation of which varies from one person to another and is related to the fluency of French of the speaker. Hock (1991) also clarifies that a “borrowing can lead to the introduction of new phonological rules, such as the [k/s] and [g/j] alternations in electric: electricity, allegation: allege which entered English from loans from French” (p. 623).

Comparable situations occur as far as morphology is concerned. An appropriate example, “court-martial,” is brought by Hock (1991). The expression is of French origin, and it contributed to a new form of attaching plurality in English. The lexeme “court –martial” does not take the plural marker at the end, like most English nouns, but it attaches to the first element – “court-s martial.” Nevertheless, in a colloquial variety of language, the regular form of “court martial-s” is also known, used, and widely accepted. So now and then, we may come across some cases where the French influence is more significant. Hock (1991) also describes two different methods of building degrees of comparatives in both languages: English and French. It is visible that the French pattern plus ‘more’ + simple adjective has been effectively relocated into English as the pattern more + adjective. The following examples illustrate the issue discussed:

- | | | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| (a) <i>beau</i> | → | <i>plus beau</i> | (French) |
| (b) <i>beautiful</i> | → | <i>more beautiful</i> | (English) (p. 383) |

The a model mentioned above, taken on from French become started existing side by side with the traditional native way of forming comparative and superlative degrees, which involves adding the inflectional suffix *-er* in comparative and *-est* in superlative forms of adjectives, like in big – bigg-er – big-est, or hot – hott-er – hot-est. What are the guidelines for using either of the two patterns? The compromising solution has been successfully found and applied in modern English grammar the following way:

- (1) Monosyllabic and disyllabic adjectives ending in *-y*, as they are principally native, take the inherited native ending *-er* for comparative and *-est* for superlative degrees. There are also some examples of disyllabic adjectives ending in *-er*. The following examples illustrate the aforementioned patterns:
 - (a) monosyllabic adjectives: old – older, fast – faster – fastest, short – shorter – shortest;
 - (b) disyllabic adjectives ending in *-y*: tasty – tastier – tastiest, happy – happier – happiest, heavy – heavier – heaviest (there is a vowel modification of *-y* into *-i-*);
 - (c) disyllabic adjectives ending in *-er*: clever – cleverer/ more clever – cleverest – most clever, bitter – bitterer – bitterest.
- (2) Other disyllabic and polysyllabic adjectives forming comparative and superlative degrees in the descriptive way, borrowed from French, as in the examples:
 - (a) disyllabic adjectives (in particular those ending in *-ing*, *-ed*, *-ful* and *-less*): *caring* – more *caring* – most *caring*, *gifted* – more *gifted* – most *gifted*, *careful* – more *careful* – most *careful*, *useless* – more *useless* – most *useless*, complete – more complete;
 - (b) polysyllabic adjectives: colorful – more colorful – most delicious, delicious – more delicious – most delicious, generous – more generous – most generous.

To facilitate the choice of the form of comparative and superlative degrees of comparison of adjectives, Hock (1991) puts forward a proposition to use a universal pattern, which would be “(native) **-er** goes with monosyllabics, (borrowed) more, with polysyllabics.”

It is worth mentioning that the inclusion of new lexemes into the borrowing language always triggers some other processes. One such procedure is called *nativization* and is of vital importance for the subject matter. Nativization is the process of adapting a borrowing into a recipient language. Nevertheless, not every single lexical unit undergoes a full nativization. Such a procedure may occur partially and at various speeds. There are definite stages that most borrowings experience in the process of their full adaptation:

- (1) initially, borrowings or loan words are italicized, glossed, or quoted to demonstrate their unfamiliar origin;
- (2) to use borrowings in a broader context – the words, nonetheless, are still sensed as foreign items, and they are recognized as such;
- (3) borrowed item is wholly integrated into the recipient language and felt like native lexeme, even though it is still of a foreign origin.

At some point, loan words can also be used metaphorically, treated as a higher level of semantic comprehension. For example, the English word “plumber” (originating from Anglo-French *plummer*, *plomner* and Middle French *plommier*, *plombier*). Durkin (2005) writes: “in the 1970s, English plumber comes to have a specific metaphorical meaning (originally in the context of the Watergate scandal) “a person employed to investigate or prevent “leaks” of information from a government office, department, etc.”” (p. 323).

