

Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse

Ćorić, Mila

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zadar / Sveučilište u Zadru**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:162:401784>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-03-09**



Sveučilište u Zadru
Universitas Studiorum
Jadertina | 1396 | 2002 |

Repository / Repozitorij:

[University of Zadar Institutional Repository](#)



zir.nsk.hr



DIGITALNI AKADEMSKI ARHIVI I REPOZITORIJI

Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku

Diplomski sveučilišni studij Engleskog jezika i književnosti; smjer: nastavnički
(dvopredmetni)

Mila Ćorić

Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse

Diplomski rad



Zadar, 2020.

Sveučilište u Zadru

Odjel za anglistiku

Diplomski sveučilišni studij Engleskog jezika i književnosti; smjer: nastavnički
(dvopredmetni)

Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse

Diplomski rad

Student/ica:

Mila Ćorić

Mentor/ica:

dr.sc. Ivo Fabijanić

Zadar, 2020.



Izjava o akademskoj čestitosti

Ja, **Mila Ćorić**, ovime izjavljujem da je moj **diplomski** rad pod naslovom **Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse** rezultat mojega vlastitog rada, da se temelji na mojim istraživanjima te da se oslanja na izvore i radove navedene u bilješkama i popisu literature. Ni jedan dio mojega rada nije napisan na nedopušten način, odnosno nije prepisan iz necitiranih radova i ne krši bilo čija autorska prava.

Izjavljujem da ni jedan dio ovoga rada nije iskorišten u kojem drugom radu pri bilo kojoj drugoj visokoškolskoj, znanstvenoj, obrazovnoj ili inoj ustanovi.

Sadržaj mojega rada u potpunosti odgovara sadržaju obranjenoga i nakon obrane uređenoga rada.

Zadar, 26. svibanj 2020.

Table of contents:

1. Introduction.....	1
2. METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURE.....	2
2.1. AIMS AND GOALS.....	3
2.2. A historical exploration of languages in contact.....	4
2.2.1 Terminology and periodization.....	4
2.3. Language mixture.....	7
2.3.1. Language borrowing.....	10
2.3.2. Anglicisms.....	12
2.4. Rudolf Filipović's research and methodology.....	14
2.5 English element in Croatian.....	16
2.6. Linguistic influence.....	18
3. CORPUS AND SOURCES.....	18
4. ANALYSIS OF ANGLICISMS ON THE ORTHOGRAPHIC LEVEL.....	31
4.1. Ortographic adaptation according to the pronunciation of the model.....	32
4.2. Orthographic adaptation according to the orthography of the model.....	33
4.3. Combination of the orthography and pronunciation of the model.....	34
4.5. Word formation under an influence of the intermediary language.....	34
4.6. Orthographic analysis of the corpus of Anglicisms in Croatian.....	36
4.7. Discussion about the analysis on the ortographic level.....	38
5. SEMANTIC ADAPTATION.....	39
5.1. Theory of semantic change.....	39
5.2. Zero semantic extension.....	43
5.3. Restriction of meaning.....	43
5.4. Expansion of meaning.....	44
5.6. Semantic analysis of the corpus of Anglicisms in Croatian.....	46
5.7. Discussion about the adaptation on the semantic level.....	53
6.CONCLUSION.....	61
7. Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse: Summary and key words.....	63
8. Anglicizmi u hrvatskom političkom diskursu: Sažetak i ključne riječi.....	64
WORK CITED.....	65

1. INTRODUCTION

This thesis aims to represent the adaptation of loanwords in the Croatian language on the orthographic and semantic levels as well as to show the immense influence of English as a global language on Croatian. The existence of global language aims to communicate globally since nowadays, more than ever, the world is connected on different levels. Being a global media of communication, i.e. lingua franca, English is used to name many new concepts, ideas, and products. As a consequence, Anglicisms today exist in different discourses – mass media, advertising, Internet, fashion, etc. Anglicisms have been widely spreading into European languages since the end of the Second World War.

Contacts among European languages and English occurred in the 17th and 18th century. Examining foreign elements in certain European languages started with the growing interest in lexicography and etymology of words, since creation of historical dictionaries began (Filipović 1986:50). In the 20th century, English contributions to European languages have become more numerous and even more interesting (Filipović 1982: 104). Moreover, immigration to the USA resulted in contacts among English and European languages (Filipović, 1986: 50). In both cases, English is a language donor and European languages are recipient ones.

Owing to the possibilities of high technologies, transportation, and means of communication, the world today can be called a global village. Therefore, new ideas and products spread extraordinarily fast and every new notion is given a name. In the 1980s, the linguist Galinsky (1991:195) found out that American neologisms required two to twenty-eight years to be adapted into German. Nowadays, it seems like these transfers happen rapidly, in a few minutes. Regarding the adoption of new foreign words, the receiving languages react differently. Thus, some languages are very receptive to it while others hold to

their purist tradition and translate most of the foreign elements. All in all, most languages choose a middle ground and try to reach some sort of a compromise. As far as Croatian is considered purist tendencies varied in force during different epochs. Therefore, with the foundation of the Republic of Croatia, these tendencies particularly increased during the first years. A significant number of Croatian words (pushed out by Serbo-Croatian being the official language) were brought back to usage. Also, these tendencies opened the way to the creation of new words (Muhvić-Dimanovski 2004:139-142).

The focus of this diploma is on Anglicisms in the Croatian political discourse on the orthographic and semantic level. In order to show the contact between the English and the Croatian language in the Croatian political discourse online newspapers portals such as „Index“ (www.index.hr), “Jutarnji list” (www.jutarnji.hr), “Nacional” (www.nacional.hr), “Globus” (www.jutarnji.hr/globus/) “Večernji list” (www.vecernji.hr), are investigated. The corpus of anglicisms includes 32 words, found in articles dating from 2016, 2017 and 2018.

2. METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURE

This thesis follows the methodology developed by Rudolf Filipović - a Croatian linguist. He was the leader of the project titled “English element in the European languages“, which served as a considerable improvement in the investigation of English loanwords. Also, he is the editor of an English-Croatian dictionary and author of many articles and books including “Teorija jezika u kontaktu” and “Anglicizmi u hrvatskom i srpskom jeziku”, which are the most important sources in elaboration of this thesis. His scientific interest was in the domain of contact linguistics, underlying the research focus of this diploma paper. Therefore, first and foremost, in the chapters that follow, the historical overview of contact linguistics and the phenomenon of linguistic borrowing will be discussed. Furthermore, the methodological procedure of Rudolf Filipović is thoroughly represented so as to explain the

ortographic and semantic analysis of the corpus of Anglicisms, 32 words in total, found in Croatian magazines aforementioned. Afterwards, the last two chapters will fully explore Anglicisms using an analysis at both the orthographic and semantic levels. These analyses will be accompanied by tabular representations showing the phonological forms and meanings of words both from English (Cambridge/The Free dictionary) and Croatian (Anić's dictionary, Veliki rječnik hrvatskog standardnog jezika, Hrvatski jezični portal) as well as the details about the newspaper articles used as sources.

2.1. AIMS AND GOALS

Showing the adaptation of Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse on the orthographic and semantic level is the primary aim of this research, which is thoroughly represented in the last two chapters. The thesis follows the methodology of linguist Rudolf Filipović along with the theoretical background of contact linguistics.

The newspapers used as a source of Anglicisms are Jutarnji list, Večernji list, Globus, Nacional and Index.hr. Since all of these sources deal with relevant social and political topics they were well suited for this research. They cover various fields such as politics, sports, economy, and culture. To represent the phonological form and explain the meanings of words from English, Cambridge Dictionary and The Free Dictionary were used. As for Croatian, Anić's dictionary, Hrvatski jezični portal along with the websites Hrvatski jezični savjetnik and Hrvatska enciklopedija were used to explain meanings from Croatian. Also, to complement several meanings of words, Veliki rječnik hrvatskog standardnog jezik was used.

While reading the articles, the prevalence of foreign words used, not only from English, was quite surprising, which provoked an additional interest in language purism and the manipulation of meaning in political discourse. Along with the subject of research of this thesis, it would be interesting to see how those topics open a path to further insights and perspectives in the fields of other social sciences, such as anthropology or sociolinguistics.

As far as I am concerned, the analysis of anglicisms in Croatian political discourse is still not thoroughly investigated, which was the main reason for choosing this topic.

2.2. A historical exploration of languages in contact

The „Theory of languages in Contact“ is based on the research conducted during the twentieth century. The term languages in contact has become common since the publication of the monography „Languages in Contact“ (1953) by Uriel Weinreich. The term languages in contact has the broader definition than the term language borrowing. In his research, Filipović (1986:17-18) observes that languages come in contact when: a) words or phrases of a giving language transfer into receiving language – in the process of language borrowing; b) when a non-native language speaker learns a foreign language. In both cases, there is linguistic interference – deviation from the norm. Nowadays, the accepted and widely used term is “Contact Linguistics” – a linguistics branch dealing with “bilingualism, language contacts, language borrowing, language acquisition, language shift etc.”

The following chapter deals with the terminology and periodization as well as the most significant researchers in the field of “Contact Linguistics” who are significant sources used throughout the paper.

2.2.1 Terminology and periodization

“Contact Linguistics” – the interdisciplinary study whose goal is to “uncover the various factors, both linguistic and sociocultural, that contribute to the linguistic consequences of contact between speakers of different language varieties” (Winford 2005: 11). The term was first put forth at the original “First World Congress on Language Contact and Conflict” in Brussels, June 1979. A significant contribution to this field was the research of Haugen and Weinreich. Together with more recent pioneers Thomason and Kaufman, they put an emphasis

on the importance of an interdisciplinary approach together with the refinement of the terminology and descriptive framework used before (Winford 2005: 9).

The linguist Jovan Ajduković (2004: 9) presents the chronological and conceptual periodization of the linguistics of language contacts, which are divided into five periods over the last fifty years of the 20th century.

1) The first period is symbolized by works of Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1950; 1953). The linguists of this period are interested in language borrowing at several levels including the “phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical“ (Ajduković 2004:9).

2) The second period (the 60s) is characterized by the research within a framework of sociolinguistics. Labov states that the language contacts are examined as a “social phenomenon” and language itself is a part of complex and dynamic processes of society (Labov 1968: 240 qtd. in Ajduković 9). The linguists including Filipović, Kurtböke and Mackey are especially keen about the universal theory of borrowing which would embrace the structural and psychological mechanisms as well as integration problems.

3) The third period (the 70s) is symbolized by the necessity to establish the theory accepted by linguists, sociologists, physiologists, and anthropologists in order to connect the “linguistic and extralinguistic levels of analysis”, as stated by Di Pietro (Di Pietro 1970:16 qtd. in Ajduković 9). Regarding the study of bilingualism, the focus shifted from the individual level to the group political identities. The term interference is signified as obsolete (Haugen: 1970, 224), so instead the expression “transfer” is used. Nevertheless, the question of interference becoming equal to borrowing is still not answered (Kurtböke 1998 qtd. in Ajduković 10).

4) In the fourth period (the 80s) the expression “Contact linguistics” is introduced (Nelde 1983:12 qtd. in Ajduković 10). Bilingualism is still widely investigated, together with its development and disappearance. Special attention is placed on language loss, code-switching and linguistic changes, especially among immigrants.

5) In the fifth period (the 90s) the terms such as “code copying” (Johanson: 1992) and the “matrix language framework model” (Myers-Scotton: 1993) are introduced. Regarding the types of contact situations, some linguists such as Thomason (1995) state that language contacts result from different social setting such as the situation of attack or stability. Conversely, other linguists such as Kurtböke (1998) state that the intensive language contacts can initiate language changes, which are especially influenced by religious and political factors.

