

Linguistica Copernicana

11/2014



REDAKTOR NACZELNY: Maciej Grochowski

RADA REDAKCYJNA: Ireneusz Bobrowski (Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN, Polska), Andrzej Bogusławski (Uniwersytet Warszawski, Polska), Gerd Hentschel (Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, Niemcy), Axel Holvoet (Uniwersytet Warszawski, Polska), Krystyna Kleszczowa (Uniwersytet Śląski, Polska), Jarmila Panevová (Univerzita Karlova, Czechy), Jens Nørgård-Sørensen (Københavns Universitet, Dania), Zuzanna Topolińska (Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Macedonia), Daniel Weiss (Universität Zürich, Szwajcaria), Anna Wierzbicka (Australian National University, Australia)

KOLEGIUM REDAKCYJNE: Maciej Grochowski (Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, Polska), Krystyna Kallas (Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, Polska), Irena Sawicka (Instytut Sławistyki PAN, Polska), Piotr Stalmaszczyk (Uniwersytet Łódzki, Polska)

SEKRETARZ REDAKCJI: Iwona Kaproń-Charzyńska

OPINIOWALI DO DRUKU: Zbigniew Babik, Wiesław Boryś, Jerzy Bralczyk, Jolanta Chojak, Magdalena Danielewiczowa, Stanisław Dubisz, Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, Piotr Krzyżanowski, Lechosław Jocz, Andrzej Kątny, Alina Kepińska, Iwona Kosek, Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz, Marek Łaziński, Thomas Menzel, Tomasz Nowak, Mikhail Ordin, Anna Pajdzińska, Jacek Perlin, Beata Raszewska-Żurek, Ewa Rogowska-Cybulska, Irena Sawicka, Jan Sokolowski, Wiesław Stefańczyk, Dorota Szumska, Marcela Świątkowska, Bone Veliczkowski, Ada Vidovič-Muha, Bogdan Walczak, Jadwiga Waniakowa, Zofia Zaron

ADRES REDAKCJI: Instytut Języka Polskiego UMK, 87-100 Toruń, ul. Fosa Staromiejska 3, e-mail: lincop@umk.pl, www.linguistica.umk.pl

OKŁADKA: Monika Pest



Periodyk oferuje dostęp do zawartości w systemie Open Access na zasadach licencji niewyłączonej Creative Commons (CC BY-ND 3.0).

Wersja papierowa jest dostępna w druku na żądanie na stronie internetowej Wydawnictwa www.wydawnictwoumk.pl

© Copyright by Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika
Toruń 2014

ISSN 2080-1068

Wersją pierwotną (referencyjną) czasopisma jest wersja papierowa.

Wydawca: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika
Ul. Gagarina 13a, 87-100 Toruń
Druk: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK
Nakład 300 egzemplarzy

SIMONA KRANJC, ANDREJA ŽELE

University of Ljubljana
Faculty of Philosophy

Borrowed Lexicon and Neologisms in Standard Language and Sociolects (the Case of Slovenian)

Key words: borrowed lexicon; neologisms; Slovene standard language

Ključne besede: prevzete besede; novotvorjenke; slovenski jezikovni standard

We try to establish how borrowed lexis and neologisms affect various types of social-functional texts, i.e. discourses. The state of various discourse types reflects the relation between standard language and sociolects; as would be expected, borrowed lexis and neologisms (particularly different types of compounds and derivations of a higher degree) encroach upon the syntax of various discourses, gradually obscuring not only certain lexical dividing lines between sociolects and standard language, but co-dependently also certain syntactic differences among various discourses. Syntactic changes are introduced by new or borrowed word-formational patterns, while an increased systemic unpredictability of word-formation (compounding, formation as overlapping and clipping) plays an important word-formational and text-formational stylistic role; all of the above influences the standardised use of language and various sociolects in such a way that an increase in the

use of new lexis forces, at the same time, the use of similar, or even identical, syntactic patterns. The new, commonly used word-formational patterns thus contribute, to an extent, to a more rapid blurring of the lexico-syntactic dividing line between sociolects, or between sociolects and standard use. This lively activity in word-formation, and the related text-formation, is a palpable indicator of a likely development of different language uses within any particular language.

Word formation reflects explicitly both objective and subjective relations to everyday content and is, thus, a vital indicator of current social relations, as well as what is happening within society in general. Word formation also expresses the dynamic or process-like nature of language and so it is one of the most important linguistic mechanisms. The expression “synchronous word formation” refers to the current process or to current and realised word-formational possibilities in a particular language; in order to investigate this issue, it is necessary to have a sufficient number of texts from as many areas of human activity as possible, particularly from the media and especially in the form of written language. When it comes to the relation between word formation and text formation, from among the available material, the most recent coinages are selected with regard to the text type in which they occur most frequently or even predominate in comparison to other derived words.

