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ABSTRACT
This article offers a brief bibliographic overview and, on this basis, outlines an illustrated typology of linguistic borrowing in which the main criterion is the level where the foreign element belongs: formal (both graphic and phonetic), morphological, semantic, lexical, syntactic, phraseological, and pragmatic. In addition, two cross-categories are devised: degree of modification of the foreign model and degree of novelty of the foreign form. This typology refers in particular to present situations of cultural borrowing from English to the Romance languages; therefore, special attention is paid to the importance of contemporary English as a model for Western languages.

1. The problem of classifying linguistic borrowing and interference

General Linguistics is still in search of a valid general classification of linguistic borrowing or interference, that is, the exchange of linguistic material between two varieties of speech, mainly two languages. From the very beginning of interlinguistic studies, some authors tried to sketch a classification of borrowing and interference. However, this attempt has always been fraught with difficulties:
1. Firstly, several ways of classifying linguistic contacts can be devised, and these ways are regarded as complementary but not reciprocally comparable. M. Pergnier states that "il y a de nombreuses façons de distinguer et de classer les faits de langue auxquels on applique le nom d’anglicismes : domaines d’emploi, fréquence, degré d’intégration, type d’interférence (lexical, syntaxique, idiomatique, etc.)" (29).

2. Moreover, these classifications are felt to be artificial and lacking full validity, as we linguists propose discrete categories that cannot embrace all the factors involved in a given socio-linguistic situation. In proposing a typology of interference for Canadian French anglicisms, Lionel Meney points out that a classification of borrowing should take into account sociolinguistic factors such as sex, social status, communicative situation, and register (930).

3. Finally, global objections to the validity of a classification of linguistic borrowing are taken by Els Oksaar: on one side, we cannot devise a general typology of borrowing on the basis of a few Western languages; on the other, successive attempts to classify borrowing are felt to be partial and imperfect, simply "because of the insufficiency of the present systems to cover most of the possibilities of the process and of the results of linguistic integration" (494).

2. General classifications of linguistic borrowing

Despite these remarks on the heterogeneity of classifications of borrowing, we can reduce this diversity to four basic types:

a) Classifications according to the kind of relationship between the affected languages: "cultural borrowing" versus "intimate borrowing" according to L. Bloomfield (461).

b) Classifications according to the kind of hierarchy between the varieties of speech affected: borrowing between national languages versus "dialect borrowing" in Bloomfield (444-45).

c) Formal classifications based upon the degree of modification of lexical units of the source or model language. This leads to the classical distinction between "loanword" and "loan translation"/"calque" used by German scholars such as Werner Betz, and later refined by American descriptivists such as Uriel Weinreich and Einar Haugen, who distinguish "importation" (straight loanword), "substitution" (loan-translation, loanshift), and "loanblends"/"hybrids," a mingling of both means (Weinreich 50-53 and Haugen 212-20).

d) Classifications according to the level or sub-system of the target/receiving language affected by a given fact of interference. This way of classifying borrowing was first devised by Jean Darbelnet in his studies of English influence on Canadian French (79-113). Darbelnet's classification has been recently refined by L. Meney, who reorganises a broad corpus of anglicisms in Canadian French into more coherent categories: Anglicisms of pronunciation, Anglicisms of orthography and spelling, morphologic...
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Anglicisms, syntactic Anglicisms, lexical anglicisms, and idiomatic or phraseological loan translations (930-39).
Michael Clyne proposes a typological classification of interference based upon the speech of German immigrants in Australia. This scholar distinguishes eight categories in relation to eight levels of a linguistic system: phonological borrowing, prosodic borrowing, graphematic borrowing, morphemic borrowing (transference of bound morphemes), morphological borrowing (transference of morphological patterns), semantic borrowing (transference of sememes), lexical borrowing (transference of lexemes), and syntactic borrowing (transference of syntactic rules). Moreover, Clyne also suggests a pragmatic perspective in the study of interference ("Sprachkontakt/Mehrsprachigkeit" 641-42).
Finally, John Humbley also sketches a classification of borrowing according to the levels of the linguistic system affected, and this time the typology is applied to a situation of "cultural borrowing", anglicisms in European French. The English Romanist argues that linguistic borrowing can affect any linguistic level, although the normal situation in cultural borrowing is lexical borrowing. Thus, we are led to believe that "lexical borrowing" (meaning and form) makes up the "core" of interlinguistic phenomena, the other categories being peripheral by nature. Therefore, Humbley goes on to mention the following categories: graphic and phonetic borrowing, morphological borrowing, semantic borrowing, lexical borrowing, syntactic borrowing, and phraseological borrowing (53-64).