Simply put, language contact is “the use of two or more languages in the same location at the same time”(Thomason 2001: 1). It is a phenomenon lasting for thousands of years, almost certainly since the beginning of mankind. It exists everywhere and differs in intensity (Thomason 2001: 6-8).

The theme of this paper - the presence of Anglicisms in the Croatian language presents just one of the possible results of language contact. Other outcomes, as stated by Thomason (2001:10) are following:

- 1) “contact induced language changes (e.g. code-switching, code alternation)”
- 2) “extreme language mixture (the result of which includes creoles, pidgins, and mixed languages)”
- 3) “language death (shift to another language or the death of speakers)”

Language contact most often results in the change in one or all of the languages. The most typical occurrence of this influence involves the borrowing of words, which will be further discussed. Bearing in mind, not only words are borrowed, but all aspects of language structure – “morphology (word structure), syntax (sentence structure), phonology (sound systems), and lexical semantics are borrowed in addition to words”(Thomason 2001:11).

2.3. Language mixture

Regarding the phenomenon of language mixture, in the 19th century some linguists differentiated the term language borrowing from the term language mixture, unlike others. Generally, the unified attitude did not exist. Schuchardt (as cited in Filipović 1986: 20) concludes that language mixture is an incomplete bilingualism and he does not differentiate between the two terms. At that time, the terms language mixture and mixed languages were used, later proved inappropriate. Many linguists such as Rask (1818) doubt the existence of mixed languages stating that languages rarely change their structure due to the external influence. Moreover, Schleicher completely negates the existence of mixed languages and thinks of a language as a “natural organism” (as cited in Filipović 1986: 19). Furthermore, Muller states that no nation or tribe was ever so isolated to resist the importation of foreign words adding that languages can be mixed in their dictionary, but never in grammar (as cited in Whitney 1881: 6). Although Whitney (1881:16) agrees with Muller about languages never mixing their grammars, he states that by a secondary process grammatical mixture can happen. Thereupon, Whitney (1881:14) concludes that when speakers of two languages, A and B begin a contact, those languages do not emerge into the new AB language, but for some time maintain their separate identities, slowly being modified. Then, we can call them A b and B a. Finally, one of the languages proves to be more powerful.

One of the most important linguists dealing with the problems of language mixture is Hermann Paul who thinks that mixture of languages is crucial for the life of a language. According to Paul (1891:460-461), words are borrowed, firstly, to fill a gap in the vocabulary. Secondly, borrowing can be a result of fashion and necessity. When transferred into language, the word slowly spreads and its usage becomes common. Firstly, a limited group of people uses it, then it becomes more and more common among other groups.

Furthermore, another influential linguist of his time was Antoine Meillet is against the term mixed languages, which he finds unsuitable because it „implies the idea of that language could be a result of the mixing of two languages in equal conditions and that it can be told if the language is the continuation of language A or of language B“. Moreover, while Meillet regards lexical borrowing to be very common, phonetical and grammatical are seen as exceptions (qtd. In Filipović 1986:25). Another important linguist dealing with terminological problems is Haugen, whose work will be discussed further.

According to Filipović (1986:26) language contact can be examined better if extra-linguistic factors, along with linguistic ones are taken into consideration. Thus, a social-cultural context is of a major importance. As a result, linguists also need to consider results from anthropology, sociology etc. One of the linguists who considered importance of anthropologists, geographers, sociologists, psychologists and other scientists is Haugen (1956). Einar Haugen (1950), in his work “The analysis of linguistic borrowing” casts away the term “language mixture” and uses “linguistic borrowing”. Referring to Paul (1925) and Meillet (1921) Haugen states that languages may switch rapidly, but “at any given moment speaker speaks only one and resort to the other for assistance” (1950: 211). The introduction of elements from one language into another represents an “alteration of the second language“, not their mixture. The term mixture suggests “the creation of an entirely new entity and the disappearance of both constituents; it also suggests a jumbling of a more or less haphazard nature” (1950: 211).

In the works of the founders of contact linguistics and bilingualism in America and Canada - Werner Leopold, Einar Haugen and Uriel Weinreich, the theory of languages in contact starts from bilingualism and a speaker is “the locus of language contact” (Weinreich 1953:71). Conversely, Havranek (1964: 178) considers bilingualism as a specific case of a contact and differentiates complete and partial bilingualism. He thinks that bilingualism needs

to be limited to the group of speakers who have dual grammatical structures and words from both languages (Filipović, 1986: 31). What attracted the most attention of linguists is the phenomenon of interference which is “the rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system, a large part of the morphology and syntax, and some areas of the vocabulary” (Weinreich 1953:1) By introducing the term interference, the old term interlingual influence got out of usage (Weinreich 1953 as cited in Filipović 1986:34).

Haugen (1953) differentiates 3 periods of adaptation of the donor language elements within the recipient language according to generations and degree of bilingualism. Firstly, there is a pre-lingual period, which corresponds to the term first generation, proposed by Filipović. Here, the words show almost absolute “native substitution“, with irregular phonetic results. In this case, an erratic substitution occurs, which means that some donor language phonemes are not always substituted by the same phonemes in the recipient language. Secondly, a period of adult bilingualism occurs, which corresponds to the Filipović’s term of second generation. Here, the knowledge of a donor language increases and the degree of bilingualism leads to the systematic substitution, which means that donor language phonemes are replaced by the same phonemes of a recipient language. Also, a new phonemic distribution occurs, which Haugen calls phonemic redistribution. The third period is of childhood bilingualism in which phonemic importation occurs. Here, a bilingual speaker takes in a loanword which in its phonetic form corresponds highest to the recipient language (as cited in Filipović, 1986: 51-52).

Within the framework of Contact Linguistics, bilingualism and language contact are the main topics of research. Nowadays, bilingualism is the basis of contact linguistics research. Both Ajduković and Filipović (1986:34) define three research periods in the development of theory of languages:

1. “Language mixture and mixed languages“
2. “Language or linguistic borrowing“
3. “Languages in contact and language contact or contact of languages. “

2.3.1. Language borrowing

At the brink of 19th century, many linguists thought that bilingualism was a necessary condition for language borrowing to occur. Paul (1891) states that a bilingual group is necessary for language borrowing to occur. Schuchardt is one of the 19th century linguists who opened the path to the modern theory of loanword investigation (as cited in Filipović 1986: 20). Furthermore, he states that a bilingual group creates conditions for language mixing, as well as language borrowing. (as cited in Filipović 1986:26).

According to Filipović (1986: 50) the process of language borrowing should be viewed as having two types. The first is the intermediary borrowing which requires an intermediary through which a recipient and a donor language get in contact. The second type is the direct borrowing in which contact between two languages is achieved directly. This contact occurs and it is realized in a bilingual speaker. Here, the donor language is a dominant, prestige language. Another difference is that intermediary borrowing does not cover the whole system of languages in contact, but only the parts of words. Conversely, direct borrowing is realized in whole words, phrases, sentences, discourses, etc. These language contacts are more intense and more comprehensive (Filipović 1986: 51-52). The relation “direct – intermediary“ is one of the crucial principles of the contact linguistics theory and the basis for analysis of language borrowing. Intermediary media can be a written word (e.g. newspapers) or a spoken word (radio, television, etc.) (Filipović 1986: 54).

Another important linguist dealing with language borrowing is Haugen who explains that borrowing is “the attempted reproduction in one language or patterns previously found in another” (1950:212). He proposes the following terminology of language borrowing:

- 1) Loanword – The meaning and its phonetic shape are imported, with exchange of native phonemes. Sometimes, hybrid is the term which is used to tell apart loanwords when “a part of the phonemic shape is imported”, but the rest is of native origin. They show “morphemic importation without substitution”. Morphemic substitution can be none, partial or complete. It operates independently of the phonemic substitution. “Complete morphemic substitution precludes phonemic substitution, but within the morphemic importation there may be a division into more or less phonemic substitution” (Haugen: 1950: 214). The simplest and most common phonetic substitution is the one of a native using sound sequence to imitate a foreign one. Complete substitution is typical of native language learners and is heard as a “foreign accent” (Haugen, 1950:215).
- 2) Loan translation (calque) – the meaning is imported and the substitution of phonemic shape is complete. Here, morphemic substitution is complete.
- 3) Loanblends – show both, morphemic substitution and importation. They are classified as: “blended stem” (where the suffix itself is meaningless), “blended derivative” (native suffixes are substituted for the foreign), “blended compounds” (the largest class of stems).
- 4) Loanshifts – show “morphemic substitution without importation”. The term “shifts” include all modifications that are not exactly grammatical or phonological. They include loan translations and semantic loans. When a newly derived meaning of a word has little to do with the old one, it is called a “loan homonym”, while a semantic overlap between the old and novel meanings, shows the existence of a “loan synonym”. They can be distinguished into “semantic displacements”, in which “native terms are applied to novel cultural phenomena that are roughly similar to something culture, and semantic confusions, in which native distinctions are obliterated through the influence

of partial interlingual synonymity” (Haugen: 1950:219). In addition, loan translations show complete native substitution. Mostly, loanshifts occur if there is a semantic and phonetic similarity between native and foreign terms. “Analogues” are interlingually similar terms, with “homophones” showing the phonetic resemblance and “homologues” showing the semantic one. (Haugen: 1950:220).

In addition, American linguist Bloomfield (1933:444-461), among other types of borrowing, also discussed “cultural borrowing” (when elements that have been borrowed are from the same area of speech), “dialectal borrowing” (when borrowed elements are transferred from one dialect to another) and “intimate borrowing” (intensive contact, one-sided, occurs when two languages are spoken in a single community). According to him, borrowing occurs through the process of cultural diffusion (in which the words as well as objects, ideas, customs are transferred from one nation to another). While cultural borrowing is “mutual”, intimate borrowing is “one-sided”, in which case there is an upper and lower language. Usually, it is the upper, dominant language which borrows words to the lower language (1933:461).

2.3.2. Anglicisms

This chapter deals with the definition and classification of the term Anglicism. Languages often need new words in order to name new objects, ideas or terms. These gaps in vocabulary can be filled by a) the formation of new words by existing elements, b) language borrowing, and c) changed or added meaning of the word which already exists. By borrowing, which is the most common and simplest way, new words are integrated and adapted into the recipient language as loanwords which fill the gaps in vocabulary (Filipović, 1990: 15).

This brings us to the definition of the term Anglicism. Although it seems trivial, some difficulties and obscurities while determining the term may occur. Firstly, words of Anglo-

Saxon origin can be classified as Anglicisms. Secondly, since many English words are of Roman origin (over 50 %) it might be difficult to determine whether the word is an Anglicism or Romanism. Thirdly, there are neologisms formed from Greek and Latin elements, such as gravitation or anode. Furthermore, the intermediary language can represent a problem as well. After Second World War, Anglicisms were directly transferred into Croatian, as well as in many other languages. In the period before, anglicisms were transferred via intermediary languages (German and French mostly) (Sočanac, 1994: 225 -226).

In his work (1990:17) provided a new, expanded definition stating that “Anglicism is every word borrowed from English language; it does not have to be of an English origin, but it has to be adapted according to the English language system and integrated into English vocabulary.”

Moreover, in all European languages secondary adaptation brings Pseudoanglicisms, words formed from English elements and appearing to be English, but do not exist as English words. Thus, they are called secondary anglicisms. They are formed by:

- a) composition – the first element is Anglicism, another is man (e.g. golman)
- b) derivation – Anglicism + suffix -er (e.g. kombajner etc.)
- c) ellipsis – by deleting a suffix -ing (e.g. happy ending – hepi end)

The analysis of corpus of the project “English element in the European languages” shows that gaps in the vocabulary can be filled equally well by Anglicisms as well as Pseudoanglicisms. While Anglicisms are mostly used by elderly speakers, younger speakers use Pseudoanglicisms (Filipović, 1986: 193-194).