1. The qualities of more recent Slovene lexis with regard to formation and meaning

The study is based on a selection of lexis from the past twenty years. The basic roles of word formation relate to lexicalisation, nominalisation, expressiveness, condensation, and style; the first three of these are crucial, condensation is less significant, while the stylistic role of affixes – as in *pisec*, *pisar*, *pisun*, *baba*, *babnica*, *babura*, *mama*, *mamica*, *mami* – is increasingly less emphasised or noticeable. Also marked forms, such as *čipovje*, *programje*, occur frequently having different roles in different text types (these two examples would seem quite marked in an academic text, but would be acceptable in a popular science text). Within word formation, nominalisation serves to condense the proposition; here, the most established and expected suffixes are *-nje* and *-ost*, as in *očetovanje*, *pedaliziranje* (as opposed to, for example *pedalizacija*), *izolativnost*, *manjrazvitost*, *razsrediščenost*. The role of con-

denising verbs and adjectives in the predicate appears in derivations with the meaning executor or bearer of the action involving *-(l)nik*, *-(l)ka* and *-ina*, for example *dekodirnik*, *čofotalnik*, *vračalka*, *vnašalka*, *pristopnina*. Another productive and semantically significant suffix, *-stvo*, is used to describe an activity: *aferaštvo*, *črnograditeljstvo*, *nadstrankarstvo*, *vedevejevstvo*, *žeparstvo* (as opposed to *žeparjenje*).

1.1. Word-formational typology in the recent lexicon

Affixation has been the most frequent word-formational process and, more recently, also derivations of a higher degree.

1.1.1. Within the systematically more predictable formations we should emphasise suffixisation, especially derivations of a higher degree, and compounding from a multi-word syntactic base.

In the recent lexicon, systematically predictable formation is restricted to a number of foreseeable derivative morphemes that correspond to a predictable number of elements in the syntactic base as well as their structure; and while there cannot usually be a formational connection between a derived word and its syntactic base, this is a key condition under which a neologism can be incorporated semantically and expressively into the Slovene language system (Vidovič Muha 1988: 162; 2011: 297).

1.1.1.1. Derivations of a higher degree are morphologically evident from their suffix, for example *-n-ica* as in *čokoladnica*, *klepetalnica*, *muzikalnica*, *poletnica* (also, by analogy, *prizivnica*, which has already lost its nominalised role) and *-n-ik* as in *bralnik*, *dekodirnik*, *oprijetnik* (along with *body/bodi*), *predsetvenik*, *svetlobnik*, *soparnik*, *paličnik*, *delilnik*, *naušnik*, *razmnoževalnik*, as well as derivations with *-ov-ec/-ev-ec*, e.g. *dnevnikovec*, *edeesovec*, *eldeesovec*, *tevejevec*. Whereas, *-n-ina* as in *pristopnina* is much less frequent, and it seems that by analogy to *-ar-na* we form *kruharna*, *ploščarna*. Apparently, the most frequently used affixes underwent erasure or neutralisation of grammatical categories of animateness and humanness, for example *balerinka* : *balirka* : *govorka*, *disketar* : *popar* : *zavarovalničar*, *skener* : *sklejšter*, *dlančnik* : *gladovnik*, *mobilec* : *tatarec* : *medijec*; one also encounters *motilnik* (*Mobilni telefoni so lahko usodni motilniki občutljivih*

naprav – Mobile phones can cause serious disturbance to sensitive devices) and *motilec* (*močnejši motilci na nizkih frekvencah* – powerful disturbing elements at low frequencies); derived forms like *bikica*, *rakica*, *robotik* are labelled as human, not as non-animate, as it is in the case of, for instance *tajnica* etc.¹ Some neologisms ending with *-ica* are slang or at least stylistically marked: *frendica*, *starčica*, *suhica*; also those ending with *-ič*, such as *kafič*, *pornič*, *krimič*, *narkič*, *mobič* and with *-aš*, such as *aferaš*, *forumaš*, *linijaš*; there also derivations from proper names like *istrabenzaš*, *ultraš*, *zidaraši* etc.

Noticeable adopted suffixes² include: *-ing*, *-(j)ada*, *-cija*, *-ija*, *-or*, *-er*, *-ar*, *-id*, *-ist* as in, for example: *rafting* (*raftanje*), *lifting* (no alternative form), *piling* (no alternative form), *parking* (as opposed to: *parkiranje*), *kanjoning* (*soteskanje*), *kaskada* ‘carrying out elements in order’, *golažiada*, *palačinkijada*, *formacija* ‘putting competitors, teams in order’, *berlusconizacija* (compare *bushizem* or *bušizem*), *marketizacija*, *medikamentacija*, *participacija*, *segregacija*, *dispraksija*, *supverzija*, *diler*, *privatizer* – *privatizator*, *marker*, *tester*, *emailer*, *skener*, *toner*, *fitneser*, *trenažer*, *maksimizator*, *multipleksor*, *debator*, *deložator*, *debatorka*, *sintetizator*, *kurzor*, *dokapitalizator*, *stresor*, *fiksar*, *marketingar*, *odpadar*, *trenirkar*, *uličar*, *karotenoid*, *ragbijaš* – *ragbi-jist*, *mačist*, *blogger/blogar* – *blogist* etc.

Forms derived more recently comprise of adjectival or verbal derivations that denote new phenomena via a root morpheme referring to relevant content, such as: *jogijski*, *jogurni*, *filmični*; *blogati*, *facebookati*, *finiširati*, *fintirati*, *goglati*, *konektati*, *levičariti*, *SMS-ati* etc.

