

Anna Romanik

Białystok, Uniwersytet w Białymstoku

VARIANTIVITY OF ANGLICISMS IN MODERN POLISH AND RUSSIAN – A LEXICOGRAPHIC PERSPECTIVE

Wariantywność anglicyzmów we współczesnym języku polskim i rosyjskim – perspektywa leksykograficzna

STRESZCZENIE: Niniejszy artykuł dotyczy problematyki wariantywności zapożyczeń angielskich we współczesnym języku polskim oraz rosyjskim. Materiał empiryczny stanowią warianty anglicyzmów (ortograficzne, fonologiczno-ortograficzne, akcentuacyjne, morfologiczne) wyekscerpowane przede wszystkim z najnowszych słowników wyrazów obcych, które pojawiły się na rynku wydawniczym w przeciągu ostatnich 15 lat. Istotą podjętej analizy jest ustalenie wspólnych „regularnych odpowiedniości” wariacji anglicyzmów funkcjonujących w obu językach słowiańskich, a także zidentyfikowanie zindywidualizowanych rodzajów wariacji charakterystycznych dla konkretnego języka narodowego. Ważnym celem badania jest także ustalenie przyczyn powstawania tak dużej liczby form alternatywnych w obu językach oraz obnażenie problemów towarzyszących zjawisku wariantywności anglicyzmów. Podjęte rozważania są niezwykle istotne z kilku perspektyw. Po pierwsze, wariantywność zapożyczeń jest sporym problemem i zarazem wyzwaniem dla leksykografów i językoznawców normatywistów, którzy nadal poszukują sposobów standaryzacji ogromu wyrazów obcych o nieustabilizowanej formie. Po drugie, istnienie ekwiwalentów językowych danej jednostki to ewidentna trudność dla przeciętnego użytkownika języka, który jest zdezorientowany, ponieważ nie wie jak pisać lub jak wymawiać nowe słowo, a słowniki nie zawsze dają odpowiedź. Uzyskane wyniki badań mogą być impulsem do podjęcia działań w zakresie uporządkowania zasad adaptacyjnych zapożyczeń i „ujarzmienia” narastającego chaosu w piśmiennictwie obu języków.

SŁOWA KLUCZE: anglicyzmy, słownik wyrazów obcych, leksykografia, język polski, język rosyjski, wariantywność

ABSTRACT: The present work discusses the issues of the variantivity of borrowings from English into modern Polish and Russian. The material for study is variants of English borrowings (based on spelling, spelling and pronunciation, stress pattern, and morphology), excerpted mainly from newest dictionaries of foreign words that have been published over the last 15 years. The analysis aims to determine common “regular correspondencies” of such variants present in the two Slavic languages under discussion, and to identify the individualised variances typical of a particular national language. An important objective of the study is also to specify the reasons why alternative forms have been emerging so

Artykuł powstał dzięki badaniom realizowanym w projekcie finansowanym w ramach programu Ministra Edukacji i Nauki pod nazwą „Regionalna Inicjatywa Doskonałości” na lata 2019-2022, nr projektu 009/RID/2018/19 kwota finansowania 8 791 222,00 zł.

Copyright © 2022. Anna Romanik. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the article is properly cited, the use is non-commercial, and no modifications or adaptations are made.

numerously in both languages, and to unearth some problems underlying the variantivity of Anglicisms. The research presented in this paper is significant for several perspectives: firstly, variantivity is a challenge to lexicographers and normative linguists still attempting to standardise the enormity of foreign lexical items of an unstable form. Secondly, the fact that a given item has its equivalents poses a problem to average language users who are often confused and do not know how to write or pronounce a word, with dictionaries not necessarily being helpful in this respect. The obtained results may encourage further steps towards the systematization of principles governing the adaptation of borrowings and the attempts to tame the present escalating chaos in Polish and Russian literature on the subject.

KEYWORDS: Anglicisms, dictionary of foreign words, lexicography, Polish, Russian, variantivity

1. Introduction

Variantivity is a phenomenon that inherently accompanies the process of borrowing from a foreign language. The assimilation of a foreign item in a new language system takes time and for this reason it may have different grammatical, phonetic and graphic properties at the initial stage of its functioning in the recipient language than at a later stage¹. It also happens that different forms of the same word co-exist as linguistic doublets. Variantivity of borrowings has recently been noticed in many languages that are intensively influenced by English – a language that has become global². Research involving an academic and lexicographic approach to variantivity has definitely been shifted from the periphery to the centre of attention of the 21st century linguistics³, and the issue is eagerly addressed by normativists, lexicographers, and researchers into contact linguistics or language use. Parallel foreign words pose a serious challenge due to the scale, intensity and changeability of the phenomenon that is being experienced here and now, and therefore is difficult to embrace. The issues highlighted in this paper encourage a deepened linguistic debate, since there is not only the need to identify the problems of variantivity, but also to find solutions.

This study attempts to offer a linguistic account of variantivity of recent borrowings from English into two Slavic languages – Polish and Russian. This juxtaposition is motivated by both similarities and differences between the two languages: on the one hand, after the change of the political regime at the turn of the 1980s and the 90s, Polish and Russian alike were strongly influenced by Western culture, including the English language. They also originate from the same group of Slavic languages

¹ M. Bańko, D. Svobodova, J. Rączaszek-Leonardi, M. Tatjewski, *Nie całkiem obce zapożyczenia wyrazowe w języku polskim i czeskim*, Warszawa 2016, s. 20.

² D. Crystal, *English as a Global Language (second edition)*, Cambridge 2003; J. Jenkins, *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*, Oxford 2007; E. Mańczak-Wohfeld, *English borrowings in two contemporary Polish lexicons of anglicisms*, "Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia" 2005, pp. 269-277; E. Mańczak-Wohfeld, A. Witalisz, *Wpływ angielszczyzny na języki europejskie i nieeuropejskie w kontekście projektu GLAD (Global Anglicism Database)*, „Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego” 2019, LXXV, s. 99-110.

