Jarosław Lipowski

Univerzita Hradec Králové, Czech Republic

# Means and Forms of Czech-Polish Semi-Communication via SMS

## Abstract

It was Einar Haugen (1966) who introduced into linguistics the term semi-communication. He examined the means of verbal communication in a group of three Scandinavian languages, the interlocutors of which used different language codes in one communication act. Asymmetry of such a discourse is manifested by a communiqué formulated in one mother tongue and perceived by a recipient on the basis of his/her own vernacular code knowledge. This article aims at analysing means and forms of Czech-Polish semi-communication via SMS. The investigation indicates that writers used in their SMS messages intended for the other-language recipients especially those linguistic means, by which they seek to increase the clarity of text messages intended for recipients – speakers of closely related (West Slavonic) languages.

*Keywords*: semi-communication, receptive multilingualism, intelligibility, Czech, Slovak, Polish.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1

The term semi-communication, introduced into linguistics by Einar Haugen (1966) while examining the means of verbal communication in a group of three Scandinavian languages, represents an asymmetric form of discourse that involves interlocutors using different language codes in one communication act. Asymmetry of such a discourse is manifested by a communiqué formulated in one mother tongue and perceived by a recipient on the basis of his/her own vernacular code knowledge. Such a form of communication places on the communicating participants greater demands: in order for the verbal communication to be effective, the producer/originator tends to choose such language resources, which

he/she considers to be for the other-language recipient as understandable as possible. The greater the effort the communiqué sender makes in choice of language means, the lesser effort in deciphering of a foreign-language text is demanded from the recipient.

Research in semi-communication currently follows two general paths: first is the continual research in *parole*,[1] which explores language elements implemented in a discourse, the second approach (new) looks into a proximal distance on the *langue* level, especially by employing the Conditional entropy method; research using this method is conducted between Danish, Swedish and Norwegian languages (Bokmål) (Gooskens 2006). The Conditional entropy method allows researchers to measure the relative distance between different languages, which means that for one participant of a semi-communication is the language of the communication partner closer/farther than the other one (Mooberg *et al.* 2007).

From the communicants' point of view the act of semi-communication is a part of a receptive multilingualism (Braunmüller 2007). The receptive multilingualism is seen as a twin-coded communication in which passively bilingual interlocutors are able to understand each other. To be passively generally assumes a prior stage of conscious learning of a language. The semi-communication, however, does not rely on the communicant's conscious language learning, but in order to have a semi-communication at all, three conditions must be fulfilled/met.

The first condition is a close relationship between languages, in which the communicants communicate.

The second condition is institutional links between environments in which the other-language discourse participants operate: the existence of shared public and public-service organizations and agencies, government bodies, and consequently the public media. Such an environment then increases a need of a contact between speakers of two or more languages. For this reason, semi-communication is more likely to be encountered in countries with federal or confederative structure and in countries with mutual above-standard relationships. Closer contacts between members of such other-language states and countries happen on cultural, social and political levels.

The third condition is an absence of conscious learning of the language of the communication partner.[2]

### 1.2

Semi-communication as partial twin-coded communication was from the 1970s also studied among the West-Slavic languages, but only on a limited level focusing at a contact between Czech and Slovak speakers, bearers of different written languages who lived in a single state structure (Horecký 1979; Budovičová 1982; Lipowski 2005; Nábělková 2008). In order to properly examine the semi-communication

---

1　Intelligibility between Danish, Swedish and Norwegian speakers explicitly examined Maurud, Ø. (1976) "Reciprocal comprehension of neighbour languages in Scandinavia." [In:] *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 20; 46–52.

2　Based on European institutions forecasts, Michael Clyne (2003, "Towards inter-cultural communication in Europe without linguistic homogenization." [In:] *Die konsten der Mehrspachigkeit. Globalisierung und Sprachliche Vielfalt*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; 39–48) drew four possible scenarios of possible multi-ethnic communication in the European Union: (1) the communication code is the English language as the lingua franca; (2) a speaker learns several genetically related languages, that are taught in contrast to the principal mother-tongue language code; (3) a speaker acquires several languages that are used in neighbouring states; (4) each speaker uses his mother-tongue and understands the language of other interlocutors. The fourth point includes the semi-communication phenomena which are discussed in this paper.

research among the West Slavic languages would be necessary to use the experience and knowledge of researchers in the semi-communication of the North-Germanic languages.[3]

In this article we try to deepen the knowledge gained from the research of contacts between different languages at the *parole* level and analyse communication via SMS messages between speakers of two West Slavic languages – Czech and Polish, and marginally the Slovak language. The purpose of the SMS communication analysis is to pinpoint the linguistic means by which the communiqué producers consciously modify their messages (Zábranský 2012/2013: 131) or vice versa, modify them without the producer's consciousness (negative transfers). Another purpose of this analysis is to try to establish, whether it is the aim of the producer to convey a clear communiqué to the recipient, or whether it is the unintended use of the other-language elements (transfers).

