

Neologisms of English Origin in Present-Day Slovak

ABSTRACT

The aim of the paper is to analyse post-1989 Anglicisms in present-day Slovak. Central concepts of the study are neologisms (new items in the lexicon of a language), present-day Slovak (the Slovak language from 1989 onwards), borrowing (one of several ways of lexical enrichment) and adaptation (the process of adapting loans into Slovak as a recipient language). The most extensive part consists of sections devoted to particular adaptation processes on the levels of phonology, orthography, morphology, word-formation, semantics and pragmatics. Finally, the paper addresses the issues of the variability and synonymy of English borrowings in Slovak.

Keywords: Slovak, English, Anglicism, neologism, adaptation

Neologizmi angleškega izvora v sodobni slovaščini

POVZETEK

Namen prispevka je analizirati anglicizme v sodobni slovaščini po letu 1989. Osrednji koncepti raziskave so neologizem (novost v leksiki nekega jezika), sodobna slovaščina (slovaški jezik od leta 1989 dalje), izposojanje (eden od več načinov leksikalne obogatitve) in adaptacija (proces prilagajanja izposojenk slovaščini kot jeziku prejemniku). Najobsežnejši del predstavljajo razdelki, posvečeni posameznim procesom prilagajanja na ravni fonologije, pravopisa, morfologije, besedotvorja, semantike in pragmatike. Na koncu je obravnavano vprašanje variabilnosti in sinonimije angleških izposojenk v slovaščini.

Ključne besede: slovaščina, angleščina, anglicizem, neologizem, prilagajanje

1 Introduction

There is no dispute that language contact is one of the linguistic universals, and the interactions that occur between people speaking different languages have consequences in their language contact. It is therefore natural that contact linguistics has become one of the well-established linguistic disciplines focusing on a large variety of subjects with three main components (i.e., linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic; Winford 2019), including bilingualism, multilingualism, code switching, language change, pidginization, creolization, lexical borrowing, and many others (e.g., Weinreich 1953; Thomason and Kaufman 1988; Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002; Goebel et al. 1996, 1997; Labov 2001; Thomason 2001; Hickey 2010; Léglise and Chamoreau 2013; Grant 2015, 2019, to mention just a few). Another indisputable truth is the contemporary importance of English as a *lingua franca*. These facts have been analysed from various perspectives in an extensive number of papers and publications (e.g., Jenkins 2007; Prodromou 2008; Mauranen and Ranta 2009; Furiassi, Pulcini, and Rodríguez González 2012; Kecskes 2019). From the 18th century onwards the influence of English on (not only) European languages has been increasing significantly. However, “the spread of English has had an extraordinary boost after the Second World War as carrier of scientific and technological innovation and as the language of business, trade, and especially of popular culture, availing itself of the most powerful means of dissemination, i.e., radio, television, cinema and the Internet” (Pulcini, Furiassi, and Rodríguez González 2012, 2).

Slovak, as one of the West-Slavic languages of Central Europe, came into closer contact with English only after the Second World War. However, for political reasons (from 1948–1989 Czechoslovakia was a part of the Communist Bloc dominated by the Soviet Union) extensive contact between English and Slovak became a reality only after the fall of the communist regime in November 1989. This year represents an important turning point both in the history of Slovakia (before 1993, a part of Czechoslovakia) and the Slovak language.

In the *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka* [Historical Dictionary of the Slovak Language] (Majtán et al. 1991–2008), covering literary Slovak from the 11th to 18th centuries, only three entries of English origin can be found (*holster/holstral/holstro* ‘holster’, *lord*, *šterling* ‘sterling’; Kopecká et al. 2011, 202). In the *Slovník cudzích slov* [Dictionary of Foreign Words] (Petráčková and Kraus 2005), covering borrowed lexical units in contemporary Slovak (from the second part of the 20th century), Anglicisms represent the fourth largest group (2,410 entries, 4.3%), after loans of Greek (27.4%), Latin (25.7%) and French origin (6.2%). Anglicisms from the 19th and 20th centuries generally fall into the following semantic categories: sport (*basketbal* ‘basketball’, *volejbal* ‘volleyball’, *tajbrejk* ‘tie-break’, *aut* ‘out’, *bodyček* ‘checking’, *dres* ‘jersey’), art and entertainment (*bigbít* ‘big beat’, *country*, *džez* ‘jazz’, *folk*, *foxtrot*, *gag*, *hit*, *triler* ‘thriller’), nature, animals, plants (*hurikán* ‘hurricane’, *monzún* ‘monsoon’, *bulteriér* ‘bull terrier’, *grizly* ‘grizzly’, *kengura* ‘kangaroo’, *kólia* ‘collie’, *grapefruit*), food and drinks (*bar*, *brandy*, *whisky*, *džús* ‘juice’, *punč* ‘punch’, *puding* ‘pudding’, *rozbif* ‘roast beef’, *hamburger*), machines and technologies (*buldozér* ‘bulldozer’, *bojler* ‘boiler’, *čip* ‘chip’, *displej* ‘display’, *lokomotíva* ‘locomotive’, *offset*, *škuner* ‘schooner’), fashion (*džínsy* ‘jeans’, *flanel* ‘flannel’, *menčester* ‘corduroy’, *mejkap* ‘make up’, *pléd* ‘plaid’), everyday life and spare time activities (*partner*, *groggy* ‘groggy’, *sex*, *vikend* ‘weekend’, *hobby*, *karavan* ‘caravan’,

kemp ‘camp’, *piknik* ‘picnic’, *stop*), economy (*klíring* ‘clearing’, *koncern* ‘concern’, *biznismen* ‘businessman’, *rating*), and others (*lord*, *totem*, *trend*, *test*).¹ Since 1989, the majority of loanwords emerging in the Slovak vocabulary have been of English origin. Our database of Slovak neologisms (16,500 entries) consists of 2,200 loans (14.4%) of which 1,900 are Anglicisms (11.9% of all entries and 82.6% of borrowed entries).² Unfortunately, in Slovak linguistics, despite the prominence of English as a contact language, neither a specialized dictionary nor a comprehensive monograph focused on Anglicisms and Americanisms have been published so far.³

The current paper is focused on structural adaptation of English borrowings in present-day Slovak, and is a partial contribution to exploring the influence of English in Slovakia and Central Europe, respectively.

2 Theoretical Background, the Concepts and the Data

2.1 Neologism

A neologism can be defined as “an item newly introduced into the lexicon of a language” (Malmkjær 2006, 601). By the term “item”, we mean any type of lexeme (one-word unit, multi-word expression, meaning, abbreviation, etc.). According to Algeo and Algeo, a new word is a form or the use of a form not recorded in general dictionaries (1991, 2). Moreover, Picone suggests: “A neologism is any new word, morpheme or locution and any new meaning for a preexistent word, morpheme or locution that appears in a language” (1996, 3). Nevertheless, it is true that the concept of neologism and newness remains vague.⁴ Our account is based on a synchronic-diachronic perspective, i.e., description of synchronic dynamism of the lexicon with regard to extra-linguistic reality, a perspective which takes into account historical turning points that motivate and affect changes in a language. Considering contemporary Slovakia and the Slovak language, it is the Velvet Revolution of 1989 which serves as the dominant milestone in the second half of the 20th century (Dolník 2003, 192–97; Ološtiak and Rešovská 2021, 304). In this respect, present-day Slovak is understood as the Slovak language from 1989 to the present, and for the purpose of this study a neologism is any type of lexeme first attested in Slovak after 1989.

¹ The examples are taken from Peciar (1959–1968) and Kačala, Pisárčiková, and Považaj (2003). Unfortunately, there are no statistics capturing the proportion of Anglicisms in these dictionaries. Information on the dates of their first attestation in Slovak relies on Králik (2015).

² These English loans are taken from the *Dictionary of Slovak Neologisms* database (Ološtiak and Rešovská 2021). The database was compiled on the basis of the authors’ observations and from the already existing dictionary of Czech neologisms – *Nová slova v češtině* ‘New Words in Czech’ (Martincová et al. 1998, 2004). The Slovak equivalents of these entries have been checked in two Slovak corpora – the *Slovenský národný korpus* [Slovak National Corpus] and *Aranea* (Benko 2014). Each database entry contains a citation form, pronunciation, grammar label, register label, definition, and examples (Ološtiak and Rešovská 2021).

³ Obviously, the question has been partially analysed from various points of view, e.g., Lenhardt (1983, 1986), Škvareninová (1991), Oravcová (1995), Ološtiak (2002), Jesenská (2007), Dobřík (2007), etc. An extensive overview of studies on the topic cannot be included in this paper, however.

⁴ As Smyk-Bhattacharjee puts it: “Despite numerous discussions and attempts at defining a neologism, it still remains a notational term that means different things to different researchers. Therefore, though intuitively understood, neologism remains a vague concept. Inconsistent terminological distinctions and the various status levels used only add to the confusion” (2009, 37).

