

Cristiano Furiassi, Virginia Pulcini and Félix Rodríguez González, eds. 2012. *The Anglicization of European Lexis*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 356 pp. ISBN: 978 90 272 1195 8.

LUCÍA LOUREIRO-PORTO

Universitat de les Illes Balears

lucia.loureiro@uib.es

This volume contains a selection of papers presented at the seminar *The Anglicization of European Lexis*, held in Turin (Italy) in August 2010, as part of the 10th International ESSE Conference. As a comparative study of the Anglicization of European languages, it serves to fill a gap in the field opened up by Görlach's (2001) *Dictionary of European Anglicisms (DEA)*, which in fact inspires several of the works in the present volume. The work comprises an Introduction, written collectively by the editors, and fifteen papers classified in three sections: 'I) Exploring Anglicisms: Problems and Methods' (seven papers); 'II) English-induced Phraseology' (five papers); and 'III) Anglicisms in Specialized Discourse' (three papers).

The editors' Introduction constitutes a comprehensive review of the terminology used in the study of Anglicisms, and could itself be used as a manual for any course on lexicology, with no question left unanswered and with a plentiful supply of examples to illustrate each notion. In this opening chapter the authors summarize the factors that should be taken into account when conducting lexicological studies, the reasons for borrowing, and the possible hierarchies of borrowing. A section is also included in praise of the usefulness of corpora in lexicological studies, a methodological approach adopted by some of the contributors here. In the following paragraphs I briefly discuss each of the fifteen studies in the volume.

Section I, 'Exploring Anglicisms: Problems and Methods', with seven papers, is the largest in the volume. In the first study, Ian MacKenzie's 'Fair Play to them: Proficiency in English and Types of Borrowing', the reader might expect to find some correlation between different levels of proficiency and different types of borrowing. However, these expectations are only superficially dealt with in the chapter's conclusions, which are not based substantially on the findings presented in the paper, but are hypotheses for future studies. In fact, the main problem with this chapter is an apparent confusion of the terms *prediction* and *speculation*, which the author uses alternatively from the first paragraph (27). For predictions to be made and tested, a detailed, scientific corpus-based study might have accompanied this chapter.

An effective use of corpora is made in the second chapter, 'Proposing a Pragmatic Distinction for Lexical Anglicisms', by Esme Winter-Froemel and Alexander Onysko.

This paper investigates the different pragmatic interpretations of Anglicisms in German, taking Levinson's (2000) theory of presumptive meanings as a starting point. The authors manage to combine a critical review of the theoretical framework (rejecting terms such as 'necessary loan' and 'luxury loan' and opting for alternatives such as 'catachrestic' and 'non-catachrestic loan') with a thorough analysis of their corpus data, which allows them to propose a most interesting refinement of the theory: that the classification of Anglicisms as catachrestic and non-catachrestic must be considered a dynamic one. It is unfortunate, however, that the authors did not specify that such dynamism is unidirectional, since, according to their own data, non-catachrestic loans may become catachrestic ones, but the opposite development is not observed.

Marcus Callies, Alexander Onysko and Eva Ogiermann's 'Investigating Gender Variation of English Loanwords in German' combines a corpus-based methodology with the analysis of a survey of German speakers, with the aim of exploring the assignment of grammatical gender to Anglicisms in German. The main conclusions are: a) surveys allow for the observation of much more variation than newspaper-based corpora do, in that the latter are usually constrained by editorial systematizing decisions, and b) there seems to be a divide between the southern German-speaking regions and the north and central areas. From a methodological perspective, the paper is impeccable and the reader is left with only one question: why did the authors choose to distribute the surveys only to German learners of English, when they claim that "knowledge of the meaning of a certain word in English could affect and even override criteria such as geographic origin" (73)?

The fourth chapter, 'The Collection of Anglicisms. Methodological Issues in Connection with Impact Studies in Norway', by Anne-Line Graedler, asks a number of questions regarding the methodological problems that arise when retrieving Anglicisms from Norwegian corpora. These include problems related to the identification of Anglicisms, the empirical data to be used, and the statistical treatment of the data extracted. Such questions are very relevant, but few answers are given, especially in the section devoted to statistical data. The article might serve as an introduction to Anglicisms in Norwegian, since it constitutes a good review of the work in this area. Nevertheless, the presence of this chapter in what seems to be the methodological section of the book is not entirely justified.

Chapter 5, 'Semi-automatic Approaches to Anglicism Detection in Norwegian Corpus Data', by Gisle Andersen, is an excellent article in several ways. Not only is the topic currently of great relevance, but Andersen's study has been conducted in a highly scientific manner, considering many different approaches to automation and justifying all decisions made. The usefulness of automatic approaches is manifest, in that they save the researcher considerable time; yet the author also describes the advantages of automatic searches in addressing concrete linguistic issues, in this case the emergence of alarmist sentiments with regard to the threat to Norwegian posed by the constant entry of Anglicisms into the language, a threat which the author elegantly minimizes by claiming that the scarcity of data in early studies may have led to impressionistic and inaccurate conclusions (11).

