

pedagogical and political discourses indicate the importance of this parameter in the prosodic system and necessitate further acoustic analysis. It is important to compare the objective components of the dynamic subsystem, namely, the intensity – the acoustic volume correlate – within the studied material.

References:

1. Захарова Ю. М. Просодична інтерференція в англomовному дискурсі (експериментально-фонетичне дослідження мови арабо-англійських білінгвів) : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Київ, 2004. 270 с.
2. Калита А. А. Фонетичні засоби актуалізації смислу емоційного висловлювання : монографія. Київ : Вид. центр КДЛУ, 2001. 351 с.
3. Постникова Л. Просодия политического дискурса в британской и американской лингвокультурах: URSS, 2011. 200 с.
4. Шейгал Е. И. Интенсивность как компонент семантики слова : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04 / МГПИИЯ им. М. Тореза. Москва, 1981. 196 с.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-227-2-53>

LEXICOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF GERMANIC ELEMENT IN THE EARLY 20th-CENTURY ENGLISH VOCABULARY

ЛЕКСИКОГРАФІЧНИЙ ОГЛЯД ЗАПОЗИЧЕНЬ З ГЕРМАНСЬКИХ МОВ НА ПОЧАТКУ 20 СТОЛІТТЯ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Polishchuk G. V.

*Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Assistant Professor at the Department
of Germanic Languages and Teaching
Methodology
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central
Ukrainian State Pedagogical
University*

Поліщук Г. В.

*доктор педагогічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри германських мов та
методик їхнього навчання
Центральноукраїнський державний
педагогічний університет імені
Володимира Винниченка*

Yarova L. O.

*Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Head of the Department of
Translation, General and Applied
Linguistics
Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central
Ukrainian State Pedagogical
University
Kropyvnytskyi, Ukraine*

Ярова Л. О.

*кандидат педагогічних наук,
доцент,
завідувач кафедри перекладу,
заступник та загальної лінгвістики
Центральноукраїнський державний
педагогічний університет
імені Володимира Винниченка
м. Кропивницький, Україна*

The paper covers foreign words in English from a synchronic perspective, with special focus on Germanic element among modern borrowings in English. The list of collected terms dated 1900–1929 (early 20th century, E20) consists of words and phrases which come from Germanic languages taken from Oxford Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases (2010). The aim of this research is to study language distribution within the English E20 lexicon with special focus on borrowings from Germanic languages in English determining its semantic domain helping to discuss relative trends in the development of modern English lexicon. The discussed items were grouped according to the language they come from, starting from the languages which donated the most vocabulary: 16,9% (*German, Yiddish, Afrikaans, Norwegian, Swedish, Swiss German*) and the following popular categories have been analyzed: history, politics, words of general character, administrative terms/law/government, music (dance/songs), fashion (clothes/names of fabric), military, sport, theology/religion, cookery (dishes/beverages (wine vocabulary)/ desserts), slang/colloquial usage, art/literature and others.

Lexical borrowing is universal, scientific literature declares 'the paradox of linguistic borrowing', i.e., the question why languages should borrow items from other languages at all, in spite of the fact that the recipient languages can be viewed as fully functioning 'system(s) of spoken or written communication used by a particular country, people, community, etc.' [11]. At present, nowhere is the sociopolitical situation such that interaction in even more languages, for example, a dozen or so, is necessary for daily life [1, p. 157-158; 3, p. 22]. According to Uri Tadmor's investigation [10], the average borrowing rate, at 24.2%, is substantial and higher than expected, it is clear that lexical borrowing is a very pervasive phenomenon and a fascinating topic for discussion in scientific literature that attracted the attention of modern scholars, who have focused on the role of borrowings in the history of the English language [10; 2], linguistic

diversity and language evolution [3], lexical matches between different languages [5], pragmatic necessity of borrowing and their cognitive and communicative value [11], etc.