Now and then, the loan item is borrowed for the second time. It may happen at different times of language development and with diverse meanings. Stražny (2005) provides an example describing the transformation of the word “chief,” which originates from the Old French “chef,” meaning “boss” or “head.” Nonetheless, later it was also borrowed for the second time as the word “chef,” this time from Modern French expression “chef de cuisine” and the meaning “head of the kitchen” (p.623).

Sometimes a still unfamiliar borrowed word is roughly associated with a native word resembling it only in a sound form. The change of a borrowed word based on a fancied analogy with the same well-known word/ phrase is called *joke/ false etymology*: for example, “cutlet – to cut – to cutlet.”

To sum it up, assimilation is the process of adjusting a word to the phonetic and lexicogrammatical norms. We distinguish three main types of assimilation: phonetic, grammatical, and lexical. Phonetic assimilation is the process of adjusting the phonetic form of the borrowed word to the sound system of the recipient language. Words that are not assimilated phonetically retain their foreign pronunciation. Grammatical assimilation is the conformation of a borrowed word to the morphological or grammatical standards of the receiving language. If a loan word is grammatically assimilated, it acquires English paradigms and categories. Lexical assimilations are the conformation of a borrowed word to the lexico-semantic system of the recipient language. If a loan word participates in word-building according to the rules of the English language, we can say it is a lexical assimilated word. By the way, a borrowed word may develop a new meaning in the receiving language.

Discussion

Since the very beginning of lexicology studies, scholars have attempted to classify various borrowings from different languages. Therefore there are many classifications that can be found in numerous linguistic sources. Nevertheless, the procedure of simplifying them and outlining their typology has always been loaded with some obscurity. For example, Capuz (1997) mentions French scholars, who offered their classifications of borrowings. Among them: Clyne (1977) registers borrowings at the subsequent eight levels of the linguistic system: phonological borrowings, prosodic borrowings, graphemic borrowings, morphemic borrowings (transference of bound morphemes), morphological borrowings (transference of morphological patterns), semantic borrowings (transference sememes), lexical borrowings (transference lexemes), and syntactic borrowings (transference syntactic rules). Humbley (1974) offers the following six classes of borrowings: “graphic and phonetic borrowings, morphological borrowings, semantic borrowings, lexical borrowings, syntactic borrowings, and phraseological borrowings” (pp. 53-64), which are quite similar to the previous one. Capuz (1997) is a young Spanish scholar who also proposed his classification of borrowings. It consists of seven types of borrowings, which are described and exemplified below.

Formal borrowings

They are considered relatively infrequent. What is more, they entail both phonological or orthographic changes. The said alterations, as maintained by Capuz (1997), “affect the form (significant) and not the meaning (signifié)” (p. 84). Examples of formal borrowings can be found

in the language used in advertising, for instance: common bewilderment of *sh* and *sch* (shreiben – schreiben) that can be recognized in the German-speaking immigrants who live in the English-speaking countries, like England, for example: “appear[...] to be a hyper characterisation of neutral units following well-known features of a prestigious foreign language” (p. 84).

Morphological Borrowings

They are habitually portrayed as an uncertain category as some linguists reject the possibility of transferring morphemes unswervingly between languages. On the other hand, it is widely accepted as real that there is a likelihood of borrowing morphemes indirectly from one language to another. It happens when a particular morpheme enters the recipient language along with the lexeme to which it is attached. Then it may begin its own life as a productive affix used in the derivation of new words in the borrowing language. Such morphemes can serve as examples of affixes of all types. Some of them may become highly productive in the borrowing language. Others may remain infertile. The next stage of adaptation for morphemes in question is when they are entirely accepted and become “known.” When they intertwine into a new language system and, as underlined above, grow to be productive. The situation for the recipient language happens to be much simpler if it receives from the donor language pairs of words, with and without an affix, like in the examples: cigar/ **cigarette**, or statue/ **statuette**, which are borrowings from French.

