

Semantic Adaptation of Anglicisms in French

Ljuba Dabo-Denegri

Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical
Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split

Adaptation of anglicisms at the semantic level comprises various changes of meaning that occur in the process of linguistic borrowing. Three types of semantic changes have been analysed in this paper: 1) changes in semantic extension; 2) ellipsis; 3) pejoration. The analysis at the semantic level has been carried out in accordance with the theoretical tenets of languages in contact theory of R. Filipović (1986, 1990)

1. Introduction

The present study was carried out within the framework of “The English Element in European Languages” project and its aim is to study the formal adaptation of English loanwords in French on the phonological, morphological and semantic level following theoretical principles of languages in contact theory of R. Filipović (Filipović 1986, 1990).

This paper is an attempt to analyse changes of meaning a model goes through in the process of its adaptation in the borrowing language. Our analysis is confined to direct borrowings only, which means that *e.g.* loan translations will not be discussed here. Pseudoanglicisms are also included in our analyses since they undergo the same process of adaptation as anglicisms.

The data for this study have been drawn from various sources: dailies and weeklies of the type *Le Monde*, *L'Express*, *Paris Match*, *Les Nouvelles Littéraires*, fashion magazine *Modes & Travaux* and dictionaries listed at the end of this article.

In the analysis of semantic changes we have employed the scheme devised by Filipović (1986:161) which is in fact a modified version of Hope's system of semantic changes: 1) changes in semantic extension, 2) ellipsis, 3) metaphor, 4) pejoration, 5) appellatives. Three out of five types of semantic changes have been analysed in this paper:

1) changes in semantic extension; 2) ellipsis; 3) pejoration. As to *changes in semantic extension*, a more precise scheme has been worked out by Filipović (1986: 169,174) in a way that *restriction in meaning* is divided into a) *restriction in number and restriction in the field* and b) *expansion in meaning* into *expansion in number and expansion in the field*. Another innovation introduced by Filipović (1986: 174) concerns the distinction between *primary* and *secondary* adaptation¹.

2. Zero extension

When a new object or a new concept is introduced into another community, there is a strong tendency of the borrowing language to accept the nomenclature offered by the lending language. Deroy (1956: 137) claims that the use of loanwords in these cases seems to be appropriate and justified. It is what he calls *l'emprunt de nécessité*. Zero semantic extension occurs when the meaning of an English loanword, having been integrated into the borrowing language's system, remains unchanged. Pergnier (1989: 53) argues that borrowing of monosemic words is rather rare, but exists nevertheless, particularly in the case when a loanword itself is a neologisme. It is a common phenomenon characteristic of all languages that borrow from English, French being no exception in that regard. A considerable number of loanwords have adapted their meaning through zero extension, at least as far as our corpus is concerned. These are loanwords that refer primarily to a more specialised field. Loanwords showing zero semantic extension belong to a wide variety of fields; terms designating foods and drinks, clothing, dances as well as those pertaining to technical and sports terminology retain their original meaning. Examples are numerous and we shall quote only some in each field:

Sports: *baseball, bowling, passing-shot, ping-pong, rugby, volley-ball, boxeur* (E. boxer)

Foods and drinks: *Coca-Cola, curry, gin, grog, haddock, hamburger, ketchup, punch, rum* (E. rum),

Music: *ragtime, rock'n'roll*

Card games: *bridge, poker, whist*

Clothing: *cardigan, pullover, sweat-shirt*

Other fields: *attaché-case, bazooka, boycott, businessman, baby-sitter, laser, overdose*

¹ Filipović (1986:55) introduces the concept of primary and secondary adaptation; the former governs the changes a model passes through until it reaches the form of a replica and the latter registers the changes a replica undergoes in the borrowing language after it has begun to behave like a native word.

3. Restriction

3.1. Restriction in number

Restriction in the number of meanings is the most common change in linguistic borrowing. Since words in a majority of cases have more than one meaning, it is a general tendency that loanwords in a new language convey only a part of their old meaning. When a lexical item is borrowed from a more specialised vocabulary, it is just this specific usage which is borrowed to the exclusion of all other usages the item may have. This phenomenon is referred to as specialisation of meaning from a general to a specific, technical one. In a large number of cases the borrowing language adopts one or two meanings, although there are cases when more than two are taken over.