Other derivational variants involve acronyms written in the form that mimics pronunciation: *cede* : *cedejka*, *betece*, *emšo*, *esemes*, *dedeve*, *džiesem* etc. With regard to their stylistic value there are considerable differences

¹ From an informative-normative point of view, more detailed descriptions of these derived words are needed within lexicological and lexicographic discussion together with a thesaurus of recent words, presented and commented on in the 2009 monograph *Novejša slovenska leksika (v povezavi s spletnimi jezikovnimi viri)* (Recent Slovene Lexis - connected with online sources), Gložančev, Alenka, Jakopin, Primož, Michelizza, Mija, Uršič, Lučka and author (ed.) and as a source also Gigafida = <http://demo.gigafida.net/> and Nova Beseda = http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/s_beseda.html.

² Borrowed affixes, upon inclusion in the Slovene language system, were also labelled as “new systemic affixes” (Logar Berginc 2006: 92).

among them: for example, *cede* is an unmarked variant that can be found in formal discourse, whereas *cedejka* appears only in informal discourse.

1.1.1.2. The more recent lexicon includes a new type of semantically specialised suffix (suffixoid) of the type *-mat*, *-teka*, *-drom*, *-fil*, *-holik* *-manija* *-pat*, *-man*, for example: *kruhomat*, *mlekomat*, *avtodrom*, *presofil*, *DVD-teka*, *obamomanija*, *pottermanija*, *meteoropat*, *walkman*, *discman*; less frequently one can notice specialised prefixes (prefixoides) of the type *avto-*, *ultra-*, *paro-*, *mini-*, *maksi-*, *mikro-*, as in *avtoportret*, *avtoimunski*, *ultramaron*, *ultrahitri*, *paroprepustnost*, *minibiografija*, *maksipoces*, *mikročip*, *mikrokozmos* etc. On the borderline between a prefix and a semantically whole initial part of a compound, there is the form *sam-* as in *samovzdrževanje*, *samozaposlitev* (Zemskaja 1992: 57), which is, in general, the most productive prefix across the Slavic languages. In consideration of these ‘affix compounds’, one could inquire whether we are witnessing the appearance of new word-formational patterns.

Affix compounds with foreign affixes/affixoides are those containing *multi-*, *turbo-*, *-fil*, *-holik*, *-mat*, *-net*, such as: *multinacionalka*, *multimedijski*, *turboglasba*, *turbouspeh*, *mlekoholik* etc. There are also affix compounds with domestic affixes/affixoides which, through generalisation of meaning, retain only their word-formational meaning and adopt the properties of an affix, for example: *dobropis*, *plinovod*, *plinomer*, *obramboslovje*, *malopodjetnik*, *veletrgovec* etc.

More recent compounds include **interfixal-suffixal compounds** with a base that is a syntactic sentence, for example: *črnogradnja*, *filmoljub*, *novorek*; *nizkopodni/nizkopražni* (*avtobus*), *nizkoprorračunski* (*film*), *zunajsončni/izvensončni* (*planet*) ipd.; the most common new compounds are the interfixal compounds with a word-combinational syntactic base of the type *samovzdrževati se*, *adidasoprema*, *videorecept*, *fitnescenter*, *internetkafe*, *diskoglasba*, *koktailobleka*, etc. In reference to these, the term “analytical adjective” arises (Zemskaja 2009: 61), used for borrowed non-declinable adjectives and ‘converse adjectives’ of the type *fitnes*, *internet*, *disko*, *kombilimuzina* (‘a limousine like a minibus’). Here, *elektromobil* could be an example of compounding with truncation, where the morpheme *avto-* is dropped, in the sense of a syntactic base for ‘car running on electricity’.

The possibility of substituting individual elements might lead us to include among the systemically predictable examples **new derived words without formational possibilities in Slovene**; these encompass borrowed compounds with an internationalised *determining?* or a determined element that is replaceable (and usually does not have a Slovene equivalent in the multi-word syntactic base):³ *afro-*, *aero-*, *agro-*, *avdio-*, *akva-*, *bio-*, *eko-*, *info-*, *kiber-* as in *afronovost*, *aerosolizacija*, *agroservis*, *akvapark*, *ekotrgovina*, *infosejem*, *kiberpanker*, *kiberklub* etc.

