Chapter 14

Conclusion: Features of Borrowing from English in 12 Languages

JUDITH ROSENHOUSE and ROTEM KOWNER

This volume was conceived to study the determinants of and motives for contemporary lexical borrowing from English, the world’s lingua franca, which since the second half of the 20th century has been playing an increasingly vital role in global politics, economy and culture and enjoys exceptionally high prestige. The foregoing chapters analysed the penetration of English loan words, mainly from American English, in 12 languages representing a wide variety of language families, political systems, economic developmental stages and historical relations with the English language and the Anglo-American world. In all of the countries under discussion (except for India to some extent), English remains a foreign language and does not enter the informal realm of full usage in private life, although it exerts an influence in the sphere of borrowed lexicon and is used to various degrees in codeswitching.

The process of borrowing words from English can be considered at least from two viewpoints: a psycholinguistic angle, reflecting the needs of individuals, and a sociolinguistic angle, reflecting the needs of communities. Personal attitudes to English vocabulary are among the psycholinguistic factors that affect and modify the individual’s motivation for or against borrowing from it, whereas communal attitudes represent sociolinguistic aspects of language development through borrowing. Both are affected by linguistic and non-linguistic factors. Linguistic factors include all the structural elements of the examined languages, that is, elements and linguistic rules which are similar to or differ from the English ones. Non-linguistic factors, such as those related to economics and politics, exert their influence in various manners, according to the specific political and social structures in each language community.

Each language has its own seasoning of the above ingredients, including a unique history and contacts with a particular set of foreign
languages. In Ch. 1 we divided these needs into three classes of elements that form the borrowing phenomenon: motives, determinants and media. In the languages portrayed in this volume, three motives for borrowing keep recurring: the need to coin new terminology and concepts, the tendency to emulate a dominant group and the tendency to create a special jargon in closed groups. These motives can hardly be isolated from the primary determinants necessary when borrowing is to occur: modernisation and economic development, prestige, ethnic and linguistic diversity, nationalism, cultural threat, national character, and the existence of regulatory linguistic establishments. We regard these motives and determinants as representing the (above-mentioned) basic dichotomy of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics, thus moulding the structure and development of languages. These motives and determinants form our model for contemporary borrowing from English. The actual spread of English loan words in the absorbing languages has been found to proceed by three major routes: direct communication, mass media and the education system. All these routes can be also considered within the psycholinguistic–sociolinguistic dichotomy, and thus complement the model.

The Main Motives and Determinants of Lexical Borrowing

This study indicates that one of the primary determinants of borrowing English loan words, as well as a major source of variability in our sample, is ethnic and linguistic diversity. Several of the 12 countries examined, such as Russia, Hungary, France, the Netherlands, Japan and Iceland, were traditionally composed of relatively homogeneous populations, at least linguistically; other countries are more heterogeneous in these respects (e.g. India, Ethiopia, Iran, Taiwan and Israel). This division has become more complex since the beginning of the 20th century, as even countries with basically homogeneous populations have witnessed increasing influxes of immigrants from different parts of the world. Thus, the prediction that greater heterogeneity will lead to greater use of English and its loan words is more or less relevant for all the languages we studied.

However, the political and ideological background which exists in various countries is apparently more effective than simply the population make-up of a country as to borrowing from English. In Iran, for example, the strongly negative attitude to the USA entailed official cessation of teaching and learning that country’s language and disallowed the use of its vocabulary in borrowings, for a certain period. This
fact goes hand in hand with the reverse prediction (see prediction C10 in Chapter 1) that the weaker the nationalist beliefs and policies, and the weaker the cultural threat to the absorbing language (prediction C11 in Chapter 1), the greater the propensity to borrow English loan words. Moreover, the stronger the national government, the less democratic the regime, and the more obedient the population (predictions C12, C13 and C14 in Chapter 1), as we see in Taiwan, Iran and Ethiopia, as well as in Soviet Russia, the easier it is for the official government to sway the population towards or against English borrowings. We also found that when a country is in conflict with some part of the Anglophone world or becomes connected to another cultural power it tends to avoid lexical borrowing from English, despite its high prestige. As examples of such processes we consider Japan in the 1930s, Hungary during the cold war and Ethiopia during the military regime at the end of the 20th century.

The linguistic control exercised by language academies and other institutions is often ambiguous. On the one hand academies compete with English borrowings by coining new lexical items in their languages, but on the other they accept and ratify the use of various English borrowings or deliberately adapt them to their languages. This activity, nonetheless, lags far behind the penetration of English borrowings into communication within the absorbing language community. Language academies and educational systems are the formal institutions concerned with English borrowings either as part of their official task (the academies) or as by-products of their official educational activities (schools). Some of these academies are more strict and influential (or ‘successful’) than others, as indicated in Figure 14.1. In countries where language academies exist, the attitude to borrowing from English is usually rather negative. Not all the language communities have language academies, however. Such countries may have some other official or semi-official institutes to deal with this issue (e.g. Iceland, Hungary, Japan and Taiwan in our sample).

