

Zeitschrift: Revue de linguistique romane
Herausgeber: Société de Linguistique Romane
Band: 33 (1969)
Heft: 131-132

Artikel: Loan-words and lexical borrowing in Romance
Autor: Goddard, K.A.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-399454>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 05.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

LOAN-WORDS AND LEXICAL BORROWING IN ROMANCE

In this article a number of approaches to the study of loan-words and lexical borrowing, with particular reference to the Romance languages, are examined in the light of recent developments in this field. In the past the subject has been treated from both the synchronic and diachronic points of view, and, until recently, the two methods of approach had this much in common, that they tended to concentrate their attention on loan-words as evidence of borrowing, rather than on both the product and the processes involved in the act of transfer and subsequent diffusion. Moreover, the subject of loan-words has normally been treated in isolation, rather than in terms of other lexical problems, and in particular that of neologism as a whole. Lexicologists and semanticists have usually considered borrowing as an aspect of neologism¹, and more recently this idea has been applied deliberately in the field of loan-word studies itself².

The synchronic approach has been developed in the United States and applied specifically to the study of the lexical interchange between American Indian and immigrant languages on the one hand, and American English on the other³, in contexts which are predominantly oral and bilingual⁴. This method of analysis classifies loan-words, the product of the process of linguistic borrowing, on the basis of purely formal criteria,

1. Cf., for example, G. Matore : « Le néologisme : sa naissance et diffusion », *Le Français Moderne*, XX, 1952, p. 87-92 ; and S. Ullmann : *Précis de sémantique française*, 3rd ed., Berne, 1965.

2. T. E. Hope : « The Process of Neologism Reconsidered with Reference to Lexical Borrowing in Romance », *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1964, p. 46-84.

3. E. Haugen : « The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing », *Language*, XXVI, 1950, p. 210-231 ; and U. Weinreich : *Languages in Contact*, 2nd ed., The Hague, 1963.

4. E. Haugen : « Problems of Bilingualism », *Lingua*, II, 1950, p. 271-290.

the degree of morphemic substitution, and hence substitution of its phonemic form, which the model has undergone in the act of transfer to the recipient language. Little importance is attached to questions of meaning, and indeed the sense or senses are regarded simply as one of a number of means of differentiating between morphemes. According to both the basic scheme as proposed by Haugen, and the more detailed version developed by Weinreich, three types of loan are distinguished on the basis of a formal comparison of the model and the loan :

LOANWORDS, the product of the unanalyzed transfer of the morpheme and its phonemic form into the recipient language; e. g. Fr. *patache*, 1573, an oral borrowing of O. Sp. *pataxe* which entered the language from the north, via the Low Countries (Mod. Sp. *patache*, 1591 is a reborrowing from French);

LOANBLENDS, the product of partial analysis of the model, resulting in the transfer of one or more morphemes and phonemic forms and the substitution of others, e. g. Fr. *alezan brûlé*, an oral, hybrid borrowing of Sp. *alazan tostado* (the unanalysed borrowing *alezan toustade*, 1611, is also found in French);

LOANSHIFTS, the product of complete analysis, resulting in the total substitution of the morpheme and of its phonemic form in the recipient language. e. g. Fr. *pot-pourri*, 1564, a calque of Sp. *olla-podrida* (the Spanish compound also occurs as an unanalysed loan in some sixteenth and seventeenth century French texts).

In the bilingual situations to which it owes its development, this specialized descriptive method is particularly useful in assessing essentially synchronic factors, such as the precise degree of bilingualism, and the extent of lexical interpenetration, by means of a formal analysis of oral borrowings, but it has immediate limitations and disadvantages if applied in the European context. In the European languages in general and the Romance languages in particular, with the exception of some categories of technical terms¹ and a number of loan-words first attested in the

1. B. E. Vidos : « Le bilinguisme et le mécanisme de l'emprunt », *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, XXIV, 1960, p. 1-19, reprinted in B. E. Vidos : *Prestito, espansione e migrazione dei termini tecnici nelle lingue romanze e non romanze* (Biblioteca dell'« Archivum Romanicum »). Series II, vol. 31), Florence, 1965, p. 211-236; and « Les termes techniques et l'emprunt », *ibid.*, p. 355-378.

mediaeval period¹, the majority of borrowings have not been made orally in bilingual situations, but have been transliterated from one written language to another, and subsequently diffused through literary channels, before reaching the spoken language where they then acquired a spelling pronunciation.