³ О.И. Осетрова, *Зaimствования интернет-коммуникации: проблема орфографической вариативности и ее отражение в словарях*, «Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики» 2018, № 3 (81), с. 160.

characterized by an outstandingly elaborated inflectional system. On the other hand, however, the two languages in question belong to two different language groups (Polish is a West Slavic language, whilst Russian: an East Slavic one) that differ significantly in terms of phonetics, morphology, and syntax. Furthermore, Polish uses the Latin alphabet, while Russian uses the Cyrillic script, which is of paramount importance to the problem addressed in this work.

The main objective of the article is to identify and characterize the types of variants of English loanwords represented in the most recent selected Polish and Russian dictionaries, with the purpose of revealing the types of such variants, to determine the dominating and peripheral groups of doublets, and to compare them in the two related languages that have been influenced by English over a similar period of time. The analysis involved variants of lexemes in their citation form (the lemma).

The whole study leads to an additional, yet very important observation concerning the problems faced by modern lexicography coping with a heavy inflow of foreign elements. The article exposes the deficiencies and shortcomings of normative regulations fixing the mess inflicted by numerous doublets and insufficient efforts made by linguists to explore borrowings that are mistakenly treated as a topic that has already been exhausted.

The acquired knowledge may give an impetus for the systematization of adaptive rules for loanwords, encourage others to clear up the confusion in the literature of both languages, and facilitate further research in contact linguistics.

2. Methods

In order to answer the above questions, a synchronic study was employed that was based on a contrastive analysis of the youngest lexical layer of the two related languages: Polish and Russian. This method will allow one to show similarities and differences in terms of the variantivity of borrowings from English that permeated into Polish and Russian at around the same time. Also, by comparing two language systems it was possible to notice potential “regular correspondencies” between the languages originating from the same proto-language and presently functioning under a strong influence of the English language.

The material for the study of linguistic variants was excerpted from dictionaries published in Poland and Russian over the last 15 years and hence recording the most recent lexical borrowings from English. These are mainly dictionaries of foreign words, but a decision was made to include also one descriptive dictionary for the large number of variants it offered.

The initial objective of the analysis was to examine variants only in mono-source dictionaries recording only borrowings from one particular donor language (“mono-source dictionary” as understood by A.I. Dyakov⁴ – in this case, the borrowings from English. However, it soon appeared that the Polish and Russian lexicography lack this

⁴ А.И. Дьяков, *Особенности «Словаря англицизмов русского языка»*, «Вестник Северного (Арктического) федерального университета: Серия Гуманитарные и социальные науки» 2015, с. 74.

type of publication and there are very few dictionaries that may serve as valuable material for study. For this reason, we used *Słownik zapożyczeń angielskich w polszczyźnie* (2010), ed. by E. Mańczak-Wohlfeld and a Russian online dictionary – *Словарь англицизмов русского языка* by A.I. Dyakov (*A Dictionary of Russian Language Anglicisms*).

Due to the limitations regarding mono-source dictionaries, the research was also based on the most recent multi-source dictionaries (lexicons of foreign words and expressions) recording lexical items of different origin. It must be noted that in these dictionaries Anglicisms seem to be the most strongly represented borrowings. Since multi-source dictionaries abound in Polish and Russian lexicography, the following works were selected for the purpose of the study: *Słownik wyrazów obcych PWN. Z przykładami i poradami* (2020), ed. by L. Drabik, *Słownik spolszczeń i zapożyczeń* (2017) ed. by M. Bańko, L. Drabik, L. Wiśniakowska, *Словарь новейших иностранных слов* (2017) by E.N. Shagalova. The list was accompanied by a descriptive dictionary entitled *Толковый словарь русского языка начала XXI века. Актуальная лексика* (2006), ed. by G.N. Sklarevskaya.

It must be noted that the analysed lexicographic works exhibit different approaches to the notation of loanwords. Firstly, the majority of sources show an objective use of lexemes, i.e. they catalogue different uses of variant loanwords recorded in the spoken language. Secondly, some of the works used in this study have a normative character, which means that due to their mission they strive for the reduction of the number of spelling parallels⁵.

3. Variantivity of Anglicisms – terminological remarks

Although variantivity has always been inherent in the study of the process of linguistic borrowing, it was brought to light as a separate problem with the development of studies into literary norm and all normalising pursuits. Many linguists argue that variantivity is a natural element of ever-evolving languages. According to E. da Rosa, “language is considered a dynamic complex system, which is in constant evolution to supply its speakers’ communicative necessities. As speakers shape their language in order to achieve an efficient communication, language may suffer processes of variation and change across the centuries”⁶. E.V. Marinova, a linguist specialising in Anglicisms in the Russian language, also considers variantivity a normal phenomenon apparently accompanying the adaptation of borrowings. She claims that the major part of variants are a proof of active loanword adaptation in a foreign language system and reflect the frequency of the use of neologisms in spoken language, at the same time testifying to their relevance⁷. E.V. Beshenkova points out that

⁵ О.И. Осетрова, *Заимствования интернет-коммуникации...*, с. 160.

⁶ E. da Rosa, *Linguistic variation in English*, “Revista de Letras” 2017, № 19 (25), p. 36.

⁷ Е.В. Маринова, *Иноязычная лексика современного русского языка: учебное пособие*, Москва 2012, с. 205.

variants are, on the other hand, symptomatic of the way language systems operate and change, and on the other – the way a new language system may be accessed⁸.

Among the most notable Polish and Russian linguists investigating the domain in question are E.V. Beshenkova, S. Gajda, Z. Greń, A. Heinz, V.N. Niemchenko, M. Ruszkowski⁹. Besides, the question of parallel loanwords has a global character and hence is widely conferred about also in other countries. The variantivity of Anglicisms has been touched upon by European scholars, including P. Chesley, S. Coat, E.E. Núñez Nogueroles¹⁰. Their works support the claim of universality and unification of variantivity of the freshest loanwords in many national languages, and highlight the significant impact the English language has on the shape of contemporary language systems in many countries. Despite relatively numerous publications on variantivity there is a need to constantly add to the existing body of research, as in many languages (including Polish and Russian) systemic Anglicisation is very strong¹¹.