Our corpus offers quite a number of examples for this type of semantic change. We have chosen only a few to illustrate how the process works.

E. *lobby* has 2 meanings + 1 additional meaning (marked under letters in W_3) and it is the meaning #2.b that has been borrowed by French which stands for “a particular group of persons, organisation or association representing a special interest”. Examples are numerous, but we shall mention just a few:

“Un divorce consacré, selon lui, par le “silences du ministre de l'énergie” et la reconstitution d'un nouveau *lobby* anti-scolaire dans la haute administration” (Le Monde, 26.01.83)

“...en avertissant les *lobbies* agricoles puissants en France, en Allemagne ou en Espagne” (Le Monde, 12.11.83)

E. *patchwork*, has 2 basic meanings + 1 additional (according to W_3). French has adopted two meanings: # 2. “pieces of cloth of various colours and shapes sewed together”:

“De quoi faire de dizaines de couvertures en *patchwork*, portemanteaux en prime”. (Le Monde, 02.01.83)

The first meaning of this loan has been also taken over by French: “something composed of ill-sorted or incongruous parts” (syn. hotchpotch, jumble). The following illustrations support the figurative and pejorative use of this loan:

“C'est dans cette atmosphère de disposition.à tout que François Dufrêne écrivit ses premières poèmes usant tour à tour de l'onomatopée, du souffle de mots de toutes les langues tracées dans tous les sens dans un sarcastique *patchwork* joy-cien.” (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 22.12.82)

“Ce télescopage entre deux ou trois révolutions ajoute au malaise devant un *patchwork* où les conflits se réduisent à des repas de tête”. (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 06.01.83)

“...il s’installe à New York et s’immerge dans son *patchwork* musical”. (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 20.01.83)

We have already said that the borrowing language adopts mainly one or more rarely two meanings; nevertheless there are cases when more than two meanings are adopted, for example the English loanword *flash*.

Of 12 basic meanings + 17 additional ones (according to W₃) French has adopted the following meanings:

7.c (according to W₃) which is used to denote “a first brief news report”, as in the following examples:

“Julien Besançon sort de son placard pour présenter le *flash* de 22 h et l’édition de 23 h. (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 20.01.83)

Nous ne retenons pas que des *flashes* d’information des fragments d’images” (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 06.01.83)

#7d. (according to W₃) which stands for “a sudden bright artificial light used in taking photographic pictures” - syn. “flashlight” and #4.a (according to W₃ - Suppl.) : “a lamp for producing a brief but intense flash of light for taking photographs” - syn flash lamp”. The following examples illustrate this usage in French:

“C’est un peu comme si le *flash* d’un photographe avait fixé là l’impossible rencontre de l’errance folle du poète éperdu d’absolu.....” (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 06.01.83)

“Les *flashes* crépitent” (Le Monde, 07.01.83)

#4.b (according to W₃ Suppl.) which belongs to the vocabulary of the world of drugs and is used for “a specific sensation after using a drug”

Semantic changes are by no means a feature which would apply to nouns only. There are quite a number of adjectives, verbs and adverbs (although very seldom) that have undergone semantic changes.

Thus, English verb *squat* has 3 meanings as a transitive verb and 5 meanings + 6 additional ones (marked under letters in W₃) as an intransitive verb. In French it is used only as a transitive verb and it is the meaning #3 that was adopted: “to occupy without title or payment of rent”.

“La “gestion de la salle d’attente n’est pas simple” disent-ils, avant d’évoquer de manière moins euphémique le choc des salles d’attentes “*squattées*” par des personnes souvent sales.....” (Le Monde, 13.11.83)

3.2. *Restriction in the field*

As already mentioned, restriction in number is the most frequent form of change of meaning. One or, less frequently, two meanings are taken over to designate a new object

or a new concept that the borrowing language lacks. However, apart from restriction in number, there are cases where the meaning of a borrowed word is narrowed in the field as well.

We have seen in previously quoted examples that F. *flash* has restricted the number of meanings with regard to the model. In French, however, it is also used in the sense of “a rapid scene of a film” which comes in fact from the third meaning of E. *flash* “the duration of a flash: a brief time” (#3.). This word is used in English in a more general sense (*answered in a flash, for a flash we thought we saw them* - according to W₃); in French, by contrast, its usage is restricted to cinema and television only.