A more recent phenomenon embraces compounds with a letter element of the type *e-*, *i-* or *m-*, which determines the core of that compound. These are called *e-* prefix compounds⁴, and depending on the established use, they fall under one of the sub-categories of either *e-*, *m-*, or *i-* prefix compound, being formationally predictable and having a predictable syntactic, multi-word base with a determining element in the form of an adjectival modifier of the type *elektronski*, *mobilni* or *internetni*: *e-knjiga* (as opposed to the unjustified and incorrect use *eknjiga*); the transformational variant of the same syntactic-semantic determining element in terms of the word-formational base is expressed in the hyphenated initial letter *e-*, *m-* and *i-*. A similar syntactic base and a word-formational construction can be seen in compounds featuring an acronymic connection of the type *PIN-številka* (< *PINevska številka*) ali *C-vitamin* (< *Cejevski vitamin*), ali *D-dur* (< *Dejevski dur*) etc.).⁵

1.1.1.3. Neologisms of lower frequency

Prefixed words: *nadjata*, *prapok*, *pravoda*, *predsetvenik*, *prenajedati se*, *prifotkati (si)*, *prismsati*, *sformatirati*, *sklonirati*, *zaasfaltirati*, *zamoralizirati*, *zamuzicirati*, *zasneževati*, *zatraviti*, *zazeleniti*, *zazipati*, *zdigitalizirati*, *zerotizirati*, *zgenerirati*, *zindividualizirati*, *zmasakrirati*, *zminimalizirati*, *zminirati*, *zmonopolizirati*, *zlobirati*, *zrelaksirati* etc; **derivations involving prepositions:** *ufilmiti*, *udružbiti*, *vprogramirati*, and **modifier derivations:** *metuljček*, *ježek*, *polžek*, *miška*; *zvončkljati*, *davkovati*, *telefonariti*, *fo-*

³ In Slovene linguistics these have been described as “compounds with replacement determined elements” (Vidovič Muha 1988: 162) or “compounds with replacement (borrowed) elements in the syntactic base” (Vidovič Muha 2011: 296).

⁴ See Logar (2004).

⁵ For compounds with a letter or acronym element, see Stramljič Breznik (2010).

kati, koketkati, kuhariti, martinčkati se, šminkirati, paničariti, pipniti etc. Among the above, there are examples of unmarked forms, somehow anchored in formal discourses, such as *zasneževati*, but also those that are marked in discourse, and thus, common in informal contexts, such as *prifotkati*.

1.1.2. Clusters, potential compounds, blends (that can at the same time be clippings) and clippings lie outside systemically predictable formation

1.1.2.1. Clusters, in the sense of “pasting words together”, include: *enodnas, kdovekaterič, nevemkateriže, dabest, pica datekap, bar bikofe, mim’grede kafe, malica k’rneki, čistomimo/čistbrezveze zabava, tvojihpetminut agencija, nočindan trgovina* etc. Many examples of this type are stylistically marked and most occur in informal discussion, for example, *bar bikofe*.

1.1.2.1.1. ‘Clustered clippings’ are a frequent phenomenon. These are compounds of unpredictable clippings as in *vlog* (< *video blog*), *blogaton* (< *blogarski maraton*), *moblog* (< *mobilni blog*), *dokudrama* (< *dokumentarna drama*) etc. They also involve overlapping sequences of letters, as in *mobitelova itak džabest ponudba*. This example also shows a marked choice that is not stylistically neutral. [marked = not stylistically neutral?]

1.1.2.2. Among the systemically unpredictable, potential compounds, i.e. those without formational links between the derived word and the syntactic base, or with an unpredictable number of formational elements, and their construction, as well as, because of the many fully semantic morphemes within, we include derivations such as: *mobitel* (< *mobilni telefon* – mobile phone), *mobinet* (< *mobilni internet* – mobile Internet), *mobikartica* (< *kartica za mobitel* mobile phone card), *telemobil* (< *telekomunikacijska mobilnost* – telecommunications mobility), *biblioklas* (< *bibliotečna klasifikacija* – library classification), *MobiPoštar/Mobipoštar* (< *mobilni aparat v vlogi poštarja* – mobile device used for email), *TeleBanka* (< *telefonsko bančništvo* – telephone banking), all of which are temporarily labelled as clipped compounds (Stramljič Breznik 2010: 135).

The unsystemic use of the hyphen with no gap on either side can be seen in the derived forms: *in-line, on-line, off-line, pin-up, jo-jo, one-man, kopi-pejstati / copy-pastati, sado-mazo, sit-com* (also: *sitcom, sitkom*), *think-tank, trip-trap* etc. The use of punctuation in *si.mobil, itak.si* etc. is, similarly, non-systemic.

1.1.2.3. *Blends (that are also clippings)*

Compounds are formed via the juxtaposition of either a clipping and a whole word, or two clippings which retain recognisable parts of the two truncated words. Such a neologism can also include an element of sound copying or a rhyme:⁶ (*E*)*stradanje* (< ‘novice iz sveta estrade’ – news from the world of popular music), *ambiguous?*: *Estrad-anje* : *E-stradanje*, *dokuportret* (< *dokumentirani portret* – documentary portrait), *globelost* (< *globalna debelost* – global obesity), *multikulti* (< *multikulturen* – multicultural), *protestival* (< *protestni festival* – protest festival), *berlinale* (< ‘Berlin annals’), *furminator* (< *fur* + term ‘comb for removing undercoat’).

1.1.2.4. Moreover, there are clippings of such type: *mobi* (*poklicati na mobi* – ‘to call someone on their mobile phone’), *mobil* (*mobili kot gibljive plastike* – ‘as flexible as plastic’, *hoteti biti mobil* – ‘wanting to be flexible’), *profi* (*biti pravi profi* – ‘to be a real pro(fessional)’, *profi vojska* – ‘professional army’), *holik* (*Na holik je slišal, na delo pa ne.* – ‘He’d heard of work, but not holic.’).