3. Towards a typology of linguistic borrowing

We consider the above-mentioned proposals, that is, typologies of borrowing according to the linguistic level affected, to be the most efficient attempts of classification for several reasons:
1. This kind of typology is quite comprehensive and allows for the explanation of many particular instances of interference and borrowing, thus partially solving the objection taken by Oksaar regarding the insufficiency of the current typologies (494).
2. Given the importance of the level where the new foreign element is incorporated, this typology bears a clear relation to the phenomena of neology. Therefore, this typology helps us to regard borrowing (especially in situations of cultural borrowing) as a neological means, capable of enriching a given language, and not as a mere incorrectness in normative terms.
3. Nevertheless, in bilingual situations, strong interference is not at all an enriching process. In this case, this typology based on the level affected is also quite useful: it becomes easier to diagnose the effects of interference in the different levels of the recipient system, thus allowing us to detect which levels are in danger (for instance, semantic and syntactic rather than lexical) and to take the measures which may be considered appropriate.
Therefore, our proposal follows most of the ideas set out by Darbelnet, Meney, Clyne and Humbley. Like Humbley, we apply this typology to a situation of "cultural borrowing" (anglicisms in Romance Languages) and we also regard "lexical borrowing" as the most common way of neological enrichment: that is, the transference of a whole lexical unit,
meaning and form. Therefore, borrowing affecting any of the remaining levels may be considered as a special case beyond the scope of "cultural borrowing." But, inasmuch as these are special cases, they may shed light on phenomena originating in instances of interference or direct contact (translations, dubbings, bilingual groups) which are later introduced into cultural borrowing situations.

If we sum up the four proposals previously examined (Darbelnet, Meney, Clyne, and Humbley), we can state the levels where transference takes place as follows: "phonological", "orthographic", "morphological", "semantic", "lexical", "phraseological" (mentioned by Humbley 63 and Meney 938), and "pragmatic" (suggested by Clyne "Intercultural Communication" 130 and Perspectives on Language Contact 98-110). These are, therefore, the eight levels of our typology.¹ As some categories are far larger than others, it is necessary to devise internal classifications. To this end, we have chosen two criteria, mentioned by several scholars, which transcend most of the levels of the main typology:

a) Formal classifications (Haugen, Weinreich) have been useful and widely applied over the last few decades. Therefore, the first cross category deals with the degree of "modification" of lexical units of the model language: "importation", "substitution", and "loanblends." In fact, this criterion was applied by Humbley and Meney when analysing "lexical borrowing", by far the largest category (Humbley 56-58 and Meney 935-38).

b) Another criterion deals with the degree of novelty represented by a given borrowing, especially on levels other than the lexical one: if the grapheme, morpheme, meaning, idiom, or construction provided by a foreign language merely increases the frequency of something similar in the receiving language, we have a "frequency borrowing"; that is, "anglicisme de fréquence" (Darbelnet 110) or "Frequenzsteigerung" for German scholars (Humbley 52). On the contrary, if the foreign element is completely new in the receiving language, we have an "absolute" (or simply an "ordinary") borrowing, this being the common situation in lexical borrowing as a neological means.