2.2 Borrowing and Anglicisms

Lexical borrowing is among the most visible evidence of language contact, a lexical component being “far more likely borrowed than phonological or grammatical components, which are more stable and less transferable” (Coetsem 2000, 58; quoted in Onysko 2007, 45). We treat the process of borrowing as one of several ways of lexical enrichment,⁵ i.e., responding to the naming need of a speech community (an onomasiological approach is foregrounded). As stated above, the language contact of English and Slovak is dealt with, English being the source language and Slovak the recipient language.⁶

The question of what can be counted as an Anglicism (i.e., English borrowing, loan, loanword)⁷ may be controversial. A broad definition is suggested by Gottlieb: “any individual or systemic language feature adapted or adopted from English, or inspired or boosted by English models, used in intralingual communication in a language other than English” (Gottlieb 2005, 163). Consequently, Gottlieb introduced a detailed structural classification including three main categories (active Anglicisms, reactive Anglicisms, code shifts) with multi-layered subdivisions (for the typology of borrowings and further discussion cf. Onysko 2007, 10ff.; Pulcini, Furiassi, and Rodríguez González 2012, 5–10). In accordance with Gottlieb (2005), we consider an Anglicism to be any linguistic element that is taken from or inspired by English (words, multi-word expressions, idioms, parts of multi-word expressions, pseudo-loans, semantic loans). Our data include mostly formally recognizable items (direct borrowings) – loans (*like, last minute*), pseudo-loans (*MP3-man* ‘MP3 player’) and hybrids (*byť in* ‘to be in’), and indirect borrowings – calques (*nástročný* ‘teenager’) and semantic loans (*mys* ‘mouse – a computer device’), for example. Lexical units coined from Anglicisms in Slovak are excluded, e.g., *blogerka* ‘blogger (she)’ derived through suffixation from the direct borrowing *bloger* ‘blogger’. However, these derivatives are treated in 3.4, because they are examples of the word-formation productivity of English loans.

3 Adaptation

Transposition of a lexical element from one environment (SL) to another (RL) may be considered as a lexical import. If a direct borrowing in the form of a loanword (cf. 2.2; Pulcini, Furiassi, and Rodríguez González 2012, 6) as the most typical type of lexical borrowing is taken into account, the first stage of such a process can be metaphorically called *cloning*, i.e., creating a copy of a particular lexical unit that is imported into RL in the form of a replica (the notion *replica* is used by several authors, e.g., Hope 1971; Filipović 1986b). However, in RL the process of adaptation is immediately activated. Adaptation is a natural reaction of RL to the existence of an element of foreign origin and, at the same time, is the materialization of the activity of RL in forms of outputs, i.e., particular lexical units. In this paper, adaptation of content items⁸ is dealt with as the central category.

⁵ Other processes may include: word-formation, semantic shift, lexicalization of multi-word expressions, *ex nihilo* creation). Nevertheless, there are many accounts of what can be termed as word-formation processes.

⁶ We also use the abbreviations SL (source language), E. for English, and RL (recipient language), S. for Slovak (some considerations are of general value, that is why we use acronyms SL and RL). For comments on divergent and multiple terminology in the field of contact-induced lexical borrowing cf. Pulcini, Furiassi, and Rodríguez González (2012, 10–13).

⁷ All of these terms are used here as synonyms.

⁸ Content items are nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs (i.e., items with full lexical meaning). According to Field (2002,

Adaptation is considered to be a multi-layered phenomenon which can be analysed in more detail on the levels of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, form and function (phonology, orthography), meaning (semantics), both form and meaning (morphology, morphemics, word-formation), and pragmatics, respectively. In order to name these notions, the Croatian linguist Rudolf Filipović (1978, 1986a, 1986b) coined two terms with the prefix *trans-* and suffix *-(iz)ation*: transphonemization (adaptation on the phonological level) and transmorphologization (adaptation on the morphological level).⁹ Other terms denoting individual adaptation processes have also been coined by Furdík (1994; written in Slovak), namely transmorphemization (adaptation on the morphemic level), transderivation (adaptation on the word-formation level), transsemantization¹⁰ (adaptation on the level of semantics), transorthographization (adaptation of spelling) and transcollocation (adaptation of collocability). In addition, one can use terms denoting adaptation on the level of paradigmatic relations (transparadigmatization), and syntagmatic relations (transsyntagmatization) (Ološtiak 2012).

In the following subsections, the sound, orthographic, morphological, word-formation, semantic and pragmatic adaptation processes are all presented.

3.1 Sound Adaptation (Transphonemization)

3.1.1 The essence of sound adaptation is a change in the sound structure of a lexeme, in which phonemes of SL are replaced by phonemes of RL, e.g., E. *pub* /pʌb/¹¹ =>¹² S. *pub* /pab/. Since sound adaptation is the transition of a sound element from the system of SL into the system of RL, the phonemic replacement is accompanied by other processes (including prosodic features and entering the phonological relations within the system of RL). The sound systems of languages feature various degrees of affinity. When comparing phonemes from languages in contact, we may claim there is no total identity. Although phonemes may be very close (articulated in the same way), in terms of phonology they operate in different sound systems. For instance, English /p/ is a bilabial, plosive, occlusive consonant which correlates with /b/

117), content items are the most likely borrowed elements (as opposed to function words, agglutinating affixes and fusional affixes; cf. also Onysko 2007, 45).

⁹ Filipović also investigated semantic and orthographic adaptation, although did not use the terms transsemantization and transorthographization.

¹⁰ Some of these terms (transsemantization, transderivation) have been proposed by Ajduković (1997, 2004) independently.

¹¹ IPA symbols are used both for E. and S. English pronunciation is taken from the online Cambridge Dictionary (<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>). The only exception is the “standard” English *r* (post-alveolar approximant) indicated as /ɹ/, which is different from the Slovak post-alveolar trill /r/. The stress is indicated, if needed. Slovak pronunciation is based on Král (1996). Conversion from the Slovak transcription system into IPA is based upon Ivanečský and Nábělková (2002, 89). For the sake of simplicity, English Received Pronunciation (RP) has been adopted. We have no room to consider variations in the pronunciation in English that would have an effect on the sound adaptation of words borrowed into Slovak, depending on the actual English source of the word (British English, North American English, etc.). Such work would also be tricky, because no similar research has been carried out in Slovak so far. Moreover, sound adaptation may be also influenced by other factors, e.g., final /ɛr/ in Slovak *hacker* /ɦɛkɛr/ is not only a replica of the American pronunciation /hækə/, but also the impact of spelling (final *-er*) and grammar (consonant ending involves inflection); cf. 3.2 and 3.3. Therefore, the pronunciation /ɛr/ is present in all words (masculine nouns) with the final *-er*, e.g., S. *biker*, *bloger*, *developer*, *headhunter*, *influencer*, *street worker*, etc.

¹² The symbol => is used to indicate the transfer from SL to RL. On the other hand, the symbol → is used to demonstrate word-formation relations (see 3.4).

(the opposition of tension is relevant and cannot be neutralised; Skaličková 1982, 112–15). Moreover, it can be aspirated in initial position. Slovak /p/ is a bilabial, plosive, occlusive consonant, correlating with /b/ as well and the correlation of voice which is neutralised is key, i.e., in a certain context the assimilation is activated (final /b/ in *pub* assimilates into /p/, if the following word begins with a voiceless consonant, e.g., *pub skoro otvoria* ‘the pub is about to open’ /pap skɔrɔ/).

3.1.2 The process of sound adaptation is often associated with transphonemization, i.e., the substitution of phonemes of SL by phonemes of RL. This term was introduced by Filipović (1978, 1986b, 1990) who distinguishes three types of transphonemization on the basis of similarities and dissimilarities between the segments of SL and RL:¹³

a) *Minimal transphonemization*¹⁴ – the substitution of phonemes which are almost completely identical in SL and RL, e.g., E. *facelift* /feɪslɪft/ => S. *facelift* /fɛjɪslɪft/: E. /f/ => S. /f/, E. /s/ => S. /s/, E. /l/ => S. /l/, E. /ɪ/ => S. /ɪ/, E. /t/ => S. /t/.

b) *Partial transphonemization* (in Croatian, *djelomična transfonemizacija*) – the substitution of phonemes that differ in some features, the degree of opening (vowels), place of articulation, aspiration, etc. (consonants), e.g., *font* /fɒnt/ => S. *font* /fɒnt/: E. /ɒ/ => S. /ɔ/, E. *hacker* /hækə/ => S. *hacker* /hɛkɛr/, E. /æ/ => S. /ɛ/.

c) *Free transphonemization* (in Croatian, *slobodna transfonemizacija*) – the substitution of phonemes of SL with no articulatory equivalents with those of RL. As noted by Filipović (1986b: 336), this type of substitution is done on the basis of orthography or extralinguistic factors, e.g., E. *hacker* /hækə/ => S. *hacker* /hɛkɛr/, E. /ə/ => S. /ɛr/, E. *europeak* /jʊərəʊ spi:k/ => S. *europeak* /ɛjʊrɔspi:k/, E. /j+ʊə/ => S. /ɛ+ɯ/ (orthographic influence). It should be added, that the absence of articulatory and functional equivalents is not the only condition for free transphonemization. Free substitution can take place even if there is an articulatory equivalent. In these cases a significant role would be played by other factors, e.g., E. (*ice*) *hockey* /ˈaɪs ˌhɒki/ => S. *hokej* /hɔkɛj/.¹⁵ The English final /i/ is substituted by the Slovak sequence of two phonemes /ɛ+j/ as a result of orthographic influence and, at the same time, in order to inflect the word (morphological factor).