Being the most organised agent for this task, educational institutions, from elementary schools to high schools and universities, are often the most important agent for the dissemination of the English language throughout the world, at least as a foreign language. All the countries studied in our volume teach English as a foreign or second language, although they diverge in the quantity and quality of this effort. Some language communities started teaching English at school only relatively recently, e.g. Hungary, Russia and Ethiopia. Some have fluctuated along the years between various foreign languages due to the social and
political situation, e.g. Taiwan, Japan, Iran and Ethiopia. Yet in certain countries, such as the Netherlands, India, and even Israel, English has long been treated at least as a second language, whether officially or not. A common denominator among countries where English was not taught in the 20th century, such as Russia, Hungary, Ethiopia and Iran, is their more complicated economic situation, usually involving lower gross national product (GNP) as well as a lesser level of democratic rights.

As implied in Chapter 1, some of the determinants we and others (e.g. Fishman, 1996b; Rubal-Lopez, 1996) have proposed are perhaps confusing and their effect is complex. Not every parameter which relates to borrowing is necessarily also a determinant. The parameter of GNP per capita, for example, is linked to lexical borrowing in a complex way. Countries still at a low stage of modernisation, and consequently with low GNP per capita, have a greater need for lexical borrowing to facilitate modernisation. By contrast, countries with high GNP per capita usually enjoy a relatively higher stage of modernisation, and often have a capitalist economy and high degree of democratic rights. Nevertheless, these very traits correlate with various factors that enhance borrowing from English, such as open borders, frequent travel abroad, access to mass communication and high consumption of the products and popular culture of Anglophone countries. Although the former case concerns the need to borrow and the latter actual inclination, GNP is clearly not a direct determinant of lexical borrowing (and is therefore not on our list) but might moderate it. Similarly, the prevalence of high education tends to encourage lexical borrowing as it is often associated with broader lexical needs and greater use of English-laden jargon. Nonetheless, in certain political circumstances high education may stimulate purism (e.g. Iran, prewar Japan), as such a tendency requires an educated, albeit reactionary, elite. Education in itself is not sufficient to enhance borrowing from English, however. The combination of generally high education in a community with a high GNP tends to intensify linguistic borrowing because of the easy access to English, greater needs for additional vocabulary and the mere fact that high GNP is related, at least at present, to strong economic, cultural and political contacts with the Anglophone world. This picture can be seen in the case of Japan, Taiwan Chinese, Dutch, French and Israeli Hebrew.

The role of schools in influencing speakers’ language habits should not be underestimated. One facet of this role was demonstrated in Poplack and Sankoff’s (1984) study of Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican students. Tested in naming familiar pictures of objects typical of the American cultural milieu, these students displayed several phenomena
of Anglicisation in their speech. These phenomena were more stable and much stronger than the same features in the speech of their parents. These findings also imply that the integration of these students in the English-speaking American environment (including both its language and its culture) was faster and deeper than that of their parents (see also González, 2001). Such a state can, in due course, lead individuals (and later on, even the whole community) to desert their first language (the classical three-generation state of immigrants’ language). Critically, this picture is relevant for our study of lexical borrowings from English to other languages, since in this age of literacy and increased schooling, generations of semi-bilingual and bilingual students learn this language all over the world.

The means of dissemination of English borrowings have proved to be of the same nature in all the language communities studied here: following school education, the first and foremost are the mass media, which developed immensely in the 20th century. These media include the written, the visual and the audio devices of newspapers, radio, cinema, TV, and most recently the computer, principally the Internet. The great scope of contact with English language and culture through all these means indeed creates for speakers the opportunity to learn and use English, and to borrow from it. The processes and basic factors that enhance lexical borrowing from English are common to the 12 languages studied above. In the following sections we elaborate on the findings of the chapters of this book. We examine, summarise and discuss the major common phenomena of borrowing English loan words and the differences between languages in borrowing from English in the setting of the above main motives and determinants.