3.1. Formal borrowing

Humbley holds that phonetic or graphic phenomena are to be subordinated to "lexical borrowing" when they are found within loanwords (53). Independent of lexical borrowing, "formal borrowing" is therefore only possible when it affects lexical units of third languages or newly coined units (mainly in advertising jargon). Both phonological and orthographic borrowing are called "formal" because they only affect the form ("signifiant") and not the meaning ("signifié"). This kind of borrowing is quite uncommon; it usually originates as a result of individual mistakes, as Darbelnet admits (81-82). Stemming from mistakes or resources in advertising, formal borrowing appears to be a hypercharacterisation of neutral units following well-known features of a prestigious foreign language, usually English:

a) Pronunciation of lexical units of a third language following English patterns: Latin sine die is turned into [sain dai] in French broadcasting (Humbley 53) and the Austrian place-name Seefeld is turned into [siffeld] because of its double ee (Rey-Debove 258). The latter
case also occurs in Spanish, where E. Lorenzo cites the name of the German footballer Uwe Seeler as being pronounced [úve síler] (El español de hoy 215).

b) In Canadian French, Darbelnet and Meney point out graphic mistakes caused by the considerable pressure of American English: baggage instead of bagage, désir instead of désir (Darbelnet 81 and Meney 932). Likewise, M. Clyne remarks on the confusion of sh and sch in the writing of German-speaking immigrants in Australia: shreiben instead of schreiben (“Sprachkontakt/Mehrsprachigkeit” 642).

c) As a resource in advertising, a large proportion of coined names for new products show a clear graphic hypercharacterisation with an English flavour (“mots français à coloration anglaise” in Feyry 129-31). Examples for French and Spanish are the following: byostatic, fyne-poynt, drag-o’matic, lui’s (Feyry 129-131); Lavypon, Dyc, Chiew, Spontex, Bankinter (Pratt “El lenguaje medios comunicación” 65-71).

d) In Spanish, the transliteration of proper names belonging to languages where the Roman Alphabet is not employed is affected by intermediary languages such as English and French. As a result, new graphemes and digraphs come to be employed in Spanish, even though a more simple, correct native solution exists: this explains the use of kh instead of the native grapheme j as a voiceless velar fricative in Khalid, Khartoum and Mikhail (Lorenzo El español de hoy 106).

3.2. Morphological borrowing

Morphological borrowing is an uncertain category, since some scholars have denied the possibility of direct transference of morphemes. Several scholars, from H. Schuchardt on, have stated that borrowing of morphemes is only possible by indirect means: certain borrowed morphemes are felt to be particularly common within the mass of loanwords introduced into a given language; thus, the speakers of that language analyse these loanwords, identify these morphemes, and become acquainted with them; later on, these morphemes become productive or generative in the receiving language. Weinreich also indicates that the morpheme is easily identified when the language receives pairs of words, with and without the morpheme: statue/statuette, cigar/cigarette (31-37). On the other hand, Humbley considers these phenomena to be more likely with semi-bound morphemes, such as -man or -ing, both common in anglicisms of French (54-55). This indirect process is thoroughly explained by R. Gusmani, who calls it “induction of morphemes” and draws attention to the criterion of productivity of foreign morphemes in the receiving language (112-34). As instances of this fuzzy category, we can cite:

a) Mingling of affixes or derivational patterns in the learned vocabulary. Darbelnet and Meney quote some examples of anglicisms in French: tranquilliseur instead of tranquillisant, détergent instead of détersif (Darbelnet 81-82 and Meney 933).

b) Interference in the formation and use of singular and plural, also mentioned by J. Darbelnet: French banlieues, in plural, because its English equivalent, suburbs, is plural (84). In Latin American Spanish, J. J. Montes Giraldo notices the pluralisation of abstract nouns according to the English patterns: políticas, calquing the English policies “plan of action”, ideologías following English ideologies; tecnologías following English tecnologies (“Calcos recientes del inglés” 37-39 and “Otros calcos del inglés” 383-389).
It is also a “morphological loan” the diffusion of English-French plurals in consonant+s in Spanish when applied to foreignisms from languages other than English and French: albums, boers, déficits, Führers, lieders (Lorenzo El español de hoy 82-84).

c) Clyne draws a clear distinction between “morphemic borrowing” (transference of bound morphemes) and “morphological borrowing” (transference of morphological patterns). According to this distinction, the instances above mentioned belong to the category of “morphemic borrowing” (“Sprachkontakt/Mehrsprachigkeit” 641). As instances of proper “morphological borrowing”, in Clyne’s terminology, we have found certain Spanish constructions influenced by English patterns: no+substantive (la no intervención) and anti+substantive (ley antimonopolio) (Marcos Marín 110-111 and Alfaro 74-75).