¹³ It should be noted that a single word may involve different types of transphonemization across different phonemes. For this reason, in the examples we only show the transfer of those phonemes that belong to the corresponding type.

¹⁴ In Croatian, Filipović uses the term *potpuna transfonemizacija* or *nulta transfonemizacija* ‘zero transphonemization’ (in English-written papers *complete* or *zero transphonemization*). He takes into consideration “those phonemes whose description is completely or almost completely identical in both languages” (Filipović 1986b, 336). The author builds his consideration on the degree of similarity of phonemes in question. However, the term transphonemization (with the prefix *trans-*) suggests a change, i.e., how a phoneme of SL transforms into a phoneme of RL, and the Croatian attribute *potpuna*, or English *complete* respectively, imply a total phonemic transfer. That means a phoneme from SL is entirely different from that of RL, so it should be replaced completely. In fact, the opposite is the case. English /f/ and Slovak /f/ differ only insignificantly, so it is not necessary to make a complete phonemic change. It can be assumed that the term complete transphonemization does not satisfactorily define the notion it represents. Probably for this reason Filipović later began to use the term *zero transphonemization* (e.g., Filipović 1990, 1997). We propose the term *minimal transphonemization*, however.

¹⁵ In fact, the Slovak word *hokej* is not a neologism according to the specific temporal frame established for this paper (in the *Slovenský národný korpus* [Slovak National Corpus], it was first attested in 1959). This example is provided only to illustrate the case.

Discussion of the boundaries between types of transphonemization as well as other methodological issues of sound adaptation, exemplified by English appellatives and proper names in Slovak, is dealt with by Ološtiak (2007, 48–56).

The typology introduced by Filipović is based on qualitative criteria (properties of phonemes). Furthermore, it is possible to introduce a complementary typology established on quantity, i.e., the number of phonemes (Ološtiak 2007, 57–59). From this viewpoint the following types can be proposed:

a) *Proportional transphonemization* – one phoneme of SL is replaced by one phoneme of RL, e.g., E. *press* /pɹes/ => S. *press* /pɹes/: E. /p/ => S. /p/, E. /ɪ/ => S. /ɪ/, E. /e/ => S. /ɛ/, E. /s/ => S. /s/.

b) *Non-proportional transphonemization* – substitution is manifested by an unequal number of phonemes in SL and RL:

ba) *Extensional transphonemization* – one phoneme of SL is replaced by more than one phoneme of RL, e.g., E. *disclaimer* /dɪs'kleɪmə/ => S. *disclaimer* /dɪsklɛjmɛɪ/: E. /eɪ/ => S. /ɛ+j/,¹⁶ E. *anti-ageing* /ænti'eɪdʒɪŋ/ => S. *anti-ageing* /antɛjɛdʒɪŋ/: E. /ŋ/ => S. /n+g/. In particular, this type occurs mostly in the substitution of the English final /ŋ/ (especially in *-ing* affixes), diphthongs and triphthongs. As a result of orthography, in RL a phoneme may be pronounced that does not occur in SL in a particular word, e.g., E. *wrestling* /reslɪŋ/ => S. *wrestling* /vrɛstlɪŋ/: E. /Ø/ => S. /v/, E. /Ø/ => S. /t/. This can be regarded as a manifestation of pseudo-transphonemization (the proper transphonemization requires the existence of segments both in SL and RL).

bb) *Reducing transphonemization* – two (or, more) phonemes of SL are replaced by one phoneme of RL. This type has not been observed in the studied material.

Qualitative and quantitative typologies are complementary, they can be combined, e.g., the relation E. /eɪ/ => S. /ɛ+j/ can be referred to as free transphonemization (the aspect of quality) and non-proportional extensional transphonemization (the aspect of quantity). In general, minimal and partial transphonemization can be only proportional, free transphonemization can be both proportional and non-proportional (Ološtiak 2007, 59).

3.1.3 It has already been mentioned that sound adaptation also features prosodic and phonological changes. For prosody, the term transprosodemization may be used. With respect to borrowing, prosodic features related to the level of a word are relevant, in particular the word stress. As far as the English-Slovak language contact is concerned, two principal differences can be emphasized: a) in English, generally, the word stress is variable and fixed,¹⁷ unlike in Slovak, where stress is fixed to the first syllable; b) in English, several stresses within

¹⁶ Phonetically, it is a reduced [j], phonologically, it is a phoneme /j/. E. /eɪ/ is mostly rendered as /ɛ+j/, e.g., E. *hit maker* /hɪt meɪkə/ => S. *hitmaker* /hɪtmɛjkeɪ/, E. *baby* /beɪbi/ => S. *baby* /bejbjɪ/. The transphonemized Slovak equivalent /ɛ:/ is rather peripheral, e.g., E. *trainer* /treɪnə/, *training* /treɪnɪŋ/ => S. *tréner* /trɛ:nɛɪ/, *tréning* /trɛ:ning/ (however, *tréner*, *tréning* are not neologisms). On the other hand, a new word *trainee* /treɪni:/ is in Slovak pronounced as /trɛjnɪ:/.

¹⁷ That is to say, English stress can be placed on different syllables within different words (*hashtag* /'hæʃ.tæɡ/ – *entertainer* /entə'teɪnə/), but its place within one particular word does not change (*hashtag* /'hæʃ.tæɡ/, not */hæʃ' tæɡ/).

the same (longer, or more complex) word can be found, on the other hand, there is only one stress in Slovak, e.g., E. *anti-ageing* /ˌæntiˈeɪdʒɪŋ/ => S. *anti-ageing* /'anti'ejdʒɪŋg/, E. *backstage* /ˌbæk'steɪdʒ/ => S. *backstage* /'bækstɛjdʒ/, E. *cross-country* /ˌkrɒs'kʌntri/ => S. *cross-country* /'krɔska:ntri/.

Transition of a phoneme from SL into RL also means functional involvement in the paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in the phonological system of RL. A transphonemized segment enters phonological oppositions established in RL. This aspect of adaptation can be termed *transphonologization*. For instance, according to Urbanová (2000, 37), for English consonants an opposition of tension is relevant, while an opposition of voice is not (Urbanová 2000, 37). Conversely, in Slovak, the opposition of tension is irrelevant, while the opposition of voice is relevant. Thus, in transphonologization process, English opposition of tension is incorporated and 'melted' into the Slovak opposition of voice, which is subject to neutralization in a certain group of Slovak consonants, namely /p – b/, /t – d/, /k – g/, /x – h/, /c – ʒ/, /tʃ – dʒ/, /ts – dz/, /s – z/, /ʃ – ʒ/, /f – fʃ/.¹⁸ Bearing these typological differences in mind, the following examples can be outlined: E. *cheesecake* /tʃiːzkeɪk/ => S. *cheesecake* /tʃiːskɛjk/, E. *must-have* /mʌst hæv/ => S. *must-have* /mazd_fiev/, E. *lookbook* /lʊkbʊk/ => S. *lookbook* /lʊgbʊ:k/.

3.1.4 Furthermore, when discussing the sound adaptation, it is essential to mention the presence and nature of pronunciation variants in RL. Pronunciation variants in the E. => S. relation largely result from the following interrelated circumstances:

a) The non-existence of phonemic equivalents has an influence on activating various means of sound adaptation, e.g., E. fricative /θ/ is replaced by S. /t/ or /s/: E. *thriller* /θrɪlə/ => S. *thriller* /trɪlɛr, sɪlɛr/, E. *think tank* /θɪŋk tæŋk/ => S. *think-tank* /tɪŋktenk, sɪŋktenk/, although the form /t/ is preferred: E. *Bluetooth* /bluːtuːθ/ => S. *bluetooth* /blʊ:tʊ:t/, not */blʊ:tʊ:s/, E. *thrash* /θræʃ/ => S. *thrash* /trɛʃ/, not /srɛʃ/.

b) Typological differences, e.g., different degrees of symmetry/asymmetry between pronunciation and orthography. In Slovak, the symmetry is much higher than that in English (it reaches 87%; Sabol 1989, 225). Therefore, the orthography plays a significant role within the process of sound adaptation (see 3.2). This fact is manifested, apart from the free transphonemization, in the competition between two kinds of sound forms: those based on substitution of SL phonemes vs. those based on orthography, e.g., E. *aerobics* /eəˈrɒbɪks/ => S. *aerobic* /ɛrobɪk, ærobɪk/.

c) Influences of varieties of English, e.g., E. *body styling* BrE. /bɒd.i stɑɪlɪŋ/, AmE. /bɑːdi stɑɪlɪŋ/ => S. *bodystyling* /bɔdɪstɑjɪŋg/ (influenced by British English), /badɪstɑjɪŋg/ (influenced by North American English).