Although SMS communication research is nowadays being engaged in by a countless number of scholars, research in SMS communication in terms of the use of multiple codes in a single discourse, or even in a one single communiqué among West Slavic languages, is still lacking.

## 2. SMS analysis

The researched pool of SMS messages were communications made between Czech and Polish speakers, several communiqués between one Slovak and a few Czechs. To complement our research, we also took into consideration a SMS communication between the single-code speakers. Participants were 25–50 years of age. The language source is deposited in the archives of the Regional Prosecutor's Office in Wrocław, Poland (Prokuratura Okręgowa we Wrocławiu) File No. V Ds 79/13.

In the presented data the author (producer, sender) of the SMS message is always marked according to his/her linguistic affiliation (CZ, PL or SK) and gender (m, f), and after the dash the same information about the recipient (recipient, addressee). Accurate data regarding the age of the communicants could not be determined.

The available source did not allow tracking of the recipients' responses – from the SMS messages was it not possible to construct dialogues. Therefore, we focused entirely on research of language means that were used by producers of such communiques. Depending on the nature of language resources, which the sender thought would help the recipient in understanding the communication, we divided them into:

1. specific-purpose borrowings;
2. quotation expressions;
3. contact variants;
4. means of substandard spheres of a language.

### 2.1. Specific-purpose borrowings

The term "specific-purpose borrowings" refers to words and terms of the recipient's language used in the producer/sender communiqué that are different form their mother tongue vocabulary, yet the sender feels their relationship (often because of common Slavic origin), so it is incorporated into the morphological

---

3   Lipowski (2012, 2013a).

structure of their own language (and language of the communiqué). These borrowings are typical only for a language of a specific speaker and serves its purpose only in a particular situation. We divided them into nouns determining relative positioning/localization, transfers of auxiliary verbs, pronominal numerals and pronominal adverbs in the role of adverbial determination and expressions regarded by the sender as somehow characteristic/symptomatic.

### 2.1.1. Nouns determining the relative localization

CZ2(m)I-PL4(f): […] szukam <u>auto gieudu</u> v lubine. […]

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Ona ma tylko auto na lubin a barak ma w krzywej jak jedziesz z chojnowa na <u>dalnice</u>. To je jej <u>cislo</u>.zavolaj do nej jak budes.[…].<u>vesnica</u> krzywa.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Zavolaj misi jak ne bude viedet gde moj tatko ma byt niech mi zavola a pocka <u>pod lekarnia</u>.ja cekam u ojca

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Ne.rekles ze cekam u tatka nebo <u>na bytu</u> gde <u>lekarna</u>?

PL1(m)1-CZ(f): mam zl.ale <u>na dalnici</u> w krzywej masz nonstop <u>zmieniarne</u>.kantor masz korony czeskie? muzesz zamienic? Kolik masz km.ja cxekam <u>na bytu</u>.

By using the specific-purpose borrowings that determine the relative location of an object, the author of the communiqué tries to indicate the place of a meeting, specific intention or position (even relative). Czech expressions used for this purpose are in Polish communiqué adapted morphologically, *e.g. vesnica* (*vesnice* [village]), phonetically *lekarnia* (*lékárna* [pharmacy]), or both ways *zmieniarne* (acc. as *směnárnu* [exchange office]). For prepositional phrases both Polish and Czech speakers leave prepositional phrase in the original (morphologically not adapted) form: *na dalnici* (*na dálnici* [on the highway]), *na bytu* (*na bytě* [at the flat]).

CZ(f)-CZ(m): Je to <u>zlutastacia Lotos</u> s Mekacem.Milu Slapni na to,nebo tady umrznu

The above example does not represent a real semi-communication, it is a message sent by a Czech speaker to another Czech speaker. However, it demonstrates the sender's effort to give the exact position in the other-language environment in order to easily identify the place stated in the message. Polish proper noun *Lotos* is characterized by a Polish common noun *stacja* (*stanice* [petrol station]) developed by Czech attributive adjective *žlutá* [yellow].