**Major Common Phenomena of English Borrowings**

The major common phenomena of English borrowings are not new in terms of the literature on this subject. The lexical items borrowed from English by another language refer to objects, concepts and terms originating from mainly two English-speaking countries: the USA and Great Britain. For this process to start, at a certain stage at least some contact had to take place between one or more of the Anglophone countries or their speakers and the other social, political or national entity (community, ethnic or linguistic group, country). The process of borrowing from English does not differ in principle from the process of lexical transfer from any source language to any other recipient language (and see Thomason & Kaufman, 1988: Ch. 4). Usually, borrowing
Involves phonetic and morphological modifications of the borrowed word as part of its adaptation to the receiving language system. An example of such a process is adding prosthetic, epenthetic or paragogue vowels to 'open' closed foreign syllables, as in ʾismanto for 'cement' in Colloquial Arabic, lincoln for 'Abraham Lincoln' in Colloquial Hebrew, and Japanese raisu for English 'rice'. Later on, or sometimes even simultaneously, it may be fully integrated in the phonology of the recipient language. Such processes have been described extensively in earlier literature on borrowing (e.g. Suleiman, 1985) and contact languages (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988).

The absence of phonetic adaptation or 'nativisation' of a borrowed word to the phonetic system of the receiving language (e.g. in the pronunciation of the English /r/) may indicate that the recipient language community is undergoing a stage of imitating the phonological system of the source language community's culture with its language. This may be due to self-denial, snobbishness, cultural admiration of any external expression of English culture, etc. (see in Chapter 1). Absence of phonetic adaptation may lead in the long run to changes in the phonological (phonemic) system of the absorbing language, as seen, for example, in the emergence of the new consonants /p/, /v/, /g/ in many colloquial Arabic dialects, and the addition of new sounds and letters (e.g. /di/, /ți/, /ți/) in the katakana script in Japanese. Phonological word length (number of syllables in a word) is a common psycholinguistic factor in borrowing, as short words tend to be borrowed more than long words due to the ease of perceiving and producing them. This is probably one of the incentives to borrow English words, with their short and often mono- or bisyllabic (Germanic) words; e.g. Hebrew lehitra'ot for English 'see you' or 'bye bye', or French fin de semaine for English 'weekend'.

Lexical borrowing is not limited to the spoken modality of a language but is usually also integrated into the written mode of the absorbing language. Sometimes this fact increases the discrepancies between spelling and pronunciation, which normally develop independently. The writing system of the recipient language may be inadequate for the structure and phonology of the borrowed word; in such cases, the alphabet of the recipient language may be spontaneously (or ad hoc) adapted to the borrowed words. This has been found to be common to Taiwan Chinese, Japanese, Modern Hebrew and Arabic in our language sample, as their alphabets differ from the English Latin-based alphabet. An additional feature is the absorption of the borrowed word with its English spelling and pronunciation, although the English spelling rules
differ from those of the recipient language. This leads to ambivalent letters and pronouncing manners. For example, the Hungarian letter ‘c’ is normally pronounced in Hungarian as the affricate /ts/ (e.g. ‘citrom’ /tsitrom/ ‘lemon, citrus’). But in words borrowed from English, the pronunciation of this letter ‘c’ is /k/ or /s/ in different environments, e.g. aktimel ‘Actimel’, the commercial name of a yoghurt type, and siti ‘city’ leading to three different ways of pronunciation of this letter (for more examples in Hungarian, see Chapter 5 in this volume).

Another common feature of English loan words in the present study is that not all of them refer to completely new ideas or objects in the absorbing language, but may refer to familiar elements. In such cases the borrowings may be used as synonyms of original words at least for a certain period or for some of the contexts they are used in. This situation creates semantic doublets, which often split into different semantic domains. Doublets can be also formed in the recipient language when new lexemes are coined in it (often by the official language institutions) to refer to newly introduced notions. Doublets may survive side by side for some time, but if they do not split semantically, generally one of them gets the upper hand and is used more frequently, while the other becomes redundant and may fall entirely out of use (see examples in the chapters on Russian, Hebrew and Icelandic above).

The English loan words reported in this book (as in other references) are mainly nouns, whereas borrowed verbs or adjectives are fewer. At a still lower rate of borrowing we find adverbials, particles and vocatives. Because of the type/token contrast this classification does not reflect the frequency of use of each of these word classes, although nouns in general are definitely the most frequently used word class. Many borrowed particles and vocatives often replace those of the absorbing language due to discourse (pragmatics) preferences, for instance, ‘OK’ or ‘hi’, so often used in many of the studied languages. In addition, borrowed phrases, idioms and whole sentences, not discussed in this volume, may contain all the mentioned parts of speech (e.g. ‘just a minute’, ‘see you’ or ‘good afternoon’).

Lexically speaking, many of the modern electrical appliances and communication devices that became widespread before and soon after World War II in North America and subsequently in Western Europe are among the most popular borrowings in all the languages studied here. Words taken from the computer or business world are often used in their original form (e.g. Arabic disk is English ‘disk’), as stems for morphologically adapted words in the absorbing language (e.g. Hungarian brainstormingoltunk means ‘we had a brainstorming session/activity’
where ‘brainstorming’ has become a verb by attaching to it the proper suffixes) or as loan translations (e.g. Icelandic stöð ‘station’ means both the physical location and the establishment of a radio or television broadcasting).