3.1.5 Importantly, the sound adaptation of abbreviations (acronyms) as a special type of lexeme is worth mentioning. In this domain several tendencies can be traced: a) pronunciation based on transphonemization: E. *PR* /piːɑːf/ => S. *PR* /pɪː a:r/, b) pronunciation based on Slovak principles: E. *MP3* /em piː/ => S. *MP3* /ɛm pɛː/, not */ɛm-pɪː/, E. *pdf* /piːdiːɛf/ => *pdf* /pɛː dɛː ɛf/, not */pɪː dɪː ɛf/, E. *USB* /juːes biː/ => S. *USB* /ʊː ɛs bɛː/, not */jʊː ɛs bɪː/;

¹⁸ Slovak transcription equivalents: /p – b/, /t – d/, /k – g/, /x – h/, /t – dʲ/, /č – dʒʲ/, /c – dzʲ/, /s – zʲ/, /ʃ – ʒʲ/, /f – wʲ/.

c) competition of a) and b): E. *PC* /pi:si:/ => S. *PC* /pɪ: sɪ:, pɛ: cɛ:/ (both forms are common), E. *QR code* /kju: 'ɑ:/ => S. *QR kód* /kvɛ: ɛr, kjʊ: a:r/ (the first form is much more common).

3.1.6 Finally, transphonemization based on orthography may be rarely used for pragmatic (expressive) purposes, e.g., *image* completely pronounced as /ɪmæʒ/ (not */ɪmɪdʒ/ based on E. /ɪmɪdʒ/) in the pejorative sense of 'negative image'.

3.2 Orthographic Adaptation (Transorthographization)

Adaptation on the level of orthography (transorthographization) covers any change of spelling. This mostly occurs as a reflection of pronunciation (*cash* => *keš*, *bike* => *bajk*) and only rarely as a simplification of geminates (*banner* => *baner*, *lobby* => *loby*).¹⁹ This is the result of typological differences (Slovak with predominantly phonemic orthography vs. English with its non-phonemic system). As a result, transorthographization of loanwords from English is a relatively common process in Slovak.²⁰ In terms of neologisms, many aspects (including spelling) of their existence and usage are subject to change. This is especially true of their orthography which can be either preserved, modified, or completely adapted.

When neologisms are at the very beginning of their lexical existence in RL, they usually retain their original spelling. This is evident in the researched database, where more than 65% of borrowings operate in Slovak with no orthographic change, e.g., *crew*, *freelancer*, *gender*, *high-end*, *impeachment*, *workout*. Whether the sound adaptation is followed by adaptation of orthography is determined by several (sometimes overlapping) factors (Ološtiak 2012), including register, whether or not the word is considered an internationalism, and various other pragmatic matters. In terms of register, the orthography of colloquial or slang words is subject to adaptation more often than that of unmarked and neutral words or terms from registers characterized by a higher level of formality.²¹ Internationalisms are less adaptable, as transorthographization could in part contradict the principle of their existence.²² Pragmatics influences adaptation in a sense that the original English spelling can, in certain contexts, be viewed as default and therefore more 'attractive' in certain contexts. Examples include terms used in professional communication,²³ words that convey a degree of prestige when English spelling²⁴ is used and words that preserve the iconicity of a brand name.²⁵ English spelling is also preserved in phrases of idiomatic or terminological character such as *cash and carry*, *coming out*, *just in time*, *lucky loser*, *soft law*, etc.

¹⁹ In Slovak, there is a strong tendency to create symmetry between spelling and pronunciation (cf. 3.1.4).

²⁰ The statement concerns English loanwords as such, i.e., not only neologisms. Older Anglicisms have a slightly different status because they have been subject to spelling adaptation for a longer time.

²¹ Considering the vertical division of register into lower – neutral – higher, with colloquial, slang and overall non-standard words at the lower end of the spectrum, neutral in the middle, and literary, administrative, and scientific terms at the higher end (Slančová 1999).

²² Note that a certain degree of transorthographization, i.e., smaller, less significant changes of spelling (adding quantity markers or simplifying the spelling e.g., *stevard*, *troh*) can be present in internationalisms in certain cases.

²³ For example, since English is the main language of IT, IT professionals tend to use the original spelling even in cases where there is a counterpart with adapted orthography already present in the language, e.g., *scrollovat* – *skrolovat* 'to scroll', *malware* – *malvér*, *software* – *softvér*, etc. (meaning this aspect can be tied to the microsocial aspect of the term register as well, see Slančová 1999).

²⁴ This is very common in the communication register of lifestyle or tourism, e.g., *lounge*, *night club*, *styling*, *wellness*, etc.

²⁵ Transorthographization in this case usually occurs only when the word denoting a branded product becomes an eponym, the name for the whole type of products not produced by the original brand, e.g., *Jeep* – *džíp*, *Walkman* – *volkmén*.

Around 10% of the borrowings consists of entries where orthographic adaptation is not necessary, as the orthographic form and its pronunciation in Slovak correspond without needing any changes, e.g., *barter*, *ending*, *font*, *grant*, *link*, *van*.

The remaining units are divided into two categories in terms of the presence of orthographic adaptation. The larger group (approximately 16%) consists of loanwords with two or more variants of spelling, one being the original English spelling and the other (or others) showing various degrees of orthographic adaptation (*outfit/outfit*, *playmatel/plejmejt*, *patchwork/pečvork/pečvork*). The second group (around 7%) is made up of adapted loanwords with no variants, the adaptation process having taken place during their relatively short existence in Slovak, e.g., E. *loser* => S. *lúzer* 'loser', E. *screening* => S. *skríning* 'screening', E. *to tape*²⁶ => S. *tejpovať* 'to tape'.

The emergence and existence of orthographic variants is usually tied to the process of establishing the fixed pronunciation of a word in RL. In the case of sound variability, more than one orthographic variant can emerge.²⁷ Among the researched material, two types of variant pairs (or triples and even quadruples in certain cases), can be described. The first type includes pairs where, along with the original variant, there is an already standardized adapted variant²⁸ – *dealer/diler*, *establishment/establišment*, *fleece/flis*, *hattrick/hetrik*, *imager/imidž*, *camp/kemp*, *clip/klip*, *team/tím*. Although the adapted form functions as the default variant, the original variant remains in use at least to a certain extent, usually for pragmatic reasons similar to those described with words that are not subject to adaptation.

Another group of orthographic variants is represented by items with an adapted variant that is not (yet) standardized, the use of which is considered colloquial or slang, e.g., *keyboard/kejbord* 'keyboard piano', *promotion/promoušň*, *remake/rímejk*, *squash/skvoš*, *time/tajm*. These adaptations may (but need not) become standardized in the future.

In the last group, orthographic adaptation is most advanced with only one adapted form (the original spelling having been dispensed with), e.g., *displej* 'part of a mobile device used to show information' (E. display), *klik* 'a mouse click' (E. click), *lízing* (E. leasing), *strečing* 'special set of exercises designed to stretch the muscles before or after other exercise' (E. stretching). This category consists mainly of earlier neologisms, i.e., units that emerged in Slovak in the 1990s and early 2000s.

Standardization of the original vs the adapted spelling forms largely follows a case by case basis, taking into account various aspects of orthographic adaptation listed in this section. Normative lexicographic works such as *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka* [Comprehensive Dictionary of the Slovak Language] (Kačala, Pisárčiková, and Považaj 2003), *Pravidlá*

²⁶ In a sense of "using kinesiology tape to relieve muscle pain".

²⁷ For example, the pronunciation of the word *management* in Slovak has fluctuated significantly. As a result, four orthographic variants exist in total – *management/manažment/menežment/menidžment*. Of these, *manažment* is the most frequent variant and eventually became standardized (i.e., recognized by normative dictionary work *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka* [Comprehensive Dictionary of the Slovak Language] Kačala, Pisárčiková, and Považaj 2003) with the other variants still used, although to a lesser degree. The original variant is for example still preserved in the name of the Faculty of Management of Comenius University in Bratislava (S. *Fakulta managementu*) despite the standardized variant already having been established.

²⁸ In cases with more variants, there is usually another adapted variant that has not become standardized (see note 27).

slovenského pravopisu [The Rules of the Slovak Orthography] (Považaj 2013), use the original spelling with the information about the correct pronunciation in cases of non-adapted words or words that do not have their adapted spelling fully established yet. In cases when the words already have variant spellings along with the original one, then, depending on their frequency of usage,²⁹ they are listed as either first or second variants of an entry word. When the adapted spelling becomes prevalent, dictionaries either include the original spelling with a note – *pôvodne pís.* ‘originally spelled’, or omit the original spelling altogether. Variation among other dictionaries can occur depending on their publication year. Nevertheless, based on the fact that the adaptation processes in neologisms are still ongoing, and many of them are not (yet) included in the listed dictionaries, a general conclusion about the preference of the original or adapted spelling cannot be drawn yet.

There is also an option of language counselling, where linguists answer questions raised by the public which usually concern the use of a concrete word, in terms of spelling, pronunciation or morphological aspects, such as declension or conjugation, e.g., <https://jazykovaporadna.sme.sk/q/60/> (for the spelling of *e-mail*, *email*, *mail*, *mejl* – accessed November 11, 2022). The answers and recommendations are based on the interpretation of already established rules in similar words and corpus research.

3.3 Morphological Adaptation (Transmorphologization)

Adaptation on a morphological level concerns a shift in grammatical categories (if SL and RL share the same category), or it reflects the attribution of a grammatical category in RL due to its absence in SL, or the loss of grammatical category in cases when RL does not have a certain grammatical category that the word possesses in SL. This process is manifested in various ways depending on to what part of speech a loan belongs to.