### 2.1.2. Auxiliary verb **být** *[to be]*

Frequent verb *být* [to be][4] in personal forms is registered/noticed in the original form by Czech authors:

---

4    Verb "to be":

| | Czech language | | | Polish language | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | person | present tense | future tense | person | present tense | future tense |
| singular | já [I] | jsem | budu | ja | jestem | będę |
| | ty [You] | jsi | budeš | ty | jesteś | będziesz |
| | on, ona, ono [He, She, It] | je | bude | on, ona, ono | jest | będzie |

CZ(M)-PL(f): <u>Jestem</u>

CZ2(m)-PL3(m): Czest,kde ted <u>jestes</u>, my jsme v Psiem poli

CZ2(m)I-PL4(f): Prepraszam,<u>jestem</u> u legnici […]

Whereas the Polish writer creates grammatically correct, although symptomatologically syntactical terms:

PL(m)-CZ2(m) <u>Budes</u> do poludnia?

PL(m)-CZ(m) […] reklem ze <u>budes</u> za 20min

PL(m)-CZ(m): Kiedy <u>budes</u>?

Here, the auxiliary verb *budeš* [will be] requires addition of a proverbial determination of a location. It is possible to declare, that a price for an intelligible communication in this case (by using a Czech auxiliary verb in the correct form in the second person singular) is a negative transfer from the Polish language in the form of unexpressed adverbial determination.

In the following communication by a Polish sender emerge a Morphological calque – negative transfer of an imperfective future form as a composite form of the verb *bude jít* [will go]:

PL(m)-CZ(m): prosim te.musis byc pred 1:00 moja kunda zena rekla ze <u>bude jit</u> kolem 1:00 a jak ne budu mit auta mam jit taxikiem a nema juz penidzy

### 2.1.3. Pronominal numerals and adverbs with adverbial function

In a brief verbal SMS communication is important to put accent particularly on the clarity of the most important components of the text. In the case of arranging a meeting via SMS a precise definition of a place and a time of such an appointment is required (see also section 1.1). Communicants therefore seek those expressions, that would allow locating time and place, and in order to provide that information as univocally as possible, they choose such lexemes which they consider to be familiar to addressees:

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Ok.jeste nevim jestli tam pojedu, ale i tak chci s tebou dnes nebo <u>jutro</u> mluvit.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Plus antena?to dobra cena.ok tak czekam <u>zitra</u> na tebe u ojca.

PL(m)-CZ(m) jo ale nie odbiera.zavolam mu <u>zitra</u> znowu.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Wez mi <u>trochu</u> do kurenia.diky

| | | Czech language | | | Polish language | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **person** | **present tense** | **future tense** | **person** | **present tense** | **future tense** |
| **plural** | my [We] | jsme | budeme | my | jesteśmy | będziemy |
| | vy [You] | jste | budete | wy | jesteście | będziecie |
| | oni [They] | jsou | budou | oni | są | będą |

PL(m)-CZ(m): posluchaj jak to udelamy.<u>dnes</u> wececer prijet <u>na byt</u> a <u>zitra</u> rano pojedymy po auto z chojnowa.

PL(m)-CZ(m): <u>Kiedy</u> budes?

One of the Polish speakers with a greater linguistic competence created a whole string of connections, or syntagma, using the aforementioned parts of speech:

PL1(m)-CZ2(m): <u>Budu dnes vecer nebo zitra</u> po poludniu ale <u>myslim ze zitra</u>.ciao

In this subgroup, we would include use of the Slovak adverb of time in a communication between a Czech and Slovak speaker:

CZ(m)-SK(m): <u>Zajtra</u>?ok?

Strong influence of foreign-language environments and foreign-language communicants is also reflected in the penetration of certain frequent expressions into communication of the same-code speakers. Such expression is the pronominal number *ile* (*kolik* [how much]):

CZ(f)-CZ(m): Jo napisu mu to mam se do te Sotey rano pro jistotu stavit?Jo a <u>ile</u>"

### 2.1.4. Expressions recognized by the sender as expressive or otherwise significantly characteristic

In the last group of the specific-purpose borrowings we included expressions characteristic or perceived as somehow striking, expressive and sometimes humorous by the sender. The noun *maminka* [mother] is usually perceived by Polish speakers as having a diminutive yet powerful positive characteristic of something warmly childish:

PL1(m)1-CZ(f): […] Jerzy <u>maminka</u>: Danuta

PL(m)-CZ2(m): […] luci chce z <u>mamka</u> sie videt i adwokat chce cislo a dane dowodu osobistego <u>maminki</u>.

