



HAL
open science

False Anglicisms in French and Bulgarian

Alexandra Bagasheva, Vincent Renner

► **To cite this version:**

Alexandra Bagasheva, Vincent Renner. False Anglicisms in French and Bulgarian. *Sŭpostavitelno Ezikoznanie / Contrastive Linguistics*, 2015, 40 (3), pp.77-89. hal-01921984

HAL Id: hal-01921984

<https://hal.science/hal-01921984v1>

Submitted on 26 Apr 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

False Anglicisms in French and Bulgarian

Alexandra Bagasheva (Sofia) and Vincent Renner (Lyon)

Настоящая статья предлагает сравнительное описание развития псевдоанглицизмов во французском и болгарском языках. Во французском существует в два раза больше псевдоанглицизмов, чем в болгарском, однако процессы, которые приводят к возникновению псевдоанглицизмов, почти одинаковы в двух языках, включая и относительную долю разных процессов. Ведущими являются процессы еллипсиса и ресемантизации, причем каждый из них обуславливает появление около 40% псевдоанглицизмов в обоих языках. Третий основной процесс, в результате которого возникает около 10% псевдоанглицизмов в анализируемой базе данных, – это композиция. Во французском обнаруживается большее лексическое разнообразие, среди псевдоанглицизмов встречается достаточное количество прилагательных и глаголов, что не характерно для болгарского языка. Примечателен тот факт, что немалая часть существующих в двух языках псевдоанглицизмов является общей – 40% болгарских псевдоанглицизмов встречаются во французском, а около 20% французских псевдоанглицизмов существуют в той или иной форме в болгарском языке.

This article offers a contrastive description of the phenomenon of false Anglicization in French and Bulgarian. French has about twice as many false Anglicisms (FA) as Bulgarian, but the distribution of the different processes of false Anglicization is very much the same, with two major processes – ellipsis and resemanticization – each accounting for about 40% of all FAs in the two languages, and a third process – compounding – accounting for another 10% of the two datasets. French contrasts with Bulgarian in its variety of lexical types and boasts a number of adjectival and verbal units, two categories which are virtually absent in Bulgarian. Another noteworthy fact is that the two languages share a considerable number of items: Bulgarian shares about 40% of its units with French, and French about 20% of its units with Bulgarian.

Keywords: French, Bulgarian, English, contact linguistics, false Anglicism

1. Introduction

For most of the languages of the world, the Anglicization of some part of the lexis is probably the most salient consequence of the increasing contact with English in the current era of globalization of communication.¹ Borrowing

¹ We are grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their remarks and suggestions. The usual disclaimers apply.

lexical units usually results in bringing the lexis of the donor and receptor language (henceforth, respectively, DL and RL) closer. This is for instance the case with the English term *basketball*, which is found without orthographic alteration in e.g. Breton, Danish, French, German and Norwegian, and which is also institutionalized in an adapted form in a variety of languages, e.g. *basketbal* (Dutch, Slovak), *basketbol* (Bulgarian, Russian, Tagalog, Turkish), *basketboll* (Swedish), *basquetbol* (Catalan), *basquetebol* (Portuguese), *basketbol* (Maltese), *basketbols* (Latvian), *basketbolli* (Albanian), *bāskēṭabala* (Bengali), *basukettobōru* (Japanese), *pasiketipolo* (Samoan). In the specific case of false Anglicisms (henceforth FAs), the influence of English has, however, the opposite effect: a lexical unit in the RL is deceptively identical or quasi-identical to an English form, and this may lead to a breakdown of communication between semi-proficient learners and native speakers of English. This is because either the unit has been institutionalized with a different meaning in the RL (e.g. *raid* means 'adventure racing' in French, *monitoring* means 'follow-up examination' in Bulgarian), or it has no institutionalized meaning in English despite the fact that it is composed of English word fragments (Bulg. *comp* 'computer', Fr. *smok* (< *smoking*) 'tuxedo') or word-building elements (e.g. Bulg. *avtopark* 'car showroom', Fr. *babyfoot* 'table soccer').