In descriptive terms these borrowings would apparently be *loanwords* according to Haugen's terminology, since transliteration from one written language to another, even with minor orthographic adjustments, followed by diffusion to the spoken language and the acquisition of a spelling pronunciation, produces a result which superficially resembles, and is in most cases indistinguishable from, the product of the transfer of the morpheme and its phonemic form in an oral situation. Indeed, up to this point, the products of both oral transfer of morphemes and transliteration can conveniently be regarded as similar, provided that the differences between the processes involved are properly asserted.

In the case of lexical borrowing between the Romance languages, however, it is at this stage that difficulties arise. Haugen suggests that *loanwords* can be classified further, on the basis of the extent to which substitution of individual phonemes has occurred in the transfer of the morpheme and its phonemic form into the recipient language. Such a criterion, however, can be applied satisfactorily only in the case of oral borrowings, where the morpheme and its phonemic shape are imported simultaneously, and any substitution of individual phonemes made in the act of transfer. It cannot be applied to transliterated borrowings which subsequently acquire a spelling pronunciation, and the majority of loan-words in the Romance languages are of this type, because they are the result of a specialized variety of morphemic transfer, consisting of importation of the morpheme alone, without the simultaneous transfer

1. Because of the close formal similarities between the various Romance languages, more especially during the early period of their independent history, and the development of their orthographic conventions based on a Latin tradition, it is frequently impossible to decide whether a given loan-word in the Middle Ages is an oral, or a transliterated borrowing, unless there is some specific indication of its probable oral origin or transmission, such as the reproduction in the orthography of the recipient language of a phonetic peculiarity of the model, or a phonetic characteristic of the language or dialect of origin, or indeed, of an intermediary language or dialect. This distinction between oral and learned borrowings, and oral and learned transmission, is of fundamental importance in the study of loan-words in the Romance languages; cf. B. E. Vidos: « Migrazione popolare e migrazione dotta », *op. cit.*, p. 345-353.

of its phonemic form, but followed by the subsequent creation in the recipient language of a new phonemic form made up entirely of native phonemes. The result may resemble very closely the product of Haugen's transfer of the morpheme and its phonemic form with complete substitution of the individual phonemes in the recipient language, but once again the processes involved are completely different.

Haugen's method is particularly apt, however, when applied to two varieties of loan-word in the Romance languages : in the first place, the relatively small number of unanalyzed oral borrowings, where the morpheme and its phonemic shape have been transferred simultaneously, usually in a bilingual situation, and, secondly, semantic loans, Haugen's *loanshifts*, where direct importation of the phonemic form does not occur¹. With regard to hybrid borrowings in the Romance languages, Haugen's *loanblends*, which involve partial analysis and morphemic substitution, and partial unanalyzed morphemic transfer, when the borrowing in question is a transliteration, then the same reservations made in the case of *loanwords* apply to the partial morphemic transfer.

In Europe, the diachronic approach, almost traditional in language study in general and in lexical studies in particular, has, from the beginning, been applied to loan-words as examples of the cultural interchange between the modern European languages; inevitably this has brought about the relegation and neglect of the formal aspect of borrowing. Formally, loan-words, whatever their source, have usually been treated, implicitly at least, as learned or semi-learned forms, depending on the period of their first appearance in the language concerned, and the extent of their participation in its subsequent phonetic evolution, on a par with those taken from the classical languages, that is, in the first instance as transliterations with minor orthographic adaptations or modifications. Indeed in the majority of historical studies of loan-words, there is no systematic treatment of the formal aspects, and any comments of this kind which happen to be included, will normally be found as illustrations of other points, in a section dealing with the identification and isolation of loan-words on the basis of phonetic criteria. From the outset, the exclusively diachronic method has created problems of its own, problems and shortcomings of which its users were frequently

1. This aspect has been developed in detail in the Romance context; cf. T. E. Hope: « An Analysis of Semantic Borrowing », in *Essays presented to C. M. Girdlestone*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1960, p. 125-141.

aware¹, and which have culminated in recent years in expressions of doubt as to whether in fact it has ever been really adequate².