In the following communiqué, the Polish author took advantage of the so called interlingual homonymy. Noun *barák*, which is in the Czech language a synonym for a villa or an opulent building, has in Polish meaning as 'shack' or 'house falling apart':

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Ok.dnes?nebo jak?ona ma 2 bambini a z tatkiem <u>na baraku</u>.

PL1(m)1-CZ1(f): ne.mimi <u>na baraku</u> a ja z klaudia.budu zitra <u>na baraku</u> ale mimi rekl ze dnes budu jit na czechy.

It could be said with a high degree of certainty, that the semantic contrast of nouns *barák*/*barak* [house], that indicate in the Polish language similar denotation as in the Czech language – 'a building,' but

in the Czech with positive, whereas in Polish with negative connotations, was for the Polish speaker an impulse to learn this word and use it in communication. From both messages it is clear that both Polish speakers knew the Czech connotative meaning of the noun, which automatically means they were aware of their semantic contrast, manifested in extent (intensity) of its properties.[5]

As a phonetically expressive term, from the speaker's point of view, also could be seen with the adverb *všechno* [everything] in a Slovak communiqué:

SK(m)-CZ(m): Je <u>vsechno</u> ok? Lebo si sa uz vcera neozval

## 2.2. Quotation expressions

As a quotation expression, words or phrases are usually identified as foreign, that are not adapted to the neither phonetic nor morphological systems of the receiving language (compare also Hrbáček 1971).

### *2.2.1. Application of quotation expressions in single-coded communication*

In the available texts, quotation expressions are found in the vast majority of single-coded Czech-Czech communiqués, less than in Slovak-Czech communiqués. Although they fulfil the condition of a semi-communication only in the latter case, the communications between the same-language speakers are interesting for the discussed topic, because these foreign codes are used to improve verbal understanding, and not for reasons to make the message more interesting:

CZ(f)-CZ(m): 290 zl + <u>podatek</u> 206 zl. Pracuje do 17

CZ(m)-CZ(f): Kurva,neodjebavej nema <u>prawo jazdy</u>…jeste by to hodila <u>do skarpy</u>!bude set i libit.

CZ(f)-CZ(m): Jo napisu mu to mam se do te Sotey rano pro jistotu stavit?Jo a <u>ile</u>"

CZ(m)-CZ2(m): Jsi normalni!<u>kolem ktere</u>??musim se domluvit i s fiestou!!

CZ(f)-CZ(m) Budu na tom druhem <u>numeru</u>

In some cases, the quotation expressions show qualities of borrowings (the phrase *kolem které* [around what time] or the verb *koštovat* [taste] which in this case has the meaning 'the price of'):

CZ(f)-CZ(m): Jo napisu mu to,mam se do te Sotey rano,pro jistotu stavit?Jo a <u>ile</u> by mela max. <u>kostovat</u>,ta chatrc?

CZ(f)-CZ(m): ? by měla max.<u>koštovat</u> ta chatrč?

CZ(f)-CZ(m): Uz jsem tu,<u>zaraz</u> ti napisu <u>ile</u> to bude <u>kostovat</u>

The Polish principal verb *kosztować* [cost], which occurs in the three following communiqués, is adapted several times by the Czech speaker. Since it is a phonetic adaptation, thus external, it is considered as

---

5    Nouns *barák/barak* [house] can also be seen as the contact variant – see section 2.3.

the quotation expression. At the same time, however, this verb performs the role of the contact synonym (see section 2.3).