Although the English lexicon is huge and deals with hundreds of thousands of concepts and lexical items, which enlarges the range of borrowing domains, the borrowing process appears to be discriminatory. Most of the borrowed words can be classified at present into two domains: the professional realm of economics, science and technology, and the realm of personal needs, including culture, entertainment and material products. Consequently, these domains can also be generalised into macro- (i.e. social, communal, state) and micro- (i.e. personal, individual) categories, parallel to the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic fields discussed above.

The use of English loan words in all the studied languages relates to academic, industrial, communicational and entertainment areas. As noted, however, languages vary in the pace of lexeme borrowing in each area, usually in parallel with their economic and cultural stages: the more developed they are economically and technologically, the more English borrowings their languages use. In fact this tendency may be attributed to modernisation and Westernisation more than to pure economics. The example of Iran is illuminating. Although Farsi has absorbed mainly technological, scientific and specific recreational terms (borrowed during the Shah’s rule in the first half of the 20th century), it has borrowed less ‘popular’ loan words since the recent rise of the Islamic Republic. This borrowing pattern can be explained by the clash that Farsi speakers face between their ideological stance and the English language, its speakers and what they symbolise in the modern world.

**Differences in Borrowing from English in the Studied Languages**

Our 12 case studies share many features in their borrowing from present-day English, but they display some conspicuous differences too. Figure 14.1 summarises and compares four features of borrowing from English as revealed in the sample of languages studied in this volume. These features are: Need, Tendency, Institutional Control and Attitude to Borrowing (defined in Chapter 1 in this volume). Let us recall them briefly: ‘Need’ describes the need for new terms from English due to the sociopolitical, economic and cultural state of the language community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Tendency</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
<th>Attitude to Borrowing</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (Mainly indifferent, positive, officially against)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (Relatively positive, pro-; weak objection)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (Officially: against, non-formally: indifferent)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (Indifferent, enhancing but officially also against)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (Officially: indifferent non-formally: positive)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (Officially: enhancing, non-formally: indifferent)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (Positive, but officially: against)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5 (Officially: against, but non-formally: indifferent)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5 (Officially: against, but non-formally: indifferent)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (Indifferent, enhancing, not against)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese (Min)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (Positive, enhancing, not against)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (Positive, enhancing; officially not against)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Need**: describes the need for new terms from English (small-medium-great)

**Tendency**: describes the tendency for spontaneous borrowing from English (small-medium-great)

**Institutional Control**: effects of a state academy of language where it exists (small-medium-great)

**Attitude to Borrowing**: describes official/non-official attitude to borrowing in speakers of the language (without numerical evaluation)

**Figure 14.1** The 12 case studies and their propensity for borrowing English vocabulary (the higher the score the greater the propensity)

It refers to the lexical gap between the existing vocabulary of a language and the incoming English vocabulary. ‘Tendency’ is related to the individual and/or communal inclination towards or aversion to another language (here: English) due to the human tendency to emulate prestigious elements of a dominant group. ‘Institutional Control’ means the presence or absence of a general language policy practised by some kind of an official language institution, one role of which is to control
borrowing. Finally, ‘Attitude to Borrowing’ refers to the recipient language speakers’ official and non-official attitudes to borrowing lexical items as a result of sociopolitical, economic and cultural conditions (as already described in Weinreich, 1953).

As there are no specific statistical indices or figures available for these features, we assessed their functions using three levels (little – medium – much). These criteria are thus relative (and cf. the borrowing scale in Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). We assigned to each feature (including both official and non-official aspects) the same three-point scale, and the number in each slot of Figure 14.1 stands for the average of the two (official/non-official) aspects.

When comparing the 12 languages examined in this study (see Figures 14.1 and 14.2), we see two extreme attitudes to lexical borrowing from English. On the one hand, French, with the lowest score of six points, seems to be the least receptive, and on the other hand, Japanese and Chinese in Taiwan, with the highest score of eleven points, seem to be the most receptive to such borrowing. The French case seems fairly straightforward. The French Academy has traditionally regulated a rigid language policy and an independent, well developed modern vocabulary for modern English terminology; in parallel, French speakers have tended to display conservative and nationalistic attitudes regarding their language. By contrast, Japanese and Chinese in Taiwan are affected by different factors. Although the political circumstances, historical background (especially in the 20th century) and the attitude to the West in the two language communities are different, both languages share fundamental and deep propensity from modernisation and Westernisation.