E. *job* has 11 basic meanings + 3 additional ones (according to W₃) and it is the meaning 5.a that has been adopted in French. In English, *job* is used in the general sense of “regular remunerative employment”, unlike French where its meaning is narrowed and stands for “remunerative but very often occasional employment”. The following example illustrates its usage in French:

“Cette législation réduit le nombre de chômeurs de centaine de milliers de personnes... Enfin, il y a beaucoup de gens en Hollande qui ont des petits *jobs* de quelques heures par jour” (Le Monde, 12.11.96)

E. *flop* has 3 different meanings and 3 additional ones (marked under letters in W₃). French has adopted the meaning #1.a “the sound of flopping” (PR) and the meaning #2.c “failure” in the informal English usage. While in English *flop* is used in a much wider context (*was a flop as a reporter, the new economic plan was a flop from the very beginning* - according to W₃) in French, however, its usage is reduced to film, theatre or spectacle. The following illustrations provide enough evidence to support this claim:

“Il n’en restera pas là, et ce seront ensuite, très vite, Vienne, Rome, Londres, Paris aussi mais pour un *flop* à la salle des agriculteurs: Paris faisait la coquette et Arthur Rubinstein n’avait pas encore l’œil et le doigt suffisamment malicieux pour la séduire. (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 22.12.82.)

“On peut tout reprocher à Alain Savory - la rentrée 1982, par exemple, qui fut un *flop* magistral - mais il faut décerner à ce brillant potache le premier prix”. (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 22.12.82.)

F. *building* adopted the first meaning (# 1.a) out of 3/4/ given by W₃ and denotes “constructed edifice designed to stand permanently and serving as a dwelling or other useful structure”. This word is used in English in a general sense of “any permanent construction regardless its size and dimensions” corresponding to F. *édifice, bâtiment, construction*; in French, however, its usage is restricted only to “a huge building having a lot of floors”, whose equivalents in English would be *tower blocks, high-rise blocks*.

“Monaco est un doux fantasme en Amérique. L’Amérique est un terrifiant fantasme à Monaco. Il y a des innombrables sièges de compagnies américaines, ces

buildings, ces capitaux qui circulent dit-on...et à côté ces rombières texanes...
(Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 06.01.83.)

According to Filipović (1986:168) changes of meaning arising from *restriction in the field* are qualified as primary changes and take place during the first stage of adaptation. It holds true for quite a number of anglicisms in Croatian. In French, however, the situation appears to be somewhat different. There are cases where the meaning of a loanword is restricted both in number and in the field during the first phase of adaptation and, admittedly, these are by far most numerous. This is shown in the previous illustrations. However, we have come across some examples in which *restriction in number* is carried out within the frame of primary adaptation and it is in a secondary stage of adaptation that already restricted meaning gets restricted even further.

Such an example is the English loanword *square*. In primary adaptation the number of its meanings in French has been restricted from 16 (+15 additional ones - according to W₃) to one (# 8.a): “an open area enclosed by residential buildings commonly laid down with trees, grass, walks, gardens”; when introduced into French (1778, in Wartburg), this loan was used in much the same sense as in English. At a later date, however, F. *square* came to mean “a public garden laid out in the middle of the square”, its meaning thus being restricted further. This change of meaning can be accounted for in terms of a secondary change because this word, in English, can not be used in the sense of its French counterpart. It is true that E. *square* may eventually have a garden laid out at its centre, nevertheless it is not a garden but the square itself (F. *place*).

“J’avais encore en mémoire des enfants blonds et bronzés se baignant nus dans les bassins des *squares*” (Le Monde, 26.01.83)

4. Expansion

Once the loanword is established in the borrowing language’s lexical system, it starts to behave like any indigenous word. It begins to be used more loosely and evolves without reference to its source. In other words, after a period of being used as a part of the borrowing language vocabulary, the intension of its meaning has been reduced and its extension has been increased. The process in which the meaning of a loanword is adapted through either *expansion in the field* or *expansion in number* can be only explained as a secondary change. The loanword extends its meaning first in the field and later in number, acquiring new meanings unknown in the source language.