Finally, the question that imposes itself is that of purism and language borrowing. On the one hand, uncritical borrowing of foreign words needs to be stopped. On the other hand, borrowing exists in all languages and complete “purity” of a language can only exist in isolated communities, which, nowadays, is impossible. Moreover, borrowing can serve as a

means of enriching a language and foreign words for which equivalents do not exist should be borrowed (Sočanac, 1994: 227).

2.4. Rudolf Filipović's research and methodology

Rudolf Filipović is the originator of Contact linguistics in Croatia. Contact linguistics examines language contacts both in theory and practice. His and his coworkers research conclusions are based on the results of research of contacts among English and European languages in Europe and the USA (Filipović, 1986:54). In his article he notes his research incentive an interest in the English element in the Serbo-Croatian language as well as his wish to contribute to the history of English words on the continent (1982:104).

Filipović (1986:53) classifies the analysis of the process of borrowing and adaptation on four levels: „the phonological, morphological, semantic and lexical level“, which will be discussed in the following chapters. Filipović's(1990: 24) approach to the study of Anglicisms is the following:

- a) “the origin of Anglicisms i.e. the original English word”
- b) “development of English word i.e. how a model becomes a replica”
- c) “the meaning of a loanword i.e. the relation between the two meanings”

The division into a primary and secondary adaptation is what makes the work of Filipović so innovative. According to this division, changes are called primary and secondary. Primary changes are typical of a bilingual speaker, unstable and susceptible to different influences. On the contrary, secondary changes are constant and typical of a monolingual speaker and his language. If a change occurs it develops slowly and it is in accordance with the recipient language tendencies (Filipović 1986: 57).

The simplest linguistic influence is realized when the donor language element – model is transferred into the recipient language. This is the beginning of a language borrowing

controlled by two basic language operations: substitution and importation. Since the adaptation of the model has different levels, a great number of changes occur. All of them need to be analyzed, classified and defined to get a broad picture of the process of adaptation.

The changes can be classified as:

a) changes of replica until the integration

b) changes of replica after the integration

(Filipović 1986: 55-56).

There are three main stages of a foreign word being accepted into a receiving language: 1) the word may preserve its original pronunciation, its use is restricted to bilinguals

2) the adaptation begins and it may get rid of foreign phonemes, but it preserves a great combination of foreign phonemic combinations and its native accentual peculiarities, which we call a foreign loanword due to its phonemic structure.

3) if the word is widely used, the process of adaptation continues – it loses foreign phonemic combinations and it is conformed to the native accentual system (Filipović 1960:80).

Furthermore, primary and secondary adaptation include two elements: chronological and qualitative, which enables a more precise analysis of the changes. Chronologically speaking, primary happens before secondary adaptation. The qualitative element is more important since it serves as a model to classify the changes from the process of adaptation (Filipović, 1986: 55-57). It is important to emphasise that they cannot be applied separately. Considering them chronologically, in the first period the word is entering and integrating the systems of the the borrowing language, whilst in the second, the word is integrated and goes through additional adaptation processes typical for native words in the borrowing language. The first period is equal to compromise replica. The changes that the words go through this

period of adaptation are called primary. During the second period, the borrowed word is called a loanword and all the changes it goes through secondary (1977: 118).

2.5 English element in Croatian

As it is already mentioned, contacts between English and Croatian increased after World War II. At that time, the project „English element in the Croatian language“ began. A distinguished member among the first of the Anglo-linguists was Rudolf Filipović. He had two important publications in 1986 and 1990, previously mentioned. These publications show how language contact theory could be applied to English loanwords collected in the Croatian language (Nikolić-Hoyt 2005: 179). Nowadays, English is widely used in the fields of economy and technology, but less in the field of culture (2005:180). According to Sočanac and Nikolić-Hoyt (2006) English in Croatia is used not only for “international public communication and terminology“, but also for “intranational conversational communication“. Position and influence of English in Croatia nowadays (as well as the rest of the world) is not the result of historical or political circumstances but different sociolinguistics and non-linguistic reasons, such as the prestigious position and global character of English language and culture:

As scholars note (Gorlach qtd. in Nikolić-Hoyt 50), “English, which imported thousands of words from French and Latin (mainly after 1066), is now by far the world’s biggest lexical exporter, and the trade is growing as English continues to dominate various fields ranging from pop music to electronic communication. Several countries have monitored the inflow of anglicisms and some have tried to block it. But language, as lexicographers have always found (...) respects neither boundary nor law“.

This influence on the Croatian language is usually caused by cultural, civilizational, scientific and technological reasons i.e. by the necessity to name new words and notions. In

addition, the English language is connected to the prestige as well as a modern and more successful style of life (Nikolić-Hoyt 2003:51). The growing presence of English words is characteristic of global teenagers as the most active initiators of language changes. Interestingly, English is the dominant language of young people, which serves them as a developer of their thoughts and feelings, ever since World War II (Sočanac and Nikolić-Hoyt 2006). Furthermore, a dominant position of the English language learning, which begins at kindergartens and other institutions for language education facilitated the spread of English words (Nikolić – Hoyt 181-182).

Purists concerned about the “anglophonisation of the Croatian language“ intent to reduce the influx of Anglicisms or fight against the influence of English. Regarding the Croatian purist tradition, it has indeed always been quite strong, although it does not have legal support and it is limited to linguistic circles and debates. Notwithstanding the resistance, the overall attitude regarding the usage of Anglicisms in Croatian is fairly positive. Because of the English influence, some structures in Croatian started to change “native patterns of syntactic forms“, especially noun phrases such as internet bankarstvo instead of internetskobankarstvo (Sočanac and Nikolić-Hoyt 2006). Anglicism in Croatian are widely spread, especially in the following thematic fields: modern technology and the Internet, sports and recreation, fashion, cosmetics, health etc. (Nikolić-Hoyt 2003:51).

2.6.Linguistic influence

In his work, *Teorijajezika*, Filipović (1986: 38) stated that the simplest form of the linguistic influence occurs when “a simple element X ”gets transferred from the donor language (LD) into the context of the recipient language (LR). The transfer of “the element X”shows the“interference” between the two languages. The element X is called “model”, and the borrowed element pronounced by the recipient language speakers is called “replica”.

Occasionally, it is difficult to determine when exactly the element X was transferred into another language. If, during this process, the element X keeps some characteristics of the donor language, then that form is called compromise replica. Furthermore, there is “a social dimension”, that is, the replica must be taken also by other speakers, which shows the transition from speech – parole into language – langue.

During this process we can differentiate the following types of diffusion or borrowing:

1. “switching“ – alternate usage of two languages by bilingual speakers and usage of non-assimilated words
2. “interference“ – occurs when “overlapping of two languages happens”
3. “integration“ – the stage in which a foreign element is a “completely adapted loanword.”

3. CORPUS AND SOURCES

Following the theoretical background, this chapter will represent the corpus of Anglicisms found in magazines *Jutarnji list*, *Večernji list*, *Globus*, *Nacional* and *Index.hr*. Articles are chosen randomly throughout the years 2016, 2017 and 2018. Articles mostly represent interviews with politicians and political commentaries. The total number of Anglicisms found is 32, the largest number of which are found in *Jutarnji list* and *Večernji list*, which are Croatian daily newspapers. Furthermore, *Globus* and *Nacional* are weekly news magazines and *Index.hr* is an online news website. It is important to emphasize that while doing the research, a large number of Anglicisms were found to be a part of Croatian political discourse. Those words were used by the authors of the articles and political analysts as well as politicians themselves in their speeches or interviews (e.g. *koncern*, *biznis* etc.) However, since the primary usage of those Anglicisms was not linked to politics, but to economics, media, fashion etc., they are not represented in this thesis.

The subsequent chapters will represent a thorough analysis of the Anglicisms on the orthographic and semantic levels as well as their usage in Croatian political discourse. The following table represents the corpus of Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse and it consists of English model, Croatian replica, article author, publication date and web source of the article. Anglicisms are listed in the alphabetical order.

Table 1: Corpus of Anglicisms in Croatian

MODEL	REPLICA	AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE/DATE OF PUBLICATION	LINK
BOYCOTT	BOJKOT	Robert Bajruši /22.10.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/sdp-ide-na-bojkot-sabora-a-potom-na-rusenje-marica-i-martine-dalic/6669138/

BLUFF	BLĚF	Ivan Hrstić /20.09.2018.	https://www.vecernji.hr/premium/plenkov-ic-i-penava-igraju-bajku-o-dobrom-kralju-1271057
BRIEFING	BRĚFING	Jutarnji hr. 26.10.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/plenkovic-oporba-zeli-destabilizirati-proces-restrukturiranja-agrokora-a-cini-mi-se-da-predsjednica-nije-dovoljno-upucena-u-dosje/6688761/
BYPASS	BYPASS (BĀJPAS)	Nino Đula/06.10.2016.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/komentari/zabara-vite-stvaranje-dugorocne-i-mocne-reformske-vlade-otkrivamo-pravi-razlog-zbog-kojeg-

			plenkovic-prvi-dogovor-silno-zeli-sklopiti-bas-s-petrovom/5109095/
CLINCH	KLINČ	Marko Biočina /13.08.2016.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/komentari/komentar-jutarnjeg-milanovic-ulazio-u-klinc-a-plenkovic-udarao-s-distance/4611038/
COMPATIBLE	KOMPATIBILAN	Mirela Lilek/07.10.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/obrazovanje/kako-je-zlatko-hasanbegovic-radio-na-jokicevoj-kurikularnoj-reformi-zaboravljena-povijest-omiljenog-povjesnicara

			hrvatske-politicke-desnice/6623361/
CONFERENCE	KONFERENCIJA	Lucija Vranković/24.01.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/biznis/tvrtke/video-foto-nova-energetska-strategija-predsjednica-kolinda-grabar-kitarovic-iznijela-5-kljucnih-smjernica-za-energetsku-buducnost-hrvatske/5546531/
CONGRESSMAN	KONGRESMEN	Jutarnjihr./ 10.02.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/svijet/americki-kongresmen-dosao-u-albaniju-pa-poceo-pricati-o-prekranju-granica-

			na-balkanu-makedonija-nije-drzava-to-je-propali-projekt/5614219/
DESK	DĚSK	Hina/14.06.2017	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/sokantno-otkrice-na-sudenju-bivsem-slovenskom-premijeru-slovenska-obavjestajna-sluzba-simala-je-sustavno-sve-telefonske-razgovore-sa-sanaderom/6239306/
ENGINEERING	INŽENJERING	Ivanka Toma/ 06.05.2018	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/sdp-ovci-usli-u-otvoreni-rat-za-zagreb-pljuste-optuzbe-za-izborni-inzenjering-i-

			manipulaciju-clanarinama-bernardic-namjesta-izbore-za-svog-covjeka/7322298/
ESTABLISHMENT	ESTABLĀŠMENT	Viktor Vresnik/28.01.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/politicki-fenomen-kako-i-zasto-je-zivizid-postao-trecanajpopularnija-stranka-vrijeme-je-da-se-zabrinemo-pernar-i-drustvo-ce-i-dalje-rasti/5562975/
EXPRESS	ĀKSPRESNO	HINA/31.08.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/prcurio-vladin-plan-za-ekspresno-micanje-ustaskog-poklica-iz-jasenovca-temelj-za-

			uklanjanje-natpisa-bit-ce-proglasenje-jasenovca-mjestom-pijeteta/6508876/
FAIR	FÊR	HINA/24.05.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/dalic-ocekuje-da-banke-regresnu-naplatu-mjenica-ne-provode-prisilno/6123242/
IMAGE	ÌMIDŹ	Ivanka Toma/24.03.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/komentari/bernardic-ostaje-na-celu-sdp-a-ali-sto-ako-hns-postane-lider-ljevice/5806715/