There also exist some other reasons for the said need for the continuation of research. It appears that in modern linguistics, “linguistic variant” has seemingly similar definitions in different linguistic compendia, yet these definitions are far from being unequivocal as they do not account for all the features of the term. Also, the subject literature lacks consistent classification of variants¹². This means that the problem requires not only documentation, illustration and description of the actual manifestations of variantivity in modern national languages, but also clarification of the very theory of variantivity and variants and its adaptation to the changing reality.

According to the dictionary definition given in an encyclopaedia *Русский язык: Энциклопедия*, linguistic variant means ‘formal options of the same linguistic unit

⁸ E.B. Бешенкова, *Теоретические вопросы нормирования орфографии: вариативность и стратегия нормирования*, «Верхневолжский филологический вестник» 2015, № 1, с. 19.

⁹ See S. Gajda, *Wariacja w języku*, Opole 1991; E.B. Бешенкова, *Теоретические вопросы нормирования орфографии: вариативность и стратегия нормирования*, «Верхневолжский филологический вестник» 2015, № 1, с. 18-24; E.B. Бешенкова, *Вариативность, узальная норма и политика нормализаторов*, «Сибирский филологический журнал» 2016, 3, с. 35-42; Z. Greń, *Wariantywność formalna w procesie adaptacji anglicyzmów w języku słowackim*, [w:] *Semantyka a konfrontacja językowa 5*, Warszawa 2015, s. 125-137; A. Heinz, *Pojęcie i rola wariantu językowego*, „Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego” 1974, vol. 32, s. 137-157; M. Ruszkowski, *Ortograficzne formy wariantywne*, „Język Polski” 2009, LXXXIX, № 4-5, s. 293-298; M. Ruszkowski, *Wariantywność współczesnej polszczyzny. Wybrane zagadnienia*, Kielce 2018; В.Н. Немченко, *Вариантность языковых единиц. Типология вариантов в современном русском языке*, Красноярск 1990.

¹⁰ See P. Chesley, *Lexical borrowings in French: Anglicisms as separate phenomenon*, “Journal of French Language Studies” 2010, № 20, pp. 231-251; S. Coats, *Variation of New German Verbal Anglicisms in Social Media Corpus*, [in:] *Proceeding of the 6th Conference on CMC and Social Media Corpora for the Humanities*, 2018 (online); E.E. Núñez Nogueroles, *Typographical Orthographic and Morphological Variation of Anglicisms in a Corpus of Spanish Newspaper Texts*, “Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses” 2017, № 75, pp. 175-190.

¹¹ О. Бондаренко, *Англизация коммуникативного пространства современной России: что дальше?* «Вестник МГЛУ. Гуманитарные науки» 2019, № 3 (819), с. 22-34.

¹² Н.С. Валгина, *Активные процессы в современном русском языке*, Москва 2003, с. 32.

that have identical meaning but usually differ in a regular, partial lack of consistency in pronunciation'¹³. This definition, although often cited by language researchers, is not complete and does not reflect the actual state of affairs as it reduces the notion of variant to the sound aspect. A similar understanding of the term can be found in *Słownik gramatyki języka polskiego* that defines linguistic variants as 'forms that have a different pronunciation but the same meaning and the same grammatical function'¹⁴. Again, such an interpretation does not account for all parallels (doublets) in a language, but is limited to the phonetic (phonological) aspect and stress pattern. However, different variants of borrowed neologisms are noted also at other levels of language structure, e.g. in the domain of morphology, syntax, or semantics. Moreover, as rightly observed by O. Kalnova, most linguistic parallels are presently recorded also in the spelling and graphic representation of a word that may – although not necessarily – be related to its sound (pronunciation)¹⁵. There are also other definitions in the subject literature that offer a different approach to variantivity. For example, M. Ruszkowski sees variants as elements that differ in form but have the same or similar function. It seems that the broader and more generalized any understanding of the term allows a wider array of currently functioning doublets that adequately reflect the linguistic reality of the day¹⁶.

In the present article linguistic variants of Anglicisms are understood as written or spoken alternative forms of a given lexical unit borrowed directly or indirectly from the English language that are semantically identical but differ in terms of grammar (morphology, phonetics and syntax) and graphic representation.

4. Results and discussion of the findings

The analysis of dictionary resources has led to several interesting conclusions. It transpires that in both Polish and Russian, variantivity of Anglicisms is rather common and even increasing in number, as may appear from the continuously growing number of notations about variant forms in dictionaries. The material gathered for study (i.e. variants of Anglicisms in Polish and Russian) is relatively easy to systematise. The collected alternate forms can be grouped into those making for certain types of variance that are identical for the two languages, and those constituting an individualised type of variation that is characteristic of a particular national language.

¹³ *Русский язык: Энциклопедия*, глав. ред. Ю. Караулов, Москва 2003, с. 61-62.

¹⁴ *Słownik gramatyki języka polskiego*, red. W. Gruszczyński, J. Bralczyk, Warszawa 2002, s. 89.

¹⁵ О. Кальнова, *Проблемы заимствования: варианты иноязычных слов в русском языке*, "Акта Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Linguistica Rossica" 2016, № 13, с. 30.

¹⁶ M. Ruszkowski, *Typy wariantywności w języku polskim*, "Respectus Philologicus" 2014, № 25 (30), s. 54.

4.1. Types of variations common for the two languages under analysis (Polish and Russian)

Doublets of words borrowed from English, excerpted from selected dictionaries, form explicit types of variations that in the majority appear to be characteristic of the two languages under analysis. The classification of alternative forms of Anglicisms has shown that as many as 8 types of variations can be considered common for both languages. The table below illustrates the types of variants of English loanwords recorded in Russian and Polish dictionaries. The indicated types of parallels are documented by using examples of words given in their canonical form (the original order of appearance in the variant pairs has been maintained).