### *2.2.2. Quotation expressions in Slovak-Czech semi-communication*

Slovak-Czech SMS communication uses some Czech phrases traditionally known in the Slovak environment. It seems that the Slovak sender not only increases the intelligibility of a communication for the perception to the Czech speaker, but especially brings to the communiqué some inner delight in the updated news:

> SK(m)-CZ(m): Ok.<u>ja taky</u>

> SK(m)-CZ(m): <u>To vis ze jo</u>. Ok volaj potom ahoj

A sort of "attractiveness" in updating the message by other language codes is evidenced by a SMS message containing elements of the three codes: the Slovak communiqué is "spiced up" by Polish pronominal adverb *kiedy* [when] and the Czech expressive verb *makám* [toil, plod]. The communiqué, although unique in the available source of messages, may be another sign that the Slovaks are from the entire West Slavic language group the most adaptable while in contact with neighbouring Slavic language speakers:

> SK(m)-CZ(m): <u>Kiedy</u> . Ja teraz <u>makam</u> lebo som 4 dni zameskal

## 2.3. Contact variants/alternatives/options

### *2.3.1*

The main product of interlingual (twin-coded) communication between users of close languages are contact variants (contact synonyms) (Buzássyová 1993; Lipowski 2013a, 2013b). A contact variant (usually lexeme or phrasal idiom) in semi-communication is typical particularly to spoken language. Contact variants are basically interlingual synonyms, that are identical or very similar in form, but their meanings are not identical. In one of the languages used in twin-coded communication the contact variant is symptomatological, but it does not exceed the boundaries of that language standard. Contact variants are various parts of speech, with the absolute majority of semantic verbs and nouns.

### *2.3.1.1*

Among the semantic verbs dominates verbum dicendi *říci/říct* [say], which Polish speakers identifies with the old Polish word *rzec*. That has in the contemporary Polish language a flavour of an old-fashioned style or bookishness. The neutral prefixed form is *orzec*. In the semi-communicates sent by Polish writers, the verb *říci/říct* is used for most of the time in correct form for the Czech language:

> PL(m)-CZ2(m): Kamil volal i <u>rekl</u> ze motor funguje ale dal starter do kontroli i starter bierze 100 apmer mocy .to je za viele o 90%.jak tak zostawi to za miesiac budu tensam problem.hleda tec starter. <u>rekl</u> ze to 80-100zl.bude

> PL(m)-CZ2(m): A masz dane starej bednarowej dla adwokata?<u>rekla</u> ci miska?luci chce z mamka sie videt i adwokat chce cislo a dane dowodu osobistego maminki.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Dobry kamrat jestes.dekuju ci i jeszcze raz przepraszam.edyta <u>rekla</u> ze chce sie szukac z toba.co ty na to?

PL1(m)-Cz(m) Vecer budu w legnicy z klaudia.zavolaj 2h pred.<u>rekne</u> ci gde jestem.

PL(m)-CZ(m): jisem ne jechal bo miska <u>rekla</u> ze to udela.ze ja mam ne jechac.to wsechno co mi <u>rekles</u> o nej to prawda…teraz to vidim.drugi raz ne jedu nigdzie.ja sem

PL(m)-CZ(m): ted?mogu jechac z tobou dnes ale vecer.ja ty a gosia ok?jestem na dalnicy.volam do godi ale <u>rekla</u> mi ze to ne prawda ze sem byl po auto a jebla telefonem

PL(m)-CZ(m): prosim te.musis byc pred 1:00 moja kunda zena <u>rekla</u> ze bude jit kolem 1:00 a jak ne budu mit auta mam jit taxikiem a nema juz penidzy

PL1(m)-CZ1(f): ne.mimi na baraku a ja z klaudia.budu zitra na baraku ale mimi <u>rekl</u> ze dnes budu jit na czechy.

PL1(m)-CZ1(f): misia <u>reknij</u> mili zeby poslal mi sms nebo ma penidze dnes nebo ne?jak ma tak bude dnes jak nema tak nebudu.zitra mousim zostac z klaudia.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): […] volal i <u>rekl</u> ze motor funguje ale dal starter do kontroli i starter bierze 100 apmer mocy .to je za viele o 90%.jak tak zostawi to za miesiac budu tensam problem.hleda tec starter. <u>rekl</u> ze to 80-100zl.bude

Sometimes the Polish speaker adapts this word morphologically to his/her native code:

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Poslalem jej sms i <u>reklem</u> ze zavolas jak budes.tam je pompa orlen.<u>reklem</u> ze tam budes cekat

PL(m)-Cz(m) jak muzesz koupit 500 bude super.je 500 i newim czy 400 mi sprzeda.moze <u>reknoc</u> wsechne nebo nic.jak nebudes mit penidze na 500 zostaw na 400.