Arabic and Farsi (Iranian) form another subgroup of limited reception to English loan words with 7.5 points. Although these languages belong to different language groups, they share certain historical and social similarities which play an important role in shaping their attitude to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Number of Case Studies</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan Chinese, Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icelandic, Hungarian, Hebrew, Russian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch and Indian languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic, Persian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 14.2* Propensity for borrowing English vocabulary – ranking order
lexical borrowing, particularly from English. Close to them is Amharic with eight points. The expansion of this language has also been crucially affected by politics and social development that in turn affected lexical borrowing. Based on the other chapters in this volume, Dutch and Indian languages form another subgroup, each with nine aggregate points, though each language reflects a different internal array of factors. Dutch speakers have been in contact with the English language and its speakers for longer periods than speakers of other languages, and they generally display a positive attitude to it. The described case of India reveals a special language policy which considers English an official agent for educational and government needs, which additionally goes hand in hand with the speakers’ daily communication needs. Thus, for Indian and Dutch speakers, perhaps unexpectedly, English is psychologically probably not as foreign as elsewhere, as they seem to accept it as part of their daily multiglossia. Four other languages (Hebrew, Hungarian, Icelandic and Russian) reveal a much more intense need for and tendency to borrowing, with ten points each.

The attitude that each linguistic community manifests to borrowing in general is significant for its borrowing tendency from English in particular. This attitude varies on a scale beginning with indifference in the lay public and ending in support by the educated and academic circles, including official institutions. Where the linguistic institutions are strong, their policies tend to conflict with public indifference to the whole issue of borrowing and loan words and the academics’ succumbing to the borrowing process. French, on the one extreme of the continuum, has a vigorous, influential and respected language academy, and its population evinces robust linguistic awareness and sensitivity, shaped in part by the activities of that academy. These features notwithstanding, Chapter 3 in this volume demonstrates that English borrowings penetrate French freely nowadays. The public attitude to English varies, and ideologically at least it tends more to the negative than to the positive. Still, English borrowings have penetrated French relatively freely, at least since the last quarter of the 20th century (for a somewhat similar situation, see also the cases of Iceland, Iran and Israel).

The case of Hungarian is different. After a long period of German cultural and linguistic impact during the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Hungarian was only little affected through much of the 20th century by Russian, due to the Russian control. Since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989, English has been rapidly and increasingly gaining a foothold in this language, not only through school education but also in daily communication (mainly on the Internet and in written ads on billboards,
newspapers, products, etc.). Hungarian and Russian are only partially similar in respect of the effect of English on them: both were weakly influenced by English before the 20th century, and old borrowings (from the 18th and 19th centuries) have long been absorbed and integrated into them, while new borrowings are still on the way to such integration, with Hungarian having probably started this process somewhat more energetically than Russian. Also Japanese and Taiwan Chinese had alternating periods of official enhancement and inhibition of the spread of English influence, according to fluctuating government policies.

In light of the analysis above, the differences are evident not so much in the processes these words undergo as in the quantity and tempo of the borrowing process in each individual language, as well as the actual selection of the lexical items borrowed from English and their fate in the borrowing language. By quantity (or rate) we mean the total number (and relative share) of borrowed words in the recipient language; by tempo we refer to the time it takes for each loan word to be integrated in these languages. The combination of quantity, tempo and selection creates the specific borrowed vocabulary of each of the languages we have studied. The case studies presented in this volume suggest that there is a great variation in these aspects not only between languages, but also within each language. That is, the borrowing process within a language is not uniform and may differ in quantity and tempo throughout time, as the circumstances and attitudes vis-à-vis borrowing from English may change, sometimes even dramatically.

These features of the borrowing process are partly dependent on extralinguistic factors, such as the availability of English words to the borrowing speakers, due to factors which include the duration of English learning at school; the frequency in which the speakers read English books and journals, watch English-speaking movies or TV, or form contacts on the Internet; the quantity of products of English-speaking origins they encounter in their surroundings, etc. Thus, countries that have only recently become acquainted with the English language and its culture have been able to borrow fewer items from it than countries where English has accompanied or competed with the national language for a longer time. Our case studies suggest that Russian, Hungarian and Amharic, for example, differ from Dutch or even from Israeli Hebrew in this respect. Further, the languages of Japan and Taiwan China, where speakers of American English had close contacts with the local population for several years (with or without the support of the local government), show a torrent of borrowings from English, although the tempo of the borrowing process fluctuates in different periods due to
governmental control of these relations with English. The vocabulary for certain basic consumer items used daily, such as imported garments, foods and beverages, and home appliances, is usually borrowed according to the habits and needs of the recipient language community. Climate, eating customs and accommodation habits are extralinguistic factors that distinguish different language communities and affect the lexical items borrowed in each language and language community, as unnecessary objects will tend not to be borrowed quickly, if at all.