In this article, our aim is to provide a contrastive description of the phenomenon of false Anglicization in French and Bulgarian. As French has had a longer and richer history of language contact with English than Bulgarian (see Alexieva 2002 and Humbley 2002 for a concise overview), it is expected that the total number of present-day Anglicisms should be higher in French than in Bulgarian. The expectations concerning FAs are unclear. The data reported in Renner and Fernández-Domínguez (2015: 151) indicate that the importance of the phenomenon of false Anglicization may markedly vary for three languages – French, Spanish and Italian – which are estimated to contain about the same number of Anglicisms in their present-day state (Bogaards 2008: 70). MacKenzie's (2012: 39) hypothesis that the spread of English proficiency in a language community is to be correlated to a decrease in the number of new FAs cannot be confirmed for these languages. No strict correlation between the relative number of FAs in the language and the proportion of speakers of L2 English in the general population can be found. On the one hand, FAs are markedly more numerous in Italian than in French, and also markedly more numerous in French than in Spanish. On the other, the estimate of proficiency in L2 English is about the same for French and Italian nationals while it is significantly lower for Spaniards (see Table 1).

Table 1: Declaration of proficiency in English in the general population of France, Spain and Italy (*Special Eurobarometer 386*, 2012)

	French pop.	Spanish pop.	Italian pop.
Able to carry a conversation	39%	22%	34%
Able to follow the news on the radio / TV	26%	12%	24%
Able to read newspaper / magazine articles	32%	15%	26%
Able to communicate online	29%	17%	29%

The structure of the article is as follows: Section 2 details the methodology adopted to gather and select the two lists of FAs under scrutiny; Section 3 introduces a typology of the various processes of false Anglicization and highlights the most salient similarities and contrasts between French and Bulgarian; Section 4 deals specifically with those units which appear in the two languages; Section 5 closes the article with some concluding remarks.

2. Methodology

Our definition of a false Anglicism is as follows: it is a lexical unit which is composed of elements which are all identical or quasi-identical to morphemes or submorphemic splinters of English, but which is not institutionalized in English, or is institutionalized with different meanings in English and in the RL. Those RL elements which correspond to inflectional morphemes are to be disregarded. For French, verbs – whose citation form is the infinitive, which is coded by the suffix *-er* for all new lexical units – were included (e.g. *flipper* 'to be scared' (informal), *remastériser* 'to remaster', *se scratcher* 'to crash'). For Bulgarian, nouns ending with the plural suffix *-i* (e.g. *bokseri* 'boxer shorts', *roleri* 'roller skates', *šorti* 'activewear shorts') were also included. Bulgarian FAs are here presented in their conventional Romanized form² and the formal quasi-identity between Bulgarian and English items is often valid only at the

² All Bulgarian examples have been transcribed, not transliterated. Transcription is the standard manner of adapting the spelling and pronunciation of English loanwords in present-day Romanized renditions of Bulgarian, unlike the accepted practice prior to the 1970s when English loanwords were mostly transliterated. As Danchev (2010: 26-33) elaborates, in transliteration what is rendered from one language into another are graphemes, so what is achieved is letter correspondences, with pronunciation not taken into consideration at all. In the transcription of loanwords (or interlingual transcription), the letters in the receptor language no longer target graphemic correspondence but aim to represent the pronunciation in the donor language (on the history of the changing standards for rendering English loanwords, see Krumova-Tsvetkova *et al.* (2013: 182)). The standard forms with diacritics have been used: ж→ž, ч→č, ш→š, щ→št, ц→c. The grapheme representing the glide /j/ is <y>, which leads to the following transcriptions: й→y, ю→yu, and я→ya. We are fully aware that this violates the Transliteration Act of 2009, but the diacritic transcription is the one most widely used in the typological and general linguistics literature and it has been adopted here for consistency purposes.

phonological level (e.g. *ekšân* = *action*, *fyčâring* = *featuring*, *čindž* = *change*). In a few cases, the absence of one-to-one graphemic correspondence between the two languages causes an Anglicism to turn into a false Anglicism: Bulgarian *farming* means 'pharming' and not 'farming'; *fišing* means 'phishing' and not 'fishing' (English <f> and <ph> are both rendered by Cyrillic <ф> in Bulgarian).