This diachronic approach was merely a specialization of the historical methods which already prevailed, to the virtual exclusion of all others, in lexical and philological studies, and which eventually gave rise to Brunot's well-known and frequently quoted dictum that « *chaque mot a son histoire* », and its development that words in general and loan-words in particular are « *témoins de l'histoire* »³. As a result, loan-words were interpreted and studied on the basis of non-linguistic criteria, and came to be regarded as essentially historical, cultural, or social symbols, which form part of the vocabulary and yet remain in some way distinct from its indigenous elements. Consequently the eliciting of the causes of individual borrowings was inseparable from the study of the loan-words themselves, and, once identified, these causes were expressed in correlated non-linguistic terms as historical, cultural, social and psychological stimuli.

Historical loan-word studies of this type, which usually deal with two of the major European languages in terms of the influence which one has had upon the other, attempt to assess the contribution which one has made to the vocabulary of the other, with the emphasis very much on the contributing as opposed to the recipient language, the lexis of the latter being frequently regarded as a repository from which the loan-words must be reclaimed for scrutiny and explanation. Once isolated in this way from the remainder of the vocabulary, they are interpreted almost exclusively in the light of non-linguistic criteria.

A broad division of loan-words into two types, based essentially on non-linguistic criteria, but at the same time still at least partially valid in lexical terms, sets up an opposition of « technical loans » and « non-technical loans »⁴, which was later developed into the better known

1. Cf., for example, E. Tappolet : *Die alemannischen Lehnwörter in den Mundarten der französischen Schweiz*, Basle, 1913, p. 53-58.

2. T. E. Hope : « L'interprétation des mots d'emprunt et la structure lexicale », *Actes du Xe Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romane (Strasbourg, 1962)*, Paris, 1965, p. 149-155; and « The Process of Neologism Reconsidered with Reference to Lexical Borrowing in Romance », *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1964, p. 46-84.

3. F. Brunot : *Les mots témoins de l'histoire*, Paris, 1928.

4. J. J. Salverda de Grave : « Quelques observations sur les mots d'emprunt », *Mélanges Chabaneau, Romanische Forschungen*, XXIII, Erlangen, 1907, p. 145-153, q. v., p. 147.

opposition of « necessary loans » and « luxury loans »¹. However the difficulties involved in any attempt at the stringent application of this arbitrary, subjective, and generally illusory distinction, were evident from the outset, and led to attempts to solve the problems raised by the application of equally arbitrary and unsatisfactory modifications and refinements², as well as to the creation of more subtle but similarly motivated divisions³.

Once isolated from the remainder of the vocabulary of the recipient language, the loan-words were classified, again on non-linguistic grounds, into semantic or onomasiological categories. These were then grouped together under more general headings according to a system normally devised specifically for the case under review, but which, nevertheless, remained more or less applicable, with minor modifications, to others⁴. That these two-tiered semantic classifications were both arbitrary and personal interpretations, may be seen by comparing two near-contemporary treatments of the same subject by different scholars⁵. In recent years, however, an *ad hoc* classification of loan-words into onomasiological or semantic categories has been applied with justification in cases where the lexical influence of one language upon another has been limited to a small number of clearly delimited spheres⁶. A refinement, no

1. E. Tappolet : *op. cit.*, p. 53-58 makes the distinction between *Bedürfnislehnwörter* and *Luxuslehnwörter*, but remains aware of its limitations.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 53-58; cf. also the review by K. Jaberg in the *Sonntagsblatt des Bund*, Berne, 16 and 23 December, 1917, quoted by B. H. Wind : *Les mots italiens introduits en français au XVI^e siècle*, Deventer, 1928, p. 10, where Jaberg proposes the replacement of the term *Luxuslehnwörter* by *Bequemlichkeitslehnwörter*. The refinements and modifications put forward by M^{lle} Wind : *op. cit.*, p. 9-14 and L. Deroy : *L'emprunt linguistique*, Paris, 1956, continue to oppose the material motivation of the « necessary loan » and the affective motivation of the « luxury loan », in fact, if not in those terms.

3. Cf., for example, E. Kaufmann : « Der Fragenkreis ums Fremdwort », *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXXVIII, 1939, p. 42-63, where a threefold division is established.

4. Cf., for example, D. Behrens : *Über deutsches Sprachgut im Französischen*, Giessen, 1923, and *Über englisches Sprachgut im Französischen*, Giessen, 1927; both works are reviewed by F. Mossé in *Les Langues Modernes*, 1928, p. 512-513.