Semantic Borrowings

It entails a process of transmitting of sememes or specific units of meaning. Capuz (1997) identifies three major types of semantic borrowings, which are the following:

- (1) *Homologs* – both items, from the source language and recipient language, demonstrate some analogy in meaning. However, their forms remain dissimilar. This type of borrowings is often called “semantic loan translation” or “semantic calque,” as it is a model of proper translation. Both lexemes share their primary meaning, but only one of them carries additional symbolic sense. The supplementary figurative sense meaning, however, can also be transmitted to another language. For instance, the English word “hawk” has its primary meaning “bird of prey.” In English, nonetheless, it also had an additional symbolic sense “hard-liner politician,” and that meaning can be borrowed by other languages.
- (2) *Analogs* – both words, as the name suggests, preserve some analogy in sense and form. Consequently, it is much easier to see the semantic transaction between them, and they are undoubtedly more frequent and widespread than homologs. Examples of semantic meaning are extensively unearthed in translations as well as in the language used by bilinguals. Very often, such examples are generally identified as “false friends” of a translator/ interpreter. For instance, Capuz (1997) illustrates this idea by providing as an example an English word “conventional” with its primary meaning “customary, traditional.” However, as the author appends “in political jargon, it has developed the sense of “non-nuclear (weapons)” that is “traditional (weapons)”” (p. 84).
- (3) *Homophones* – both lexemes show similarity in the form, but not the meaning. They are analogous as far as orthography and pronunciation are concerned, but the meaning remains different. For example, the English word “grocery” has its primary meaning, “grocer’s shop.” It was spread into American Portuguese “grosseria,” which has the primary meaning

“rude remark.” The new meaning carried along with the borrowing, however, is a “grocer’s shop.”

Lexical Borrowings

In linguistics, borrowing (also known as lexical borrowing) is a word from one [language](#) is adapted for use in another. In that case, the word that is borrowed is called a “borrowing,” “a borrowed word,” or “a loanword.” It is interesting to mention that the [English language](#) has been described by Crystal (1995) as an “insatiable borrower.” More than 120 other languages have served as sources for the contemporary vocabulary of English. On the other hand, present-day English is also a significant donor language – the leading source of borrowings for many other languages. Stražny (2005) observes the interface between two languages and maintains, “when different languages come into contact with each other, some degree of lexical borrowing inevitable takes place” (p.462). It is a widely acknowledged truth that lexical borrowings are among the most frequently identified loans. At the commencement, all borrowings were recognized and categorized as linguistic ones. Capuz (1997) offers to divide them into three groups:

- (a) *Importation* – this is the most direct transmission between languages. Both the form and the meaning are imported without any additional amendments. For example, *CD-ROM*, *club*, *pop*, *best-seller*, *poster*, *show*, and countless other examples in various areas of everyday life.
- (b) *Loan blends or hybrids* – these are lexical borrowings that involve both “importation” and “substitution” or, in other words, “transfer” and “reproduction.” Therefore, Capuz (1997) proposes a subdivision into three types of loan blends or hybrids:
 - transferred stem + reproduced derivative affix, like in words: *filth-y* (En) → *fil-sig* (Ger), or *swing-ing* (En) → *swin-ant* (Fr);
 - native stem + transferred affix, like in words: *four-age* (En) → *Futter-age* (Ger);
 - hybrid compounds, as in various anglicisms, like in words: *porte-containers* (Fr), *manager de carretera* (Es), or *tenis de mesa* (Es).
- (c) *Substitution or loan translation* – an example of lexical borrowing, which is a “complete morphemic substitution of lexical units of the language,” as Capuz (1997) elucidates. The paradigm in question always entails two or more elements. First, they are identified and analyzed, and then they are rendered into a recipient language. Contrasting to semantic borrowing, a loan translation deals with formulating a new lexeme in the borrowing language, like in the example of “grate-ciel” (Fr) “sky-scraper,” this happens to be a novel compound in French (p. 87).

Syntactic Borrowings

It deals with relationships between lexemes and other words. It is the form of the morphemic substitution that is always adopted. Syntactic borrowings entail various grammatical relationships, predominantly issues of agreement, dependence, and order. Capuz (1997) proposes two types of syntactic borrowings:

- (a) *Syntactic Innovation* – this is the case where the structure is completely unidentified in the borrowing language. For example, *estar siendo* + passive participle in Spanish can stand as a syntactic borrowing from the English form *am/is/are* + being + passive participle.
- (b) *Syntactic Borrowing of Higher Frequency* – when the form is known and recognizable in the borrowing language. Nevertheless, it is relatively rare and limited to particular distributional contexts.

Similar to syntactic borrowings, *phraseological borrowings* also involve a morphemic substitution, known as *loan translation*. As underlined by Capuz (1997), it “must imply a metaphor, an image,” “both the model and the loan translation must be idiomatic, with a global sense which cannot be derived from the addition of the senses of its constituents.”