The two lists of FAs gathered for this research were culled from a variety of lexicographical sources. Initial lists of FA candidates came from the *Dictionnaire des anglicismes* (1984) and the *Petit Robert de la langue française* (2015) for French, from the *Dictionary of New Words in Bulgarian* (2010) and the *Dictionary of Foreign Words in Bulgarian* (2012) for Bulgarian, as well as the *Dictionary of European Anglicisms* (henceforth DEA) (2001) for the two languages. A set of seven general-language English dictionaries, i.e. the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, the *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, the *Collins English Dictionary* (henceforth CED), the *Macmillan Dictionary Online*, the *Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary*, the *Oxford English Dictionary* (henceforth OED), the *Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, was then used as a reference lexicon. If the FA candidate was listed in English with the same meaning as in the RL in at least one of the above dictionaries, it was discarded; if it was not listed, or listed with different meanings in English and in the RL, it was included in the final list. This led to discarding items like Bulgarian *kul* ('cool jazz') and *friklaiming* (which are both listed in the OED) and French *crash test*, *double-scuttle* (CED) and *lasting* (OED) from our final lists, even though they are marked as false Anglicisms in the DEA.

A number of other FA candidates were not retained. French is a pluricentric language and items which are not in common usage in France (i.e. are marked as nationally marked variants by lexicographers) were not retained (e.g. Belgian French *kicker* 'table soccer' and *zoning* 'industrial park'). Hybrid formations were not included either. Like the superordinate category of hybrid Anglicisms, which includes items such as French *blackbouler* 'to blackball' (< Eng. *black* + Fr. *boule* 'ball') and Bulgarian *ekšân geroy* 'action hero' (< Eng. *action* + Bulg. *geroy* 'hero'), the category of hybrid FAs includes outputs which combine an English and a native word-building element, but they crucially differ in so far as FAs have no institutionalized equivalents in English if one attempts to substitute the non-native elements by their English cognates, as in the following examples:

- Fr. *moto-ball* 'motorcycle football' > **motorball*;
- Fr. *papy-boom* 'severe population aging' > **grandpa-boom*;
- Bulg. *blusar* 'bluesman' > **blueser*;³
- Bulg. *skinar* 'skinhead' > **skinner*.

³ The two Bulgarian suffixes *-ar* and *-âr* are to be carefully distinguished. The *-ar* suffix is native and thus leads to the coinage of a hybrid Anglicism when it is concatenated to a base of English origin. The *-âr* suffix is a rendition of English *-er* and is thus found in "pure" borrowings, which may be true or false Anglicisms, e.g. *bestselâr* 'bestseller' and *dispensâr* 'tape dispenser'.

The class of hybrid FAs also includes Bulgarian items combining an English base and the native feminine suffix *-k-a*⁴ to form an output which is perceived as stylistically marked (informal) and axiologically negative (e.g. *digitalka* 'digital camera', *ofšorka* 'offshore company', *pleyboyka* 'Playboy playmate').⁵

We counted lexical senses rather than borrowed or newly coined forms as some forms have more than one sense: in Bulgarian, *mis* means 'beauty pageant' and 'beauty queen', *flipper* means 'pinball machine' and 'game of pinball'; in French, *cash* means 'in cash' and 'directly', *fox* means 'fox-terrier' and 'fox-trot', *sport* means 'casual' and 'sportsmanlike'. We also counted as different units the various formal variants which may be co-institutionalized in the RL, such as *smok* and *smoking* for 'tuxedo' in French, notably because they may be outputs of different processes of neologization.

The sources for the original FA candidates in the two languages cannot be considered to be totally homogeneous as the methodology used to gather lexical units in general and Anglicisms in particular inevitably varies from one dictionary to another. It is a well-known inconvenience, which has been discussed in the literature on dictionaries of Anglicisms (Gottlieb 2005; Busse 2008), and this will necessarily affect the absolute accuracy of some comparisons. The discordance is, however, minimized here by the fact that the two lists have been compiled by merging FA candidates taken from a variety of sources. The final lists of 127 Bulgarian and 256 French units seem to us to be large enough to provide a representative overview of the properties of FAs in the two languages and to form the basis for cautious contrastive statements.