PL(m)-CZ (m) […] barak otwarty muzesz isc do srodka.<u>reklem</u> ze budes za 20min

PL(m)-CZ(m): moja zena czeka na mnie w legnicy a chce byn jechal do klaudii.moge jej <u>reknoc</u> ze dojedu zitra wecer ale dnes musim jit na legnicu.mimi ja sem twoj prija

PL1(m)-CZ1(f): <u>reknij</u> mimi by koupil mi czarne(ciemne) piwo.diky

PL1(m)-CZ1(f): <u>reknij</u> mili niech mi zavola

*2.3.1.2*

In order to establish a contact, the common Polish greeting *Witam* [hello, welcome] is used by a Czech speaker in the message aimed at a Polish recipient:

CZ2(m)-PL5(m): <u>Witam</u>,proshe te,nehodil by jsi me, z Dobroszowa do Wroclawi?

In the message above a distinct effort of the sender to attract more attention from the message recipient – a Polish taxi driver, could be seen. In the greeting function the contact variant *witam* has to be regarded as a symptomatologic (in the Czech language the greeting requires the personal pronoun in the subject: *vítám vás* [(I) welcome you]). Peculiarity of this formulation is further manifested by the fact that the Czech sender used this expression in connection with a verb in the second person singular, while in modern-day Polish communication, the greeting *witam* is commonly used when making contact in electronic media.

### *2.3.1.3*

The verb *szukać* is used by a Czech speaker in accordance with the Polish meaning 'search':

CZ2(m)I-PL4(f): Prepraszam,jestem u legnici a <u>szukam</u> auto gieudu v lubine.

The Polish verb *szukać* is formally homonymous with synchronous Czech expressive word *šukat* in the sense of having sexual intercourse.[6] Polish speakers have used this verb twice in the reflexive form with the reversible pronoun *się* [one-self], apparently due to identification of this word with the Polish expressive reversible verb *pieprzyć się* [fuck]:

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Reknij edycie kiedy dojade na barak do tebe.ona chce <u>sie</u> <u>szukac</u> z tobou

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Dobry kamrat jestes.dekuju ci i jeszcze raz przepraszam.edyta rekla ze chce <u>sie</u> <u>szukac</u> z toba.co ty na to?

### *2.3.1.4*

The same Polish speaker uses a different verb dicendi closely linked to the telephone communication – *zavolat*, exploiting the Czech meaning of this word 'to make a phone call' (a meaning unknown to Polish language). This verb is used in various forms in accordance with the Czech meaning, the imperative form is only adapted:

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Poslalem jej sms i reklem ze <u>zavolas</u> jak budes.tam je pompa orlen.reklem ze tam budes cekat

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Kamil <u>volal</u> i rekl ze motor funguje ale dal starter do kontroli i starter bierze 100 apmer mocy. […]

PL(m)-CZ2(m): <u>Zavolaj</u> mi jak wstaniesz

PL(m)-CZ2(m): <u>Zavolaj</u> misi jak ne bude viedet gde moj tatko ma byt niech mi <u>zavola</u> a pocka pod lekarnia.ja cekam u ojca

---

6 The Czech verb *šukat* [fuck] is synchronously expressive. As an archaism it also occurs in the sense as 'look intensively and quickly for something,' 'search swiftly,' 'deftly move around the room' or 'move agilely.'

PL(m)-CZ(m): ted?mogu jechac z tobou dnes ale vecer.ja ty a gosia ok?jestem na dalnicy.<u>volam</u> do godi ale rekla mi ze to ne prawda ze sem byl po auto a jebla telefonem

*2.3.1.5*

Czech verb *volat* [call] in the above sense is related to the Polish verb *dzwonić*[7] [call] that the Czech speaker uses in accordance with the meaning in Polish language while messaging to a Polish recipient.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Poslalem jej sms i reklem ze <u>zavolas</u> jak budes.tam je pompa orlen.reklem ze tam budes cekat

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Kamil <u>volal</u> i rekl ze motor funguje […]

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Ja jsem mu vcora <u>dzvonil</u>.

*2.3.1.6*

To express the meaning of the word *odjet* [leave, drive away] the Czech speaker uses the prefixed verb *vyjet* [start, depart] in line with the Polish meaning, commonly used in the Czech language as well. In this case, it cannot be unequivocally said, that this is a semi-communication phenomenon or interference:

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Promin,<u>vyjizdela</u> pred 11h.na <u>autostrade</u> byl <u>wypaDek</u>.rikal jsem ji to at tam je do 12h.