To round off a very stimulating chapter, Andersen provides many sound suggestions for improvements in automated searches.

The next contribution, Tvrtko Prčić's 'Lexicographic Description of Recent Anglicisms in Serbian: The Project and Its Results', reports on the compiling of a dictionary of recent Anglicisms in Serbian (published in 2001) and the results of this after a decade. Prčić, one of the authors of the dictionary, reviews the different problems faced by lexicographers in its production, which makes the contribution a highly useful guide for anyone embarking on a similar project in another language. It is an honest assessment of a collective work in which the author does not hesitate to include self-critical observations and judgments. My only concern regarding this study is that, although the authors of the dictionary claim to have included only Anglicisms with "some degree of integration" (135, 136), the way in which such a degree is measured is not clarified.

The last chapter of Section I is 'Anglicisms in Armenian. Processes of Adaptation', by Anahit Galstyan. The degree of integration of Anglicisms (referred to as 'domestication') is the main issue in this paper, which includes sections on each level of linguistic analysis: phonetic, graphemic, grammatical and semantic integration. The chapter is very clearly written and provides excellent guidance for the reader unacquainted with the Armenian language. However, I feel that refinements could have been made in three areas. Firstly, 'semantic integration' remains an underdefined label. Secondly, the exact source of the data is not explained clearly; only a quantitative, corpus-based study would allow for conclusions such as "most loanwords have remained monosemantic" (165). Finally, even though different levels of analysis are considered as a means of determining the degree of integration of Anglicisms in Armenian, no comprehensive index is provided to allow the reader to assess the different degrees of integration undergone by each loanword.

Section II, 'English-induced Phraseology', contains five papers. The first of these is 'Phraseology in Flux. Danish Anglicisms Beneath the Surface', by Henrik Gottlieb. This is an excellent example of a well-conducted piece of research, the perfectly-woven combination of bibliographical review and analysis of corpus-data allowing the author to succeed in the dual aim of identifying the types of English-based phraseological calques, and of determining whether these are preferred over their equivalent Danish expressions. The author also concludes with some suggestive remarks on the role played by corpus-based analysis in lexicological studies, observing that the linguist's intuition, when checked against corpus-data, often proves to have been biased.

The following chapter, by Ramón Martí Solano, "Multi-word Loan Translations and Semantic Borrowings from English in French Journalistic Discourse", includes a comparison of the phraseological units found in *Frantext*, the largest French corpus, and in a corpus consisting of the weekly issues of *Le Nouvel Observateur* (*LNO*) over a ten-year period, compiled by the author. His main conclusions are: (1) that mass media resort to English-based loan translations and semantic borrowings to a higher degree than other registers, and (2) that these phrases exhibit different degrees of integration in French. Concerning the former conclusion, no quantitative information about the

specific characteristics of the *LNO* corpus is provided (number of words, etc.), which makes the comparison with *Frantext* appear to be speculative. The latter conclusion is actually expected, and the reader might have appreciated a discussion of the relevant implications of this fact.

José Luis Oncins-Martínez's 'Newly-coined Anglicisms in Contemporary Spanish: A Corpus-based Approach' is an excellent example of the kind of research that can be carried out with the help of corpora. With the aim of assessing the usefulness of two Spanish corpora (*CORDE*, diachronic, and *CREA*, synchronic) for lexicological studies, the author studies four semantic Anglicisms and four loan translations. After a rigorous analysis of the data, he concludes that these corpora are indeed good resources for this sort of study. At the same time, every question that the reader might reasonably have regarding the eight Anglicisms under analysis is answered with scientific rigour, including queries on the normalized frequencies of the Anglicisms or their diachronic distribution and regional variation, among others.

The next chapter is Sabine Fiedler's '*Der Elefant im Raum... The Influence of English on German Phraseology*'. In line with the previous paper, the author scrutinizes corpora with the aim of identifying phraseological units, divided into borrowings and loan translations. She resorts to four clear and sound criteria to identify a given phraseological unit as an Anglicism, although no solid conclusions seem to have been reached, since the lack of information regarding the features of the diachronic corpus (number of words, etc.) does not allow for a reliable diachronic description of the phraseological units. In addition, following the descriptive sections, the author hypothesizes as to the relationship between linguistic borrowings and cultural borrowings, trying to answer the familiar question of whether Anglicisms constitute a threat to German. There is no doubt that these reflections may inspire further research, but they do not constitute conclusions as such, in that the author merely provides speculative explanations about the alleged intentions of speakers.