Some lexical loan translations carry not only the primary meaning but also some shades of it, which are conversational. They can be subdivided into three types:

- (a) *Locutions or lexical idioms* – these are either nominal cases, like *round table* (En) → *mesa redonda* (Es), *cold war* (En) → *guerra fría*, *beautiful people* (En) → *gente guapa* (Es), or adverbial cases, like *somehow* (En) → *de algún modo / de alguna manera* (Es).
- (b) *Lexical and syntagmatic idioms* – these are founded on a verbal construction, like *to play a role* (En) → *jugar un papel* (Es), or *to be in the same boat* (En) → *estar en el mismo barco* (Es).
- (c) *Statements* – these come as examples of formulae, cliché, or sayings as well as proverbs (Capuz, 1997, pp. 90-91).

Conclusion

Borrowings enter the language in two ways: through oral speech (by immediate contact between people) and written speech (by indirect contact through books, etc.). Oral borrowing took place chiefly in the early periods of history, whereas in recent times, written borrowing gained importance. Words borrowed orally are usually short, and they undergo considerable changes in the act of adoption. Written borrowings preserve their spelling and some peculiarities of their sound form. Their adaptation is a long and laborious process.

Assimilation is the process of adjusting a word to the phonetic and lexico-grammatical norms of the language. We distinguish three main types of assimilation: phonetic, grammatical, and lexical. Phonetic assimilation is the process of adjusting the phonetic form of the borrowed word to the sound system of the recipient language. Grammatical assimilation is the conformation of a borrowed word to the morphological or grammatical standards of the receiving language. If a loan word is grammatically assimilated, it acquires (get) English paradigms and categories. Lexical assimilations are the conformation of a borrowed word to the lexico-semantic system of the recipient language. If a loan word participates in word-building according to the rules of the English language, we can say it's a lexical assimilated word.

In this research, we present the following classification of French borrowings in contemporary English: *phonological borrowings*, *prosodic borrowings*, *graphemic borrowings*, *morphemic borrowings* (transference of bound morphemes), *morphological borrowings* (transference of morphological patterns), *semantic borrowings* (transference of sememes), *lexical borrowings* (transference of lexemes), and *syntactic borrowings* (transference of syntactic rules).

About the Author:

Bila Ievgeniia Sergiivna, an Associate Professor of the English language Department, National University “Odesa Maritime Academy”, Ukraine. Field of interest: cognitive linguistics, onomastics, intercultural communication, psycholinguistics, methods of teaching foreign languages, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6101-501X>

Bondarenko Ievheniia Volodymyrivna, an Associate Professor of the English language Department, National University “Odesa Maritime Academy”, Ukraine. Currently she is interested in studying the formation of the professional competence of future navigators in the process of professional education. ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4802-2228>

Maslova Svitlana Yakivna, an Associate Professor of Philology Department, Odesa National Maritime University, Ukraine. Now is working on modern problems of linguistics and methods of teaching English. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0510-2789>

References

- Brinton, L.J. & Arnovick, L.K. (2006). *The English Language: A Linguistic History*. Oxford University Press.
- Capuz, J.G. (1997). Towards a Typological Classification of Linguistic Borrowing (Illustrated with Anglicisms in Romance Languages), *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 10, 81-94.
- Clyne, M. (1977). Intercultural Communication Breakdown and Communication Conflict: Towards a Linguistic Model and its Exemplification. In C. Molony, & H. Zoobl, & W. Stolting (eds.), *Deutsch im Kontakt mit anderen Sprachen / German in Contact with Other Languages*. Stolting. Kronberg: Scriptor, 129-46.
- Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkin, P. (2005). *The Oxford Guide to Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2002). *An Introduction to Language* (7th ed.). The United States of America: Thomson and Wadsworth.
- Graddol, D. (2000). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. United Kingdom: The English Company Ltd.
- Hock, H. & Brian D. J. (2009). *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hock, H. H. (1991). *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hughes, G. (2000). *A History of English Words*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Humbley, J. (1974). Vers une typologie de l'emprunt linguistique. *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 25, 46-70.
- Jespersen, O. (1964). *Language*. New York: Norton Library.
- McArthur, T. B. & McArthur, F. (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2005). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (7th ed.)
- Stražny, P. (ed.) (2005). *Encyclopedia of Linguistics, Volume 1*. New York, Oxon: Fitzroy Dearborn (An imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group).