It is worth mentioning that German borrowings in E20 had been already thoroughly analyzed by us in [9], and it plays significant role in the group of Germanic languages – 62,5%. Our attention would be concentrated on other Germanic languages which have noticeable impact on English vocabulary. Yiddish, historically a variety of German influenced heavily by Hebrew and spoken by Jewish communities over a wide area of central and eastern Europe, also described for that reason as 'Judaeo-German' extinct [8, p. 441], gives 22,2% of borrowings to the English language among other Germanic languages in our data. Yiddish is proved to be the major supplier of slang vocabulary into E20 English – 56,2% not only among Germanic languages, but all languages under study in our data, e.g., *schlock* (cheap, shoddy or defective goods; interior material; trash), *dreck* (rubbish, trash), *yenta* (a woman who is a gossip or busybody; originally a personal name), *meshugaas* (madness, craziness, nonsense, foolishness), *tochus* (the buttocks), *mazuma* (money, cash; especially betting money), *kibitz* (look on at cards or some other activity, especially offering unwanted advice; speak informally, chat), *schlep* (haul, carry, drag; go or move reluctantly or with effort), *tsuris* (problems or difficulties, trouble, worry), etc. The majority of these words are marked in the dictionary as US slang, so they were brought by the nearly three million Yiddish-speaking Jews who emigrated to North America in the late 19th and early 20th centuries [7, p. 379]. We agree completely, that there are many simple cases of culturally motivated borrowing where a cultural importation is accompanied by a lexical importation in a straightforward way, e.g. English borrowing kosher from Yiddish [4].

Food items also attract attention and constitute 25% of all Yiddish borrowings, such as *latke* (in Jewish cookery a pancake, especially one made with grated potato), *bagel* (a dense bread roll in the shape of a ring, characteristic of Jewish baking), *blintze* (a thin rolled pancake filled with cheese or fruit and then fried or baked), *nosh* (food, a meal; a snack eaten between meals; to eat food greedily. First used to denote a snack bar), etc. 12,5% of borrowings belong to Jewish folklore and traditional clothes, as the general rule says that, among lexical items, cultural vocabulary is always borrowed first, whereas basic vocabulary is generally more resistant to borrowing. [5, p. 12], e.g., *dybbuk* (in Jewish folklore a malevolent wandering spirit that enters and possesses the body of living person until exorcised), *yarmulke* (a skullcap worn in public by orthodox Jewish men or

during prayer by other Jewish men; originated from Polish cap or Turkish raincoat); not very many Yiddish general words entered English at that period (6,5%), e.g., *naches* (a sense of pleasure or pride, especially at the achievements of one's children; joy, gratification; from Hebrew contentment), etc. Further investigation showed that Yiddish has proved to be the source of the verb borrowability into English not only among Germanic languages but also among 38 languages under consideration: 18,7%, e.g., *schlep*, *kibitz*, *nosh* etc., despite of the fact that nouns usually show high borrowability (81,3% in our data) because of their semantic function as designations of new things, the need for affective enrichment or euphemism, the need for differentiation, and a general need for renewal. The prominence of nouns over non-nouns is explained by their relative frequency in the receiving language and so the motivation to borrow nouns must be attributed to the richness of semantic content rather than frequency or the structural properties of nouns as potential stand-alone elements [6, p. 2]. So, not only social and attitudinal factors (prestige of the donor language, puristic attitudes) work, but grammatical factors [4] (e.g., the claim that verbs are more difficult to borrow than nouns because they need more grammatical adaptation than nouns) as well in case with Yiddish.

It has been found out that 6,9% of Germanic borrowings in our data belong to Afrikaans (6,9%), defined as Germanic, derivative from Dutch, spoken in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa by emigration [8, p. 12]. The majority of borrowings are nouns indicating family relations, such as *oupa* (a grandfather, an elderly man), *ouma* (grandmother, an elderly woman); names of plants: *rooibos* (evergreen South African shrub of the pea family, the leaves of which are used to make tea), etc.; food items: *koeksister* (a plaited doughnut dipped in syrup, a traditional South African confection). One case of adjective borrowing was registered: *lekker* (pleasant, sweet, nice, good, excellent; in South Africa a general term of approval) – 20% in our research.