3.3. Semantic borrowing

Semantic borrowing implies the transference of a sememe or unity of meaning. As the words between which this transference takes place show certain formal or semantic analogy, some scholars have proposed the following classification (Haugen 219-20 and Humbley 58-61):^2

a) “Homologues.” Both words only show analogy of meaning, but the form is quite different: it is, therefore, a proper translation, hence this kind of borrowing has been called “semantic loan translation” or “semantic calque.” We have found that both words share a primary literal meaning. In that case, the word from the model language transfers a new meaning, mainly metaphorical, to the other; hence, we can speak of “borrowed metaphors.” For instance, the American term hawk has two main meanings: one primary, “bird of prey”, another one metaphorical, “hard-liner politician” (in the jargon of politics). As the French épervier and the Spanish halcón share the literal primary meaning with the English term, the secondary metaphorical meaning can be employed as well (Humbley 58-59).

b) “Analogue.” Both words show analogy in form as well as in meaning (generally linked to etymological related words or “cognates”). Therefore, the semantic transaction between them is quite easy; hence, analogues are more common than homologues, at least in Western languages. This kind of semantic borrowing arises easily in the process of translation and in the speech of bilinguals: they are known as “false friends.” We can see this process with another term taken from the influential jargon of politics in the USA: in English, conventional has the literal primary meaning of “customary, traditional”, but in political jargon it has developed the sense of “non-nuclear (weapons)”, that is, “traditional (weapons).” The linguistic factor of formal and semantic similarity, and the strong influence of American political vocabulary result in the adoption of the new meaning by French conventional and Spanish convencional (Lorenzo Anglicismos hispánicos 490).

c) Finally, there appear to be “homophones”, when both words only share the form, but without any similarity in meaning. Nevertheless, Haugen limits this type of semantic borrowing to certain misinterpretations in bilingual settings: English grocery “grocer’s shop” > American Portuguese grosseria “rude remark”, along with the new borrowed meaning ‘grocer’s shop’ (Haugen 219). As for cultural borrowing in Europe, Humbley holds that etymologically related words in English and in Romance languages always share
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a certain semantic content, however minimal it may be: e. g. between English *to control* “to have power” and French *contrôler* “to check” (Humbley 61).

3.4. Lexical borrowing

Lexical borrowing is by far the most common type of transference between languages. In fact, “borrowing” has been traditionally identified with “lexical borrowing”, as we can see in the classic work of L. Deroy (18-21). This being the largest group of all, a further division becomes essential. Humbley and Meney follow the formal criterion set up by the American descriptivists E. Haugen and U. Weinreich, that is, the degree of modification of the lexical units of the model language (Humbley 56-58 and Meney 935-38). According to this criterion, in fact one of our cross-categories, we have three main types of lexical borrowing.

3.4.1. Importation

“Importation” (“morphemic importation” in Haugen) is defined as the direct transference of a lexeme, that is, both meaning and form. In fact, importation is usually identified with “lexical borrowing” itself: anglicisms such as *club, pop, best-seller, poster, show, CD-Rom* are shared by nearly all the Romance languages. Since this is by far the largest category of borrowing, further divisions are also useful:

1. Regarding the degree of assimilation of a foreign lexical item, a practical (but theoretically fuzzy) distinction has been drawn: “loanwords” versus “foreign words” (or “denizens” versus “aliens”), the origin of which goes back to the 19th-century opposition between “Lehnwort” and “Fremdwort” made by German scholars with a puristic bias (hence, French “emprunt” versus “mot étranger”, Spanish “préstamo” versus “extranjismo”). According to this distinction, especially useful in prescriptive studies, *fútbol* (<football), *mitín* (<meeting), *filme* (<film), *cóctel* (<cocktail), and *estrés* (<stress) are “loanwords”, whereas *sketch, sandwich, airbag, spray,* and *marketing* are “foreign words”, all of them within the larger category of “lexical anglicisms” in Spanish.