3. A typology of the processes of false Anglicization

Our typological approach does not aim to focus on output forms, but rather on the processes of false Anglicization as it is the best vantage point from which to observe the dynamics of neologization. This means for instance that multilexemic FAs are not necessarily classified as outputs of compounding:

⁴ The *-k-a* suffix is usually treated as a single affix denoting feminine gender (Radeva 2007; Stoyanov 1993), but at the morphotactic level, it contains a derivational component, *-k-*, and an inflectional component, *-a*, which becomes *-i* in the plural. The issue of the homonymy/polysemy of the *-k-* suffix is complex and beyond the scope of this article.

⁵ Bauer and Huddleston (2002: 1677, 1681) directly associate feminine markers with small size and imitation. Small size in turn is the prototypical core of the semantic category of the diminutive (Jurafsky 1996: 534), which is a radial category where 'small' is directly linked with 'female' and 'contempt' in a structured polysemy model (ibid.: 542). The derogative and informal status of *-k-a* in Bulgarian assigns it to the category of expressive means with rising productivity in the contemporary language (see e.g. Avramova 2003; Blagoeva 2003; Krumova-Tsvetkova *et al.* 2013; Zidarova 2008).

- French *barefoot* is a case of ellipsis of English *barefoot skiing*;
- French *battle-dress* and Bulgarian *penkiler* are outputs of resemanticization (respectively 'ordinary military uniform' > 'cotton-twill military jacket' and 'pain-relieving drug' > 'jack-of-all-trades')⁶ because they are also institutionalized compounds in English.

Three main types of false Anglicization have been identified: subtractive processes, which share the defining property that the RL output is obtained from a form of shortening of the DL input, additive processes, which consist in concatenating word-building elements of English origin, and cases of resemanticization. The analysis was based on a comparison between each FA and its closest equivalent in present-day English or, in case of specific etymological information provided in the above-mentioned lexicographical sources, the DL unit which was the historical input at the time of borrowing. The latter case can be illustrated by the following items:

- Fr. *catch* / Bulg. *keč* 'professional wrestling' < Eng. *catch-as-catch-can*;
- Fr. *chatterton* 'friction tape' < Eng. *Chatterton's compound*;
- Fr.-Bulg. *smoking* 'tuxedo' < Eng. *smoking jacket*;
- Fr. *tansad* 'pillion' < Eng. *tandem saddle*.

The classification of the 383 FAs under study led to further identifying four processes which are significantly productive in the two languages:

- clipping, when the subtraction is lexeme-internal: e.g. Eng. *jeans* > Fr. *jean*, Eng. *scooter* > Fr. *scoot*, Eng. *computer* > Bulg. *comp*, Eng. *hurdles* > Bulg. *hârdel*;
- ellipsis, when the subtraction is lexeme-external: e.g. Eng. *pressbook* > Fr. *book*, Eng. *dreadlock* > Fr. *dread*, Eng. *football* > Fr. *foot*, Eng. *goalkeeper* > Fr. *goal*, Eng. *Cardiff coal* > Bulg. *kardif*, Eng. *combat trousers* > Bulg. *kombat*, Eng. *flip phone* > Bulg. *flip*, Eng. *bureau de change* > Bulg. *čeiindž*;
- compounding, when two bases are concatenated: e.g. Fr. *clapman* 'clapper loader', Fr. *flash-ball* 'rubber ball gun', Fr. *home-trainer* 'exercise bicycle', Fr. *speed-sail* 'beach windsurfing', Bulg. *beibifon* 'baby monitor', Bulg. *bodipâmp* 'strength training';
- resemanticization, when the DL input is given a new meaning in the RL which is not institutionalized in English: e.g. Fr. *lunch* 'midday meal' > light lunch buffet', Bulg. *bronzing* 'sun tanning' > sunless tanning', Bulg. *dog* 'domesticated canid' > Great Dane', Bulg. *pampers* 'Pampers-brand diapers' > diapers', Bulg. *top* 'upper garment' > flashy sleeveless sweater'.