3.3.1 Nouns. Morphological adaptation of nouns includes the processes of transgenerization (change of grammatical gender), transdeclension (change of declension), and transnumerization (change of grammatical number). A change of grammatical gender often occurs, since the systems of gender in English and Slovak are based on different principles. The natural gender-based system in English divides nouns denoting persons according to their biological sex; all other nouns denoting inanimate objects and phenomena are assigned the neuter gender (Corbett 1991). In Slovak, the situation is more complicated and several factors are relevant (natural gender, formal criterion, paradigmatic criterion). The natural gender principle operates the same way as in English, since nouns denoting persons are automatically assigned grammatical gender based on the referent’s biological sex³⁰ (masc. *nerd*, *mentee*, fem. *showgirl*, *barbie*). If a loanword does not denote a person, formal and paradigmatic criteria are activated. Each grammatical gender has its “strong” formal final position:³¹ consonant (masculine), vowel *-a* (feminine), vowel *-o* (neuter), e.g., *web* (masc.),

²⁹ The usage is usually checked in corpus databases.

³⁰ Which, in turn, can cause the noun to be uninflected, e.g., *cheerleader*, *miss* (both denote women and are assigned the feminine grammatical gender but lack the ending *-a*, which is necessary for a feminine noun to be inflected; cf. note 31).

³¹ The ‘strong’ position is prototypical for the corresponding gender and enables a loan to be inflected. Feminine and neuter nouns with less typical or untypical stem endings remain uninflected (e.g., fem. *šou* ‘show’, *world music*, *homepage*) despite the existence of different declension patterns, fem. *dlaň* ‘palm’ and *kost* ‘bone’; neutr. *srdce* ‘heart’,

utilita (fem.), *bingo*, *taebo* (neutr.). At the same time, assigning the gender may be influenced by paradigmatic criteria, i.e., *fashion* is transgenerized as feminine, because its synonym *móda* ‘fashion’ belongs to that category, similarly *home care* (fem.) ← *starostlivosť* (fem.) ‘care’, *site* (fem.) ← *stránka* (fem.) ‘site’, *rave party* (fem.) ← *oslava* (fem.) ‘party’. A complex process can be demonstrated by the following loans: E. *netiquette* => S. *netiketa* (fem.) ← *etiketa* (fem.) ‘etiquette’, E. *utility* => S. *utilita* (fem.) ← *pomôcka* (fem.) ‘utility’. These entries are assigned feminine gender as a result of paradigmatic criteria and, at the same time, the ending *-a* typical for feminine nouns is attached, so the words can be inflected.

It follows from the above that English neuter nouns can be adapted in Slovak as masculine nouns (*catering*, *disclaimer*, *editorial* ‘editorial’, *facelift*, *firmware*, *pole dance*), feminine nouns (*world music*, *netiketa* ‘netiquette’) and neuter nouns (*smoothie*, *taebo*).

After assigning a certain grammatical gender, the word is included in a particular declension type (masc. *kartridž* ‘cartridge’ – gen. sg. *kartridža*, dat. sg. *kartridžu*, nom. pl. *kartdridže*, etc.; neutr. *taebo* – gen. *taeba*, instr. sg. *taebom*, etc.) or remains uninflected (fem. *message*).

3.3.2 Verbs. Transmorphologization of verbs manifests itself through the addition of a suffix in order to conjugate the word, e.g., *resetovať* ‘to reset’, *uploadovať* ‘to upload’, *kliknúť* ‘to click’ (see 3.4.2). Verbs with such suffixes can be included in a particular conjugation type.

3.3.3 Adjectives. In the database, there are three categories of adjectives: a) denominal uninflected adjectives coined by conversion, e.g., *last minute* (noun) → *last minute* (adj.) (*last minute dovolenka* ‘last minute holiday’), *au pair* (noun) → *au pair* (adj.) (*au pair agentúra* ‘au pair agency’); b) those that can be explained either as denominal derivatives coined by word-formation (*unisex* → *unisexový* ‘relating to a unisex’, *grunge* → *grungeový* ‘relating to grunge’), or as inflected entries by means of a suffix with a grammatical function (adj. *unisex* → adj. *unisexový*, adj. *grunge* → adj. *grungeový*; cf. 3.4.2); c) those that can be explained only as inflected entries, because in Slovak the presupposed noun does not exist (adj. *cool* → adj. *coolový*, adj. *light* → adj. *lightový*). Categories b) and c) presuppose the existence of adjectival variants such as *cool* – *coolový*, *unisex* – *unisexový*, *light* – *lightový*, *grunge* – *grungeový*, *hardback* – *hardbackový*. Uninflected adjectives such as *last minute dovolenka* ‘last-minute holiday’, *cool pokec* ‘cool chat’, *open air festival* represent the most visible morphological innovation under the influence of English, i.e., adoption of the features typical for analytic languages.

3.4 Word-Formation Adaptation (Transderivation)

3.4.1 Word-formation adaptation (transderivation)³² appears to have a multifaceted character. First of all, it is useful to explain cross-linguistic and intralinguistic facets of transderivation. The **cross-linguistic aspect** depends on a comparison of the word-formation status of a word in SL and RL. From this perspective, transderivation most often manifests itself as a

vysvedčenie ‘certificate’, and *dievča* ‘girl’. This shows that in Slovak, as RL, the central and typical mechanisms are activated for adaptation.

³² Furdík (1994) did not specify this term in detail. However, he dealt with individual manifestations of word-formation adaptation giving examples of loans of Hungarian origin in eastern Slovak dialects.

loss of word-formation motivation (Furdík 1994, 99). The relation between motivating and motivated words of SL is interrupted, because a motivated word is usually borrowed without its motivating word, e.g., E. *outside* → *outsider* => S. Ø → *outsider* (the English word *outsider* is derived from *outside*, while Slovak *outsider* is not motivated), E. *size* → *oversize* => S. Ø → *oversize*, E. *snow* + *board* → *snowboard* => S. Ø → *snowboard*, E. *short* + *list* → *shortlist* => S. Ø → *shortlist*. Motivational relation is preserved if both members of a motivational couple have been borrowed, e.g., E. *hoax* → *hoaxer* => S. *hoax* → *hoaxer*, E. *to hate* → *hater* => S. *hejtovať* → *hejter*. The **intralinguistic aspect** is related to the integration of a loan into the word-formation system of RL. This includes a number of manifestations (operating on various levels, see 3.4.2) that represent the adaptation function of word-formation motivation (Furdík 2004). Additionally, the existence of couples such as *provider* → *subprovider*, *hoax* → *hoaxer* provide evidence for interconnectedness between cross-linguistic and intralinguistic aspects. Both motivating and motivated words such as *hoax* → *hoaxer* have been borrowed and, at the same time, they enter the word-formation relations of RL.

3.4.2 In the following section, a brief outline of word-formation adaptation processes in Slovak is given (cf. also Furdík 2004, 121–22).

A special case is represented by suffixation for inflectional morphological purposes. A suffix is attached to a non-inflected word to make it inflectable, e.g., *miss* → *miss-ka*, *selfie* → *self-ičko*, *cool* → *cool-ový*. This process is typical for acronyms (*SMS* → *SMS-ka*, spelled also *esemeska*, *MMS* → *MMS-ka*, *ememeska*), and obligatory for verbs. Since the Slovak verb must be conjugated and conjugation is possible only by means of certain final morphemic sequences (especially *-ovať* and *-núť*), for a borrowed verb it is thus necessary to attach such a suffix, e.g., E. *to hate* => S. *hejt-ovať*, E. *to scan* => S. *sken-ovať*, E. *to stalk* => S. *stalk-ovať*, E. *to click* => S. *klik-núť*.

In some cases, a specific process of remotivation is activated. Initially, a borrowed Anglicism is usually a simple, non-motivated unit (e.g., *stalking*, *browsing*). However, it may become a derivative if an underlying word exists that can be perceived as its motivating element, e.g., *stalkovať* → *stalking*, *browsovať* → *browsing* (cf. *trénovať* ‘to train’ → *tréning* ‘training’, *driblovať* ‘to dribble’ → *dribbling* ‘dribbling’).³³

Further stages entail an Anglicism in the function of a motivating word from which new words are coined:

- a) A combination of borrowed word-formation means, bases and affixes. This is mainly the consequence of the fact that both members of a word-formation pair have been borrowed, and hence their word-formation relation has been borrowed as well:

³³ These are the records of the first mention in the *Slovenský národný korpus* [Slovak National Corpus] (collected by the function frequency distribution over time). Sometimes nouns occur before corresponding verbs (*stalking* (1998) – *stalkovať* (2012), *dribbling* (1960) – *driblovať* (1964)), in some cases they appeared at the same time (*tréning* (1955) – *trénovať* (1955)). The pair of *browsing* (2002) – *browsovať* (1998) is the evidence of a verb occurring before a noun. It has to be stressed, however, that the direction of motivation does not depend on temporal criteria (which member of a pair was attested sooner or later). What is more important is the semantic relation. Since an action is primarily expressed by verbs, nouns denoting an action are viewed as deverbal and secondary. The principle is the same as in Slovak *loviť* (verb) ‘to hunt’ → *lov* (deverbal noun) ‘hunting’.

e.g., E. *vlog* → *vlog-er* ⇒ S. *vlog* → *vlog-er*, E. *boss* → *boss-ing* ⇒ S. *boss* → *boss-ing*.

b) A combination of borrowed bases with domestic affixes: *crossover* → *crossover-ový* ‘relating to a crossover (a type of vehicle)’, *diler* ‘dealer’ → *dealer-ka* ‘dealer (she)’, *mail* ‘e-mail’ → *mailik* ‘e-mail (brief, or positive attitude) (diminutive)’.