2. A purely formal and categorial classification of lexical borrowings by morphemic importation has been widely applied. Starting from Weinreich’s distinction between “simple words” and “compound words” (47-48), some scholars have proposed a more detailed classification of anglicisms on the basis of a broad set of formal criteria (morphemic, categorial, and word formation):


b) Categorial: nouns (*test, fan, twist, bar, derby, film; supermarket, juke-box, strip-tease, ginger ale*), adjectives (*dry, sexy, groggy*), verbs (Italian *boicottare, filmare, flirtare*; French *stopper, sprinter*; Spanish *chutar, driblar, flirtar*), participles (*thrilling, long-playing*), and adverbs, interjections and formulae (*okay, all right, good bye, please*) (Carstensen 37, Klajn, 24-32 and Meney 935).

c) Word formation resources: phrases and idioms (*no comment, on the rocks, new look, no man’s land*), acronyms and abbreviations (*NATO, K. O. , O. K. , SOS, USA*), trade names
(Kodak, Scotch, Coca-Cola), and onomatopoeic words (growl, slam, mainly in comic strips) (Klajn, 24-32 and Meney 935).

3.4.2. Loanblends or hybrids

These terms were defined by Haugen as those instances of lexical borrowing in which we find both “importation” and “substitution” (215), or “transfer” and “reproduction”, in Weinreich’s terms (47-52). According to further divisions outlined by Weinreich and Humbley, we propose these types of loanblends:

a) Transferred stem and reproduced derivative affix: English *filth-y* > Pennsylvania German *fil-sig*; English *swing-ing* > French *swing-ant* (Weinreich 51-52 and Humbley 57-58). Concerning anglicisms in Spanish, we can quote *footballer > futbolista*, *leadership > liderato/liderazgo*, *boxing > boxeo* (Pratt El anglicismo en español 157-158).

b) Indigenous stem and transferred affix: uncommon situation, illustrated by French *four-age* > German *Futter-age* (Weinreich 52). A possible example in anglicisms of Spanish is *behavior-ism* > *conduct-ismo* (Lorenzo Anglicismos hispánicos 125).

c) Hybrid compounds: anglicisms such as *porte-containers* in French (Humbley 58) and *manager de carretera* (< road manager), *tenis de mesa* (< table tennis), and *juego de rol* (< role playing) in Spanish (Lorenzo Anglicismos hispánicos 559-614).

3.4.3. Substitution or loan translation

Complete morphemic substitution of lexical units of the language model produces the category known as “loan translation”, also known as “calque.” After examining several studies of loan translation, we can extract these general ideas in order to typify this category:

1. Loan translation consists of the reproduction of a foreign lexical complex by means of native material, usually after having analysed the elements of this foreign complex.

2. As this reproduction tends to be faithful to the model, the loan translation is said to be a borrowing caused by a translation, an “emprunt par traduction” in Deroy’s words (215) or a “Lehnübersetzung” as defined in the German tradition (Betz 136).

3. As the model is composed of two or more elements, firstly analysed and later translated, it becomes clear that the “loan translation” is always a polymorphemic unity (although graphically either univerbal or multiverbal).

4. In relation to this, another important idea set out by French and German scholars is that “loan translation” (unlike “semantic borrowing”) creates a new lexical unit in the receiving language (Deroy 215-16 and Zindler 31): *gratte-ciel* (< English *sky-scraper*) is a new compound in French, whereas *réaliser* in the sense of “be conscious of” (< English *to realise*) is not a new lexical unit in French, but only a new acquired meaning (Humbley 62).