CZ2(m)-PL(m): bude.Misa,pred 10min.<u>vyjela</u>.

*2.3.1.7*

The verb *podobać się* [like] is used with the correct meaning in the following Czech communiqué:

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Ve wroclawiu,ale <u>niepodoba</u> se mi tu.

*2.3.1.8*

In the following messages conducted in Polish, the Polish sender uses the less common word *drzewo*, a noun meaning 'mass' (it is, however, very likely that it is slang term for forbidden goods). On the contrary, the Czech speaker used in response to the Polish recipient the standard Polish word *drewno* [wood]:

PL3(m)-CZ2(m): Czy po poludniu bedziecie w domu ? <u>Drzewo</u> chca przywiezc.

CZ2(m)-PL3(m): Juz jsi to <u>drewno</u> kupil?

PL3(m)-CZ2(m): halo <u>Drzewo</u> dzis czy jutro?

PL3(m)-CZ2(m): <u>Drzewa</u> nie bedzie bo nie ma jak prywiezc.

---

7    The Czech verb *zvonit* has a meaning of 'sound the bell' or 'to produce the sound of a bell.'

### 2.3.2

A part of the contact variant nouns are expressions technical in nature, coming from the field of engineering, informatics or construction:

PL(f1)-CZ2(m): Jak budes na <u>baraku</u> zavolaj mi.mam klienta na hyundaia.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Mimi tu je <u>spetny sygnal</u>.krzywa 39.przed pompa do prawa a 600m <u>barak</u> z niebieskim dachem

PL(m)-Cz(m) 60….04 pani halinka.<u>barak</u> otwarty muzesz isc do srodka. […]

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Ona ma tylko auto na lubin a <u>barak</u> ma w krzywej jak jedziesz z chojnowa na dalnice. To je jej cislo.zavolaj do nej jak budes.66….74.vesnica krzywa.

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Przyjedz zitra do poludnia po motor.kup <u>bateryku</u> do motoru.ta funguje ale jest stara

PL(m)-CZ(m): ja sem nebyl szofer.ne moja vina.jakbym bym z kim innym ne miska tak by to ne bylo. rekles jej vecer by moja <u>baterke</u> dac do bmw?ona mi rekla bym tego ne robil.

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Pockej tam ja tam dojedu a necham tam <u>motor</u> a toho tvojeho mechanika.ok?

Writers of those messages developed a "successful" effort to avoid misunderstandings – all underlined contact synonyms in Polish communiqués are used with the correct Czech meaning, as well as in Czech communiqués the contact word *motor* [engine – in Czech] is used in Polish (figuratively) in the sense of *motocykl/motorka* [motorcycle]. In the Polish communiqué the variant *barák* is used in the sense of 'house,' *i.e.* in the sense in which it is currently and commonly used in colloquial Czech language. Similarly the colloquial term *baterka* [flashlight or battery] is used in the sense of a 'car battery' that is morphologically adapted into Polish. The evidence, that it is a contact variant rather than perhaps a quotation expression, lays in the fact that the Polish writer adapts the lexeme in another communication to the Polish diminutive *bateryjka*. It is significant that such adaptation of this entire lexeme in Polish, compensates, in a sense, a rare morphological non-adaptation: the Polish writer adds the Czech grammatical case ending *bateryjk<u>u</u>* (and not *bateryjk<u>ę</u>*).

### 2.3.3

Between the contact variants, the interjection *cześć* [hi] appears in a communiqué sent by a Czech speaker, in which he employs in the Polish meaning as a standard greeting for contact. In the Czech language the noun *čest* regarded as a form of an out-dated or expressive greeting, but neutral as a noun denoting 'positive moral status or moral clarity' [honour]. On the contrary, the Polish word *cześć* is as a noun, in the sense of 'respect or regard,' rarer.

CZ2(m)-PL3(m): <u>Czest</u>,kde ted jestes, my jsme v Psiem poli

CZ2(m)-PL3(m): <u>Czest</u>,[…] ze tebou prijede okolo 18h.bendes doma?