The quantity and tempo of borrowing depend also on psycholinguistic and linguistic features, such as the semantics (relevance and importance) of the borrowed lexical items for the speakers of the absorbing language and the relation between the phonological and morphological structures of English and the recipient language. For important words, the lack of certain phonemes and differences in articulation of similar phonemes in the absorbing language compared with English does not prevent speakers of the recipient language from using those words. But this often follows morphophonological adaptation, which varies according to the rules in each language. For example, the difficulty of pronouncing English /l/ and /r/ by native Japanese and Chinese speakers, /p/ by native Arabic speakers, /w/ by native Russian speakers, as well as /h/ by Chinese and French, leads to the creation of easily pronounced versions of the English words in the recipient language. Hence, the morphophonological or phonotactic rules of the English loan words which differ from those of the recipient language lead to various strategies of morphophonological adaptation of words; examples are xipi for ‘hippy’, e-ka for ‘e-card’, sha-la for ‘salad’ or ma-da for ‘motor’ in Taiwan Chinese. (For an analysis of consonant cluster reduction in several English varieties see Schreier, 2005.)

Moreover, the actual modifications of the original English item in the recipient language vary according to the structure of that language and yield different forms in different languages. An illustration is the variety of the following adaptations, translations and coined words for English ‘helicopter’ which may be used as a loan word, too: Hebrew masoq (from the root n-s-q meaning ‘ascend, levitate’), Arabic mirwaha (derived from the root r-w-h ‘wind’) and Farsi bal-gard (derived from ‘wing + circulate’, operate in circles, which is an accurate loan translation of the English term). The terms for English ‘battery’ are another example: in addition to the English form in some adaptations (e.g. Hebrew bateriya, Hungarian bateria), Hebrew solelā (lit. a mound, an embankment), Hungarian vilanyelem (lit. electronic element), Literary Arabic haṣida (lit. filler) and Colloquial Arabic batiṯa (lit. battery, Farsi batri, and Japanese denchi (lit.
electrical pond, but see also batteri cha-ja for ‘battery charger’ and batteri kōitsu for ‘battery efficiency’).

To sum up this section, our considerations are set out in Figures 14.3 and 14.4, which present the main factors and processes of English loanword integration as found in our study. They also show the stages involved in this process. It starts with psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors on the one hand and non-linguistic (extralinguistic) and linguistic factors on the other. The various factors can lead to several outcomes, as shown at the end of Figure 14.4. Some illustrative examples are mentioned in Figure 14.3. As noted, the actual outcomes depend on the specific conditions in each receiving language and in this sense they are unpredictable. We actually view the whole process as leading to four possible results, which may occur diachronically, and in varying distributions, in different languages: some languages may present only a limited number of borrowing processes, while others may pass all the four stages. The last stage (full integration) may be reached in some borrowed words of a certain language more quickly than in other words. These four stages engender many combinations of borrowings in the different languages, as indeed we find in the real world. One contribution of our volume is in organising these combinations in a coherent structure of sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors, parameters and devices within the scope of time and linguistic space.

Invasion or Enrichment: Attitudes to English Loan words and Language Growth

Each of the languages discussed in this volume has a unique historical, cultural and economic background. Nonetheless, they all share rapid expansion in the 20th century. Most of them had to take long strides in order to reach their current economic, technological and cultural state. Even Dutch, which is the closest to English genetically and has had many contacts with the English language and people long before the 20th century, has undergone linguistic and sociolinguistic processes not unlike those in other languages.

The attitude to borrowing seems to differ in each language community but the underlying motives are similar. Speakers’ attitudes to the English ‘borrowing invasion’ lie between two poles: wariness and ideology (‘How will this language affect and change the purity of my own language?’) and instrumental interest (‘How important is this language for me in work, business, fun and leisure?’). They are moved by the desire to acquire it as a global tool of communication, and if not master it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociolinguistic factors</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Psycholinguistic factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-linguistic factors</strong></td>
<td>Politics, Economics, Culture</td>
<td>War, peace, conquests, etc. Trade, import/export, value Social morals, High culture: arts, literature, literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic factors</strong></td>
<td>Related language, Non-related language</td>
<td>Easy word integration, Difficult word integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motives &amp; determinants</strong></td>
<td>Status and prestige in community, tendency to emulate a dominant group, tendency to create a special jargon in closed groups, modernization and economic development, ethnic and linguistic diversity, nationalism, national character, cultural threat, existence of regulatory linguistic establishments</td>
<td>Need to coin new terminology and concepts, tendency to create a special jargon in closed groups, ethnic and linguistic diversity, the existence of regulatory linguistic establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact point: English → Language X/ Sociolinguistic factors</strong></td>
<td>Education, Media, Direct Communication</td>
<td>School, higher education, adult courses, etc. newspapers, radio, TV, cinema, Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result: stages of Linguistic borrowing</strong></td>
<td>1. &quot;As is&quot; 2. Phonetic adaptation 3. Morphological adaptation 4. Complete immersion</td>
<td>In &quot;easy&quot; words, In words with new phonemes, In nearly immersed words, In words whose foreign origin is not felt or known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14.3 Main factors for borrowing English vocabulary
fully at least to know some of it for their functional advantage, either psychologically for snobbery or as a tool for communicating with native English speakers and others.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, the use of English in another language has been described as a quintessential example of neocolonialism (Fishman, 1996b); that is, the exploitation of a colony even after it is no longer occupied. In the 20th century, among the linguistic communities