4.1. *Expansion in the field*

There are numerous examples in our corpus showing extension of meaning, but nevertheless we cannot draw the conclusion that all of them qualify for this type of semantic change. There are cases where certain expressions are used in wider contexts

than appropriate. Being primarily media inventions, not accepted on a wider scale, after a certain time they fall into disuse. Consider the following examples:

“Imaginé au mois de mars, elle dessine les contours d’un “nouveau type d’unité” entre “toutes les forces syndicales, sociales et politiques qui veulent battre la droite” et s’exposent, pour 1998, à un *remake* d’union de la gauche” (Le Monde, 12.11.96)

“Le climat consensuel qui semble régner à Washington aurait de qui nourrir l’optimisme des Américains, si ceux-ci n’avaient l’impression à un *remake* de 1992:..” (Le Monde, 13.11.96)

“...la position étrange des quatre pays occidentaux - France, Grande-Bretagne, Allemagne et Canada - associés aux Etats-Unis au sein du groupe de contact à propos du principal obstacle à un règlement négocié: le “lien” (*linkage*) établi par... (Le Monde, 25.01.83)

“Certes, nous avons apprécié que M.Maurois affirme, en septembre, devant l’Assemblée générale des Nations Unies, l’opposition de son pays au *linkage*. (Le Monde, 25.01.83)

E. *remake* was adopted by French in the sense of “a new version of a previously made film”; its meaning was adapted through *zero extension* (the only meaning the model has in the source language has been preserved in the replica). E. *linkage* was introduced as a specialised term used in biology: “relationship between genes that causes them to be manifested together in inheritance” the number of meanings has been restricted from three (+ 1 additional - according to W_3) to one (#2). As can be seen from the examples above, these loans in their recent usage in the borrowing language acquire more general sense which corresponds more closely with that of their models. For the time being, it is difficult to predict whether these loans will preserve their expanded usage or will remain to be used sporadically. Social factors, amongst others, will also play an important role in that regard.

In our opinion, *expansion in the field* should imply something that is generally accepted, known and used on a larger scale. Though examples are not so numerous as those concerning *restriction in number*, we shall nevertheless give a few to illustrate this category of semantic change.

We have already mentioned that English loanword *job*, when introduced into French, narrowed its meaning and meant “remunerative, but very often occasional employment”. In its recent usage, however, it has acquired a more general sense and has come to denote “profession, any remunerative employment”. Its usage is however confined to familiar speech where it stands for the French word *boulot*, which is also used colloquially:

“Comme si un jeune n’avait jamais envie de fonder sa propre société, de financer son *job* et d’en créer d’autres” (L’Express, 12.11.1997)

“Trois types de *jobs* y sont proposés: l’inscription des étudiants, la saisie informatique et le guichet de paiement” (Modes & Travaux, III 1990)

Similarly, F. *check-up*, retained one of two English senses: “a general physical examination”. It is the only meaning that appears in both *Dictionnaires des anglicismes* (RDA, LDA). *Le Petit Robert* and *Le Petit Larousse*, however, quote also the widened usage of this word which comes to mean “complete examination, verification” in general, as the corresponding English term does:

“Les inspecteurs des services judiciaires actuellement sur l’île sont chargés d’éclaircir cette affaire et de faire le “*check-up*” de la justice en Corse” (Le Monde, 15.01.83)

Sports terminology provides also some good examples for this type of semantic change. The English loanword *match* was initially borrowed by French as a term for turf (1827, in Mackenzie). Subsequently its usage extended to other sports as well and became used generally in the sense of “competition”. Unlike its usage in English, F. *match* is used to designate sports events which do not enter the category of matches in English (Orr, 1935:298): thus “*un match d’athlétisme*” or “*le match (de rame) Oxford-Cambridge*” if translated into English, they would require some other terms instead, e.g. *athletic contest* or *the Oxford-Cambridge boat race*.

Consequently, in primary adaptation this loan has restricted its meaning in number from 6 (according to W₃) to one (#2.a). In secondary adaptation, its meaning has expanded in the field and has come to denote “competition” in general.