Several marginal processes also deserve a mention. Some FAs are attested to have arisen through:

⁶ For details on this example of extreme semantic shift, see Alexieva (2008: 44).

- the concatenation of a base and an affix (Eng. *pep* > Fr. *peps*, Eng. *remaster* > Fr. *remastériser*);
- the blending of the two bases of the DL input (Eng. *bicycle motocross* > Fr. *bicross*, Eng. *tandem saddle* > Fr. *tansad*);
- the reversal of the ordering of the bases of the DL input (Eng. *trap-ball* > Fr. *balltrap* 'skeet shooting', Eng. *walkie-talkie* > Fr. *talkie-walkie*);
- the lexicalization of an onomatopoeia which is homophonous with an English lexeme (Fr. *scratch* 'Velcro');
- the formal alteration (here, more specifically the complexification of the onset and coda) of the DL input (Eng. *crash* > Fr. (*se*) *scratcher*);
- the forced respelling of the DL input into the RL's alphabet (Eng. *pharming* > Bulg. *farming*, Eng. *phishing* > Bulg. *fišing*).

The FA outputs sometimes also result from the combination of several of the above processes. In French for instance, *clergyman* (< *clergyman's suit*), *collector* (< *collector's item*) and *master* (< *master's degree*) were obtained through the ellipsis of the original semantic head and the clipping of the final 's'. In Bulgarian, *logistik* 'logistics specialist' results similarly from the ellipsis of the original head noun and the clipping of the final *s* segment.

FAs are about twice as numerous in French as in Bulgarian but the distribution of the various processes of false Anglicization presented in Table 2 brings to the fore a number of noteworthy similarities between the two languages as far as percentages are concerned.

Table 2: Distribution of the processes of false Anglicization in French and Bulgarian

	French	Bulgarian
Ellipsis	110 (43%)	54 (42.5%)
Resemanticization	95 (37.1%)	56 (44.1%)
Compounding	23 (9%)	11 (8.6%)
Clipping	4 (1.5%)	2 (1.6%)
Other processes	10 (3.9%)	2 (1.6%)
Combination of processes	14 (5.5%)	2 (1.6%)
<i>Total</i>	256 (100%)	127 (100%)

Ellipsis and resemanticization are the two dominant processes and occur with fairly equal frequency (about one FA in four for each process), compounding is involved in a sizeable number of cases (about one FA in ten), and all the other processes are virtually negligible from a quantitative standpoint. The loss of formal and semantic transparency of any input as it enters the RL is the one element which may explain the prevalence of both ellipsis and resemanticization. Leaving out part of the DL input is functionally unproblematic. Likewise, when a lexical item is borrowed – or rather copied

to best describe the phenomenon in question (see e.g. Alexieva 2008) –, it enters the RL with a specific unmotivated sense from which it may develop new senses that have not arisen in the DL on the basis of various mechanisms of semantic change:

- semantic narrowing: e.g. *bronzing* (Eng. 'sun tanning' > Bulg. 'sunless tanning'), *šorti* (Eng. 'shorts' > Bulg. 'activewear shorts');
- semantic widening: e.g. *pampers* (Eng. 'Pampers-brand diaper' > Bulg. 'disposable diaper'), *tupperware* (Eng. 'Tupperware-brand plastic food container' > Fr. 'plastic food container');
- metonymy: e.g. *stretch/streč* (Eng. 'affording high elasticity' > Fr.-Bulg. 'high-elasticity fabric'), *fliper* (Eng. 'player-control plastic bat' > Bulg. 'pinball machine' > 'game of pinball'), *mis* (Bulg. 'beauty queen' > 'beauty pageant').