**Figure 14.4** Motives, determinants and outcomes of English loan-word integration in borrowing languages
we examined, this description is applicable only to India and to pre-Israel Palestine, which were occupied or administered directly by the British for significant periods (the Indian subcontinent for about two centuries until 1947 and Palestine from 1918 to 1948). In addition, it may be applicable also to Japan which was occupied by American forces for nearly seven years after World War II. In a neocolonialist view, the ongoing ‘English invasion’ carries certain advantages for English-speaking countries and English speakers in such communities to this very day (cf. Tsuda, 1986).

Viewing this linguistic advantage as deliberate exploitation, as Fishman (1996a) suggests, is undoubtedly judgmental and does not reflect the common public attitudes to English in our sample languages. In fact, in many of our case studies the majority of the population are either unaware of this supposedly exploitative nature or, if asked, do not regard it as such. This unawareness or even positive regard to English does not mean, of course, that native English speakers do not benefit from a neocolonialist effect. The opposite is true – and therefore, it could be argued, this attitude to English only proves how pervasive and internalised this effect is. (See, for example, the study conducted by Fisherman, 1986, for Hebrew, quoted in Chapter 7 in this volume. See also the description of the attitudes of Russian speakers to English in Chapter 6, and the descriptions of the attitude to English in France and the Netherlands in Chapters 3 and 4, respectively.) These positive attitudes to English explain the success of English but also serve as a warning for its future, which is the topic of several studies (Crystal, 2003a; Graddol, 1997). The negative attitude to Russian, the lingua franca of East Europe during the cold war era, is an example of the swift decline of the influence of such a language as soon as the mother country disintegrates. This was the case with the Soviet Union after 1989, ironically only a short time after linguist William Gage (1986: 379) had predicted that ‘the world balance could shift, leading to the eclipse of English by Russian’.

Lexification processes, and even relexification processes (Horvath & Wexler, 1997), which apply in non-Creole and Creole languages alike, seem an attractive explanation for the ease of English penetration into world languages. Certain differences exist between this process in Creole languages and in the languages examined in this volume. One such difference is that most of the countries whose languages were studied here were not physically ‘subdued’ by English or English speakers. The term ‘subjugation’ could be used metaphorically, however, as the above-mentioned term ‘neocolonialism’ suggests, as the effect of English also involves cultural changes. Thus viewed, the penetration of (American) English elements into any language could be perceived also as a material
and conceptual invasion which affects (subdues) the (independent, original) spirit of the native speakers of that language. In the same vein, even snobbery — an oft mentioned motivation (in this volume and elsewhere) for the use of English — could be considered such a ‘mental subjugation’ process.

Considering the above hypotheses, should the languages and processes we examined be compared to those of Creole languages in the long run? Superficially, this question is interesting to follow, for borrowed words constitute a part of Creole language structure. Creole languages have been defined in various manners (e.g. Bickerton, 1986; Chaudenson, 1992; McWhorter, 1998; Thomason, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988), but in principle they involve several source languages and usually their phonology and grammar are closely related to one source language at least (cf. Holm, 2004). Still, borrowed words in themselves do not change the nature of a language so extremely, although lexical borrowing often coincides with other contact phenomena, such as loan translation. Hence we may hypothesise that in the very long run, say a few centuries, borrowed words from English, combined with grammatical (morpho-syntactic) features, which penetrate these languages through calque (loan translation), might at least alter the recipient languages substantially. Creoles, however, differ from this vision as they develop usually very quickly (see e.g. Thomason, 2001).