5. R. Ruppert : *Die spanischen Lehn- und Fremdwörter in der französischen Schriftsprache*, Munich, 1915, and W. F. Schmidt : *Die spanischen Elemente im französischen Wortschatz, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, LIV, Halle, 1914.

6. Cf., for example, S. C. Gardiner : *German Loanwords in Russian 1550-1690* (*Publications of the Philological Society*), Oxford, 1965.

less arbitrary and subjective in its conception, and still firmly based on non-linguistic criteria, was introduced by the Dutch linguist J. J. Salverda de Grave¹, and employed by him and his followers². His scheme required the isolation and classification of loan-words into semantic or onomasiological categories, and the subsequent arrangement of these categories into a hierarchy which reflected a progression from the most general to the most intimate and personal influences. However, the introduction of any kind of classification of loan-words was in itself an important innovation, since it had been the practice in earlier works simply to list them alphabetically, or, when more than one source was treated, alphabetically by language of origin³; even so, it was not an innovation which was immediately or universally accepted⁴. The hope was at least implicit in this proposal of a generally applicable scheme, that its use would eventually facilitate a comparative study of the borrowed vocabulary of the European languages, thus providing a source from which general historical and cultural conclusions might be drawn, and indeed some interesting preliminary results were obtained⁵.

The purely diachronic study of loan-words which have been totally isolated from the rest of the vocabulary, raises problems and difficulties which can be solved only by the application of synchronic criteria, the

1. J. J. Salverda de Grave : *art. cit.*

2. J. J. Salverda de Grave : *De Franse Woorden in het Nederlands*, Amsterdam, 1906. An earlier work by the same author adopts a quite different, and essentially formal approach, and is concerned primarily with phonetic criteria for identification, and the subsequent phonetic treatment and evolution of the loan-words; v. « Les mots dialectaux du français en moyen néerlandais », *Romania*, XXX, 1901, p. 65-112. Cf. also, for example, B. H. Wind : *op. cit.*; M. Valkhoff : *Étude sur les mots français d'origine néerlandaise*, Amersfoort, 1931; J. H. Terlingen : *Los italianismos en español desde la formación del idioma hasta principios del siglo XVII*, Amsterdam, 1943; a more recent study which incorporates the same scheme is J. Herbillon : *Éléments espagnols en wallon et dans le français des anciens Pays-Bas*, Liège, 1961.

3. Cf., for example, M. Lanusse : *De l'influence du dialecte gascon sur la langue française de la fin du XV^e siècle à la seconde moitié du XVII^e*, Paris, 1893, and D. Loubens : *Recueil de mots français tirés des langues étrangères*, Paris, 1882.

4. Cf., for example, H. R. Boulan : *Les mots d'origine étrangère en français (1650-1700)*, Amsterdam, 1934, and K. König : *Überseeische Wörter im Französischen (16-18 Jahrhundert)*, *Beihfte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, XCI, Halle, 1939.

5. J. J. Salverda de Grave : « Quelques observations sur les mots d'emprunt », *Mélanges Chabaneau, Romanische Forschungen*, XXIII, Erlangen, 1907, p. 145-153, *q. v.*, p. 148-150; B. H. Wind : *op. cit.*, p. 14.

introduction of which has the advantage of completely re-orientating the whole question, posing it in terms of the lexical needs of the recipient language rather than motivation in the source language, and rendering the rigid separation of borrowed and other elements of the lexis impossible. This change of emphasis from the exporting to the importing language has become characteristic of recent studies ¹.

The first and perhaps most important of these problems was one of definition. Whatever the source, a diachronic list of words of foreign origin in any language will contain, in addition to those loans which have been assimilated into the vocabulary, any number of ephemeral and peripheral loans, such as hapax, including many exoticisms, individual bilingual creations and *mots livresques*, which remain in a state of suspended animation in relation to the rest of the vocabulary. Whilst the list remains valid in purely diachronic terms, the two categories can be separated only by the application of synchronic, lexical and semantic criteria, which establish a distinction between what has been described as the attempt at borrowing and the assimilated or definitive loan ². Scholars were conscious of this synchronic distinction ³, and, for a while at least, as the titles of some studies indicate, a partially successful attempt was made to differentiate loan-words (*Lehnwörter*) from foreign words (*Fremdwörter*), though an absolute, systematic distinction was neither intended or achieved, the two terms being used in complementary juxtaposition to obtain global coverage of the field ⁴.