TABLE 1.

Types of variations of Anglicisms observed in the Polish and Russian dictionaries under study

Variance type	Notation in Polish dictionaries (selected examples)	Notation in Russian dictionaries (selected examples)
1) Spelling: one word (closed), separate words (open), hyphenated words	<i>battledress / battle-dress, boys band / boysband, breakpoint / break point, callback / call-back / call back, city light / citylight, cocktail-party / cocktail party, crash test / crash-test, eye-liner / eyeliner, flower power / flower-power, go-cart / gocart (gokard), head hunter / head-hunter / headhunter, high life / high-life, hotspot / hot spot, kick bokser, kickbokser / kick-boxer, koktajlbar / cocktail-bar, logbook / log book, night club / night-club, offline / off-line / off line, online / on-line / on line, pikap / pick-up, political fiction / political-fiction, pop-art / popart, pop-song / pop song, pornobiznes / porno biznes / porno-biznes, second hand / second-hand, sex shop / sex-shop, short-track / short track, SIM-lock / SIM lock, skate park / skate-park, snack-bar / snack bar, toe-loop / toe loop, trade mark / trademark,</i>	<i>ауттрейд / аут-трейд, бабл-вафля / бабл вафля, бодибар / боди-бар, бренч-пресс / бренчпресс, блокхаус / блок-хуас, блоу-офф / блоуофф, вебсерфинг / вебсерфинг, виктим-блейминг / виктимблейминг, дабл-фейс / даблфейс, и-мейл / имейл, камингаут / каминг-аут, каучсерфинг / кауч-серфинг, киллер-фича, килер фича, клаудчейсинг / клауд-чейсинг, кодшеринг / кодшеринг, леди-бой / леди-бой, лифтбэк / лифт-бэк, массмедиа / масс-медиа, милкшейк / милк-шейк, нетбук / нет-бук, ньюсмейкер / ньюс-мейкер, олдскул, олд-скул, офф-лайн / оффлайн, редимейд / реди-мейд, ролл-ап, роллап, серфкоучинг / серф-коучинг, смоки-айс / смоки айс, солдаут / солдаут, старпан / старп-ап,</i>
2) Spelling of a single or double consonant in roots of words	<i>assembler / assembler, baner / banner, billboard / bilbord, bullterier / bulterier, controlling / kontroling, filer / filler, flipper / fliper, ful / full, gras / grass, hipis / hippis, kiler / killer, kolaps / kollaps, labeling / labelling, mastif / mastiff, ofsajd / offside, padak / pad-dock, ploter / plotter, poppers / popers, raper / rapper, skiff / skif, sparing / sparring, stepper / steper, support / suport, topless / toples, transmitter / transmitter, trekking / treking</i>	<i>батон / баттмон, боди-попинг / боди-поппинг, боттлнек / ботлнэк, груфи / груффи, клабер / клаббер, кодграбер / кодгаббер, коммитмент / комит-мент, крипти-тред / крипи-тред, макфлуппи / макфлури, мастиф / мас-тифф, мок / мокк, нолли / ноли, пулинг / пуллинг, релинг / реллинг, реферал / реферрал, санплекс / са-плекс, селфхилл / селф-хил, сквоатер / сквоаттер, скиннинг / скининг,</i>

Variance type	Notation in Polish dictionaries (selected examples)	Notation in Russian dictionaries (selected examples)
3) Alternative spellings of vowels	<i>outsajder / outsider, bekhend / backhand, biper / beeper, beat / bit, bitels / beatles, bootleg / butleg, bourbon / burbon, cheerleaderka / czirliderka, clearing / kliring, dealer / diler, digitalizacja / dygitalizacja, drug / drag, dred / dread, fighter / fajter, gej / gay, inerfejs / interface, kongresman / kongresmen, lead / lid, leader / lider, lobbyista / lobbista, oldboy / oldboj, outsider / outsajder, plastik / plastyk, pool / pul, punk / pank, rockman / rockmen, router / ruter, silikon / sylikon, singel / singiel, skeet / skit, sleeping / sliping, slums / slams, spicz / speech, spid / speed, spiker / speaker, spleen / splin, spoiler / spojler, spray / sprej, squat / squot, surfować / serfować, tranking / trunking, wadery / wodery, zombie / zombi,</i>	<i>апскёртинг / апскертинг, бадибэг / бодибэг, беби-фейс / бейби-фейс, биг дата / биг дейта, боттлнек / ботлнэк, букмейкер / букмеер, бэклог / баклог, бэкпекер / бэкпэкер, бэтмен / бэтман, видеоченджер / видеочейнджер, виндглайдер / виндгляйдер, виндзор / виндзер, дисконт-брокер, дискаунт-брокер, инвизалайн / инвизилайн, кантри-клуб / кантри-клуб, квотерхорс / кватерхос, конвертер / конвеотор, кэжуэл / кэжуал, лойер / лоер, ме-формер / миформер, нетмейл / нет-мыл, ноуклан / ноклан, премейд / примейд, профит-тейкинг / профит-тайкинг, сэгвей / сегвей, скейлер / скалер,</i>
4) Alternative spellings of consonants	<i>blockers / blockers, canionig / kanionig, caravan / karawan, casting / kasting, chips / czips, czarter / charter, czat / chat, clipart / klipart, cracker / kraker, dancing / dansing, deweloper / developer, donut / doughnut, dzoker / jocker, ekspat / expat, faktoring / factoring, fokus / focus, forsing / forcing, gadżet / gadget, haker / hacker, joint / dżoint, interview / interview, karting / carting, keczup / ketchup, konsulting / consulting, light / lajt, lunch / lancz, owerlok / overlock, oser / okser, padok / paddock, pershing / perszing, quiz / kwiz, spicz / speech, Strecz / stretch, thatcheryzm / taczeryzm, trik / trick, uniseks / unisex,</i>	<i>антиалиасинг / антиалиазинг, блютус / блютуз, брутал-дэт / брутал-дез, герлс / гёрлз, диджибук / дигибук, ланжэд / ланжэ, лаунж-зона / лаундж-зона, ливайсы / ливайзы, лэйнхауз / лэйнхаус, полисер / полицер, предиктанд / предиктант, селз-хаус / селе-хаус, скауз / скаус, ститчинг / стичинг,</i>
5) First letter in majuscule/miniscule	<i>Backspace / backspace (comp.), big-bang / Big-Bang, COBOL / Cobol, Delete / delete (comp.), Enter / enter (comp.), First Lady / first lady, HTTP / http, Internet / internet, Jr / jr, New Look / new look, Shift / shift (comp.), WASP / Wasp,</i>	<i>Интернет / интернет,</i>
6) Inflectional (gender) contrasts	<i>celebryt / celebryta (masculine/feminine), New Age (masculine inanimate pluralless, inflected or uninflected), one-step (inflected or uninflected), publicity (feminine or neuter), reality show (masculine inanimate or neuter, uninflected), reality TV (feminine or neuter), soft core</i>	<i>батл / батла (masculine or feminine), бенефициарий / бенефициар (neuter or masculine), битмана / битман (masculine or feminine), бракет / бракета (masculine or feminine), дамаг / дамага (masculine or feminine), имиджборд / имиджборда (masculine or feminine),</i>