The “lexical loan translation” is therefore the morphemic substitution of a polymorphemic unity of a foreign language by means of elements, previously existing in the receiving language as independent lexemes, but new as a lexical compound with a global sense. But
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even in that restricted sense, "loan translation" is also a large category. Following the German tradition, we propose the following distinction:
a) "Loan translation proper" (a term coined by Weinreich in order to match the German term "Lehnübersetzung") is an exact loan translation, not only in meaning but also in structure (Betz 136 and Weinreich 51): for instance, loan translations from English into Spanish such as auto-defensa (< self-defence), ciudad jardín (< garden city), desempleo (< unemployment), estación de servicio (< service station) (Lorenzo Anglicismos hispánicos 559-614).
b) "Loan rendition" (a term also coined by Weinreich in order to match the German term "Lehnübertragung"), is an approximate loan translation (Betz 136 and Weinreich 51); therefore, another valid term is A. Martinet's "calque approximatif" (170). We have observed three main cases of this kind of "approximate loan translation":
1. Asymmetric loan translations are translations in which part of the model is properly translated and part of it is freely translated: Latin paen-insula "nearly-island" > German Halb-insel "half-island" (Betz 136); English countdown > Spanish cuenta atrás; English skinhead > Spanish cabeza rapada (Lorenzo Anglicismos hispánicos 559-614).
2. Contracted loan translations, mainly used to coin native "equivalents" in order to replace "dangerous" foreign words: French palmarès replaces English hit-parade; Spanish azafata replaces English air-hostess; Spanish portero replaces English goal-keeper.
3. Expanded loan translations, as polymorphemic German Vaterland, from monomorphemic Latin patria (Betz 136). This kind of approximate loan translation is also useful in the coining of native equivalents, as seen above: in Spanish, quiebra comercial replaces English crash (which usually becomes crack in the Romance languages) and auge súbito replaces English boom.

3.5. Syntactic borrowing

Syntactic borrowing always takes the form of "morphemic substitution" because, as some scholars state, syntactic borrowing deals with relations, not with mere words. Syntactic borrowing is sometimes difficult to separate from "morphological borrowing": as we have already seen, the latter implies the transference of morphemes and morphological patterns; "syntactic borrowing", on the contrary, takes into account grammatical relations, especially those of order, agreement, and dependence, according to Weinreich (29-43). In order to establish further divisions within this category, we can only make use of our second cross category: the degree of novelty of the foreign element, in this case, the foreign construction. Therefore, following Pratt, we can distinguish between:
a) "Syntactic innovation": the construction is completely unknown in the recipient language, for instance, estar siendo+past participle in Spanish as a syntactic loan translation from English am/are/is being+past participle (Pratt El anglicismo en español 210-11).
b) "Syntactic borrowing of higher frequency": this construction was known in the recipient language, but it was not very common or was limited to certain distributional contexts.
(Pratt El anglicismo en español 209). That is the case of the excessive use of the passive construction in Spanish due to English influence in translations and dubbings.

3.6. Phraseological borrowing

Just like syntactic borrowing, phraseological borrowing is also only possible as “morphemic substitution”, that is, “loan translation.” Phraseological loan translations are theoretically possible inasmuch as “lexical loan translations” affect polymorphematic units (see above). Therefore, the loan translation can affect units consisting of several words. However, phraseological borrowing is quite difficult to typify and its boundaries with other categories (lexical loan translation, syntactic borrowing and pragmatic interference) are particularly fuzzy:

1. Mere formal and categorial criteria, like those suggested by Deroy (translation of a syntagmatic unit) and by Humbley (beyond the boundaries of the “lexie”) are felt to be insufficient and do not solve the problems of delimitation (Deroy 215-20 and Humbley 63): lexical compounds share some formal and semantic features with idioms, whereas some highly lexicalized syntactic constructions are also formally similar to idioms.

2. Given the failure of formal criteria, a more suitable explanation could be found in semantic criteria, as we can see in Meney: “ce sont toutes les expressions figurées du français canadien ... calques sur des expressions figurées anglaises. Pour qu’il y ait calque idiomatique ou phraséologique, il faut qu’il ait métaphore et que la métaphore provienne de l’anglais” (938).