INTERVIEW	INTÈRVJŪ	Goran Penić/16.07.2016.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/zasto-novi-list-nije-objavio-intervju-s-bozom-petrovom-sto-je-to-petrov-rekao-pa-povukao.../4535129/
LEADER	LÍDER	N.R./ 25.05.2018.	https://www.vecernji.hr/premium/hoce-li-itko-kukuriknuti-u-ciboni-1247685
LOBBY	LÖBI	Tea Romić/ 16. 02.2018	https://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/hrast-hrvoje-zekanovic-lgbtiq-odjel-knjiznice-gay-lobi-nametanje-ideologije-1226782

MEETING	MĪTING	Nino Raspudić/18.4.2018.	https://www.index.hr/vijesti/clanak/je-li-ovo-bio-najgluplji-diplomatski-skandal/1039574.aspx
PARTNER	PĀRTNER	Vanja Nezirović/ 30.04.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/most-je-izvrsio-samoubojstvo-bivsi-savjetnik-petrova-hdz-most-nece-uzeti-treci-put-sdp-ga-nece-htjeti-probati-prvi-put-a-za-oporbu-je-nesposoban/5981211/
RATING	RĚJTING	Milan Ivkošić/ 11.05.2018	https://www.vecernji.hr/premium/plenkov-ic-na-htv-u-dobrodosla-promocija-zbog-pada-rejtinga

			1244581
ROUND	RÜNDA	Hina/ 04.10.2016.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/zavrsila-i-peta-runda-pregovora-hdz-a-i-mosta-ali-dogovora-jos-nema-plenkovic-najavio-novi-sastanak-nada-se-da-ce-do-ponedjeljka-biti-sve-gotovo/5019320/
SLOGAN	SLÖGĀN	Marko Biočina/ 08.11.2018.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/komentari/spasi-milana-osudi-daliju-branitelji-su-napali-daliju-oreskovic-zato-sto-je-navodno-rekla-da-su-oni-

			metastaza-problem-je-sto-ona-to-nije-izjavila/8031509/
SPEAKER	SPĀKER	Dražen Ćurić/ 09.06.2016.	https://www.vecernji.hr/premium/tudman-je-okupljao-ljude-i-kontrolirao-ekstremiste-a-karamarko-samo-izaziva-nove-podjele-1090711
SPIN (DOCTOR)	SPĪN	Hina/16.05.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/gr-moja-hdz-ove-tvrdnje-da-je-most-za-ukidanje-dubrovačko-neretvanske-zupanije-klasicni-su-spin-prije-izbora/6073729/

START	STÄRT	Ivica Beti/ 23.05.2018.	https://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/horvat-nikad-me-nitko-nece-navesti-da-kazem-bilo-sto-protiv-karamarka-1247201
SUMMIT	SÄMIT	Augustin Palokaj/ 06.01.2018.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/globus/Globus-politika/juncker-porucuje-srbiji-i-hrvatskoj-necemo-uvoziti-vase-granicne-sporove-rijesite-ih-sami/6907947/
TIMING	TÄJMING	Jutarnji.hr/ 13.09.2018.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/darko-milinovic-na-twitteru-se-rugao-plenkovicu-moj-krivi-tajming-penavin-krivi-tajming-evo-i-branitelji-u-krivom-

			tajmingu-kad-je-pravi/7824918/
TREND	TREND	Hina/07.05.2017.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/globus/Globus-politika/petrov-je-nepristojan-osporava-vodstvo-hdz-a-i-sdp-a-a-kako-je-uopce-on-dosao-na-celo-mosta/4518740/

TRIGGER	TRIGER	Željka Godeč/27.05.2016.	https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/martinovic-ostaje-uz-karamarka-pridruzuju-mu-se-lovrinovic-i-misic/4109322/
---------	--------	-----------------------------	---

4. ANALYSIS OF ANGLICISMS ON THE ORTHOGRAPHIC LEVEL

This chapter will represent the orthographic adaptation of anglicisms, along with examples of anglicisms from Croatian political discourse found in the following newspapers such as “Jutarnji list” (<https://www.jutarnji.hr/>), “Večernji list” (<https://www.vecernji.hr/>), “Nacional”, (<https://www.nacional.hr/>), “Globus” (<https://www.jutarnji.hr/globus/>), and “Index” (<https://www.index.hr/>).

According to Filipović (1983: 74) the phonological form of an Anglicism is indicated by four indices a, b, c or d following “the pronunciation of the English model, its spelling, both pronunciation and spelling or is modified by an intermediary language“.

Nikolić-Hoyt (2000: 158) writes about the discrepancy between the number and the relation between English and Croatian graphemes and phonemes, while English phonemes cannot always be easily replaced by corresponding Croatian graphemes. In other words, English phonological system has 44 phonemes (20 vowel phonemes and 24 consonant phonemes). They are represented by 26 graphemes of English alphabet, which means that one English grapheme can represent more than one phoneme. In contrast, Croatian has 30

phonemes (5 vowel phonemes and 25 consonant phonemes), which are represented by 30 graphemes.

4.1. Orthographic adaptation according to the pronunciation of the model

Filipović (2005: 16) notes that the orthography of the anglicism according to the pronunciation of the model is formed in a way that English phonemes are represented by the graphemes of the recipient language.

This analysis is based on defining the graphemes of the recipient language which could represent the phonemes of the donor language. Thus, there are five English vowel phonemes

/i:/, /e/, /ʌ/, /ɔ:/, /u:/ and 16 consonant phonemes /b/, /g/, /m/, /n/, /f/, /v/, /l/, /h/, /s/, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/, /j/, /r/ in the first group. Since they have corresponding phonemes in Croatian, they are represented by Croatian graphemes: ⟨i⟩, ⟨e⟩, ⟨a⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨u⟩ and ⟨b⟩, ⟨g⟩, ⟨m⟩, ⟨n⟩, ⟨f⟩, ⟨v⟩, ⟨l⟩, ⟨h⟩, ⟨s⟩, ⟨z⟩, ⟨š⟩, ⟨ž⟩, ⟨č⟩, ⟨dž⟩, ⟨j⟩, ⟨r⟩, ⟨a⟩.

In the second group, five English vowel phonemes /ɪ/, /æ/, /ɑ:/, /ɒ/, /ʊ/ are represented by orthographic equivalents in Croatian: i), e), a), o), u). Four English consonant phonemes /p/, /t/, /d/, /k/ are represented by Croatian graphemes ⟨p⟩, ⟨t⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨k⟩ (Nikolić-Hoyt 2005:158-159).

Regarding the third group, the orthography of Anglicisms is based on the orthography of the model or some sociolinguistic factors (Filipović, 2005: 21). Eight English diphthongs are replaced by monosyllabic clusters in Croatian: eng. /eɪ/ >cro. ej, eng. /aɪ/ >cro. aj, eng. /ɔɪ/ >cro. oj (e.g. eng. play-off/plej-of/ >cro. plej-of, eng. nylon /naɪlɒn/ >cro. najlon, cro. boy /bɔɪ/ >cro. boj). Furthermore, they can also be replaced by bisyllabic clusters: eng. /aʊ/ >cro. ⟨(au)⟩. For example (e.g. eng. foul /faʊl/ >cro. faul). As Filipović noted (2005: 22), /aʊ/ can also be represented as ⟨(ov)⟩ (cowboy – kovboj) . Reduction of English diphthongs into Croatian

monophthongs is also possible. For example, /əʊ/, /iə/, /eə/, /ʊə/ can be represented as ⟨o⟩ (e.g. goal – gol), ⟨i⟩ (clearing – kliring), ⟨e⟩ (fair – fer) and ⟨p⟩ (puritan – puritan).

Finally, four English consonant phonemes /θ/, /ð/, /ŋ/, /w/ are represented by Croatian graphemes ⟨t⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨ng⟩, ⟨v⟩. (e.g. eng. farthing /'fa:ðɪŋ/ > cro. farding, eng. whiskey /wɪskɪ/ > cro. viski (Nikolić – Hoyt 2000: 159).

4.2. Orthographic adaptation according to the orthography of the model

Filipović (1990: 29) states that a significant number of anglicisms are transferred to Croatian by orthography and it is common that while forming the replica, the advantage is given to the orthography. In his work Filipović (1986: 57) emphasizes this as one of the basic principles.

Commonly, the orthography always had a preference when forming the basic model of a loanword. On the contrary, recently, English loanwords keep their original orthographic form due to the prestigious influence of English language and the raising number of speakers as a foreign language (Nikolić-Hoyt 2005:190). For an anglicism to be adapted according to the orthography of the model "the principle grapheme by grapheme" is usually used. However, alphabets of Croatian and English are not completely the same, so graphemes q, w, x, y which do not exist in Croatian alphabet are replaced by other graphemes. Moreover, Croatian graphemes which are not replaced by English ones are ć, đ, nj, lj. English vowel graphemes i, e, a, o, u are replaced by Croatian graphemes i, e, a, o, u. English consonant graphemes are replaced by the following: b > b, c > c, d > d, f > f, g > g, h > h, j > j, k > k, l > l, m > m, n > n, p > p, r > r, s > s, t > t, v > v. However, if there are double consonants in the orthography of the English model they are replaced by single grapheme. For example: bb > b, mm > m, tt > t (Nikolić – Hoyt 159-160). However, some new examples of loanwords keep the double consonants (e.g. fitness) (Nikolić-Hoyt 2005:191).

4.3. Combination of the orthography and pronunciation of the model

As it is already noted, in this adaptation, the first part of an Anglicism is formed according to the pronunciation, another according to the orthography of the model, or vice versa. According to Filipović (1986: 57) this is the most common category while Anglicisms with retained original orthography but adapted pronunciation are part of it. This type of formation is distinguished from the one where the original orthography is preserved (e.g. back-up) (Nikolić-Hoyt: 191).

4.5. Word formation under an influence of the intermediary language

In his work *Teorijazezika*, Filipović (1986: 190) explains that some final explanations of the adaptation cannot be shown if we do not determine the influence of the language which played an intermediary role in the transfer of the model into the recipient language or even in the adaptation of the model into compromise replica and replica. Furthermore, Muhvić – Dimanovski (1996: 457) states that intermediary language can affect the choice and adaptation of a borrowing. The influence of the intermediary language sometimes can be present at only one level, but it is usually seen on several levels at the same time. The more levels it can be seen on, the more probable the influence of the intermediary language – although this criterium is not completely reliable (Muhvić-Dimanovski 1996:459).

The most prevalent languages in this process of borrowing are German and French. Filipović marks them as “first class intermediary languages”, since they had a major significance in the transmission of English words into European and other languages (1986: 190). To determine a role of an intermediary language in the borrowing process, the way in which loanwords transmit from one language into another has to be shown. Sometimes, the third language may be involved. The analysis shows that sometimes, it is impossible to

explain the origin of the pronunciation of certain borrowings, if an intermediary language along with its influence is not determined. Since German had an important role in Central Europe (because of the political situation) the existence of a large number of German borrowings is not so surprising. After losing its influence and with English becoming a new dominant world language, German became an intermediary language. Its influence can be seen from these examples: strike /Straik/ > ger. Streik /ftraik/ >cro. štrajk (Nikolić Hoyt 2000: 160).