Variance type	Notation in Polish dictionaries (selected examples)	Notation in Russian dictionaries (selected examples)
	(masculine inanimate or neuter, plural-less, uninflected),	<i>ковернот</i> / <i>ковернота</i> (masculine or feminine), <i>копирист</i> / <i>копиристка</i> (masculine or feminine), <i>ман</i> / <i>мана</i> (masculine or feminine), <i>микрофиш</i> / <i>микрофиша</i> (masculine or feminine),
7) Alternative stress pattern	<i>make-up</i> [mejkap / mejkap]	<i>маркетинг</i> / <i>маркетинг</i> , <i>демаркетинг</i> / <i>демаркетинг</i> ,
8) Alternative spelling of the suffix –tion, –sion	<i>liposukcja</i> / <i>liposuction</i>	<i>акшен</i> <i>риплей</i> / <i>эксн</i> <i>риплей</i> , <i>локейшен</i> / <i>локейшн</i> , <i>нон-фикшен</i> / <i>нон-фикшн</i> , <i>промоушен</i> / <i>промоушн</i> , <i>релейшн</i> / <i>релейшен</i> , <i>сейшен</i> / <i>сейшн</i> ,

The systematized research material presented in the above table supports the claim that the variantivity of contemporary Anglicisms in Polish and Russian is similar in character and manifests itself by identical types of variance, predominantly at the level of spelling, phonology and grammar, at the same time maintaining the individual, distinctive properties of the particular language. The analysis has revealed 8 types of linguistic variations present in both Polish and Russian. Clearly, they are not equally productive. For example, morphological or stress pattern contrasts are situated on the periphery of the whole set of variations, while the most part of alternative forms pertain to spelling (as one, separate or hyphenated words, single or double consonants) or to what may be tentatively referred to as the domain of phonology-and-spelling since the variants belonging to this group are principally dominated by phonetic phenomena reflected in orthography. The most popular types of variations common for both languages definitely deserve a closer look.

One of the most frequently recorded variations of Anglicisms in Polish and Russian is the different notation of English loanwords (spelled as **one word, separate or hyphenated words**). This type of alternative is found in etymologically complex words. Particular borrowings usually have two alternates, but new units may happen to have even three such forms (this was noted in the Polish sources, e.g. *hat trick* / *hat-trick* / *hattrick* or *head hunter* / *head-hunter* / *headhunter*). On the one hand, the large number of alternative forms may be indicative of the weak assimilation of a foreign item in a new system, but it may also result from erroneous usage. On the other hand, this is most often caused by the unstable spelling of English etymons in the source language, i.e. in English. Many English compounds have alternative forms (open, closed, hyphenated compounds), which have received extensive coverage in the subject literature¹⁷. According to V. Kuperman and R. Bertram, “the spelling of compounds is a source of frustration for many writers of accurate nor exhaustive”¹⁸.

¹⁷ Ch. Sanchez-Stockhammer, *English Compounds and their Spelling*, Cambridge 2018.

¹⁸ V. Kuperman, R. Bertram, *Moving spaces: spelling alternation in English noun-noun compounds*, “Language and Cognitive Processes” 2013, vol. 28, № 7, p. 940.

The issue in question affects not only neologisms, but also more stabilized English vocabulary whose spelling is subject to modification. As a consequence, Polish and Russian linguists alike face difficulty in their attempts to compile a coherent set of rules governing the correct spelling of structurally complex loanwords in a situation that the donor language does not have such a stable system of rules either.

The analysis has shown that variations in the spelling of compounds (open / closed / hyphenated) are a common and fundamental problem related to the adaptation of English borrowings in Polish and Russian. According to related literature, the problem has also been observed in other languages.

The variants representing **alternate spelling of vowels or consonants** are phonological / spelling doublets. There are several explanations for the “double” notation of such forms. Firstly, the alternative notation of consonant and vowel sounds results from the use of two ways of adaptation of the same foreign word via transcription or transliteration (which is also the most frequent cause of variantivity of Anglicisms with a single or double consonant in the root of a word). Secondly, in English phonemes are realized by different speech sounds that do not always have an accurate equivalent in the Slavic languages under study. Both Russians and Poles make efforts to use up their phonetic inventory to reproduce the sound of a borrowed word in the closest possible way; however, as shown by Table 1, such efforts do not produce homogenous effects. It happens that in this group of variants (in Polish and Russian alike) there are instances of one phoneme being realized by a number of different speech sounds. Understandably, such variations are based on individualised graphic and phonetic means of separate language systems (see Table 2).

TABLE 2.

Variants of Russian and Polish equivalents of English vowels and consonants.