4.2. *Expansion in number*

Expansion in number is also a secondary change in linguistic borrowing and is not so common as *restriction in number*. It seems quite natural for a loanword to lose, in the borrowing language, part of its meanings than to acquire completely new ones. Expansion in number occurs in loans which have been long established in the borrowing language and have been used on a rather large scale.

Sociological as well as sociolinguistic factors seem to play an important role in the process of semantic expansion. Sense changes arising from expansion of meaning are by no means universal, they depend on and are typical of each language community. Whereas restriction of meaning is much easier to define and describe, expansion of meaning, by contrast, cannot be always entirely explained. Explanations offered for some examples are sometimes incomplete and unstable. They may vary from case to case, from one period of time to another. (Filipović, 1986:174).

We have already seen that E. *flash* restricted its meaning in French, both in number and field, in the process of primary adaptation. At the secondary stage of adaptation, F. *flash* has developed two new meanings, unknown in the source language. Thus, it has

acquired the meaning of “an announcement or advertisement broadcast”, as in *flash publicitaire* (commercial), which is confirmed by PR. The second new meaning of this word is quoted by *Le Petit Larousse*. Namely, in adjectival apposition, F. *flash* conveys the meaning of the English word “promotional”, as in the example *vente flash* “promotional sale of certain articles in department stores”.

E. *gadget*, when borrowed by French, designated “a small ingenious invention” (#1. out of 2 given by W₃), much as in English. At a later date it became used in a figurative sense unknown in English, giving rise to such expressions as *une réforme-gadget*, *un sac gadget* (RDA), which do not exist in the source language. The following examples illustrate its figurative and pejorative use in French:

“Va-t-elle, au nom des anniversaires, transformer l'évènement en “*gadget culturel*” (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 06.01.83)

“Le réseau couteur” un *gadget* poétique qui met un peu d'oxigène dans ce fatras galactique...” (Les Nouvelles Littéraires, 06.01.83)

E. *poplin* underwent *zero extension* at the moment of its transfer to the borrowing language. It has been used to designate “a strong plainwoven fabric used for clothing”. In its recent usage in French it has acquired an additional meaning which does not exist in English: “shirt or jacket made of rough silky material.”

“Cours chercher ma *popeline* chez Pressing' 2000! (DICO français/français)

Numerous pseudoanglicisms fit into this category of semantic change. Created in the borrowing language by means of English elements, either by word formation or ellipsis, they acquire entirely new meanings unknown in the lending language. Thus F. *cargo* takes over the meaning of the English compound *cargo-boat*, and cannot be used in the sense of its English counterpart.

“Il s'embarque comme seul passager sur un *cargo*, débarque en Italie” (Paris Match, 20.01.83.)

Similarly F. *pressing*, a pseudoanglicism formed by means of E. suffix *-ing*, has acquired in French two meanings, unknown in English. Its first sense stands for “dry cleaner's”, as in the example:

“Elles courent de l'école à l'hypermarché, de la banque au pédiatre, du bureau au *pressing*” (Modes & Travaux, IV 1990).

The second meaning belongs to sports terminology and denotes “a constant pressure”:

“Après une vingtaine de minutes de *pressing* danois, Per Pederson...” (Le Monde, 12.11.83)

There is another group of anglicisms, very important as far as these two languages are concerned, that are used in different sense from the original one - "faux amis". These words are very similar in form, if not identical, in both languages. In this case it is a meaning, not a word, that is transferred from the source language to an existing word in the borrowing language. Examples are numerous, but we have chosen just one as illustration: F. *opportunité* has acquired, under the influence of English *opportunity*, the meaning of "a favourable occasion":

"Deux rendez-vous à ne pas manquer pour vos *opportunités* de carrière". (Le Monde, 12.11.83)

"Une *opportunité* intéressante pour un généraliste capable d'animer un encadrement de production et un...". (Le Monde, 25.01.83)

5. Ellipsis

Ellipsis, truncation of words and phrases, is a very common means of semantic change. In linguistic borrowing it occurs in two ways (Filipović, 1990:69):

1. Ellipsis in the model - a loanword has been transferred to the borrowing language in an already elliptical form: *destroyer*<*torpedo-boat destroyer*, *hobby*<*hobby horse*, *pub*-*public house*, *bourbon*<*bourbon whisky*, *porter*<*porter' beer*, *hansom*<*hansom-cab*, *leg*<*black leg*, *norfolk*<*Norfolk jacket*, *oriel*<*oriel window*. These examples will not be dealt with in our paper because they do not affect the formation of anglicisms and will be therefore treated like all other models.