Muhvić – Dimanovski in her article (1996: 462) discussed the complexity of this process by showing how the origin of a borrowing can be shown as English in one and German in another dictionary. Some of the authors claim that the first possible intermediary language is the most important, conversely, others think that the origin has to be linked to the last one. Also, some of the authors, when explaining origin, put two or more possible languages. The author (1996: 458) says that in the past, German language along with Italian had a very important role. There has always been a strong economic cooperation between Germany and Croatia and nowadays, many people move and look for a job there. All of these reasons represent a sociolinguistic background which favors language contacts. As Filipović (1986:94) noted, German as an intermediary language has been discovered in adaptations such as consonantal groups šp, št or forms such as blef and beterflaj. Regarding Italian and French as intermediary languages, Filipović states (1990: 95-96) that it is difficult to determine and identify their influence.

For the time being, this type of borrowing is highly unusual since contacts among English, German and Croatian are “direct“ (Nikolić-Hoyt 2005: 192).

4.6. Orthographic analysis of the corpus of Anglicisms in Croatian

Table 2. Orthographic analysis of corpus of Anglicisms in Croatian

Model	Pronunciation	Orthography	Combination of orthography and pronunciation	Intermediary language
bluff /blʌf/				blëf engl. bluff ← dutch
boycott /bɔɪkət/	bòjkot			
Briefing	brìfing			
bypass /'baɪpɑ:s/	bäjpas			
clinch /klɪntʃ/	klinč			
desk /desk/		dèsk		
establishment /ɛstæblɪʃmənt/			estàbljšment	
engineering /ˌɛn.dʒɪ'nɪə.rɪŋ/			inženjèring	
express /ɛkspres/			ekspresno	
fair /fer/			fër	
image /ɪmɪdʒ/	imidž			
interview /ˈɪn.tə.vju: /	intèrvjū			

conference /kən'fərəns/				konferència ger. Konferenz
kongressman /kən'grɪsmən/			kòngresmen	
compatible /kəm'pætəbəl/			kòmpatibīlan	
leader /lɪdər/			Líder	
lobby /lɒbi /	lòbi			
lobbyist /lɒbɪst/	lòbist			
meeting /mi:tiŋ/			Mìting	
partner /pɑ:tnər/		pärtner		
rating			Réjting	
round /raʊnd/				rùnda germ. runde
slogan /sləʊgən/		slògān		
speaker /'spi:kə- ər/			spīker	
Spin		spìn		
start /stɑ:t/		stårt		
summit /sʌmɪt/	sàmit			
team /ti:m/	tīm			
timing /'taɪ.mɪŋ/			Tājming	
trend /trɛnd/		trènd		
trigger /'trɪgər/			Triger	

Orthographic analysis of Anglicisms in Croatian will be represented in the table below. The table represents models and four levels of adaptation, that is, pronunciation, orthography, combination of orthography and pronunciation and intermediary language.

4.7. Discussion about the analysis on the orthographic level

It can be concluded that the biggest number of Anglicisms are adapted according to the combination of orthography and pronunciation. Furthermore, a great number of them is adapted according to the orthography, which is not surprising since many Anglicisms from the older period were transmitted in written. On the one hand, to be in accordance with the standard norm, a basic form of an Anglicisms is the one adapted most into the system of the recipient language. On the contrary, due to prestigious influence of English language and culture, many of them keep their original orthography and pronunciation as Nikolić-Hoyt (2005: 191) states. In addition, there are differences in orthography of the two languages: the orthography of Croatian relies on pronunciation, while the orthography of English is based on etymology of words. So, for instance, graphemes ⟨q⟩, ⟨w⟩, ⟨x⟩, ⟨y⟩ are replaced by those most similar in pronunciation (Filipović, 1990: 56). Regarding the word formation according to pronunciation, phonological levels of Croatian and English should be taken into consideration. Thus, phonemes in the English language are substituted with the most similar phonemes in the Croatian language. Only two Anglicisms (runda and blef) are adapted through the influence of an intermediary language (German), which is not surprising since, as stated previously, contacts among English, German and Croatian are nowadays frequent and direct.

5. SEMANTIC ADAPTATION

In this part, semantic adaptation will be discussed accompanied with examples from the articles from these newspapers: Jutarnji list, Večernji list, Nacional, Globus and

Index. Cambridge dictionary along with The Free Dictionary were used to explain meanings from English. Anić's dictionary as well as Hrvatskijezični portal along with Hrvatskijezičnisavjetnik and Hrvatska enciklopedija were used to explain meanings from Croatian. In addition, Velikirječnik hrvatskog standardnog jezika was also used to complement several meanings.

Nowadays, the influence of English is becoming more and more widespread. As Nikolić – Hoyt stated English is an “international language used in many important areas of communication including diplomacy, technology, science, sports, advertisements, and the internet” (2003: 169). Despite purist tendencies of a standard norm, Croatian language cannot be excluded from the influence of English language, which started in the 19th century and after World War II, contacts between these two languages became even stronger, when studies of English elements in Croatian began (2003: 169-170). The author implies on a great number of “unintegrated and internationalized English words”, while stating that major part of her corpus consists of foreign words – “ad hoc borrowings”, which are written as originals and not adjusted to the recipient language. Therefore, they are not real Anglicisms. (2003: 171).

5.1. Theory of semantic change

In order to define semantic borrowing Filipović (1986:155) quotes a linguist Louis Deroy (1956:93) who stated that semantic borrowing includes not only words, but morphemes, phonemes and parts of words. Also, new meanings can be added to the old ones. Regarding the latter, Ullmann (1962:165) added that if the contact between languages (one being role model to the other) is extremely strong, this phenomenon is pretty common. Regarding the similarity between old and new word meanings, Haugen (1950:171) differentiates between homonym loans – “if the new meaning has nothing in common with

the old” and synonym loans – “if a new shade of meaning is added to the native morphemes”. Furthermore, Hope (1962:127) accepts the existence of homonym loans but suggests that synonym loans should be understood as polysemy. For him, polysemy is unstable and relative in comparison with homonymy, which makes it more difficult to recognize (qtd. in Filipović 1986: 156). Furthermore, in contrast to Haugen (who stated that there was no satisfying method for classifying semantic similarity), Hope (1966:133) adds that in the process of semantic borrowings, all kinds of semantic changes can occur such as:

- a) changes in semantic extension,
- b) ellipsis,
- c) appellatives (place and proper names),
- d) pejoration and euphemisms,
- e) metaphors (qtd. in Filipović 1986: 156-157).

Some of the main roles of semantics are to show causes of semantic changes, nature of semantic changes and consequences of semantic change. The most famous classification of causes of semantic change is given by Ullmann (1962), who states that these causes can be linguistic, historical, social, psychological, foreign influences and the need for new names. His theory is criticized by some linguists, including Blank who stated that his list “lacks both a cognitive and empirical background and is merely an eclectic collection of motivations, necessary conditions and accessory elements” (1999: 66). Among all types, Blank (1999:66-67) acknowledges only social and psychological one. Social causes include words used by speakers in a limited context which eventually become “semantically restricted to the actual sense they have in this context”. However, the meaning of the word may be generalized if used outside its context (such as eng.lure “decoy” – “anything that attracts”). As for psychological ones, Blank (1999: 67) refers to Sperber (1965) who introduced “the theory of psychological grounding of semantic change”. According to Sperber “emotionally marked

concepts can serve as onomasiological centre of attraction for other words to verbalize the attractive concepts and vice versa, serve as a cognitive basis, as a semasiological centre of expansion for verbalizing concepts” (Blank 1999:67). Regarding the last two causes, the analysis of the vocabulary of many languages, including Croatian, shows that a) borrowing foreign words and b) changing and/or adding the new meaning to an already existing word are commonly used especially with new terms regarding science and technology. The need for new words is fulfilled in many ways, the most interesting being the latter in which metaphor and other types of semantic changes are used (Filipović 1986: 158- 159).

Regarding the nature of semantic change, there is always an interconnection between new and old meanings. Sometimes, it can itself be so strong and change the meaning. In other cases, the interconnection only transfers the change caused by different reasons. So, the semantic change categories are:

- a) those based on the interconnections between meanings
- b) those based on the interconnection between forms

Therefore, 4 main types of semantic changes are: a) metaphor – similarity according to the meaning, b) metonymy – interconnection according to the meaning, c) folk etymology – similarity according to the form and d) ellipsis – interconnection according to the form (Filipović 1986:159).

Metaphor is one of the most important elements of the language and literature. Ellipsis is a common type of semantic change, “truncation of words and phrases” (Dabo – Denegri, 1998: 36). Ellipsis is common in languages which have a tendency towards shortening phrases. (Filipović, 1986: 159). Two types of ellipsis are: a) ellipsis in model and b) ellipsis in Anglicism. The first one occurs in the donor language and is adapted as Anglicism in the recipient one. Another occurred during transfer; hence, it is the result of language borrowing (Filipović 1990:69-70). Furthermore, other semantic changes that occur are pejoration and

amelioration of meaning with the first one extremely common. Pejoration happens during the process of secondary adaptation. Thus, it is conditioned by “completely free usage of a loanword in the recipient language and sociological factors” (Filipović, 1986: 178).

According to Filipović semantic adaptation is “independent of phonological and morphological adaptation, but it logically follows after these two because after the integration of a loanword into the borrowing language system has been carried out, we can certainly state how and to what degree it has been adapted, i.e. changed” (1986: 166). To analyse semantic changes, Filipović expanded Hope’s classification and modified it by adding the concepts of primary and secondary adaptation. According to Filipović (1986:160) the differences between semantic changes in one language and those occurring during the transfer of a model into replica and its further adaptation are the core of innovations in the theory of languages in contact.

To represent the semantic adaptation of loanwords, Filipović proposed the following classification:

- 1) “Zero extension”
- 2) “Restriction of meaning:
 - a) in number of meanings
 - b) in semantic field”
- 3) “Expansion of meaning:
 - a) in number of meaning
 - b) in semantic field”

(Filipović, Menac 2005: 51).

5.2. Zero semantic extension

According to Filipović (1968: 110) it occurs when loanwords integrate into the Croatian language system without the change of meaning. Usually, these Anglicisms belong to specialized areas such as: a) food and drink, b) sport terms, c) dances, d) card games, e) clothes, f) dog names etc. (Filipović, 1990: 37-38). Many English words which belong to this type are derived from English neologisms - words which still do not have secondary or/and additional meanings. From the 17th and 18th century, a great English influence potentiated social factors for conditions to create new phrases consisting of foreign elements (Filipović, 1986:194). Due to an enormous impact of English language, many English words in Croatian retain their original pronunciation, morphology, orthography and therefore act as foreign words. Their translations are rare and not transparent. In addition, this impact leads to creations of Pseudoanglicisms – words consisting of English elements or English words not derived from English, abbreviated in a new form (Nikolić-Hoyt 2003: 175). As it already mentioned, Pseudoanglicisms only go through the process of secondary adaptation, in contrast with Anglicisms. Thus, they are called secondary Anglicisms. As a result of “new, hybrid forms of languages and cultures”, Pseudoanglicisms are “a result of global influences meeting local traditions” (Sočanac and Nikolić-Hoyt 2006).

5.3. Restriction of meaning

As Filipović stated (1986:164), this is a general tendency of borrowings since they are transferred to the recipient language in order to satisfy the need to name certain objects or ideas from the culture or civilization of the donor language. The most common examples of Anglicisms belong to this type. According to Filipović (1986: 110) “the restriction begins with specialization from a general to a technical sense”. Mostly, English words have several meanings, so the recipient language retains only one (in most cases) necessary to name ideas,

things etc. Furthermore, Nikolić-Hoyt (2003:175) states that usually the retained meaning diminishes the significance of other meanings of a word.