Norwegian (4,3%), as the North Germanic spoken in Norway, is world famous as the greatest supplier of sport terms in different languages, is registered in our data to present exactly sport items in E20, such as *slalom* (a downhill ski race on a zigzag course marked by artificial obstacles, flags; a similar obstacle race for canoeist, water-skiers, skateboarders), *skijoring* (the sport or recreation of being pulled over snow or ice on skis by a horse or a dog). *Krill* (a small shrimplike planktonic crustacean of the open seas, eaten by a number of larger animals, including some whales and seals) is widely used not only in English, but was completely assimilated in Ukrainian as well. The majority of Norwegian borrowings are nouns,

though *slalom* is also borrowed as a verb (move or race in a winding path, avoiding obstacles).

Swedish borrowings constitute 2,8% of nouns, such as geology term *varve* and the name of popular winter drink *glogg* (a Scandinavian winter drink, consisting of hot sweetened red wine, with brandy, almonds, raisins and spices).

Conclusions. Cultural vocabulary is proved to be always borrowed first among lexical items, thus, the presence of a substantial number of cultural borrowings from Germanic languages makes the hypothesis of loanwords very likely: semantic domains differ in their borrowability, i.e., lexical items pertaining to the modern world, clothing, political relations, food and drink, sport are more frequently borrowed than words from the domains of sense perception, spatial relations, body terms, kinship, etc. Germanic languages have different impact on the lexicon of English in the early 20 century: Yiddish was proved to be the major supplier of slang vocabulary – 56,2%, also various semantic groups of borrowings were determined due to its frequency (food items 25%, folklore and traditional clothes 12,5%; general words 6,5%, etc.). Afrikaans (6,9%) was found out to supply nouns indicating family relations and food items; Norwegian (4,3%) – as the supplier of sport terms in different languages; Swedish (2,8%) – geology terms, name of popular winter drink, etc. Differentiation into word classes of borrowed words was given and it has been found out that nouns are more borrowable than adjectives or verbs (81,3%), nouns appear at the top of the list but Yiddish has proved to be the source of the verb borrowability into English not only among Germanic languages but also among 38 languages under consideration: 18,7% proving that not only social and attitudinal factors work, but grammatical as well in case with Yiddish, thus, the presence of the Germanic element in the vocabulary of English is significant.

References:

1. Magami Aygun. Concepts of Borrowings in Modern Science of Linguistics, Reasons of Borrowed Words and Some of Their Theoretical Problems in General Linguistics. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. Vol. 5, No. 6; 2015. P. 157–163. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n6p157>
2. Anthony P. Grant. Loanwords in British English. From the book *Loanwords in the World's Languages*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218442.360>
3. Harald Hammarstrom. Linguistic diversity and language evolution. *Journal of Language Evolution*, 2016, Vol. 1, No. 1. P. 22.

4. Martin Haspelmath. Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. From the book *Loanwords in the World's Languages*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218442.35>
5. Alexei Kassian. Lexical Matches between Sumerian and Hurro-Urartian: Possible Historical Scenarios. *Cuneiform Digital Library Journal* 2014:4, p. 12. https://cdli.ucla.edu/file/publications/cdlj2014_004.pdf
6. Yaron Matras, Evangelia Adamou. Word classes in language contact. 2021. fhalshs-03276022. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-03276022/document> P.1-2
7. Oxford Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases. Second Edition. Oxford University Press, 2008. 408p.
8. Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics. Second Edition. Oxford University Press, 2007. 443p.
9. Polishchuk G. German borrowings in English in the early 20 century. «Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія Філологія. Журналістика». Том 33 (72) № 1, 2022. С. 181–186.
10. Uri Tadmor. Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. From the book *Loanwords in the World's Languages*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218442.55>.
11. Esme Winter-Froemel. The pragmatic necessity of borrowing: Euphemism, dysphemism, playfulness – and naming. *Taal en Tongval*, Volume 69, Issue 1, Sep 2017, p. 17–46 <https://doi.org/10.5117/TET2017.1.WINT>