2. Ellipsis in anglicism - a semantic change has occurred during the transfer of a loanword into the borrowing language. Thus it might occur that a replica is an ellipsis and, on the contrary, a model is a complete word or a phrase. In some languages, such as French, the tendency of shortening words and phrases is more strongly expressed than in others. To quote Pergnier (1989:44) "it is extremely rare for a plurisyllabic loan to penetrate as a whole into current usage. J.Rey-Debove (1986) considers the truncation of too long and too complicated English phrases judicious, since the shortened forms may not have more than one meaning. Purists, on the other hand, express their criticism in this regard because this process leads to an ever increasing number of pseudoanglicisms. Thus English loanwords *smoking*, *snack*, *country*, *strip*, derived from *smoking jacket*, *snack bar*, *country music*, *comic strip*, do not have the same meaning they would have if they were used as such in English. Elliptical forms seem to be in a more common use than their full forms, they are shorter hence easier to pronounce and unambiguous as such in the borrowing language. In a number of cases, however, they show parallel usage with their full forms. It is worth noting that some loanwords, in particular those taken over by the borrowing language at an earlier date, underwent special evolution in the process of their integration and were established as elliptical forms only, e.g. F. *smoking*<E. *smoking jacket*. Even more interesting is the case of the loanword *poudingue*; borrowed by French in 1753 (Bloch-Wartburg), this loanword was completely

integrated into the phonological and morphological system of French that a native speaker of French could hardly recognise it as ellipsis of the English compound *pudding stone*.

F. *manifold* < E. *manifold paper/manifold writer*

F. *manifold*, established in the elliptical form only, is an interesting case with regard to the model. According to RDA and GLLF, this loanword is derived from the compound “manifold writer”. On the other hand, LDA and PR quote “manifold paper” as its source. Since all quoted dictionaries give the same meaning for both entries (manifold writer and manifold paper) “a lightweight paper used with carbon paper to produce multiple copies”, it is to assume that *manifold* is abbreviated form of *manifold paper*. Moreover, the same entry, *manifold paper*, is also given by W₃.

F. *box* < F. *box-calf* < E. *box-calf*

The elliptical form is used in parallel with the full form with no change of meaning. According to PR and RDA the second part of the compound, *calf*, is also possible in French, though in less frequent use than *box*.

F. *side* < F. *side-car* < E. *sidecar*

This ellipsis, showing parallel usage with its full form, is an interesting case with regard to meaning. Beside the meaning borrowed from English “a car attached to a motorcycle for the accommodation of a passenger and supported by a single third wheel”, it acquires a new meaning in French and apart from the first meaning denotes also “the whole vehicle”. According to J.Orr, in this latter sense it is a characteristic example of pseudoanglicism (RDA). Its full form has given rise to the derivative *sidecariste/sidecariste*.

F. *cross* < F. *cross-country (running)* < E. *cross-country*

This elliptical form is also used in parallel with its full form with no change of meaning. Its complete integration in French has been attested by numerous compounds created in the borrowing language: *cyclo-cross*, *moto-cross*, *side-car cross* or *side-cross*, *crossman*, *cyclo-crossman*.

6. Pejoration

Pejoration of meaning, though common in language², does not occur very often in linguistic borrowing. Ullmann (1981:232) claims that xenophobia may fill some foreign

² Pejorative developments are so common in language that some early semanticists regarded them as a fundamental tendency, a symptom of a ‘pessimistic streak’ in the human mind” (Ullmann, 1981: 231).

words with a derogatory sense. German *Ross* “charger, steed” has given French *rosse* “sorry steed, crock”.