Closer scrutiny of the definitive loans from a particular source reveals that few if any are, or ever have been, precisely synonymous with any

1. Cf., for example, M. de Paiva Boléo : *O problema da importação de palavras e o estudo dos estrangeirismos (em especial dos francesismos) em português*, Coimbra, 1965; B. E. Vidos : *op. cit.*

2. B. E. Vidos : « Les termes techniques et l'emprunt », *op. cit.*, p. 355-378, *q. v.*, p. 370-371, where the terms *tentative d'emprunt* as opposed to *emprunt définitif* are introduced. This synchronic opposition firmly re-establishes borrowing as an essentially lexical process and a form of neologism, since equally valid, parallel, distinctions may be made in precisely the same fashion in the case of other neological processes, e. g. *tentative de création : création définitive ; tentative de dérivation : dérivation définitive*.

3. J. J. Salverda de Grave : *art. cit.*, p. 151-152; B. H. Wind : *op. cit.*, p. 21-24.

4. Cf., for example, R. Ruppert : *op. cit.* and A. Ksoll : *Die französischen Lehn- und Fremdwörter in der englischen Sprache der Restaurationzeit*, Breslau, 1939. For further examples, and for examples of the otherwise interchangeable use of these two terms v. L. Deroy : *op. cit.*, p. 345-425.

other term in the recipient language, a fact which at once calls into question the charge of unnecessary duplication so frequently levelled by the purists. The present writer has studied over six hundred examples of Hispanisms in French, from the late eleventh century to the present day, without encountering a single demonstrable case of such synonymy, although a few cases of homonymy do occur, and a similar statement has recently been made concerning a larger Romance sample of some three thousand loanwords, representing the lexical interchange between French and Italian from the twelfth to the nineteenth centuries¹. Indeed, on the basis of these two samples, the traditional distinction between necessary and luxury loans would appear to be invalidated, since everything points to all the loans in question being necessary ones. In fact, the only real value of this distinction in lexical terms lies in equating it with the opposition between definitive loans and attempts at borrowing.

The introduction of many of the definitive borrowings corresponds to an innovation in the material world, and since the two processes are parallel, it is loans of this type which can be interpreted most satisfactorily in culturo-lexical terms. Lexically, they are mere additions to the vocabulary, and their assimilation causes few, if any, repercussions beyond an occasional extension of the range of a generic term. French borrowings from Spanish provide numerous examples of these concomitant loans², many of which denote previously unknown commodities brought back to Europe by the early explorers and colonialists of Central and South America; for example, French *patate*, *tomate*, *tabac*, whilst others indicate phenomena which belong essentially to the New World, such as French *ouragan* and *volcan*. Similar loans of more specifically European origin include French *castagnette*, *guitare*, and *sarabande*.

Yet other loan-words, however, do not denote outright innovations in the material world but rather new or revised concepts resulting from the continuous process of reappraisal in the conceptual sphere. Such borrowings can still be interpreted to some extent, but by no means entirely, in terms of a cultural and lexical parallel, since they are, in

1. T. E. Hope : « The Process of Neologism Reconsidered with Reference to Lexical Borrowing in Romance », *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1964, p. 46-84, q. v., p. 56-58.

2. The term *préstamos concomitantes* is first used by J. H. Terlingen : *op. cit.*, p. 30 and is preferable to any other so far proposed.

addition, motivated internally by the need to express and differentiate the revised concept. The lexical repercussions of the introduction of such loan-words are more far-reaching, since this normally sets up a chain reaction of restriction, extension, and differentiation of meaning amongst terms of similar or related sense. An example is the borrowing of French *brave* in the fifteenth century, from both Spanish and Italian sources, to express new noble virtues which were conceived as being quite different from the essentially feudal ones previously denoted by *preux*, *fier*, etc. ¹.