Both a) and b) result in the formation of partial word-families (word-formation nests) including multi-word expressions: e.g., *aerobik* ‘aerobics’ → *aerobikový* ‘relating to aerobics’, *aerobička* ‘female person who does aerobics’, *step aerobik* ‘step aerobics’, *vodný aerobik* ‘water aerobics’; *lobby*, *loby* ‘lobby’ → *lobovať* ‘to lobby’, *lobing* ‘lobbying’, *lobovanie* ‘lobbying’, *lobizmus* ‘lobbyism’, *lobista* ‘lobbyist’, *lobistka* ‘lobbyist (she)’, adj. *lobistický* ‘relating to a lobbyist or lobbyism’, adv. *lobisticky* ‘in a way typical for a lobbyist or lobbyism’. In Slovak, one of the largest word-families constituted on the basis of new Anglicisms is represented by the words *weblog* and *blog*. A corpus-based case study focused on this word-family (Ološtiak 2021) shows not only its astonishing extent (more than 200 units), but also a multidimensional structure on the basis of which it is organized and a close relationship between word-formation and borrowing.³⁴

3.5 Semantic Adaptation (Transsemantization)

Semantic adaptation (transsemantization) is a process of adaptation in terms of (usually) simplifying the polysemic structure of a word from SL. This means that only one or two meanings are usually borrowed in RL,³⁵ e.g., *fashion* “a style that is popular at a particular time, especially in clothes, hair, make-up, etc.” (CD³⁶ 2022)³⁷, *chat* “a discussion that involves sending messages over the internet, by phone, using a messaging service, etc.”³⁸ (CD 2022), *label* “a company issuing commercial recordings”³⁹ (MW⁴⁰ 2022), *light* “made with lower calorie content” (MW 2022) or *volume* “the degree of loudness or intensity of sound” (MW 2022). Interestingly, many of semantically adapted loanwords (e.g., *chat*, *label*, *light*) have the secondary, semantically transferred meanings of the original English word.⁴¹

Semantic adaptation does not, however, have to automatically mean reduction to a monosemic lexical unit. In some cases, the word is borrowed with a set of either connected or independent

³⁴ Let us mention at least a few examples without further commentary or translation into English (some words occur in two or more orthographic forms, though only one of them is given here): *weblog*, *webloger*, *weblogging*, *blog*, *blogovať*, *blogger*, *bloggerka*, *blogerský*, *bloging*, *bloggerstvo*, *blogovací*, *blogovanie*, *blogosféra*, *videoblog*, *vlog*, *vlogger*, *vloggerka*, *vlogerský*, *fotoblog*, *flog*, *floger*, *flogerka*, *flogerský*, etc. Obviously, some of these words may be treated as borrowings with ‘inherited’ derivational relations from SL (e.g., *blogger*, *bloging*, *fotoblog*, *flog*).

³⁵ All the definitions listed illustrate lexical meanings of Anglicisms borrowed into Slovak.

³⁶ Cambridge Dictionary.

³⁷ The English word *fashion* is given a different number of meanings depending on the dictionary used. There are only two of them in Cambridge Dictionary (2022) but eight meanings in total in the Merriam-Webster (2022).

³⁸ In English, this meaning is a result of a semantic shift from the primary meaning “a friendly informal talk” (Cambridge Dictionary 2022).

³⁹ Of 13 meanings listed in total (Merriam-Webster 2022), only one has been borrowed into Slovak. Two directly related meanings have not been borrowed, “a brand of commercial recordings issued under usually a trademarked name”, and “recording so issued”.

⁴⁰ Merriam-Webster.

⁴¹ The primary meaning of a given lexical unit is based on the numbered listing of definitions in the entries in two current lexicographic works – Cambridge Dictionary and Merriam-Webster.

meanings, e.g., *free* “not tied by conventions” and “not costing money, costless”,⁴² *coach/kouč* “a person that trains and guides a sportsperson in preparation and during competition”⁴³ and “a person in charge of training employees in particular skills connected to their working position”,⁴⁴ *raft* “a rubber inflatable dinghy used for floating on rapid rivers” and “the action of floating on rapid rivers considered as adrenaline sport; rafting”. Monosemy is therefore not a default result of semantic adaptation; however, simplifying of the semantic structure often occurs.

Another aspect of semantic adaptation is represented by semantic calques, i.e., “a process in which only a semanteme of a word not its form is transferred” (Onysko 2007, 14), e.g., *mys* “a small input device used to control the cursor on a computer monitor” being derived from the primary meaning of the word *mys* “a small rodent with grey fur living in proximity to people’s households” (cf. English *mouse*); *inteligentný* with the secondary semanteme “capable of being connected to other devices by using various wireless technologies” (cf. English adjective *smart*); *epický* being used as a synonym for *výnimočný*, *skvelý* “extraordinary” (cf. English *epic*), *toxický* with a new meaning “exhibiting unhealthy behavioural patterns or dynamics (especially in the context of relationships)” (cf. English *toxic*).

3.6 Pragmatic and Stylistic Adaptation (Transpragmatization)

Transpragmatization describes a process of adaptation of loanwords in terms of the pragmatic or stylistic value of a word and concerns any change of these aspects when the loanword is attributed a pragmatic or stylistic mark in comparison to its pragmatically and stylistically neutral status in SL (Ološtiak 2012). The change in pragmatic or stylistic status of a word can encompass expressiveness (both emotionality and evaluation), register, as well as temporal aspects.

In terms of register, a very common means of pragmatic adaptation is when a neutral English lexical unit becomes slang or colloquial in Slovak, e.g., *bikel/bajk*, *ban*, *cash/keš*, *shoplšop*, *single* ‘not in romantic relationship’, *song*, *story*.⁴⁵ In this case, transpragmatization occurs as a result of these neologisms entering paradigmatic – synonymic relations with neutral lexical units (both in terms of register and temporal aspect). Transpragmatization can be also tied to transorthographization which can be an additional signifier of the colloquial or slang character of a word.

A shift from neutral in English to mass media register in Slovak also occurs, albeit to a much lesser degree. A few examples include *comeback* “artist’s return to the scene after a longer hiatus” and *no comment*.

Pragmatic adaptation also concerns shifts in temporal markedness, i.e., neological status of

⁴² Merriam-Webster (2022) lists 15 meanings of *free* in total; moreover, each of these main meanings is further subdivided into specified meanings.

⁴³ In this meaning, the neologism is a synonym for the previously borrowed and already fully adapted word *tréner*.

⁴⁴ In English, the word *coach* in the personal sense is itself a result of a semantic shift, the earlier meaning of the word being a ‘horse-drawn carriage’.

⁴⁵ For example, slang usage in Slovak: *V dnešnej dobe bezbotovostných platieb obdobie kešu máme už za sebou*. ‘In today’s era of wireless payments, the age of cash is long gone.’ vs. neutral usage in English: *The proper way to pay in Austria is to give your cash and say the amount you wish to pay, including tip*. (both examples were taken from the Aranea corpus database, Benko 2014).

lexical units. In Slovak, the whole database consists of neologisms that are temporally marked with many loans from the database holding the same status in SL (e.g., words denoting new technologies, new phenomena in politics, social relationships, science, entertainment, lifestyle etc., such as *fake news*, *firewall*, *follower*, *LGBTI+*, *mobbing*, *paddleboard*). However, there is also a significant number of borrowings considered neutral in English (in terms of temporality). This may be due to either the Slovak neologism functioning as a synonym to another Slovak lexical unit (*fresh* “young, up-and-coming”, *happy*, *hardback*, *level* “part of a computer game accessible after completing certain tasks”), or to a loanword denoting a referent previously not present in Slovak extralinguistic reality. With the change in political system – and, basically, of the whole society – many words denoting newly emerged phenomena were borrowed from English since the Anglo-American cultural influence on globalization is arguably the most significant. The most prominent among these are words denoting phenomena connected to politics and the economy – *broker*, *developer*, *junk bond*, *cash flow*, *kredit* ‘credit’, *letter of intent*, *lobby*. The same applies to words denoting phenomena from popular culture, a capitalist market economy and marketing, e.g., *bilbord* ‘billboard’, *fast food*, *cheerleader*, *kornfleksy* ‘cornflakes’, *opening party*, *peepshow*, *rebranding*, *revival* “musical act or band that performs the music of a well-known, usually no longer active artist or band trying to emulate their style as accurately as possible”, *squatting* “illegally occupying abandoned buildings, usually in urban areas”.

In essence, transpragmatization concerns a change in pragmatic status connected to the essence of the loanword in terms of it being a catachrestic (a new lexical unit and a new concept introduced in RL) or non-catachrestic innovation (a new lexical unit represents a concept that already exists in RL and is named by a different equivalent) (Onysko and Winter-Froemel 2011). A change in register is a direct result of the loanwords being non-catachrestic as they function (usually) as colloquial or slang words alongside neutral, already existing lexical units in RL. The change in the neological status of loanwords falls into both catachrestic and non-catachrestic categories. Lexical units naming new phenomena that were not previously part of the pre-1989 society while they were established in the Anglo-American environment represent catachrestic innovations, whereas those that are borrowed only with the intention of a lexical “upgrade” for purely pragmatic reasons are automatically categorized as non-catachrestic innovations.