1.2. New lexis in terms of meanings

1.2.1. As a rule, the meaning of existing lexemes, both old and new, is constantly widening, for example: *kruhomat* is a ‘machine for baking bread’ and a ‘device for dispensing bread’; *smrekica* is ‘a Christmas tree’ or ‘the pattern formed by skis when walking uphill wearing skis’, similarly, *venček* is ‘a repeating half turn when skiing’, *inkubator* (‘young researchers’), *butik* (for sweets, bread), *deteljica* (‘road’), *gnezdenje* (‘data’), *izparilnica* (‘accessory’).

1.2.2. The semantic revival of certain expressions is less frequent or even rare (as seen, for instance, on the Internet in 2010): *ceh* (*društvo Mladinski ceh* – ‘society of youth guilds’), *borza* (*pravila Ljubljanske borze d.d.* – ‘the rules of Ljubljana Stock Exchange’), *borznik* (*Naj vse skupaj propade, borzniki pa naj si najdejo pošteno delo.* – ‘Let it all collapse and the stockbrokers find an honest job.’), *buržuj* (*izbrani novopečeni buržuji* – ‘selected, newly minted bourgeois’), *dražbenik* (*klikanje dražbenika z miško* – ‘click on the

⁶ The typology of formationally unpredictable lexis in a word-formational stylistic context is discussed by Logar Berginc (2006).

auction symbol'), *mecen* (*gospodarstvenik in mecen* – 'businessman and patron'), *aristokrat* (*obubožani aristokrat in salonski lev* – 'impoverished aristocrat and lounge lizard'), *posestnik* (*posestnik ovčar* – 'shepherd landowner', *legalni posestnik orožja* – 'legal owner of a weapon'), *cestniniti* (*financiranje cestnih odsekov, ki se ne cestninijo* – 'finance road sections where there is no toll charge'), *perišče* (*avtopralnica s petimi perišči* – 'car wash with five bays'), *akcijski* (*akcijska cena* – 'special offer'), *jogurtni* (*jogurtni preliv* – 'yoghurt dressing', *jogurtna revolucija* – 'yoghurt revolution'), *goveji* (*goveja glasba* – 'folksy' music', *goveja tv* – 'folksy' TV'), etc.

2. The functioning of more recent lexis in texts

The word-formational system of a language is actually realised in texts, which open the linguistic options to speakers of that language. Texts also reflect users' creativity and the metalinguistic possibilities that allow speakers to create new words on the basis of the established rules. The functioning of any new lexis can be most broadly examined within corpora. As might be expected, borrowed lexis and neologisms (especially different types of compounds and derivations of a higher degree) intervene with the syntax of different discourses. Syntactic changes are noticeably introduced by new or borrowed word-formational patterns, while a strong word-formational and text-formational stylistic role is also played by the increasingly systemic unpredictability of word formation (compounding; formation via overlapping and clipping). From a text-formational point of view, one can also infer and verify which texts facilitate the formation and dissemination of neologisms and nonce derivations, as well as what is the mutual role of these derivations in shaping texts. In addition, one can also establish which procedures promote the formation and use of systemically unpredictable derivations. The broadest range of word-formational patterns possible was taken into account here, as dictated particularly by the new modes of communication.

Upon the examination of corpora and some randomly selected types of discourse, it seems that the new lexis is, to a great extent, linked to the novel forms of communication, which depend on unprecedented extralinguistic factors and channels of communication that combine features of the aural and the visual. Thus, formal written communication (via email) has been "invaded" by elements that, from a traditional linguistic, descriptive point of view,

would normally be interpreted as marked. However, in these new forms of discourse, they are seen as self-evident and stylistically unmarked, for example, *lepe* (za lepe pozdrave – ‘best wishes’), *všečkati* (‘like’) and so on.

3. The mutual dependence of word-formational and text-formational stylistics

The dynamic functioning of word formation and a text related to it is a specific indicator of the direction being taken by different types of usage within a particular language. Increased use of new lexis imposes the employment of similar or even identical syntactic patterns. Word-formational stylistics is part of text-formational stylistics, and so the stylistic analysis of word formation is obviously combined with its text-formational counterpart. This subject is also investigated in contemporary pragmatics, which observes and explains language phenomena from a contextual point of view.

Linguistic pragmatics studies the *use of language*, a form of *behaviour* or *social action*. Thus, the *dimension*, which the pragmatic perspective is intended to give insight into, is *the link between language and human life in general*. Hence, pragmatics constitutes also *the link* between linguistics and the rest of the humanities and social sciences. (Verschueren 1999: 7)

Basically, at the most elementary level, pragmatics can be defined as the study of language use, or, to employ a somewhat more complicated phrasing, the study of linguistic phenomena in terms of their usage properties and processes. This base-level definition does not delineate a strict boundary between pragmatics and other sub-disciplines of linguistics, such as discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, or conversational analysis. Nonetheless, it is rarely disputed, and if considers its logical consequences, it has interesting implications for the position in which pragmatics is to be situated within the science of language in general. (Verschueren 1999: 1)

Since pragmatics cannot be equated with any specific level of analysis, it cannot be included among the traditional elements of the language theory. But Verschueren (1999) states clearly that linguistic phenomena studied in terms of their use can be found at any level of language structure and can concern any kind of relations between meaning and form. The question that pragmatics can try to answer is: How do we use language resources?