Therefore, a “phraseological loan translation” must imply a “metaphor”, an “image”, in Darbelnet’s terms (110-11). In other words, 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. That is, in our opinion, the basis of a “phraseological loan”, although the limits with the other categories above mentioned is by no means clear-cut: for instance, “lexical loan translations” are usually neological means almost exclusive of technical languages (summit conference, frogman), but some of them show some idiomatic shade of meaning (especially collocations such as cold war, round table) (Pratt El anglicismo en español 202-07). A classification of phraseological loan translations is taken from those proposed by Zuluaga and Corpas for Spanish idioms:

a) “Locutions” or lexical idioms:

1. Nominal: collocations of adjective+substantive with an idiomatic meaning; English round table > Spanish mesa redonda, English cold war > Spanish guerra fría, English beautiful people > Spanish gente guapa (Pratt El anglicismo en español 202-07 and Lorenzo Anglicismos hispánicos 559-614).


b) Both lexical and syntagmatic idioms (verbal): Spanish jugar un papel, from English to play a role; Spanish estar en el mismo barco, from English to be in the same boat (Lorenzo Anglicismos hispánicos 342 and 633).

c) “Statements.”

1. “Phrasal”: formulae or clichés, also a type of “pragmatic borrowing” (see below).
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2. “Texts”: proverbs and sayings, such as Spanish llorar sobre la leche derramada (« to cry over spilt milk), quoted by Lorenzo (Anglicismos hispánicos 592).

3.7. Pragmatic borrowing/interference

Pragmatic borrowing was first proposed by the Australian scholar Michael Clyne. Clyne suggested the study of “language contact at the discourse level,” mentioning several aspects, such as discourse markers, preformulated discourse, and differences concerning speech rules and discourse routines (Perspectives on Language Contact 98-110). A more elaborated proposal is found in another work by Clyne, where the expression “pragmatic transfers” is first used (“Intercultural Communication” 130). Starting from the operative concept of “communicative competence”, this scholar draws attention to the fact that in different languages (even in those as closely culturally related as German and English) differences in discourse routines can lead to a “communication breakdown” when intention is not properly understood, and even to a “communication conflict”, when the intention conveyed is just the opposite. Clyne himself illustrates that, answering an offer, the German Danke (schön) conveys an affirmative intention; on the contrary, the theoretical English equivalent, thanks/thank you usually has a negative intention. Therefore, the German-speaking immigrant in Australia is likely to make a communicative mistake when he uses the English thanks/thank you with an affirmative intention (Perspectives on Language Contact 107-10 and “Intercultural Communication” 131).

Since pragmatic borrowing seems more likely to occur in bilingual situations, we prefer the term “pragmatic interference.” In fact, in some studies about English influence on Canadian French a similar notion can be seen: Darbelnet includes some peripheral instances such as the use of merci at the end of a lecture or the habit of announcing quotations with the formula et je cite in the category of “anglicismes de culture” (111-12). Following Clyne’s suggestions, we propose several possible categories of “pragmatic interference”:

1. Although Clyne mentioned “discourse markers” with phatic function as an instance of pragmatic interference (Perspectives on Language Contact 98-99), we propose to regard importation or substitution of any kind of foreign connectives and discourse markers as “pragmatic interference.” For instance, in Spanish and Italian some scholars have studied the greater frequency of bien/bueno and bene, respectively, as a loan translation of English well as an initial element in answers, especially in dubbings from American films (Llorente Maldonado 56-57 and Dardano 234).

2. Differences concerning “discourse routines” and “speech rules” were also taken into account by Clyne (Perspectives on Language Contact 107-110). In Spanish linguistics, A. Zuluaga gives the name “clichés” to the phraseological statements which are only allowed to appear in one particular discourse genre, as for instance conversational language (204-06). We have also recorded something similar in anglicisms of the Romance languages: a) The discourse routine when answering a telephone call is digame in Spanish and pronto in Italian. Because of the influence of inappropriate translations in the dubbing of American films, it has become common in both languages the formula ¿sí?, a pragmatic
loan translation from American English ¿yes?, with a peculiar tentative lengthy tone (Lapesa 198 and Rando 117).
b) Montes Giraldo points out the literal loan translation forget it! > ¡olvídalo!, quite common in the dubbing of American films and TV series. As a closing device to an communicative event with a shade of refusal to an offer, the usual Spanish expressions are nada, déjalo (estar), no teprocupes, no importa. However, as a result of its reiterative occurrence in dubbings, the cliché ¡olvídalo! (possible in other contexts) has gained a firm foothold in Spanish (“Calcos recientes del inglés" 47-48).