4 Variants and Synonyms

Since certain features of loanwords can make their usage in RL somewhat difficult for users, the existence of variants and synonyms – either of Slovak origin or with Slovak features – that facilitate the inclusion of these lexical units into the grammatical system of Slovak enables the adaptation process. As a result of this, often either two synonymous neologisms emerge or a loanword exists in Slovak along with its already established variant.

Examples of neological synonyms where a loanword competes with a word (usually) coined by means of word-formation⁴⁶ include *au pair* – *babysitterka* – *opatrovateľka*, *bodyguard* – *osobný strážca*, *downloadovať* ‘to download’ – *stiahnuť*, *follower* – *sledovateľ*, *hotline* – *horúca*

⁴⁶ And thus of Slovak origin.

linka, sharovať ‘to share’ – *zdieľať, subscriber – odberateľ, transgender – transrodový, wireless – bezdrôtový*. In the majority of these cases, the Slovak equivalent is the calque of its replica.⁴⁷ However, not all of those pairs can be categorized as absolute synonyms; often the two equivalents differ in pragmatic aspects, especially in terms of register (see 3.6) where the loanword is colloquial or slang whereas the Slovak equivalent is considered neutral. Of the examples listed, *downloadovať, follower, shareovať, subscriber* or *wireless* typify this category of stylistic synonyms. Comparing the frequency of synonyms in corpus databases,⁴⁸ it is apparent that the words of Slovak origin are more common, with frequencies that are usually three or even four times greater than that of the related loanwords. One exception is *hotline – horúca linka* where the loanword has a significantly higher occurrence than its Slovak equivalent. Therefore, no straightforward conclusion on language users’ preferences can be drawn on this issue.

Certain loanwords – particularly acronyms and other words with specific features preventing them from being used in accordance with Slovak grammar or word-formation rules⁴⁹ – also have variants that follow grammatical rules (they can be inflected), e.g., *DVD – DVD-éčko, gif – gifko, miss – misska, MILF – MILF-ka, SMS – SMS-ka* (see also 3.4.2). However, inflected variants are all considered colloquial.

5 Conclusion

The significance of the impact of English on the present-day Slovak lexicon is evident from the results of this study. Out of 16,500 neological entries in the database, 14.4% (2,200) are loans of which only 300 are not Anglicisms. In other words, English entries represent 11.9% of all neological entries and 82.6% of the borrowed neological entries.

Anglicisms in the database cover a range of communication registers, such as transportation (*off-road, pikap* ‘pickup truck’), business/the economy (*benchmarking, outsourcing*), arts, entertainment and media (*doom metal, docusoap, soundtrack, spiker* ‘speaker’, *spot*), gastronomy (*smoothie, wrap*), fitness, wellness and lifestyle (*nail art, crossfit*), medicine (*pacemaker, stent*), IT and the Internet (*like, open source, proxy, webmaster*), psychology (*burnout, mobbing*), politics (*europeak, welfare state*), social issues (*streetwork, underclass*), sports (*downhill, paraglajd* ‘paraglide’), telecommunication (*roaming, smartfón* ‘smartphone’), and tourism (*all inclusive, skipass*).

It is not possible to define adaptation as following a set template; particular processes operate with various speeds and strengths. However, as mentioned by other authors, transphonemization (apart from code shifts, or code-switching elements), i.e., sound adaptation is fundamental. On the other hand, orthographic changes take place over a longer period of time. This is also true of transderivation in the sense of the intralinguistic aspect of this process (the loan becoming a motivating word).

⁴⁷ Of the examples listed, *opatrovatelka* is not an exact calque because it is derived from the verb *opatrovať* ‘to care for’.

⁴⁸ The frequency was checked in the *Slovenský národný korpus* [Slovak national corpus] (prim-9.0-public-all, 2020), as well as web-based corpus *Aranea* (Benko 2014).

⁴⁹ Such as nouns that cannot be the subject to declension.

Another fact worth emphasizing is the interaction and cooperation of adaptation processes, e.g., transphonemization driven by orthography (S. *skibus* /skibus/, not */skības/, S. *wrestling* /vrɛstlɪŋ/, not */rɛslɪn/). On the other hand, transorthographization may be affected by pronunciation (*bajt* 'byte', *mejľ* 'mail'). Transmorphologization of verbs is supported by word-formation (the existence of suffixes with grammatical function: E. *to book* => S. *book-ovat*). On the level of morphology, some borrowings are adapted on the basis of their relationship to their synonyms, e.g., *fashion* is feminine, because its synonym *móda* is feminine (this is evidence of transparadigmatization having an influence on transmorphologization).

To illustrate this, the adaptation of the noun *hoax* can be outlined as follows:

a) Sound adaptation: E. *hoax* /həʊks/ => S. *hoax* /ɦoʊks/, or /ɦoaks/; minimal and proportional transphonemization: E. /k/ => S. /k/, E. /s/ => S. /s/; partial and proportional transphonemization: E. /h/ => S. /ɦ/; free and non-proportional extensive transphonemization: E. /əʊ/ => S. /ɔ+ʌ/, or /ɔ+a/.

b) Orthographic adaptation: spelling does not change (zero transorthographization).

c) Morphological adaptation: E. *hoax* (neuter) => S. *hoax* (masculine; singular paradigm: nominative, accusative: *hoax*, genitive, dative: *hoaxu*, locative: *hoaxe*, instrumental: *hoaxom*; plural paradigm: nominative, accusative: *hoaxy*, genitive: *hoaxov*, dative: *hoaxom*, locative: *hoaxoch*, instrumental: *hoaxami*).

d) Word-formation adaptation: 1) cross-linguistic aspect: in English, the noun *hoax* was probably converted from the corresponding verb, in Slovak, it is not motivated; 2) intralinguistic aspect: the word *hoax* is the basis of the following lexemes: *hoaxový* (adj., "relating to a hoax"), *hoaxer* (noun, "a person who sends hoaxes"), *hoaxovať* (verb, "to send hoaxes").

e) Semantic adaptation: in English, there are two meanings of *hoax*: "a plan to deceive someone, such as telling the police there is a bomb somewhere when there is not one, or a trick", and "a plan to deceive a large group of people; a trick" (CD 2022); "an act intended to trick or dupe", and "something accepted or established by fraud or fabrication" (MW 2022). In Slovak, two meanings can be observed: "falsehood or fake news usually spread in online social media";⁵⁰ "a message (such as an email or a status posted on social media) containing falsehood or fake news". Although these are not yet registered by English dictionaries, we presume they can be considered established and separated from the original primary and secondary meanings, as is evident from the following example: *The Mountain Lion Foundation debunks an old hoax, an e-mail story circulating about a Montana couple being saved from a mountain lion attack by their mule that also includes graphic photographs of the mule reportedly fighting and killing the lion.*

f) Pragmatic and stylistic adaptation: in the case of the neologism *hoax*, pragmatic adaptation is not present. Both in English and in Slovak, the word is used primarily in the context of the Internet register; the markedness in terms of register is retained.

⁵⁰ For example, this meaning is already attested in the French dictionary *Le Robert* (2022) as "information fautive, périmée ou invérifiable propagée par Internet", i.e., "false, outdated, or unverifiable information spread on the Internet".

This overview shows the need for further research in the field, e.g., the typology of English loans, possible ‘adaptation patterns’, factors influencing the spread of English in Slovak, the English element in particular registers, Anglicisms in relation to English as a foreign and as a second language, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic and cultural aspects, and so on. In Slovak studies, the focus should now be placed on comprehensive publications (especially on compiling a dictionary and preparing synthetic monographs) in order to shed multidimensional light on Anglicisms and Americanisms in the Slovak lexicon.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the Contract no. APVV-18-0046.