The final contribution to section II is 'English Influence on Polish Proverbial Language', by Agata Rozumko. The author provides a detailed description of ten proverbs, based on the data drawn from three Polish corpora as well as from the World Wide Web (in accordance with Wierzbicka 2010). The use of the latter, of course, does not allow for a quantitative approach to the proverbs, but it does help the author illustrate the metalinguistic tags used to introduce them and the main contexts in which they are found. Rozumko also comments on the possible reasons as to why so many English proverbs have been borrowed into Polish, tentatively concluding that they are a result of the influence of the popular and philosophical Anglo-American culture. Her reflections, which are of great value from a cultural perspective, will surely inspire researchers interested in the history of proverbs.

Section III, 'Anglicisms in Specialized Discourse', contains just three papers. The first of these is 'English Direct Loans in European Football Lexis', by Gunnar Bergh and Sölve Ohlander, and contains information regarding 25 English football terms in 16 European

languages (including Germanic, Romance and Slavic languages, as well as a miscellaneous class). The data are extracted from *DEA* (Görlach 2001) and ranked according to two criteria: the expansion of the Anglicisms in the 16 languages, and the propensity of each language to accept these direct loans. The authors conclude that two factors are responsible for the main findings: a) linguistic similarity (i.e. a short typological distance), and b) the socio-cultural attitudes of speakers towards the acquisition of direct loans. The interest of this chapter is probably more societal than linguistic in nature, and the authors acknowledge that their ideas should be studied in far greater detail.

Paola Gaudio's 'Incorporation Degrees of Selected Economics-related Anglicisms in Italian' follows. The author has compiled her own corpus from issues of the *Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU)* in their English and Italian versions, amounting to 10 million words. With the help of *WordSmith Tools*, she isolates eighty economics-related Anglicisms and classifies them as, (1) non-incorporated, (2) semi-incorporated, and (3) fully-incorporated Anglicisms, beginning with the hypothesis that the context of use and the frequency of the Anglicism determines its degree of integration. This paper constitutes a very honest and creative piece of research, with sound implications for contemporary society.

The last paper in the section and in the volume is Sabrina Fusari's 'Anglicisms in the Discourse of Alitalia's Bailout in the Italian Press'. This is also a very contemporary topic, and once again the author compiles her own corpus, based on articles from two Italian newspapers, *Corriere della Sera* and *La Repubblica*, with the aim of determining the role played by Anglicisms and false Anglicisms in the transparency of the information provided. She concludes that the meaning of some operations was obscured by the use of unknown Anglicisms and the bad quality of the translation of others. The author relies on the often-stated idea that this use of new Anglicisms is a euphemistic way of biasing the language of the news (e.g. Fairclough 2006). She is, however, very cautious in her conclusions and says that it is not possible to determine whether this attempt to obscure language is made intentionally or is unconscious. The article is highly relevant within the literature on critical discourse analysis.

All in all, the editorial work underlying this volume is remarkable, as seen in the almost encyclopedic introduction as well as the ascription of papers to each of the sections. Furthermore, the edition is extremely tidy (I have not identified one single typo!). Some of the papers are very relevant and illuminating from a linguistic perspective, while others appear to be more valuable from a social or cultural angle. I should also point out that the critique offered in these lines is based on the assumption that the book's readership is expected to have a linguistic background and to be familiar with specific methodologies. Notwithstanding any comments on individual chapters, all the papers here have something to contribute to different research fields, particularly popular culture. From this perspective, the book can be considered as a solid interdisciplinary bridge between cultural and linguistic studies. It certainly sheds considerable light on the study of Anglicisms in European languages and will greatly engage future researchers.

WORKS CITED

- FAIRCLOUGH, Norman 2006: *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- GÖRLACH, Manfred, ed. 2001: *Dictionary of European Anglicisms (DEA)*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- LEVINSON, Stephen C. 2000: *Presumptive Meanings. The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- WIERZBICKA, Anna 2010: *Experience, Evidence, and Sense. The Hidden Cultural Legacy of English*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Received 26 February 2013

Accepted 8 April 2013

Lucía Loureiro-Porto is Lecturer in English Linguistics at the University of the Balearic Islands (Spain). Her main research interests are the study of grammaticalization processes in the history of English, English historical syntax and semantics, and sociolinguistic variation from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. She is currently involved in a project on the study of grammatical variation in World Englishes.

Address: Departament de Filologia Espanyola, Moderna i Clàssica. Edifici Ramon Llull. Campus UIB. Ctra. de Valldemossa km 7.5. 07122, Palma de Mallorca, Spain. Tel.: +34 971 259763. Fax: +34 971 173473.