The explanation for the absence of metaphors probably lies in the interlingual character of FAs. Metaphor research, including cognitive linguistic and neural accounts, as well as the embodiment thesis (see e.g. Gibbs 2005; Lakoff 2008; Lakoff and Johnson 1999), leads us to suggest that it is difficult for interlingual domain-mapping to occur. Metaphors are conceptual (i.e. mental) operations which surface in human language and which enable speakers to structure, construe and communicate about abstract areas of knowledge and experience in more concrete experiential terms (see e.g. Hurford et al. 2007; Lakoff and Johnson 2003). Molecular (i.e. complex) metaphors are made up of clusters of primary metaphors (O'Grady 2005) based on recurring correlations between fundamental dimensions of experience which start accumulating in childhood. We thus hypothesize that the conditions of familiarity and concreteness of source domains and of developmental strengthening of metaphoric counterpart connections make interlingual metaphoric mapping in contact-induced neology highly unlikely.

French and Bulgarian FAs differ quantitatively in some of their lexical types. Adjectival and verbal outputs are almost non-existent in Bulgarian (the only unit is *fešan* 'trendy', and virtually all the other FAs are nouns, the adverb *keš* 'in cash' being the only exception) whereas there is a marked tendency to create new Anglicized adjectives and verbs in French, as the following two sets illustrate:

- *addict* 'addicted', *cash* 'direct', *design* 'designer', *destroy* 'wasted', *fair-play* 'sportsmanlike', *fashion* 'trendy', *hype* 'hip', *just* 'tight', *knock-out* 'knocked-out', *off* 'fringe / off-camera / off the record', *snob* 'snobbish', *space* 'weird', *speed* 'hyper', *sport* 'casual / sportsmanlike', *trash* 'trashy';
- *badger* 'to swipe in', *flasher* 'to have an instant crush', *flipper* 'to be scared', *relooker* 'to make over', *remastériser* 'to remaster', *se scratcher* 'to crash'.

Also, eponymic FAs form a remarkable set of items in French – *bermuda* 'Bermuda shorts', *bristol* 'Bristol board', *carter* 'crankcase', *chatterton* 'friction

tape', *portland* 'Portland cement', *pullman* 'luxury coach bus', *tupperware* 'plastic food container' – while they appear to be comparatively rarer in Bulgarian (the only listed units are *kardif* 'Cardiff coal' and *pampers* 'disposable diaper').

4. Dual false Anglicisms

A number of FAs are formally identical or quasi-identical in the two languages, but they are considered to be dual FAs rather than false cognates only if they share the same meaning in French and Bulgarian, which is not always the case (*dansing/dancing* means 'dance floor' in Bulgarian and 'dance hall' in French; *dog/dogue* means 'Great Dane' in Bulgarian and 'Molosser dog' in French). The total number of French-Bulgarian dual FAs thus amounts to 50 units, as illustrated by the following pairs: *bowling/bouling* 'bowling alley', *gin-tonic/džin-tonik* 'gin and tonic', *clip/klip* 'video clip', *cocktail/kokteyl* 'cocktail party', *camping/kâmping* 'campground', *scotch/skoč* 'Scotch tape', *tramway/tramvay* 'tramcar', *happy end / hepiend* 'happy ending'. It is a remarkable figure, especially for Bulgarian as it represents almost 40% of its FAs. This may be explained by two different factors. First, a number of Anglicisms in general, and FAs among them, circulate from a country to another via mediating languages. French for example has historically served as a mediating language for a number of Anglicisms and the DEA for instance indicates that the FAs *camping* and *smoking* were originally coined by ellipsis in French and then spread throughout Europe, to respectively thirteen and all of the sixteen sample languages represented in the dictionary. The globalization of communication and cultural practices on the European continent has thus undoubtedly played a role in the dissemination of identical FAs in a variety of languages. Even though there is, as far as we know, a lack of hard evidence concerning this second hypothesis, it is also plausible that some general cognitive mechanisms may be at play in parallel in two or more languages and explain the appearance of identical FA outputs. Inputs become formally and semantically opaque as they enter the lexicon of the RL. It is thus not unexpected that some multilexemic units that have been borrowed by several RLs may undergo a same process of subtraction, which has been triggered by the principle of linguistic economy and which respects lexemic boundaries. For the various processes of addition and semanticization, such a separate-origin scenario is, however, less likely, and the circulation scenario via mediating languages more likely.

5. Conclusion

French has about twice as many FAs as Bulgarian, which, in view of Table 3, fails to confirm MacKenzie's prediction that there is an inverse correlation between L2-English proficiency and FA neology.