Restriction of meaning belongs to the primary adaptation, so it is noted by IS1. It can be shown in number of meanings (symbol n) and within the area of meaning (symbol f) (Filipović, 1990: 38-39). Restriction in the number of meanings (S1n) occurs only when one (in some cases, more than one) specific meaning is transferred to the recipient language (Filipović 1986:165). Restriction in the field (S1f) occurs rarely and it is difficult to determine it (Filipović 1990: 59).

5.4. Expansion of meaning

Expansion of meaning shows the secondary adaptation and it is marked with S2. It can be divided into: expansion in a number of meanings (S2n), and expansion in the field of sense/-s (S2f). In order to occur, loanword needs to be completely integrated into the lexical system of the recipient language and its usage needs to be as of any other native word – common and free. Eventually, the intensity and the precision of its meaning reduce, while the field of meaning becomes extended (Filipović 1986: 169-170). However, newer English words used in Croatian have still not integrated into the lexical system or developed additional meanings due to the limitations of Croatian language norm as well as the influx of new words. Conversely, new English words are used by spreading their meaning both in the field and number of meanings (Nikolić-Hoyt 2003:177).

Expansion in the number of meanings is linked to the sociological and sociolinguistic factors to the greater extent than the expansion in the field of senses. It is very difficult to explain it precisely, because of utterly different reasons of expansion (Filipović, 1990: 40). Likewise, these reasons are also typical of each language community in which they occur. Since the sociological factors are more difficult to determine than the linguistic ones, the

process of expansion usually remains inexplicable (Filipović, 1986:174). As a part of this process, many Pseudoanglicisms are formed. Often, thanks to globalisation (mediated by English), expansion of meaning crosses the borders of languages. These examples of expansion are not noted in dictionaries, but in conversational language (young people in urban settings), as well as newspaper articles (Nikolić-Hoyt 2003: 179-180).

5.6. Semantic analysis of the corpus of Anglicisms in Croatian

The following sections show the semantic analysis of Anglicisms on the semantic level. Dictionaries used in the analysis are and Cambridge Online Dictionary (<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>) along with The Free Dictionary (www.thefreedictionary.com). To provide meanings from Croatian Hrvatskijezični portal along with Anić’s dictionary and Velikirječnikhrvatskogstandardnogjezika are used. The following tables contain definitions for Anglicisms in the Croatian language according to the degree of transsemantization. The analysis will be wrapped up with a short conclusion.

Table 4: Zero semantic extension of Anglicisms in Croatian (S0)

MODEL	REPLICA
<p>Congressman</p> <p>1. “a man who belongs to a congress, especially a member of the US House of Representatives”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Kongresmen</p> <p>1., „članpredstavničkogdomaameričkogKongresa; kongresnik”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Compatible</p> <p>1. “able to exist, live, or work successfully with something or someone else”</p> <p>2. “able to be used with a particular type of computer, machine, device, etc.” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Kompatibilan</p> <p>1. “koji je u skladusačimekojifunkcionirasukladno s drugima [kompatibilankompjuterski program]; primjeren, spojiv, uskladiv”</p> <p>2. “inform. kojiposjeduje kompatibilnost (u odnosunanekogdrugog)”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Conference</p>	<p>Konferencija</p>

<p>1. “a group of sports teams that play each other in organized competitions” 2. “an event, sometimes lasting a few days, at which there is a group of talks on a particular subject, or a meeting in which especially business matters are discussed formally”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>1. “vijećanje, razmjena mišljenja većeg broja ljudi s predviđenim dnevnim redom” 2. “sastanak predstavnika različitih država u kojem se rješavaju međunarodni problemi [konferencija o hrani; mirovna konferencija]” 3. “sport udruženje i natjecanje sportskih momčadi (ob. u SAD-u)”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Desk 1. “a type of table that you can work at, often one with drawers” 2. “a place, often with a counter (= a long flat narrow surface) especially in a hotel or airport, where you can get information or service” 3. an office that deals with a particular type of news for a newspaper or broadcasting company(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Desk 1. “publ. prostor u uredništvu ili uredništvu u kojem se pregledaju i obrađuju za objavljivanje prispjele vijesti i drugi tekstovi [radi u desku]” 2. “posebni ured, ob. privladizadužen za komunikaciju s određenom državom [desk za Hrvatsku privladi SAD]” 3. “stol, ob. u knjižnici ili uredu u kojoj se obavljaju specifični poslovi”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Express 1. “using a service that does something faster than usual”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Ekspresno 1. “vrlo brzo, što je brže moguće, bez odgađanja [poslati pismo ekspres]; ekspresno, hitno, žurno”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Leader 1. “someone or something that is winning during a race or other situation where people are competing” 2. “a person in control of a group, country, or situation” 3. “the most important violin player in an orchestra”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Lider 1. “pol. prvak političke stranke, ideološki i kakve druge skupine; vođa” 2. “sport onaj koji vodi [lidernogometne lige]; vodeći” 3. “glazb. vođa orkestra, glazbenik koji ima ključnu ulogu; u jazzu, najčešće predvodnik kolektivnih improvizacija ili vodeći solo list”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Lobbyist 1. “someone who tries to persuade a politician or official group to do something”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Lobist 1. “onaj koji nastoji pridobiti zastupnike u parlamentu i drugi tijelima za neki politički ograničen program”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Slogan</p>	<p>Slogan</p>

<p>1. “a short easily remembered phrase, especially one used to advertise an idea or a product” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>1. “frazakojaiizražavanaraviliciljevenekogpoduzeća , idejeiligrupe (političkestrankei sl.); moto, parola” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Spin doctor 1. “someone whose job is to make ideas, events, etc. seem better than they really are, especially in politics” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Spin doctor 1. “stručnjacipolitičkogmarketinga (tzv. spin doktori) najčešće u političkimstrankamaizvršnojvlastikako bi premajavnostiprilagodili (čestoiskrivili) informaciju u svojukorist” (https://www.lzmk.hr/).</p>
<p>Trend 1. “a general development or change in a situation or in the way that people are behaving” 2. “a new development in clothing, make-up, etc.”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Trend 1. “općasklonost, tendencijapremačemu [trend je mnogih da živeizvanužeggradskogsredišta]” 2. “smjerrazvoja [trend rastacijena]” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>

Table 5. Anglicisms in Croatian with restriction in the number of meanings (S1n)

MODEL	REPLICA
<p>Bluff 1. “an attempt to bluff” 2. “a cliff or very steep bank” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Blef 1. “razg. obmanakojuoobmanjivačprovoditako da sebeilištodrugoprikazujeboljim, vrednijimitd. negošto jest [uhvatiti (dobiti, pridobiti) kogablef, žarg. pridobitikoga (za nekiprojekt, idejui sl.) nabrzinu, dok se nijesnašao]; obmana, prijevara” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Establishment 1. “a business or other organization, or the place where an organization operates “ 2. “the important and powerful people who control a country or an organization, especially those who support the existing situation” 3. “the process of starting or creating something, for example, an organization” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Establišment “sociol. društveni, stručniilipolitičkislojkojivladaodređenimdjelomdruštvenogživ otaiodređujenačinponašanja, djelovanjaipravila po kojima se prihvaćajuvrijednosti [političkiestablišment; umjetničkiestablišment]”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Fair 1. “treating someone in a way that is right or</p>	<p>Fer 1. “koji je častan u postupcimaiposlovima [ferčovjek]; pošten”</p>

<p>reasonable, or treating a group of people equally and not allowing personal opinions to influence your judgment”</p> <p>2. “if something is fair, it is reasonable and is what you expect or deserve”</p> <p>3. “(of skin) pale, or (of hair) pale yellow or gold”</p> <p>4. “quite large”</p> <p>5. “(of an idea, guess, or chance) good, but not excellent”</p> <p>6. “(of weather) pleasant and dry”</p> <p>7. “(of a woman) beautiful”</p> <p>(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>2. “koji je ispravan [ferodluka]; pravedan”</p> <p>3. “koji je umjerenopovoljan; nido barniloš [ferugovor]” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Image</p> <p>1. “a picture in your mind or an idea of how someone or something is”</p> <p>2. “the way that something or someone is thought of by other people”</p> <p>3. “a mental picture or idea that forms in a reader's or listener's mind from the words that they read or hear”</p> <p>4. “any picture, especially one formed by a mirror or a lens”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Imidž</p> <p>“term. izglediponašanjepremapublici, javnostiilidruštvu u cjelini, slikailidojamkaopredodžba o kome [imidžzavodnika; imatidobarimidž]”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Interview</p> <p>1. “a meeting in which someone asks you questions to see if you are suitable for a job or course”</p> <p>2. “a meeting in which someone answers questions</p>	<p>Intervju</p> <p>1. “razgovornamijenjensredstvimajavnoginformiranja [datiintervju; (za)tražitiintervju]”</p> <p>2. “a. razgovor u okviruankete, istraživanjajavnogmišljenjailiznanstvenogistraživanja b. razgovorsasvrhomupoznavanjanekeosobe (zbogdobivanjaposla, stipendijeisl.)”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>

<p>about himself or herself for a newspaper article, television show, etc.”</p> <p>3. “a meeting in which the police ask someone questions to see if they have committed a crime”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	
<p>Lobby</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “a group of people who try to persuade the government or an official group to do something” 2. “the (large) room into which the main entrance door opens in a hotel or other large building” 3. “in the UK parliament, a room where someone meets a member of parliament who they have arranged to talk to, or one of the two passages that members of parliament walk through as a way of voting” <p>(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Lobi</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “utjecajna skupina ljudi koja zastupa određene interese, skupina za pritisak [antinuklearni lobi]” 2. “predvorje hotela ili druge veće zgrade” (hjp.znanje.hr).
<p>Round</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “a number of things or group of events” 2. “drinks that you buy for a group of people” 3. “a single slice of toast, or a sandwich” 4. “a set of regular visits that you make to a number of places or people, especially in order to take products as part of your job” 5. “a song for several singers, who begin 	<p>Runda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “sport a. dionica boksačkog meča (u trajanju od dvije do tri minute) nakon kojeg slijedi jednog minute odmora b. u atletici, motociklizmu i sl. jedan obilazak kružne staze (u atletici 400 m); krug” 2. “žarg. krug (u izbornoj aktivnosti, šetnji, narudžbi pića i sl.) [platiti rundu / platiti piće društvu]”(hjp.znanje.hr).