Data obtained from the analysed dictionary resources

English letters (including digraphs) representing vowels	Variants of Russian equivalents	Variants of Polish equivalents
<i>a</i>	<i>a:e, a:eŭ, a:э, a:я, e:eŭ, e:э, eŭ:aiŭ, eŭ:э,</i>	<i>a:e, a:ej;</i>
<i>ai</i>	<i>aiŭ:eŭ, eŭ:эŭ, eŭ:ы,</i>	<i>ai:aj, ai:e</i>
<i>ay</i>	<i>ee:eŭ, eŭ:эŭ,</i>	<i>ay:ej</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>e:a, e:u, e:eŭ, e:э,</i>	<i>e:ei</i>
<i>ea</i>	<i>e:э</i>	<i>ea:e, ea:i</i>
<i>ee</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>ee:i</i>
<i>ey</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>ey:ej</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>a:y, e:ě</i>	<i>i:aj, i:y,</i>
<i>o</i>	<i>o:a, o:e, o:oy,</i>	<i>o:a</i>
<i>oa</i>	<i>oa:oy</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>
<i>oo</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>oo:u</i>

English letters (including digraphs) representing vowels	Variants of Russian equivalents	Variants of Polish equivalents
<i>ou</i>	<i>o:ay, oy:ay,</i>	<i>ou:au, ou:u, ou:o,</i>
<i>u</i>	<i>a:ю, e:ě, y:a,</i>	<i>u:i,, u:a,</i>
<i>ua</i>	<i>o:a, ya:yə</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>
<i>c</i>	<i>c:ц</i>	<i>c:k, c:s</i>
<i>ch</i>	<i>тч:ч</i>	<i>ch:cz, ch:k, ch:sz,</i>
<i>ck</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>ck:k</i>
<i>d</i>	<i>д:m</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>
<i>dg</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>dg:dż</i>
<i>g</i>	<i>дж:z, жд:ж,</i>	<i>g:dż</i>
<i>ghn</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>ghn:n</i>
<i>gth</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>gth:t</i>
<i>j</i>	<i>дж:дз</i>	<i>j:dż</i>
<i>s</i>	<i>c:з</i>	<i>s:sz</i>
<i>sh</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>sh:sz</i>
<i>tch</i>	<i>тч:ч</i>	<i>tch:cz</i>
<i>th</i>	<i>т:з, c:з,</i>	<i>th:t</i>
<i>q</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>q:kw</i>
<i>v</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>v:w</i>
<i>x</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>	<i>x:ks</i>
<i>z</i>	<i>з:ц</i>	<i>No variant forms recorded</i>

The above table shows that the combinations of the notation of vowel sounds appear more frequently in Russian (33 pairs) than in Polish (19 pairs). Conversely, Polish has more combinations of consonant notation (18 pairs) than does Russian (10 pairs).

Other types of variants recorded in the two languages under scrutiny are represented scarcely, hence the decision to move them to the periphery of the system.

4.2. Variants of anglicisms characteristic of particular national languages (Polish and Russian)

The study revealed 8 types of loanword variants in Polish that are also recorded in contemporary Russian. However, in Russian, along with the already mentioned 8 variations there also exist 3 other types of alternates that are exclusively Russian-specific.

This can be explained by the fact that variantivity in the Russian language is also manifested in the writing system (script). The Anglicisms that are incorporated into

Russian in their original graphic form, i.e. the Latin alphabet, evidently stand out from the Cyrillic script, therefore making interesting combinations of variants that consolidate the two separate alphabets: the Latin and the Cyrillic. Loanwords in the form of “quotes” in Russian are not a novelty. In the 18th and 19th centuries, borrowings (mainly from French) proliferated in literary works. Nowadays, however, borrowings massively invade the language irrespective of the type of discourse, being especially abundant in the mass media, the Internet in particular. Graphic variantivity is not applicable to Polish for obvious reasons – both the donor and recipient language use the same Latin script, therefore English borrowings in written Polish are not noticeable at a first glance. In Russian, on the other hand, Anglicisms evidently contrast to, and even compete with the Cyrillic letters, which results in a juxtaposition of variant pairs that represent two different alphabet systems. This kind of instability of word form may be illustrated by the following doublets: *e-mail* / *имейл*, *Google* / *Гугл*, *mass-media* / *масс-медиа*, *notebook* / *ноутбук*, *online* / *on-line* / *онлайн*, *upgrade* / *апгрейд*.

Furthermore, the analysis has shown that the Russian-specific kind of variation of English loanwords, manifested in co-existent forms written in two different alphabets, is a productive type that appears in dictionaries with increasing frequency (*face-контроль* / *фейс-контроль*, *web-дизайнер* / *веб-дизайнер*, *web-сайт* / *веб-сайт*). It must be pointed out that accommodating words written in the Latin script is a lexicographic novum that may indicate that the Latinisation of the Russian language has become a fact. Latinisms recorded in dictionaries are a living proof that they are accepted in the literary language.

Yet another type of Russian-specific variation are pairs of Anglicisms that differ in the presence of the soft sign (soft yer), i.e. the letter (ь), that exists only in the Cyrillic alphabet, is not expressed by a speech sound but instead it serves a purely grammatical function: it softens its antecedent consonant, contributes to a grammatical characteristics of a word, or affect the pronunciation of the ioted vowel it precedes, e.g. *аттитюд* / *аттитюд*, *болл-ченьдж* / *болл-чендж*, *броул* / *брол* / *броль*, *вирджинский рил* / *виргинский риль*, *консюмеризм* / *консьюмеризм*, *макдоналдс* / *макдональдс*, *менестрель-шоу* / *менестрел-шоу*, *ню-рейв* / *нью-рейв*, *пиксел* / *пиксель*, *тилт* / *тильт*, *фолдер* / *фольдер*, *хаскель* / *хаскелл*, *ютюб* / *ютьюб*. The presented variants are in fact different not only in spelling, but also in pronunciation.