Therefore, pragmatics does not constitute an additional component of the language theory, but it offers a different perspective. [...] No doubt, there are units of linguistic structure that lend themselves more readily to pragmatic investigation rather than to the resource-oriented explorations. This is the case for most of the supra-sentential units, such as texts, conversations, or discourse in general. The reason is that these are typical *products of putting resources to use*. On the one hand, they expand the range of resources itself. For instance, beyond sounds, words and sentences, there are argumentation patterns, styles, genres and the like. On the other hand, the latter group cannot even be defined outside the usage context. Nonetheless, there are definitely *no* linguistic phenomena, at any structural level, that a pragmatic perspective can afford to ignore. (Verschueren, 1999: 2–3)

3.1. The mutuality of word formation and text formation

The lexemic aspect concerns the role of the most recent lexis in Slovene, which is to update word formation as a mechanism functioning in specific texts: 1) the relation between non-derived and derived in the formational process; 2) the word-formational structure of lexemes and the semantic realisation of affixes, as well as the semantic divergence of neologisms that share the same root; 3) the affix synonymy within the same word-formational meaning; 4) word-formational play and expressions in relation to a specific text.

The discursive aspect implies that, from the point of view of text formation or various possible discourses, different initial criteria need to be identified, together with a discourse or text typology, that will represent a tool for all subsequent judgements regarding the use and prevalence of certain lexis in particular texts or discourses, as well as their functions and effects. Discourse can be defined (here) as the total of discursive practices within a society, incorporating a system of different genres. When considering the relation between lexis and discourse, it is enough if we distinguish between: performative discourses, which through the interpersonal, meta-linguistic function are connected with the addressees, particularly in the domain of law; cognitive discourses, connected through the ideational function with the scientific-academic field; imaginative discourses, and all the possible genres they involve, connected via the text-formational function to the field of literature and the creative use of language in general; and finally,

pragmatic discourses with the manipulation of all the mentioned metalinguistic functions, associated with everyday human activities – this being the widest area, which is covered by the media.⁷

3.1.1. Below, we show the mutual relation between the type of lexis being used and the particular types of texts. We can expect that the greatest number of word-formational possibilities, particularly those that are systemically hard to predict or simply unpredictable, are facilitated and permitted in pragmatic texts (i.e. commonly generated everyday texts, adverts and informational texts) and imaginative texts (i.e. literature, and other trivial descriptions and narrations). By contrast, performative and cognitive texts cannot allow lexical unpredictability or ambiguity, and therefore, make use of more established lexis, the majority of which either gradually becomes systematised or falls into disuse.

3.1.1.1. Mutually dynamic word-formational and text-formational functioning

It is in common, pragmatic texts, produced especially by the media, and in imaginative texts, ranging from literature to more trivial texts for entertainment, where the most dynamic and up-to-date word-formational activity can be found. It continues to appear in the following forms:

- 1) the exchange between unformed-formed units within the synonymous use of lexemes: *bandži* – *bungee* – *bandžiskok* – *bungee jumping* – *bandžati* (*to je edini center za skoke z elastiko* – ‘this is the only centre for bungee jumping’./*In vse bi naredila, recimo, skočila bi tudi bandži, če bi bilo treba. In če sta za, bosta imela prvo bandži poroko v Evropi* – ‘And I would do anything, even bungee jumping if necessary. And, if you are in favour, you will have the first bungee jumping wedding in Europe’ /newspaper *Dobro jutro*, 2003/);
- 2) the word-formational and semantic extension of derivations that have the same root, including semantic divergence of neologisms with a common root: *stajkunizirati* (*Skladov zaenkrat še ni nihče stajku-*

⁷ The discourse typology is taken from Skubic (2005), who successfully synthesises relevant foreign linguistic findings, and appropriately presents and uses them in Slovene.