<p>singing one after the other at various points in the song”</p> <p>6. “a part of a competition”</p> <p>7. “a bullet or other single piece of ammunition”</p> <p>(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	
<p>Spin</p> <p>1. “a way of describing an idea or situation that makes it seem better than it really is, especially in politics”</p> <p>2. “the movement of something turning round very quickly”</p> <p>3. “a short journey in a car for pleasure”</p> <p>(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Spin</p> <p>1. “fiz. unutrašnjakutnakoličinagibanjaelementarnečesticeilisustavačestica; česticeimajuilicijelilipolovičnikvantnibrojspina, uspb. bozon, fermion”</p> <p>2. “sport a. u tenisuistolnomtenisuudarackojim se loptazarotira ob. ofenzivnarotacijausmjerenanaprijed [forhend spin] b. rotacijaloptyceokovlastiteosi” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Start</p> <p>1. “the beginning of something”</p> <p>2. “the act of beginning to do something”</p> <p>3. “an advantage that you have over someone else when you begin something”</p> <p>4. “a sudden movement of the body that you make when something has surprised or frightened you”</p> <p>5. “including all of something, from the beginning to the end”</p> <p>6. “first, or as the first in a set of things”</p> <p>7. “used when giving a first example of something”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Start</p> <p>1. “a. polazaknatjecatelja u utrcinaodređeniznakstartera; trenutakpolaska b. mjesto s kojegangatjecateljkreću u utrku”</p> <p>2. “u momčadskim sportskimigrama a. naglokretanjeigrača s mjesta u borbi za loptu b. beskompromisnidvoboj s protivničkimigrčem s ciljem da mu se oduzmeloptaili da se onesposobi”</p> <p>3. “pren. prvafaza u nekomposlu; početak [nije dobro, već u startukasnimo]”</p> <p>(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Summit</p> <p>1. “an important formal meeting between leaders of governments from</p>	<p>Samit</p> <p>1. “pol. konferencijanajvišihpredstavnikadvijuilivišedržava; sastanaknavrhu” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>

<p>two or more countries”</p> <p>2. “the highest, most successful, or most important point in something”</p> <p>(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	
<p>Team</p> <p>1. “a number of people or animals who do something together as a group”</p> <p>2. “used in a number of phrases that refer to people working together as a group in order to achieve something”</p> <p>3. “used to refer to a group of people who support a particular person or a particular point of view”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Tim</p> <p>1. “term. skupina stručnjaka i specijalista okupljenih na kakvu projekatnu ulazu; radna grupa [radni tim; udarni tim]”</p> <p>2. “sport dvajli višesportša/sportša i koji igraju zajedno na istoj strani; momčad, ekipa [muški tim; ženski tim]” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Trigger</p> <p>1. “a part of a gun that causes the gun to fire when pressed”</p> <p>2. “an event or situation, etc. that causes something to start”</p> <p>3. “something that causes someone to feel upset and frightened because they are made to remember something bad that has happened in the past” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Triger</p> <p>1. “ono što pokreće kakvu događaj ili reakciju” (http://jezicni-savjetnik.hr/).</p>

Table 6. Anglicisms in Croatian with restriction in the field of meaning (S1f)

MODEL	REPLICA
/	/

Table 7. Anglicisms in Croatian with expansion in the number of meanings (S2n)

MODEL	REPLICA
<p>Briefing</p> <p>1. “information that is given to someone just before they do something, or a meeting where this happens”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Brifing</p> <p>1. “a) kratak sastanak u kojem unaprijed određeno je o čemu će se raditi; b) kratak izvještaj, informacija o nekoj temi ili poslu”</p> <p>2. “konferencija za novinstvo s uputama za pisanje” (Veliki rječnik hrvatskog standardnog jezika).</p>
<p>Bypass</p> <p>1. “a medical operation in which the flow of a person's blood is changed to avoid a diseased part of their heart”</p> <p>2. “(ROAD) a road built around a town or village so that traffic does not need to travel through it”</p>	<p>Bypass</p> <p>1. “med. a) kirurški zahvat kojim se premošćuje bolesni ili oštećeni dio organa, omogućuje protok krvi, likvor ili gastrointestinalnog sadržaja [izvesti bypass; napraviti bypass]; premosnica, premošćenje”</p> <p>b. “tkivo tako obrađeno i listavljeno u takvu funkciju [napravilo se mu dvobypassa; dvostruki bypass; trostruki bypass]; mimovod, premosnica, zaobilaznik”</p> <p>2. “a) građ. cijev ili kanal kojim se osigurava pomoćni prolaz plin i lichte kućini b) tehn. staza iske i impedancije kojom se električna struja provodi oko komponente, a ne kroz nje; zaobilaznica”</p> <p>3. “sprečavanje prijenosa određenih frekvencija bez ometanja željenog signala”</p> <p>4. “žarg. sredstvo kojim se nastoji prevladati neka teška situacija [kredit je jedini bypass u današnjoj situaciji]”</p> <p>(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Engineering</p> <p>1. “the work of an engineer, or the study of this work” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Inženjering</p> <p>1. “skup djelatnosti koje imaju za cilj racionalno i funkcionalno projektiranje građevina i tehnički i industrijskih postrojenja”</p> <p>2. “ured, poduzeće i sl. za tehničko-organizacijske, inovatorske i usluge”</p> <p>3. “svaka djelatnost koja se temelji na znanju i vještini inženjera (biološki inženjering) – skup znanja i poslova međusobno povezanih radi dobivanja određene rezultata); financijski inženjering – financijske operacije, čestonarubizakoničnosti; genetički inženjering”</p> <p>(Veliki rječnik hrvatskog standardnog jezika).</p>
<p>Meeting</p> <p>1. “a planned occasion when people come together to discuss something”</p> <p>2. “an occasion when people meet each other,</p>	<p>Miting</p> <p>1. “okupljanje većeg broja pojedinaca u kojem se govori i raspravlja o javnim pitanjima (javni/politički/protestni miting)”</p> <p>2. “natjecanje (sport)”</p>

<p>especially when this was not planned” 3. “a group of people who have met for a particular purpose” 4. “a sports competition” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>(Velikirječnikhrvatskogstandardnogjezika).</p>
<p>Rating 1. “a measurement of how good or popular someone or something is”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Rejting 1. “term. ugled, vjerodostojnostfizičkeilipravneosobe, ocjenakojuuživaju u javnosti, ocjenakojomihljudiprocjenjuju [imatidobarrejting; unišitirejtingglupošću]” 2. “kaooprvidiopolusloženice, koji se vrednuje u bodovimaidrugimsličnimjedinicamanatemeljupostignutihuspjeha, glasovanjapublikei sl. [rejting-bodovi; rejting-lista; rejting-pozicija]”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Speaker 1. a person who gives a speech at a public event 2. someone who speaks a particular language 3. the part of a radio, television, or computer, or of a piece of electrical equipment for playing recorded sound, through which the sound is played. A speaker can be part of the radio, etc. or be separate from it 4. the person who controls the way in which business is done in an organization (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Spiker 1. čitačtekstova, programanaradijuilinateleviziji 2. (speaker) pol. predsjednikparlamenta (Donjegdoma u EngleskojiKongresa u SAD-u) (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>

Table 8. Anglicisms in Croatian with expansion in the field of meaning (S2f)

MODEL	REPLICA
<p>Boycott commerce, politics: 1. “the action of refusing to buy a product, do business with a company, or take part in an activity as a way of expressing</p>	<p>Bojkot 1. “činmoralneosudekojim se odbijasuradnja s pojedincem, organizacijom, poduzećemildržavom, organiziranoodbijanjesuradnje u čemu, odbijanjesudjelovanja [organiziratibojkot;</p>

<p>strong disapproval”(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>provestibojkot; vršiti/izvršitibojkot]; opstrukcija”</p> <p>2. “ekon. prekidodnosa s određenom osobom, organizacijom, zemljom radipritiskai iznuđivanjazahtijevanihustup aka” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Clinch</p> <p>1. “the position two people are in when they are holding each other tightly in their arms, when fighting or showing” love(dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Klinč</p> <p>1. “sport zahvatkojimboksačhvata protivnikaivješanjem o njegaonemogućavaborbu”</p> <p>2. “pren. stanjenedogađanja, spletenostikoja ne dopuštainicijativu [držatikoga u klinču, razg. držatikoga u položaju da ne moženištaučiniti, držatikoga u šahu]; zauzlanost”(hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Partner</p> <p>1. “a person or organization you are closely involved with in some way”</p> <p>2. “one of the owners of a company”</p> <p>3. “the person you are married to or living with as if married to them, or the person you are having a sexual relationship with”</p> <p>4. “one of a pair of dancers or one of a pair who are playing a sport or a game together, especially when the pair are playing as a team” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Partner</p> <p>1. “a. onajkojizajedno s kimsudjeluje u izvedbičega u paru [plesni partner] b. protivnik u sportu, kartanjui sl. [šahovski partner; kartaški partner]; suigrač”</p> <p>2. “bračnisuputnikilionajkojidiijeliintimnosti s drugim [bračni partner; ljubavni partner]”</p> <p>3. “suradnik u zajedničkomposlu, ulaganjui sl.; kompanjon, ortak” (hjp.znanje.hr).</p>
<p>Timing</p> <p>1. “the time when something happens”</p> <p>2. “the ability to do something at exactly the right time”</p> <p>3. “the ability to play or sing all the notes in a piece of music at the correct speed and rhythm” (dictionary.cambridge.org).</p>	<p>Tajming</p> <p>1. “usklađivanje vremena za kakav događajilipriliku”</p> <p>2. “a) prilagođavanjeilnadzortako da se pokretiilidogađajidogode u pravilnom, očekivanomiliželjenomsljedeu b) osjećaj za ritamivrijemeštogaimaglazbenikirežiser”</p> <p>3. “šp. a) vremenskakoordinacijapokretailiudaraca; b) vremenskousklađivanje međusobneigreigrača u momčadskimšportskimigramama” (Velikirječnikhrvatskogstandardnogjezika).</p>

5.7. Discussion about the adaptation on the semantic level

As it can be seen from the tables above, 11 Anglicisms are formed by the zero semantic extension, more precisely, words konferencija, kongresmen, kompatibilan, desk,

ekspresno, lider, lobbist, partner, slogan, spin doktor and trend. This type of extension is quite common and words which retain their original meanings from donor language usually belong to a specialised area such as professions (e.g. lobbyist, congressman), dances, food and drink etc. Usually, Anglicisms which undergo this type of extension are the words with one or two meanings, but this table shows three examples of Anglicisms with three meanings (desk, leader, partner).

Furthermore, 16 Anglicisms are formed by the restriction in the number of meanings. According to Filipović (1968:112) this is a general tendency of borrowings. It occurs more frequent than the zero extension, since the recipient language borrows only one (or more than one) relevant meaning. So, for example, due to the irrelevance of other meanings to be transferred, the word *sumit*, out of two meanings in English, retained only one in Croatian signifying a political conference, while the word *trigger* out of three meanings retained only one in Croatian, that of an activator, e.i. something which starts a reaction. However, it should be noted that, according to the website Hrvatskijezični portal, the word *spin* also shows restriction in the number of meanings lacking the first meaning from English. Nevertheless, further research shows that the word *spin* is indeed used correspondingly in a political discourse. Therefore, the same as in English, this word represents a technique used by the experts spin doctors in order to adjust or distort information for their benefit. Thus, the word is used in pejorative sense and it denotes fake, ambiguous information. Other Anglicisms found are *blef*, used in the sense of deception, *establišment* (political, social etc.) denoting people who have power and control over an organization, country etc., *feras* something reasonable and honourable, *imidžas* an impression about someone or something (e.g. a good or bad political image), *intervjuas* “a meeting in which someone answers questions about himself/herself”, *lobias* an influential group of people which represents particular interests, *runda* used in the meaning of sequence, when talking about political elections, *start*, among other meanings

retained, used in a pejorative sense denoting a beginning, samitin the meaning of a political conference and tim (such as a team of a particular politician) as “a group of people supporting a particular person or a point of view”.

On the other hand, restriction in the field of meaning is less common and none examples of Anglicisms can be offered.

Moreover, expansion of meaning also occurs rarely. As Dabo Denegri states that the loanword firstly extends its meaning in the field and later in number. As a result, it acquires new meanings, unfamiliar in the donor language (1998:32). Expansion of meaning is very difficult to determine and it is often ambiguous. Regarding this phenomenon, a foreign word, as Filipović stated, (1968: 114) can have a specialised meaning, but when borrowed into “another linguistic milieu loosens the fixed frame of its sense and consequently expands its meaning”. Such is the word *brifing* which retained the original meaning from English, but later it acquired a new meaning, that of a conference. The same happened with the word *bypass* which today denotes also “a means to overcome a difficult situation” and “the prevention of the transmission of certain frequencies”. Furthermore, the Anglicism *inženjering* also retained the original meaning from English, but later it acquired new meanings. Nowadays, it is used in many discourses (politics, finances, biology etc.) and it denotes a kind of fraud. Expansion in the number of meanings can also be explained through the Anglicism *miting*, which meaning became specialised because of secondary adaptation signifying a “political assembly of people”. Firstly, the word showed the restriction of meaning retaining the 4th one from English (a sports competition). Furthermore, the word *rejting* retained the original meaning from English, but in Croatian is also used as a compound noun which refers to scoring. The same goes for the Anglicism *spiker* which restricted the number of meanings and later acquired a new meaning of a “person reading the text on the radio/TV”.