In the course of the analysis of the Russian dictionaries, very interesting doublets were identified that differ in the presence or absence of Russian letter **р** [Eng. r] **г** [Eng. g], **д** [Eng. d], **б** [Eng. b], e.g.: *андеграунд* / *андерграунд*, *андерайтер* / *андеррайтер*, *арчери-биатлон* / *ачери-биатлон*, *афтермаркет* / *афтемаркет*, *афтепати* / *афтерпати*, *бейс-клаймбинг* / *бейс-клайминг* *инфортеймент* / *инфотеймент*, *квотерхорс* / *кватерхос*, *нёрд* / *нёд*, *пампинг-хаус*, *пампин-хаус*, *парти* / *пати*, *пресс-парти* / *пресс-пати*, *файнворд* / *файндворд*. It may be assumed that the above variations result from elision in English that was (or was not) taken into account by Russians, from rhotic or non-rhotic accents, or from diverse pronunciation in the source language (i.e. depending on the British or American English variant employed).

4.3. Problems implied by variantivity

A particularly important place in the collection of Anglicisms recorded in dictionaries is occupied by spelling variants (manifested in writing) and phonemic-spelling alternates (manifested in both writing and speech). Such a large number of alternatives in Polish and Russian alike may be confusing to the speakers of these languages, especially due to the orthographic chaos. As noticed by O. Kalnova¹⁹, the situation is paradoxical because orthography reflected in dictionaries should be regulatory and indicate one correct spelling variant (as might be expected by language users).

Based on the review of contemporary dictionaries it may be stated that variants pose a problem not only to average language users but also to lexicographers. The analysis of resources under scrutiny has shown differences at the structural level of dictionary entries and also in vocabulary inventory. On top of that, dictionaries exhibit different approaches to the presentation of variants: objective (presentation of usage) and “relatively normative” (the presentation of codified forms of loanwords based on literary norms). This dissonance in the approach to notation is by no means an expression of criticism towards lexicographers as it is in line with lexicographic tradition. However, this is an objective fact which in the end hampers the systematization of “encyclopaedic” knowledge about borrowings possessed by language users. The whole situation is further complicated by the lack of explicit information concerning dictionary status and normative recommendations.

There is another problem that was brought to light during the dictionary analysis: given a pair of variants, dictionaries tend to avoid the identification of the one that reflects the spelling rules agreed on by normativists. Such a preventive attitude is a consequence of the lack of coherent spelling regulations, which is proved by, for example, *Объяснительный русский орфографический словарь-справочник* (2017). This dictionary, recommended by the Institute for Russian Language at the Russian Academy of Science, describes the principles of loanword adaptation and thereby provides the spelling rules for Anglicisms in the modern Russian language. It appeared that the set of rules proposed by codifiers to govern the description of borrowings, Anglicisms included, is not sufficiently comprehensible. The adopted recommendations (related in general to the spelling of open, closed and hyphenated compounds) involve too many deviations from a given spelling norm – sometimes the exceptions seem to outnumber the examples of borrowings spelled in compliance with a recommended principle. Even expert linguists can hardly tackle these rules, hence the question arises whether an average language user stands any chance to comprehend and correctly apply the propounded interpretation. The answer seems obvious.

The examination of dictionaries exposed a further serious issue – namely, different sources contain different pairs of variants of the same loanword, which only amplifies confusion, especially for average speakers of a language.

¹⁹ О. Кальнова, *Проблемы заимствования...*, с. 32.

The research presented in this article has unveiled problems that require solutions, most of all the formulation of more transparent and possibly more restrictive rules regulating the adaptation of foreign items to a new language system, plus explicit principles governing the spelling of loanwords. Simplified spelling rules might contribute to the decrease of variantivity. Such postulates are addressed to respective Polish and Russian institutions responsible for the normalization processes.

5. Conclusions

To conclude, variantivity of English borrowings is a present-day phenomenon, noticeably reflected in dictionaries. The Polish and Russian languages have been strongly influenced by English since roughly the same period (the turn of the 1980s and 90s) and therefore the interference of English with these two languages is comparably intense. This study has proved that in the two related Slavic languages (Polish and Russian) there exists a sequence of regular phenomena inflicted by the serious impact of the English language. The analysis has revealed 8 types of linguistic variations present in both Polish and Russian (the spelling of open, close and hyphenated words, of single or double consonants in the root of a word, alternative spelling of vowels, alternative capitalization of a word etc.). Also, several types of doublets have been identified; however, these are typical only of the Russian language and result from the contact of the different graphics of the two writing systems. Dictionary data prove that the variantivity of loanwords pertain principally to the domain of writing (spelling) and phonology / spelling, and less noticeably to grammar and stress pattern. In the course of research certain problems were revealed that relate to the very existence of the variantivity of borrowings: differences in the presentation of lexemes, the lack of standardised principles governing the spelling of Anglicisms, too many spelling exceptions that inflict writing quandary resulting from blurred spelling rules, poor awareness of normative knowledge concerning loanwords among the speakers of both Russian and Polish. These issues seem a considerable challenge to Polish and Russian lexicographers and codifiers – a challenge that need to be addressed and tackled.

References

- Bańko M., Svobodova D., Rączaszek-Leonardi, J., Tatjewski, M., *Nie całkiem obce zapożyczenia wyrazowe w języku polskim i czeskim*, Warszawa 2016.
- Beshenkova E.V., *Teorieticheskiye voprosy normirovaniya orfografii: variativnost' i strategiya normirovaniya*, „Vierkhnievolzhskiy filologicheskii viestnik” 2015, vol. 1.
- Beshenkova E.V., *Variativnost', uzual'naya norma i politika normalizatorov*, „Sibirskiy filologicheskii zhurnal” 2016, vol. 3.
- Bondarenko O., *Anglizatsiya kommunikativnogo prostranstva sovremennoy Rossii: shto dal'she?*, „Vestnik MGLU. Gumanitarnye nauki” 2019, № 3 (819).
- Chesley P., *Lexical borrowings in French: Anglicisms as separate phenomenon*, “Journal of French Language Studies” 2010, vol. 20.