- niziral* – ‘So far, the funds have not been exploited by unscrupulous businessmen.’ /Internet 2011/), *kokakolizacija* (*Ni se moč izogniti kokakolizaciji in mcdonaldizaciji* – ‘It is impossible to avoid Coca-colonisation and McDonaldisation’ /newspaper *Dnevnik* 2001/), *očetovanje* (*V Sloveniji je praksa aktivnega očetovanja še precej v zametkih* – ‘In Slovenia, the practice of active fatherhood is still in its infancy’ /magazine 2005/), *družbenica* (*družbenica, imetnica obeh poslovnih deležev* – ‘partner, the owner of both businesses’ /newspaper *Delo* 2008/), *soproizvodnja* (*soproizvodnja električne in toplotne energije* – ‘coproduction of electricity and thermal energy’ /newspaper *Novice* 2007/);
- 3) the extension of affixal synonyms and homonyms: *blogar* – *blogger* – *blogist* – *blogaš*, *ploščarna*, *kruhar* (by analogy with *knjigarna*, *pisarna* etc.; *Tega ne dobiš niti v specializiranih ploščarnah v Ljubljani* – ‘You won’t get this even in a specialised record shop in Ljubljana’ /newspaper 2007/; *Ponoči se je vračal z ženitovanja in čisto sam šel mimo tako imenovane kruharne* – ‘At night he returned from the wedding and, completely on his own, passed a bread shop’ /Branko Gradišnik, 1999/); *družbenost* (as the opposite of *zasebnost*); *srečališče* (analogous to, e.g. *igrišče*: *Aktivno bomo vzpodbujali in razvijali medgeneracijska srečališča Mariborčanov* – ‘We shall actively promote and develop intergenerational meeting places for the people of Maribor’ /Internet 2010/); *družinskost* (*strankarska tv družinskost* – ‘political party family image on TV’ /*Delo* 2000/);
- 4) the update of word-formational games and expressions: *foruumaš* – *forumaš* (*Prepričan sem, da gre pri anonimnih forumaših za zelo podkovane strokovnjake* – ‘I am convinced that these anonymous forum users are very well-versed experts’ /Internet 2010/), *hudojček* (*Hudojčki, katerih edini namen je, da na naš obraz privabijo nasmeh, iz naših ust pa vzklik: »O hudo!«* – ‘Those whose only purpose is to get us to smile and to say ‘Wicked!’’ /Anja 2005/), *šerati* (*To naj bi bilo zaveznitvo, zdaj pa neke /dez/informacije šerajo* – ‘This is supposed to be an alliance, but now they are sharing (dis)information’ /Internet 2011/), *všečkati* (*Všečkajte članek o albumu* – ‘Like the article on the album’ /Internet 2011/).

3.1.1.2. *The need for greater stability and predictability*

Academic texts and performative, administrative texts, which largely belong to organisational disciplines and which, due to their targeting and the implementation of their content, must have a much more predictable lexis in terms of meaning (i.e. texts in which neologisms remain within systematised or established word-formational patterns), need to make use of established word-formation mechanisms within textual patterns. In technical texts, there is a noticeable presence of the suffix *-nik* and its semantic extension: *kodralnik* and *ravnalnik* (instead of, for example, *Figaro* in hairdressing), *oprijetnik* (for *body/bodi*, the item of clothing), *urejevalnik*, *prevajalnik*, *dekodirnik*, *razhroščevalnik* (in computing), *vršičkati* ('You need to regularly nip off the buds' /Gardening handbook 2002/), *pravoda* ('natural still mineral water with low sodium content' /Internet 2010/), *telomer* ('a duplication of DNA, found at the end of chromosomes' /technical text, *Zdravje*, 2005/), *suhozid* ('A terraced garden can be formed using dry stone walls', magazine *Rože in vrt* 2002), *blogoreja* (*Na spletu razsaja anonimna blogoreja* – 'To spread anonymous blog material online' /*Dnevnik* 2009/).

4. The blurring of lexico-syntactic borders across different sociolects or between sociolects and standard language

The blurring of lexico-syntactic boundaries across various sociolects, e.g. between a given dialect and slang, as well as between sociolects and standard language, e.g. everyday spoken Slovene and standard written Slovene, is possible in pragmatic and imaginative texts. In dialect speech, forgotten dialectal words are often replaced with slang expressions; newly-borrowed expressions function similarly, becoming part of common lexis, including the written register. It is most usual and expected that derivations without word-formational formulae are being used in texts without text-formational formulae.

From the word-formational point of view, compounding, as an ever more frequent phenomenon in contemporary Slovene, dissolves the borders between different sociolects, by introducing playfulness at the lexemic and syntactic level. This lexico-syntactic simultaneity of compounding facilitates a direct relation between the spoken base and the word-formational expres-

sive realisations, such as: *pica datekap*, *bar Bikofe*, *mim'grede kafe*, *malica k'rneki*, *čistomimo/čistbrezveze zabava*, *ortounulo mobi*, *paket trizame*, *tvo-jihpetminut agencija*, *nočindan trgovina*, *biti mim'stvar*, etc. Precisely, thanks to their current lexical unpredictably, spontaneity and expressive liveliness, such compounds can represent the spoken-written realisations of either the general standard spoken language, likewise a particular dialect or local speech, or of the standard written language. As elements of word-formational stylistics, these compounds include, and at the same time, implement modality. They belong to both word formation and text formation simultaneously, and because of their dynamic role in speech and language, they are also part of the current flexible systematicity. Through the way they are formed, compounds can be discussed as nonce formations, moreover, compounding can take place at the level of a phrase (*mim'grede kafe*, *kvatebriga bend*) or a clause (*Bikofe*, *Itak.si*, *Simobil*, *Taklemamo*, *Celhalozanič*). Direct, and therefore, unpredictable formation of words and texts from speech places the creation of nonce phrases and clauses in the foreground. The currentness and liveliness of word formation and the utilisation of words in a text calls for a more consistent consideration of the functional sentence perspective, which, at least in the common written practice, is not properly established.