3. Very similar to the latter category is the interlingual difference in the use of what Clyne calls “preformulated discourse segments“ (Perspectives on Language Contact 99). In Spanish linguistics, A. Zuluaga uses the term “fórmulas de fijación pragmática,” which are regarded to be typically associated with a given speech situation (207-213). We have identified three main groups:
a) “Addressing formulae” (“honorific roles“ in Clyne “Intercultural Communication” 131-35). Lázaro Carreter regrets the spread of the loan translation damas y caballeros (< ladies and gentlemen) in order to adress an audience, since the traditional Spanish formula has always been señorasy señores (Dardo en la palabra, 625).
b) “Politeness and request formulae.” Also in that field, Spanish and Italian scholars have reported the diffusion of certain native formulae, seldom used in the past times: this is the case of por favor and prego, request formulae which have spread in both languages in order to match the English request form please, quite common in films (Lorenzo El español de hoy 124-25 and Dardano 234).
c) “Farewell formulae” from a foreign language are easy to adopt in order to show cosmopolitism and snobbery. In colloquial Spanish, Miranda mentions chao (< ciao ), au revoir and bay bay (< English bye, bye) (83).

4. Finally, other possible categories of pragmatic borrowing include:
a) “Modality”: interferences in the fields of negation, questions, statements and sentence adverbs. As for sentence adverbs, Vázquez-Ayora regards the increasing use of long sentence adverbs in Spanish (instead of adverbial expressions or impersonal constructions) as a dangerous “frequency anglicism”: for instance, the abuse of obviamente as a sentence adverb matching the English obviously, instead of the traditional impersonal construction es obvio que+clause: estamos en algún planeta, obviamente (< we’re on some planet, obviously) instead of es obvio que estamos en algún planeta (116-18).
b) Interjections, inasmuch as they convey, according to Almela Pérez a certain illocutive force (105-08) : hey, okey, guau (< wow) in Spanish.

4. Conclusions

This typology accounts for the vast majority of interlinguistic phenomena, thus allowing for a clear perspective of every linguistic level of the recipient system. Related to this, our examples have shown the strong influence of contemporary English (mainly American) on Western languages, exemplified by those belonging to the Romance group. Although dealing with a situation of cultural borrowing (indirect, impersonal, without large bilingual
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groups), English models pervade all the linguistic levels, in addition to the lexical one, where English pressure is, as expected, far stronger than in any other.

Notes

1. Another category has also been considered. It is known as the boundaries of borrowing, including such phenomena as false loans and creations. But given the complexity of this category, we feel it best to examine it more carefully and perhaps to analyse it in a separate study.

2. Both the explanation and examples given by J. Humbley are used as a base of reference for this study.

3. It should be noted that “importation” is the American descriptivist term, whereas European scholars use other terms such as French “emprunt intégral” and “emprunt direct”, Italian “prestito integrale”, German “integrale Entlehnung”, and Spanish “préstamo patente.”

4. We use sometimes this long expression, “lexical loan translation” (Spanish “calco léxico”, French “calque lexical”) in order to distinguish calques which affect the lexical level from those which affect other levels (phonological and syntactic).

5. The third member of both classifications, “loan creation”/ “Lehnschöpfung”, is defined as a free loan translation that bears no formal and structural resemblance to the foreign model. For this reason, scholars regard it as a “creation” or “false loan” and no longer a “loan translation.”

6. All these examples are the source of loan translations in Spanish: conferencia cumbre/conferencia en la cumbre, hombre rana, guerra fría, mesa redonda.
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