Horvath and Wexler (1997) suggest another feature of relexification in Creole languages with relevance to borrowing processes in non-Creole languages, that is the relative speed of the spread of the foreign words within the recipient language. The English loan words in the languages discussed in this volume usually also spread very quickly in the borrowing languages, especially due to the global encroachment of the Internet system and the other mass communication media; this phenomenon has developed in particular within the period of the last quarter of the 20th century. In the borrowing process we may be observing a ‘slow motion’ version of Creole relexification (see, e.g. the discussion on Arabic in Horvath & Wexler, 1997: 56; and on the time element in creolisation in Holm, 2004: 144–146). In time, the effects of the English language may gradually depart from such a process of lexical change and encompass increasingly more parts of the grammar of the absorbing language. Ultimately it may change them into new varieties which will then be structurally more similar to Creole languages. This would lead to a change of the nature of the recipient language. Holm’s (2004) definition of ‘partially restructured languages’ could be adequate also for this situation. This process has probably happened many times over in the
history of languages, as Holm (2004: 146) also notes, although at present we have no knowledge of it. The developing branch of contact linguistics is apparently heading toward this kind of research.

We are uncertain about future outcomes of these processes. Unexpected extralinguistic forces may intervene and change linguistic and social structures in the future, as the case of the Russian language with the fall of the Soviet Union has recently demonstrated (cf. Crystal, 2003a). A borrowed element can reach the stage of being entirely integrated into the absorbing language so that its origin is no longer noted (or even known). This state is assumed to have taken place after a relatively long time, as we see in the absorption of Greek and Persian words in Arabic, Egyptian and Acadian words in Classical Hebrew, Chinese words in Japanese, French words in Middle English, German words in Hungarian, or English words in Russian. We can only speculate how long it may take for English loan words to reach such a state in other languages in our modern ‘global village’. Depending on the ratio of borrowed words to native words in a recipient language, it seems that at least in some cases it should not take more than a few decades to reach a similar stage.

Several scholars have sought to assess the duration of similar processes, for example, creolisation in Creole languages, using various methods. In such situations demographic factors (such as the ratio of native language speakers of both languages, as well as Pidgin language speakers) are crucial, but they are not the only ones. Time, namely duration of contact and usage of foreign lexical items, and linguistic factors are equally important (cf. Holm, 2004). Although lexical borrowing is a less complex process than creolisation, the same basic sociolinguistic factors should be relevant for the fate of borrowed words in their new environments.

Coda

Overall, the English lexical ‘invasion’ is revealed to be a natural and inevitable process, driven by psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic and sociohistorical factors. It may be even considered part of the processes of universal linguistics. Morphophonological adaptation features of lexical expansion through borrowing and lexical use of borrowed words are found in the speech of L2 learners at any age and in codeswitching, in addition to Pidgin and Creole languages. The processes described above relate to sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of language use on both the diachronic (developmental) and the synchronic (current) levels.
Our sample of 12 different languages at the beginning of the 21st century, with the borrowing phenomena they manifest, has helped us take a step toward understanding linguistic and extralinguistic forces that affect the development of languages in general and even their diachronic development. The magnitude of lexical borrowing from English in each of these languages is the result of interaction between a number of enhancing and inhibiting factors (see Figures 14.3 and 14.4). Viewed together, these factors may explain the current pattern of borrowing from English, and demonstrate the prevalence of a number of determinants that underlie this process probably in any language.

Not all the questions that merit serious discussion could be answered in the present framework due to methodological constraints discussed in this volume. Ideally, the topic of English borrowings in other languages calls for an examination of the structure of the whole lexicon of each studied language in all world languages. In addition, it might be possible to weigh the relative value of these determinants using statistical methods (as used by Bickerton, 1984, and Owens, 1998, 2004, in different contexts), and thereby analyse to what extent they affect the discussed languages. Nonetheless, the focus of our examination was on the cultural, historical and social background of the encounter of each language with English in this linguistic process, and on the inventory of lexical elements in each of these languages. Although speakers of certain languages tend to regard English loan words in their language as an invasion, with time this usually ends in silent reconciliation, when the loan words are nativised and completely integrated in the recipient language.

In sum, contemporary lexical borrowing from English is revealed in the fast spread of its items in different languages and their speaking communities, mainly through material consumption items and the media, particularly among the younger generation. The motives, determinants and processes described in Chapter 1 of this volume appear to be active and thus pertinent to all the case studies presented above. Still, the results of these factors in several cases are not simple to derive, because of the countless combinations of the determinants within each language community, as indeed ‘anything is possible in this domain’ (Thomason, 2001: 68). As human language is inherent to humans, its fundamental development is bound to be universal and common, at least when viewed from a generalising perspective. We therefore assume that studies of other languages where English lexical borrowings are found will be able to reveal in them the determinants defined here and facilitate further analysis and generalisation of these characteristics.