References

- Ajduković, Jovan. 1997. *Russisms in Serbo-Croatian Dictionaries. Principles of Adaptation. Dictionary*. Beograd: Foto Futura.
- . 2004. *An Introduction to Lexical Contact: The Theory of the Adaptation of Russisms in South and West Slavic Languages*. Beograd: Foto Futura.
- Algeo, John, and Adele S. Algeo, eds. 1991. *Fifty Years Among New Words. A Dictionary of Neologisms, 1941–1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benko, Vladimír. 2014. “Aranea: Yet Another Family of (Comparable) Web Corpora.” In *Text, Speech and Dialogue. 17th International Conference, TSD 2014, Brno, Czech Republic, September 8–12, 2014. Proceedings*, edited by Petr Sojka, Aleš Horák, Ivan Kopeček, and Karel Pala, 257–64. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Coetsem, Frans van. 2000. *A General and Unified Theory of the Transmission Process in Language Contact*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Corbett, Greville. 1991. *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobřík, Zdenko. 2007. *Jazyky v kontaktoch (Anglicizmy a iné slová cudzieho pôvodu v nemčine a slovenčine)*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela.
- Dolník, Juraj. 2003. *Lexikológia*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.
- Field, Fredric W. 2002. *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Filipović, Rudolf. 1978. “Tipovi transfonemizacije u jezicima u kontaktu.” *Filologija* 8 (8): 99–106. Accessed November 28, 2022. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/184193>.
- . 1986a. *Teorija jezika u kontaktu. Uvod u lingvistiku jezičnih dodira*. Zagreb: Jugoslovenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Školska knjiga.
- . 1986b. “Research Guidelines for Analysing Anglicisms in Serbo-Croatian.” In *English in Contact with Other Languages. Studies in Honour of Broder Carstensen on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, edited by Wolfgang Viereck and Wolf-Dieter Bald, 333–43. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- . 1990. *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo – razvoj – značenje*. Zagreb: Jugoslovenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Školska knjiga.
- . 1997. “The Theoretical Background of the Project ‘The English Element in European Languages.’” *Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabensia* 42: 105–10. Accessed November 28, 2022. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/120285>.
- Furdík, Juraj. 1994. “Integračné procesy pri lexikálnych prevzatiach.” *Jazykovedný časopis* 45 (2): 95–102.
- . 2004. *Slovenská slovo tvorba (teória, opis, cvičenia)*. Edited by Martin Ološtiak. Prešov: Náuka.
- Furiassi, Cristiano, Virginia Pulcini, and Félix Rodríguez Gonzáles, eds. 2012. *The Anglicization of European Lexis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Goebel, Hans, Peter H. Nelde, Zdeněk Starý, and Wolfgang Wölck, eds. 1996. *Kontaktlinguistik / Contact Linguistics / Linguistique de contact. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung / An International Handbook of Contemporary Research / Manuel international des recherches contemporaines. 1*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- , eds. 1997. *Kontaktlinguistik / Contact Linguistics / Linguistique de contact. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung / An International Handbook of Contemporary Research / Manuel international des recherches contemporaines. 2*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Gottlieb, Henrik. 2005. "Anglicisms and Translation." In *In and Out of English: For Better, for Worse?*, edited by Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers, 161–84. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Grant, Anthony P. 2015. "Lexical borrowing." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Word*, edited by John R. Taylor, 431–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , ed. 2019. *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hickey, Raymond, ed. 2010. *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hope, Terry E. 1971. *Lexical Borrowing in the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ivanecký, Jozef, and Mira Nábelková. 2002. "SAMPA Transcription and the Slovak Language." *Jazykovedný časopis* 53 (2): 81–95.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitudes and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jesenská, Petra. 2007. *Jazyková situácia na Slovensku v kontexte EÚ, s ohľadom na anglicizmy v slovenskej dennej tlači*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela.
- Kačala, Ján, Mária Pisárčiková, and Matej Považaj, eds. 2003. *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka*. 4th ed. Bratislava: Veda.
- Kecskes, Istvan. 2019. *English as a Lingua Franca. The Pragmatic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kopecká, Martina, Tatiana Laliková, Renáta Ondrejková, Jana Skladaná, and Iveta Valentová. 2011. *Staršia slovenská lexika v medzijazykových vzťahoch*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Kráľ, Ābel. 1996. *Pravidlá slovenskej výslovnosti*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- Králik, Ľubor. 2015. *Sruční etymologický slovník slovenčiny*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Labov, William. 2001. *Principles of Linguistic Change: Social Factors*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Léglise, Isabelle, and Claudine Chamoreau, eds. 2013. *The Interplay of Variation and Change in Contact Settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lenhardt, Ján. 1983. "Adaptácia anglických vokálnych zvukov [ə] a [ɜ:] v slovenčine." *Slovenská reč* 48 (2): 160–67.
- , 1986. "Vokálna kvantita v súčasnej angličtine a jej prepis v slovenčine." *Slovenská reč* 51 (2): 96–101.
- Majtán, Milan, Vincent Blanár, Izidor Kotulič, and Štefan Peciar, eds. 1991. *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka I: A – J*. Bratislava: Veda.
- , eds. 1992. *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka II: K – N*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Majtán, Milan, Vincent Blanár, Izidor Kotulič, and Marie Majtánová, eds. 1994. *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka III: O – P (pochytka)*. Bratislava: Veda.
- , eds. 1995. *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka IV: P (poihrať sa – pytlovať)*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Majtán, Milan, Rudolf Kuchar, and Jana Skladaná, eds. 2000. *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka V: R (rab) – Š (švrkotat)*. Bratislava: Veda.
- , eds. 2005. *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka VI: T – V*. Bratislava: Veda.
- , eds. 2008. *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka VII: Z – Ž. Dodatky*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Malmkjær, Kirsten, ed. 2006. *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge.
- Martincová, Olga, Vladimír Mejstřík, Albena Rangelová, Václava Holubová, Zdeňka Opavská, Zdeňka Tichá, Ivona Tintěrová, Mílada Voborská, and Věra Schmiedtová, eds. 1998. *Nová slova v češtině 1. Slovník neologismů*. Praha: Academia.
- Martincová, Olga, Vladimír Mejstřík, Ladislav Janovec, Jitka Mravinacová, Zdeňka Opavská, Albena Rangelová, Jindra Světlá, Pavla Šmídová, Zdeňka Tichá, and Ivona Tintěrová, eds. 2004. *Nová slova v češtině 2. Slovník neologismů*. Praha: Academia.
- Mauranen, Anna, and Elina Ranta, eds. 2009. *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Dueling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-Switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2022. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ološtiak, Martin. 2002. "Transfonemizácia v kontaktovom vzťahu angličtina – slovenčina." *Jazykovedný časopis* 53 (2): 111–26.
- . 2007. *Jazykovoštruktúrný a komunikačno-pragmatický status vlastného mena (adaptácia anglických proprií v slovenčine)*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity.
- . "Poznámky ku konceptu interlingválnej demotivácie v slovenčine." In *Jazykoveda v pohybe*, edited by Alena Bohunická, 148–57. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.
- . 2021. "Poznámky k slovtvornej adaptácii prevzatých pomenovaní (na príklade slovtvorného hniezda *blog*)." *Jazykovedný časopis* 72 (3): 769–86.
- Ološtiak, Martin, and Soňa Rešovská. 2021. "A Dictionary of Slovak Neologisms (A Project Description)." *International Journal of Lexicography* 34 (3): 302–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecaa029>.
- Onysko, Alexander. 2007. *Anglicisms in German. Borrowing, Lexical Productivity and Written Codeswitching*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Onysko, Alexander, and Esmé Winter-Froemel. 2011. "Necessary Loans – Luxury Loans? Exploring the Pragmatic Dimension of Borrowing." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (6): 1550–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.12.004>.
- Oravcová, Anna. 1995. "Anglicizmy v dennej tlači." In *Spisovná slovenčina a jazyková kultúra*, edited by Ján Doruľa, 97–107. Bratislava: Veda.
- Peciar, Štefan, ed. 1959–1968. *Slovník slovenského jazyka*. 6 volumes. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.
- Petráčková, Věra, and Jiří Kraus, eds. 2005. *Slovník cudzích slov*. Translated by Ľubica Balážová, Ján Bosák et al. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo – Mladé letá.
- Picone, Michael D. 1996. *Anglicisms, Neologisms and Dynamic French*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Považaj, Matej, ed. 2013. *Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Prodromou, Luke. 2008. *English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-Based Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Pulcini, Virginia, Cristiano Furiassi, and Félix Rodríguez Gonzáles. 2012. "The Lexical Influence of English on European Languages. From Words to Phraseology." In *The Anglicization of European Lexis*, edited by Furiassi, Cristiano, Virginia Pulcini, and Félix Rodríguez Gonzáles, 1–24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sabol, Ján. 1989. *Syntetická fonologická teória*. Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav L. Štúra SAV.
- Skaličková, Alena. 1982. *Fonetika súčasnej angličtiny*. Praha: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- Slančová, Daniela. 1999. *Reč authority a lásky. Reč učiteľky materskej školy orientovaná na dieťa – opis registra*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity.
- Smyk-Bhattacharjee, Dorota. 2009. "Lexical Innovation on the Internet – Neologisms in Blogs." PhD diss, University of Zurich.
- Škvareninová, Oľga. 1991. "Anglicizmy v konfrontácii so slovenčinou." In *Studia Academica Slovaca* 20, edited by Jozef Mistrík, 281–92. Bratislava: Alfa.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G., and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Urbanová, Ludmila. 2000. "Phonetics & Phonology." In *Rudiments of English Linguistics*, edited by Pavol Štekauer, 1–60. Prešov: Slovacontact.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Winford, Donald. 2019. "Theories of Language Contact." In *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*, edited by Anthony P. Grant, 51–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Electronic Sources

Cambridge Dictionary. 2022. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/> (accessed November 11, 2022).

Le Robert. 2022. <https://www.lerobert.com/> (accessed November 11, 2022).

Merriam-Webster. 2022. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/> (accessed November 11, 2022).

Corpus Sources

Slovenský národný korpus – prim-9.0-public-all. 2020. Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra SAV. <https://korpus.juls.savba.sk> (accessed November 11, 2022).

Aranea – Araneum Anglicum II Maximum. 2022. Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences, Ľ. Štúr Institute of Linguistics. http://aranea.juls.savba.sk/aranea_about/index.html (accessed November 11, 2022).

Aranea – Omnia Slovaca Publica II Maximum. 2022. Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences, Ľ. Štúr Institute of Linguistics. http://aranea.juls.savba.sk/aranea_about/index.html (accessed November 11, 2022).