Furthermore, spontaneous nonce formations also include modificatory derivations, coined on the spur of the moment, such as: *hudojček*, *všeček*, *kengurujček*, *lupinica* etc. Another instance of word play is represented by semantic clagues as in *brezplačni dolpoteg* ('free download'), *vsiljivo čivkanje na medmrežju* ('invasive chatter on the Internet') etc.

5. Some final thoughts

The role of the most recent lexis in Slovene is to update word formation as a process mechanism in specific texts. Cognitive texts from the field of science and performative administrative texts, which largely belong to organisational disciplines and which need to make use of established word-formational patterns within textual patterns. In technical texts, there is a very noticeable presence of the suffix *-nik* and its semantic widening: *kodralnik*, *ravnalnik* etc. It is in everyday pragmatic texts, produced especially by the media, and in imaginative texts, from literature to more trivial texts for entertainment, where the most dynamic and up-to-date word-formational activity

can be found: *bandži – bungee – bandžiskok – bungee jumping – bandžati, blogar – blogger – blogist – blogaš* etc. From the word-formational point of view compounding, as an ever more frequent phenomenon in contemporary Slovene, helps to blur the borders between different sociolects, also introducing playfulness at a lexemic and syntactic level as a direct relation between the spoken base and word-formational expressive realisations of the type *pica datekap, bar Bikofe, čistomimo/čistbrezveze zabava, ortounulo mobi* etc.

As would be expected, borrowed lexis and neologisms (particularly various types of compounds and derivations of a higher degree) encroach upon the syntax of various discourses and co-dependently also certain syntactic differences among various discourses – and syntactic changes are introduced by new or borrowed word-formational patterns.

Bibliography

Gigafida = <http://demo.gigafida.net/>

GLOŽANČEV A. and KOSTANJEVEC P., 2006, Novejše besedje slovenskega knjižnega jezika, *Jezikoslovni zapiski 12/2*, s. 89–103.

GLOŽANČEV A., JAKOPIN P., MICHELIZZA M., URŠIČ L. and author (red.), 2009, *Novejša slovenska leksika : (v povezavi s spletnimi jezikovnimi viri)*, Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.

HALLIDAY M. A. K., ²1994, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Edward Arnold.

LOGAR N., 2004, Nove tehnologije in nekateri nesistemski besedotvorni postopki. Aktualizacija jezikovnozvrstne teorije na Slovenskem (Členitev jezikovne resničnosti.), in: *Obdobja 22*, Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, s. 121–132.

LOGAR BERGINC N., 2006, Stilno zaznamovane nove tvorjenke – tipologija, *Slavistična revija 54* – special edition, s. 87–101.

Nova Beseda = http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/s_beseda.html

SKUBIC ERMENC A., 2005, *Obrazi jezika*, Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

STRAMLJIČ BREZNIK I., 2010, *Tvorjenke slovenskega jezika med slovarjem in besedilom, Zora 71*, Maribor: FF UM.

VERSCHUEREN, J., 1999, *Understanding pragmatics*, London: Arnold.

VIDOVIČ MUHA, A., 1988, *Slovensko skladijsko besedotvorje ob primerih zloženek*, Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete, Partizanska knjiga.

VIDOVIČ MUHA, A., 2011, *Slovensko skladijsko besedotvorje*, Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.

ZEMSKAJA A. E., 1992, 2009, *Slovoobrazovanie kak dejatel'nost' (na materiale periodičeskoj pečati, živoj razgovornoj reči, hudožestvennoj i naučnoj literatury)*, Moskva: LIBROKOM.

**Prezeta leksika in novotvorjenke med jezikovnim standardom
in sociolekti (na primeru slovenščine)**

(povzetek)

Avtorici ugotavljata, kako prezeta leksika in novotvorjenke vplivajo na različne tipe socialno-funkcijskih besedil oz. diskurzov. Stanje različnih tipov diskurzov namreč posledično odraža razmerje med jezikovnim standardom in sociolekti: prezeta leksika in novotvorjenke (zlasti različni tipi zloženek in višjestopenjskih izpeljank) pričakovano posegajo v skladnjo različnih diskurzov, in sicer tako, da se postopoma zabrisujejo ne le nekatere leksikalne meje med sociolekti in standardom, ampak soodvisno temu tudi nekatere skladenjske razlike med različnimi diskurzi. Skladenjske spremembe vidno vnašajo ravno novi oz. prevzeti besedotvorni vzorci, na drugi strani pa ima močno besedotvorno in besedilotvorno stilsko vlogo tudi povečano sistemsko nepredvidljivo tvorjenje besed (sklapanje, tvorjenje kot prekrivanje in krnjenje); vse naštetu vpliva tako na standardizirano rabo jezika kot na različne sociolekte tudi tako, da povečana raba iste nove leksike izsili tudi rabo podobnih ali celo enakih skladenjskih vzorcev. Vsesplošno rabljeni novi besedotvorni vzorci torej do neke mere prispevajo k bolj pospešenemu zabrisovanju leksiko-skladenjskih mej med sociolekti oz. med sociolekti ter standardno rabo. Živahno delovanje besedotvorja in z njim povezanega besedilotvorja je konkreten pokazatelj, kam težijo spremembe različnih jezikovnih rab znotraj določenega jezika.