Regarding the expansion in the field of meaning, the word the Anglicism partner can serve as an example. In the primary adaptation, the word showed the restriction in the number of meanings and later it expanded its field of meaning from “one of the owners of the company” to “an associate”. Furthermore, the word *tajming* retained the original meaning of “the ability to do something at exactly the right time”. Apart from being used in music terminology, in the secondary adaptation, the word extended its field of meaning, now being also used in sports terminology denoting a coordination of moves and game among players. As it can be seen from the table, the words *bojkot* and *klinč* retained their original meanings from English, but both expanded their fields of meanings, so the Anglicism *bojkot* apart from denoting a refusal of cooperation (as seen in the article - a political party boycotting a government), is also used in the economics discourse to denote the end of a cooperation due to pressure and extortion. Furthermore, the Anglicism *klinč* apart from retaining the original meaning from English, denoting a position in boxing, it is also used figuratively denoting a state without initiative, entanglement.

6. CONCLUSION

The primary goal of this paper was to present and analyse the orthographic and semantic adaptation of Anglicisms in the Croatian language. In conclusion, this work has represented a contact between English and Croatian in a political discourse as well as immense influence of the English language in the modern world. In addition, this paper has provided a basis and insights for future studies and research in the field of "Contact Linguistics". As Nikolić-Hoyt and Sočanac stated, "the position of English in Croatia nowadays is not the result of the historical or political circumstances but a result of the current sociolinguistic situation due to the global character and prestigious position of the English language and its culture". Due to this prestigious position, many English words retain their original orthography and pronunciation. Moreover, a great production of Pseudoanglicisms occurs.

Regarding the orthographic analysis, it was shown that the greatest number of Anglicisms were adapted according to the combination of orthography and pronunciation. In general, the adaptation according to the orthography is also common since, as it is already specified, many Anglicisms from the older period were transmitted in written form. On the one hand, regarding the standard Croatian language norm, a basic form of an Anglicism is the one adapted most into the system of the recipient language. On the other hand, due to the prestigious influence of English language and culture, many of them keep their original orthography and pronunciation.

With regard to the semantic analysis, the greatest number of Anglicisms restricted their number of meanings, which according to Filipović, is the general tendency of borrowings. Usually, only one specific meaning is transferred to the recipient language. Also, zero semantic extension is quite frequent and those Anglicisms are usually connected with specified semantic fields such as food and drink, professions etc. Expansion of meaning,

conversely, is not so common and it is difficult to determine. As it is already stated, to occur, loanword needs to be completely assimilated into the lexical system of the recipient language and be used freely as any other native word. Examples of expansion of meaning are usually not found in dictionaries, but in newspaper articles or particularly, in conversational language of young people, since they, according to Nikolić-Hoyt, are “the most active starters of language changes and consumers of English language and culture” (2003: 180).

7. Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse: Summary and key words

This work aims to show the orthographic and semantic level of adaptation of Anglicisms in Croatian political discourse. The work is based on the theory of Rudolf Filipović, the founder of Contact Linguistics in Croatia, whose methodology is elaborated thoroughly. The corpus (32 words) is found in the following newspapers: Index, Nacional, Večernji list and Jutarnji list with its political portal Globus, throughout 2016, 2017 and 2018. The orthography of an Anglicism is formed according to: (a) the orthography of the model, (b) the pronunciation of the model, (c) the combination of model's orthography and pronunciation and (d) the influence of an intermediary language. On the semantic level, there are three degrees of adaptation: 1st degree - zero extension, 2nd degree - restriction of meaning: (a) in number of meanings, (b) in semantic field and 3rd degree – expansion of meaning: (a) in number of meanings, (b) in semantic field.

Key words: contact linguistics, Anglicisms, orthographic analysis, semantic analysis, Rudolf Filipović, political discourse, linguistic borrowing

8. Anglicizmi u hrvatskom političkom diskursu: Sažetak i ključne riječi

Cilj istraživanja ovog rada je pokazati stupanj adaptacije anglicizama na ortografskoj i semantičkoj razini u hrvatskom političkom diskursu. Rad se zasniva na teoriji utemeljitelja kontaktne lingvistike u Hrvatskoj, Rudolfa Filipovića, čija je metodologija detaljnije objašnjena kroz rad. Istraživački korpus (32 riječi) obuhvaća sljedeće časopise: Index, Nacional, Večernji list te Jutarnji list s političkim portalom Globus, kroz 2016, 2017. i 2018. godinu.

Ortografija anglicizma se formira prema: (a) ortografiji modela, (b) izgovoru modela, (c) kombinaciji ortografije i izgovora modela i (d) utjecaju jezika posrednika. Na semantičkoj razini, postoje tri razine adaptacije: nulta ekstenzija, suženje značenja - u broju značenja i značenjskom polju te i proširenje značenja - u broju značenja i značenjskom polju.

Ključne riječi: kontaktna lingvistika, anglicizmi, ortografska analiza, semantička analiza, Rudolf Filipović, politički diskurs, jezično posuđivanje

WORKS CITED

1. Ajduković, Jovan. Uvod u leksičku kontaktologiju. Beograd: Foto Futura, 2004.
2. Anić, Vladimir. Rječnik hrvatskog jezika. Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2006.
3. Blank, Andreas; Koch, Peter. Historical Semantics and Cognition. New York: de Gruyter, 1999.
4. Bloomfield, L. Language. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1933.
5. Dabo-Denegri, Ljuba; Dragičević, Dragica; Menac, Antica; Nikolić-Hoyt, Anja; Pugh, Stefan M.; Sočanac, Lelija; Žagar-Szentesi, Orsolya. "Adaptacija posuđenica iz šest europskih jezika u hrvatskom." Zbornik Zagrebačke slavističke škole, edited by Stipe Botica, Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, Zagrebačka slavistička škola, 2003, pp. 343-350.
6. Filipović, Rudolf. Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo, razvoj, značenje. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1990.
7. Filipović, Rudolf. "Can a dictionary of -isms be an Etymological Dictionary?" LEX'eter. Edited by R.R.Hartmann, 1983, pp. 73-79.
8. Filipović Rudolf, Menac Antica. Engleski element u hrvatskome i ruskom jeziku. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2005.
9. Filipović. Rudolf, Phonemic importation, *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia* (SRAZ), 9-10, Zagreb 1960, pp. 177-189.
10. Filipović, Rudolf. Primary and Secondary Adaptation of Loan-Words. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 22, 1977, pp. 116-125.
11. Filipović, Rudolf, „Semantic extension changes in adaptation of english loan-words in serbo-croatian.“ *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*, Vol. No 25-26, 1968, pp. 109-119.
12. Filipović, Rudolf. Teorija jezika u kontaktu. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1986.
13. Filipović R. "The English Element in European Languages." *Reports and Studies*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Vol 2, 1982, pp. 105-111.

14. Filipović Rudolf. "The Theoretical Background of the Project "The English Element in European Languages". *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabienisa*, Vol. 42, 1997, pp. 105-110.
15. Galinski, Heinz. "Americanisms, Briticisms, Canadianisms, New Zelandisms, and Anglicisms in contemporary German", *Languages in Contact and Contrast*, edited by Vladimir Ivir et al., Mouton, 1991, pp. 195-221.
16. Globus: (<https://www.jutarnji.hr/globus/>) [various articles, period: 01.10. – 01.11. 2019]
17. Haugen, Einar. „The analysis of Linguistic Borrowing“ – In: *Language*, 1950.
18. Hrvatski jezični portal (hjp.znanje.hr/) [period: 01.10.-01.11. 2019]
19. Hrvatska enciklopedija (<https://www.enciklopedija.hr/>) [period: 01.03-05.03.2020]
20. Index.hr: Nezavisni hrvatski news i lifestyle portal (www.index.hr) [various articles, period: 01.10. – 01.11. 2019]
21. Jezični savjetnik (<http://jezicni-savjetnik.hr/>) [period: 01.03-05.03.2020]
22. Jojić, Ljiljana ed. *Veliki rječnik hrvatskoga standardnog jezika*. Školska knjiga, 2015.
23. Jutarnji list: (<https://www.jutarnji.hr/>) [various articles, period: 01.10. – 01.11. 2019]
24. Merriam – Webster online dictionary (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/>) [period: 01.10. – 01.11. 2019]
25. Muhvić-Dimanovski, V. "New Concepts and new Words-how do Languages Cope with the Problem of Neology?". *Coll. Antropol.* 28 Suppl. 1, 2004, pp.139-146.
26. Nacional: (<https://www.nacional.hr/>) [various articles, period: 01.10. – 01.11. 2019]
27. Nikolić-Hoyt, A., Sočanac, L. "English in Croatia: Past and Present", *Innovation und Kontinuität in Sprache und Kommunikation verschiedener Sprachkulturen/Innovation and Continuity in Language and Communication of Different Language Cultures*, edited by Rudolf Muhr, Peter Lang Verlag, 2006, pp. 305-322.
28. Nikolić-Hoyt, A., Menac, A., Dabo-Denegri, Lj., Dragičević, D., Nikolić-Hoyt, A., Sočanac, L., Žagar-Szentesi, O. "Adaptacija ortografije engleskih posuđenica u hrvatskom

- jeziku". Ortografska adaptacija modela šest europskih jezika u hrvatskom, *Filologija*, 34, 2000, pp. 158-160.
29. Nikolić-Hoyt, Anja. "Hrvatski u dodiru s engleskim jezikom" *Riječ časopis za filologiju*, 9, 2003, pp. 48-55.
30. Nikolić-Hoyt, Anja. "Hrvatski u dodiru s engleskim jezikom." *Hrvatski jezik u dodiru s europskim jezicima*. Edited by Lelija Sočanac, Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus, 2005, pp. 179-205.
31. Paul, H. *Principles of the history of language*. London; New York: Longmans, Green. 1891.
32. Sočanac, Lelija; Dabo-Denegri, Ljuba; Dragičević, Dragica; Menac, Antica; Nikolić-Hoyt, Anja; Žagar-Szentesi, Orsolya. "Adaptacija modela šest europskih jezika u hrvatskom na semantičkoj razini." *Filologija : časopis Razreda za filološke znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, 41, 2003, pp. 123-186.
33. Sočanac, Lelija. "Engleski kao globalni jezik danas (English as a Global Language Today)." *Riječ: časopis za filologiju*. 9, 1. 2003, pp. 82-88.
34. Sočanac, Lelija. "Engleski kao lingua franca u Europi (English as a Lingua Franca in Europe)." *Jezik u društvenoj interakciji (Language in Social Interactions: Proceedings)*, 2005, pp. 437-445.
35. The Free Dictionary: Dictionary, Encyclopedia and Thesaurus (www.thefreedictionary.com) [period: 01.10. - 01.11. 2019]
36. Thomason S.G. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2001.
37. *Večernji list*: (<https://www.vecernji.hr/>) [various articles, period: 01.10. – 01.11. 2019]
38. Weinreich, Uriel. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York XII, 1953.

39. Whitney, William D. "On Mixture in Language." Transactions of the American Philological Association, XII, 1881, pp. 5-26.
40. Winford D. An Introduction to Contact Linguistics. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 2003