Finally, there is usually a small, but significant minority of loan-words which cannot be made to fit satisfactorily into any semantic or onomasiological category, nor can the causes of their being borrowed be adequately explained either in purely cultural, historical or social terms, or in a combination of these and lexical terms, because they are neither extrinsic, nor extrinsic and intrinsic, but purely intrinsic, and can, therefore, be elicited only by the application of synchronic criteria to the vocabulary of the recipient language. The purely lexical motivation of a number of Italianisms in French has been amply demonstrated, and expressed in terms of the comparative defectiveness of an existing sign, and the comparative efficiency of the loan-word ². The same can be done for a number of French borrowings from Spanish, one such being the sixteenth century loan *embarrasser*, 1574 'to block, encumber' < Sp. *embarazar*. When first introduced into French, this loan-word expressed a concept previously denoted by Fr. *empêcher*, the earliest senses of which are 'to restrain' and 'to encumber' in a physical sense. By the fifteenth century, it had acquired the additional senses of 'to embarrass, put in a difficult situation' and 'to prevent'. As a result of its reflexive use in the sense of 'to encumber', it came to mean 'to busy, occupy' in the sixteenth century, when it also continued to mean 'to resist', 'to oppose' and 'to prevent'. Fr. *empêcher*, therefore, became inefficient in some contexts requiring the sense 'to encumber', because of the difficulty of differentiating it from other transitive senses. Consequently, Fr. *embarrasser* 'to encumber' quickly established itself, though examples of Fr. *empêcher* in this sense are still found in the seventeenth century ³.

1. T. E. Hope : *art. cit.*, p. 62.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 63-68.

3. Only a bare outline of the development of Fr. *empêcher* is given ; for further details cf. *FEW*, IV, p. 579-580.

This method of studying and interpreting loan-words has a number of important advantages. It makes their isolation from the rest of the vocabulary of the recipient language impossible, at the same time rendering any scheme for their rigorous overall classification into semantic or onomasiological categories on the basis of non-linguistic criteria completely irrelevant, however useful such a grouping may be on a limited scale for the concomitant loans. The dangers and misconceptions which may arise from an attempt to discuss and interpret a partially, or fully lexically motivated borrowing solely in non-linguistic terms have been dealt with elsewhere ¹.

Consideration of the lexical aspect of loan-words, where appropriate, helps to re-establish borrowing in its rightful place as a form of neologism. Too often in the past it has been regarded as a special case, dependent on external, rather than internal motivation ², and as a result, loan-words themselves have been treated as peculiar and particularly unstable examples of the process ³. A more general examination of the three linguistic situations dealt with above, which are concerned with the lexical solution of problems arising from material innovation, conceptual reappraisal, and the replacement of a lexically defective unit of the vocabulary, would show that in many other precisely similar cases the solution has been provided, not by borrowing, but by the creation of a neologism from the internal resources of the language concerned.

The advantage in the adoption of a method which is essentially diachronic, yet at the same time synchronically orientated, diachronic synchrony as it has been called ⁴, is that it permits a far more flexible approach in its concentration on the act of transfer and its lexical consequences, allowing the application of as many different kinds of analysis and interpretation as are appropriate to the individual examples. In the Romance languages, it in no way precludes the simultaneous interpretation of some loan-words on the basis of the culturo-lexical parallel, others in both cultural and lexical terms, and yet others in purely lexical

1. T. E. Hope : « Loan-words as Cultural and Lexical Symbols », *Archivum Linguisticum*, XIV, 1962, p. 111-121 and XV, 1963, p. 29-42.

2. Cf., for example, E. Pichon : « L'enrichissement lexical dans le français d'aujourd'hui », *Le Français Moderne*, III, 1935, p. 209-22 and 325-44.

3. Cf., for example, M. Roques : « Sur l'incertitude sémantique des mots d'emprunt », *Miscellanea J. Gessler*, Duerne, 1948, p. 1066-1072.

4. B. E. Vidos : *art. cit.*, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

terms; at the same time, its validity is not impaired by the application of purely formal criteria of analysis to both oral and semantic loans, nor by the use of the technique of organic etymology ¹.

Above all, by re-establishing borrowing as an aspect of neologism, and studying individual loan-words in their lexical context, this method brings the subject firmly within the orbit of semantics. It is in a position to make substantial contributions to this science, since the study of the lexical borrowing within the history of a given language, which over a long period may result in lexical renovation ², provides a wealth of precisely documented evidence which is invaluable in the study of semantic change. Of equal importance are the results of the comparative study of borrowings between two or more languages, and in this field the lexical interchange between the Romance languages provides a source of hitherto relatively untapped material.

Belfast.

K. A. GODDARD.

1. *Ibid.*, p. 375-378.

2. Cf. M. H. Roberts : « The Problem of the Hybrid Language », *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXXVIII, 1939, p. 23-41.