- Coats S., *Variation of New German Verbal Anglicisms in Social Media Corpus*, [in:] *Proceeding of the 6th Conference on CMC and Social Media Corpora for the Humanities*, 2018 [online:] <http://jultika.oulu.fi/files/nbnfi-fe2018101838464.pdf>.
- Crystal D., *English as a Global Language (second edition)*, Cambridge 2003.
- Dyakov A.I., *Osobiennosti „Slovara anglicizmov russkogo yazyka”*, “Vestnik Severnogo (Arkticheskogo) federal'nogo universiteta” 2015, vol. 1.
- Gajda S., *Wariancja w języku*, Opole 1991.
- Greń Z., *Wariantywność formalna w procesie adaptacji anglicyzmów w języku słowackim*, [in:] D. Roszko, J. Satoła-Staśkowiak (Eds.), *Semantyka a konfrontacja językowa 5*, Warszawa 2015.
- Heinz A., *Pojęcie i rola wariantu językowego*, „Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego” 1974, № 32.
- Jenkins J., *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*, Oxford 2007.
- Kalnova O., *Problemy zaimstvovaniya: varianty inoyazychnykh slov v russkom yazyke*, “Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Linguistica Rossica” 2016, vol. 13.
- Kuperman V., Bertram R., *Moving spaces: spelling alternation in English noun-noun compounds*, “Language and Cognitive Processes” 2013, № 28 (7).
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld E., *Angielski językiem międzynarodowej komunikacji*, „Alma Mater” 2005, 75.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld E. & Witalisz A., *Wpływ angielszczyzny na języki europejskie i nie-europejskie w kontekście projektu GLAD (Global Anglicism Database)*, „Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego” 2019, LXXV.
- Marinova E.V., *Inoyazychnaya leksika sovremennogo russkogo yazyka*, Moskva 2012.
- Markowski A., *Kultura języka polskiego. Teoria. Zagadnienia leksykalne*, Warszawa 2011.
- Niemchenko V.N., *Variantnost' yazykovykh yedinit. Tipologiya variantov v sovremennom russkom yazyke*, Krasnoyarsk 1990.
- Núñez Nogueroles E.E., *Typographical Orthographic and Morphological Variation of Anglicisms in a Corpus of Spanish Newspaper Texts*, “Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses” 2017, vol. 75.
- Osetrova O.I., *Zaimstvovaniya internet-kommunikatsii: problema orfograficheskoy variativnosti i yeyo otrazheniye v slovarakh*, “Filologicheskiye nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki” 2018, № 3 (81).
- Rosa da E., *Linguistic variation in English*, „Revista de Letras” 2017, № 19 (25).
- Ruszkowski M., *Ortograficzne formy wariantywne*, „Język Polski” 2009, LXXXIX, № 4-5.
- Ruszkowski M., *Typy wariantywności w języku polskim*, „Respectus Philologicus” 2014, № 25 (30).
- Ruszkowski M., *Wariantywność współczesnej polszczyzny. Wybrane zagadnienia*, Kielce 2018.
- Sanchez-Stockhammer Ch., *English Compounds and their Spelling*, Cambridge 2018.
- Valgina N.S., *Aktivnyye protsessy v sovremennom russkom yazyke*, Moskva 2003.

Dictionaries

- Bańko M., Drabik L., Wiśniakowska L. (Eds.), *Słownik spolszczeń i zapożyczeń*, Warszawa 2017.
- Beshenkova E.V., Ivanova O.E., Cheltsova L.K. (Eds.), *Obyasnitel'nyy russkiy orfograficheskiy slovar'-spravochnik*, Moskva 2017.
- Drabik L. (Ed.), *Słownik wyrazów obcych PWN. Z przykładami i poradami*, Warszawa 2020.

- Dyakov A.I., *Slovar' anglitsizmov russkogo yazyka*, [v:] <http://anglicismdictionary.dishman.ru/Slovar>.
- Gruszczyński W. & Bralczyk J. (Eds.), *Słownik gramatyki języka polskiego*, Warszawa 2002.
- Karaulov Y. (Ed.), *Russkiy yazyk: Entsyklopedia*, Moskva 2003.
- Mańczak-Wohlfeld E. (Ed.), *Słownik zapożyczeń angielskich w polszczyźnie*. Warszawa 2010.
- Shagalova E.N., *Slovar' novyeyshikh inostrannykh slov*, Moskva 2017.
- Sklarevskaya G.N., *Tolkovyy slovar' russogo yazyka nachala XXI veka. Aktual'naya leksika*, Moskva 2006.

Note on the author

Anna Romanik – dr, adiunkt w Katedrze Językoznawstwa Sławistycznego (Uniwersytet w Białymstoku). **Wybrane publikacje: monografie:** *Sposoby nominacji przedmiotów odzieży we współczesnym języku rosyjskim*, Białystok 2012: Wydawnictwo UwB; *Księgi metrykalne chrztów Kościoła rzymskokatolickiego dekanatu białostockiego z II połowy XIX wieku. Treść i struktura metryk. Alfabetyczne spisy imienne, tom 2, rok 1880*, Białystok 2019: Wydawnictwo UwB (we współautorstwie z L. Dacewicz, J. Smakulską). **Artykuły:** *Manipulation in Russian advertising of nutriments and dietary supplements*, „Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis” 131 (2014), s. 269-278; *Nominacje barw w rosyjskich magazynach modowych (prototypizacja i analiza strukturalna)*, „Prace Językoznawcze” 2019, XXI/4, s. 211-221; *Лексика эпохи коронавируса (на примере польского и русского языков)*, [в:] *Русский язык коронавирусной эпохи*, отв. ред. М.Н. Приемышева, Санкт-Петербург 2021: Институт лингвистических исследований РАН, с. 495-507.

ORCID: 0000-0002-2733-6503

Email: a.romanik@uwb.edu.pl