Our corpus, however, does not provide many examples which would show this type of semantic change. Admittedly, there are illustrations that are used exclusively in a pejorative sense in the borrowing language: *gang*, borrowed by French in the meaning of “a company of criminals” (#3.b₍₂₎ - according to W₃), owes its pejorative usage to American detective films which had a great success immediately after the World War II (RDA); similarly, *politicien* is also used pejoratively in French “one primarily interested in political offices or profits derived from them as a source of private gain”. These loans, however, did not come into being in the course of borrowing, on the contrary, they were taken over from English in an already derogatory sense. Among rare illustrations there is one quoted by Höfler (1982): *flanelle* - this loan underwent, in the borrowing language, pejorative development and has been used in the sense of “an abstinent client in a brothel”. A derogatory shade of meaning is also felt in the expression *jambes de flanelle* - “limp, lifeless legs”, though this usage is confined to a more familiar speech. The loan *rosbif* (E. roast-beef) has also acquired an unfavourable meaning in French. According to *Le Petit Robert*, this word stands for “Englishman” in familiar usage.

7. Conclusion

Adaptation of anglicisms at the semantic level comprises various changes of meaning that occur in the process of linguistic borrowing from the moment of transfer to complete integration into the borrowing language. English loanwords fit into the framework of linguistic changes that occur in the process of linguistic borrowing. Nearly all English loanwords go through restriction in the number of meanings which precedes secondary changes *i.e.* expansion of meaning either in number or in the field. A considerable number of loans undergo zero semantic extension, *i.e.* they preserve their original meaning. These loanwords belong to a wide variety of fields as sport, music, food, drinks, clothing. Restriction in field is not such a frequent phenomenon as restriction in number. It is carried out within primary adaptation, though there are cases which belong to secondary adaptation. Expansion of meaning in both field and number is a secondary change since loanwords in the borrowing language acquire new meanings unknown in the source language. Ellipsis is a very frequent means of semantic change. The majority of loanwords show parallel usage of full and elliptical form, though there are cases which are established in the borrowing language in elliptical form only. Pejoration of meaning is an infrequent phenomenon in linguistic borrowing. Examples of this type of semantic change are very rare in our corpus.

ABBREVIATIONS

RDA	=	Robert: Dictionnaire des anglicismes (1984)
LDA	=	Larousse: Dictionnaire des anglicismes (1982)
PR	=	Le Petit Robert (1988)
GLLF	=	Grand Larousse de la langue française (1989)
W ₃	=	Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language (1971)

REFERENCES

- Bloch, O.-Wartburg, W. (1975), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Debove, J.R. - Gagnon, G. (1988), *Dictionnaire des anglicismes*, Le Robert, Paris.
- Deroy, L. (1956), *L'emprunt linguistique*, Les Belles Lettres, Paris.
- Le Nouveau Petit Robert* (1993) Paris.
- Filipović, R. (1986), *Teorija jezika u kontaktu*, JAZU, Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Filipović, R. (1990), *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo-razvoj-značenje*, JAZU, Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Guiraud, P. (1964), *La sémantique*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Höfler, M. (1982), *Dictionnaire des anglicismes*, Librairie Larousse, Paris.
- LAROUSSE, (1989), *Grand dictionnaire de la langue française*, Paris.
- LAROUSSE, (1996), *Le Petit Larousse Illustré*, Paris.
- Lyons, J. (1979), *Semantics*, Cambridge University Press.
- Mackenzie, F. (1939), *Les relations de l'Angleterre et de la France d'après le vocabulaire*, Librairie E.Droz, Paris.
- Orr, J. (1935), *Le français moderne*, tome III, No 4, Paris.
- Pergnier, M. (1987), *Les anglicismes*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Ullmann, S. (1981), *Semantics - An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Vandel, Ph. (1992), *Le DICO français/français*, Editions Jean-Claude Lattès.
- Walter, H.& G. (1991), *Dictionnaire des mots d'origine étrangère*, Larousse, Paris.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language*, (1971), Merriam.
- Weinreich, U. (1979), *Languages in Contact*, Mouton Publishers, The Hague.

SEMANTIČKA ADAPTACIJA ANGLICIZAMA U FRANCUSKOME

Adaptacija značenja na semantičkoj razini obuhvaća različite promjene značenja koje se javljaju u procesu jezičnog posuđivanja. U radu se analiziraju tri tipa semantičkih promjena: 1) promjene u semantičkoj ekstenziji; 2) elipsa; 3) pejoracija - pogoršanje značenja. Analiza semantičkih promjena provedena je u skladu s teoretskim postavkama teorije jezika u kontaktu R. Filipovića (1986, 1990).