Table 3: Declaration of proficiency in English in the general population of France and Bulgaria (*Special Eurobarometer 386*, 2012)

	French population	Bulgarian population
Able to carry a conversation	39%	25%
Able to follow the news on the radio / TV	26%	17%
Able to read newspaper / magazine articles	32%	16%
Able to communicate online	29%	20%

What is, however, remarkable when comparing French and Bulgarian is that the distribution of the different processes of false Anglicization is very much the same, with two major processes – ellipsis and resemanticization – each accounting for about 40% of all FAs in the two languages, and a third process – compounding – accounting for another 10% of the two datasets. French, however, contrasts with Bulgarian in its variety of lexical types and boasts a number of adjectival and verbal FAs, two categories which are virtually absent in Bulgarian. Another noteworthy fact is that the two languages share a considerable number of FAs: Bulgarian shares about 40% of its units with French, and French about 20% of its units with Bulgarian. It should thus be finally remarked that if false Anglicization increases the distance between the lexis of the DL and the RL, it may also contribute to bringing the lexis of two RLs slightly closer.

References

- Alexieva 2002: Alexieva, N. Bulgarian. – In: Görlach, M. (ed.) *English in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 241–260.
- Alexieva 2008: Alexieva, N. How and why are Anglicisms often lexically different from their English etymons? – In: Fischer, R. and H. Pułaczewska (eds.). *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008, 42–51.
- American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, (5th ed) 2011. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. <http://www.ahdictionary.com> (accessed 13 June 2015).
- Avramova 2003: Avramova, C. *Slovoobrazovatelni tendencii pri sâstestvitelnite imena v bâlgarskiya i češkiya v kraya na dvayseti vek*. Sofia: Heron Press, 2003.
- Bauer and Huddleston 2002: Bauer, L. and R. Huddleston. Lexical word-formation. – In: Huddleston, R. and G. K. Pullum (eds.). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 1621–1721.
- Blagoeva 2003: Blagoeva, D. Univerbaciyata v nay-novoto slavyansko slovoobrazuvane. – *Sâpostavitelno ezikoznanie*, 2003, XXVIII/3: 5–21.
- Bogaards 2008: Bogaards, P. *On ne parle pas français. La langue française face à l'anglais*. Brussels: De Boeck Duculot, 2008.

- Busse 2008: Busse, U. German dictionaries of Anglicisms and their treatment of borrowings from English. – In: Pfalzgraf, F. and F. Rash (eds.). *Anglo-German Linguistic Relations*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008, 13–32.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 3rd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british> (accessed 13 June 2015).
- Collins English Dictionary, (11th ed). Glasgow: HarperCollins. <http://www.collinsdictionary.com> (accessed 13 June 2015).
- Dančev 2010: Dančev, A. *Bâlgarska transkripciya na angliyski imena*. (4th ed) Sofia: “Iztok – zapad”, 2010.
- Gibbs 2005: Gibbs, R. *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Görlach 2001: Görlach, M. *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Gottlieb 2005: Gottlieb, H. Anglicisms and translation. – In: Anderman, G. and M. Rogers (eds.) *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2005, 161–184.
- Humbley 2002: Humbley, J. French. – In: Görlach, M. (ed.). *English in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 108–127.
- Hurford, Heasley and Smith 2007: Hurford, J., B. Heasley and M. Smith. *Semantics: A Coursebook*, (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Jurafsky 1996: Jurafsky, D. 1996. Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. – *Language* 72/3: 533–578.
- Krumova-Tsvetkova, Blagoeva, Kolkovska, Perniška and Božilova 2013: Krumova-Tsvetkova, L., D. Blagoeva, S. Kolkovska, E. Perniška and M. Božilova. *Bâlgarska leksikologiya i frazeologiya. Tom I, Bâlgarska leksikologiya*. Sofia: Akademično izdatelstvo Marin Drinov, 2013.
- Lakoff 2008: Lakoff, G. The Neural Theory of Metaphor. – In: Gibbs, R. (ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 17–38.
- Lakoff and Johnson 1999: Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- Lakoff and Johnson 2003: Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- MacKenzie 2012: MacKenzie, I. Fair play to them: Proficiency in English and types of borrowing. – In: Furiassi, C., V. Pulcini and F. Rodríguez González (eds.). *The Anglicization of European Lexis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012, 27–42.
- Macmillan Dictionary Online. <http://www.macmillandictionary.com> (accessed 13 June 2015).
- Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary. <http://www.merriam-webster.com> (accessed 13 June 2015).
- Milev et al. 2012: Milev, A. et al. *Rečnik na čuždite dumi v bâlgarskiya ezik*. (5 izd.). Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 2012.
- O'Grady 2005: O'Grady, J. Primary metaphors as inputs to conceptual integration. – *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2005, 37: 1595–1614.
- Oxford English Dictionary. <http://www.oed.com> (accessed 13 June 2015).

- Perniška, Blagoeva and Kolkovska 2010: Perniška, E., Blagoeva, D., and S. Kolkovska. *Dictionary of New Words in Bulgarian*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 2010.
- Petit Robert de la langue française*, version numérique 4.2, millésime 2016, du *Petit Robert, dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française*. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 2015.
- Radeva 2007: R a d e v a , V. *V sveta na dumite*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Sofyiyskiya universitet "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 2007.
- Random House Unabridged Dictionary*. 1997. New York: Random House. <http://dictionary.infoplease.com> (accessed 13 June 2015).
- Renner and Fernández-Domínguez 2015: Renner, V. and J. Fernández-Domínguez. False Anglicization in the Romance languages: A contrastive analysis of French, Spanish and Italian. – In: Furiassi, C. and H. Gottlieb (eds.). *Pseudo-English: Studies on False Anglicisms in Europe*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015, 147–157.
- Rey-Debove and Gagnon 1984: R e y - D e b o v e , J. and G. G a g n o n . *Dictionnaire des anglicismes: les mots anglais et américains en français*, (2nd ed). Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 1984.
- Special Eurobarometer 386, Europeans and Their Languages, Report*. 2012. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf (accessed 14 June 2015).
- Stoyanov 1993: S t o y a n o v , S. *Gramatika na bālgarskiya knižoven ezik*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Sofiyskiya universitet "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 1993.
- Zidarova 2008 : Z i d a r o v a , V. Diminutivi i leksikalna nominaciya. http://georgesg.info/belb/personal/zidarova/deminutiva_lex.htm (accessed 14 June 2015).

Псевдоанглицизмите във френския и в българския

Александра Багашева (София) и Венсан Рене (Лион)

Настоящата статия предлага качитативно сравнително описание на развитието на псевдоанглицизмите във френския и в българския език, като основният фокус пада върху типологизация на видовете псевдоанглицизми и очертаване на основните прилики и разлики в процесите на поява на псевдоанглицизми в двата езика. Във френския псевдоанглицизмите са два пъти повече, отколкото в българския, но процесите, които водят до възникването на псевдоанглицизми, са почти еднакви в двата езика, включително и относителният дял на различните процеси. Два са водещите процеси – елипса и ресемантизация – като всеки един допринася за около 40% от псевдоанглицизмите в двата езика. Третият основен процес, чрез който възникват около 10% от псевдоанглицизмите в анализиранията база данни, е композицията. Във френския се наблюдава по-голямо лексикално разнообразие, като са налице доста прилагателни и глаголи, които като псевдоанглицизми почти не се срещат в българския

език, поради факта, че в българския език е налице съгласуване по род и число и прилагателните обикновено се адаптират посредством роден деривационен материал, а глаголите се дооформят, за да могат да се впишат лесно в морфологичната парадигма на глагола в българския. Забележителен е фактът, че двата езика споделят голяма част от съществуващите псевдоанглицизми – 40% от българските псевдоанглицизми се срещат във френския, а около 20% от френските псевдоанглицизми съществуват под някаква форма в българския език. Обяснението на тези факти е сложно и изисква мултидисциплинарен подход, което е следваща стъпка в изучаването на псевдоанглицизмите в езиците по света.

e-mails: abagasheva@gmail.com;
vincent.renner@univ-lyon2.fr