*2.3.4*

The purpose of the following communication of a Czech speaker is to seek help with another Czech person to find out a reading from a timetable. The sender used the preposition *okolo* [around] that in Polish language forms the prepositional phrase expressing time (whereas in Czech it is linked with determination of a place). Use of this preposition in Czech-Czech SMS communication can be assessed as negative transfer; due to the communication situation, the nature of the message and type of communicants, it is unlikely that this is the (intentional) updating of SMS:

CZ(f)-CZ(m), Podivej se,kolik mi to jede <u>okolo</u> 17:30

## 2.4. Means/devices from substandard sphere of a language

*2.4.1*

Although the Czech communicants are not dialect-speakers, some elements of Salesian-Polish dialect used in the Karviná and Těšínsko region develop into their idiolect. These speakers are aware of the lexical dialect phenomena, which is proven by its application in some SMS communiqués aimed at Polish partners; mostly in use of adverbs:

CZ(m)-PL(f): Jdes chlastat <u>dziszo</u>?

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Sebrali toho kamarada AMG.Jeep bende nachystany <u>dziszo</u> nebo v pondeli.

CZ(m)-PL(f): A <u>cimu</u> tak pozdno?

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Ja jsem mu <u>vcora</u> dzvonil

In one message the noun in the adverbial function of a place *do roboty* [to work] is used. The noun *robota* (work or job in Polish; in Czech it has the colloquial meaning of hard work, drudgery or corvée) is also a contact variant that is in the Salesian-Polish dialect used with the meaning of 'employment' in the sense of 'place of work'[8]:

CZ2(m)-PL(f1): Jdes dziszo <u>do roboty</u>?

*2.4.2*

This frequent prepositional phrase (*do roboty*) came into communication of two Czech speakers and could be considered as a negative transfer from a dialect to the standard Czech language:

CZ2(m)-CZ(n): V kolik jde <u>do roboty</u>?

*2.4.3*

On the other hand, in SMS messages sent by a Polish author we can find lexical elements of the substandard Polish language sphere – coming from the Upper-Silesian dialect:

---

8    In Polish, in this sense, it is somewhat outdated.

PL(m)-CZ(m): Wsechno ok hehe cekam na tebe moj <u>kamracie</u>

PL(m)-CZ2(m): Dobry <u>kamrat</u> jestes.dekuju ci i jeszcze raz przepraszam.edyta rekla ze chce sie szukac z toba.co ty na to?

PL1(m)1-CZ1(f): zavolaj mi co mam robic.ten <u>kamrat</u> czeka.rychle

PL(m)-CZ2(m):Wez mi trochu <u>do kurenia</u>.diky

PL(m)-CZ(m): biegal po tej vescinie hledal pomocy placil za swoje penidze a ona <u>kuryla</u> to gowno w aucie.

### 2.4.4

In a Slovak-Czech semi-communication is, as a substandard Slovak element, used the verb *pokecat*[9] [chat]:

SK(m)-Czech: Ty si magor. Tak si volame aby sme sa stretli niekde a <u>pokecali</u> ok?

SK(m)-Czech: Urcite budem ale <u>pokecame</u> zajtra okoloobedu by som vyrazil

### 2.4.5

In one communication the Czech sender has used a regional (Moravian) form of a pronoun, with non-contractional group of phones (in linguistic sense) *oje* familiar in standard Polish:

CZ2(m)-PL(m): Pockej tam ja tam dojedu a necham tam motor a toho <u>tvojeho</u> mechanika.ok?

The application of this pronoun form is rather considered as a negative transfer. Non-contractional forms in shape-forming (in morphemic sense) extension are alive in both Czech-Salesian and Moravian substandard, thus it is likely that the author used it unintentionally.

## 3. Conclusion

By the analysing of SMS communication between Polish, Czech and Slovak speakers, we have confirmed that writers used in their SMS messages intended for the other-language recipients especially those linguistic means, by which they seek to increase the clarity of text messages intended for recipients – speakers of closely related (West Slavonic) languages.

---

9   *Kecať* a *pokecať* [chat] are non-standard Slovak lexemes, often used in informal conversation, as well as in dialogic and other texts. In certain circles of Slovak linguists, writers and cultural workers, there is a fight against using this distinct Bohemian lexeme. See for example: Mihalik, Vojtech (1995) *Ako nehrešiř proti slovenčine*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Spolku slovenských spisovateľov.

Table 1. Semi-communication phenomena

| Type of semi-communication phenomenon | Number of units | Number of occurrences |
|---|---|---|
| Specific purpose borrowings | **22** (23)* | **36** (37) |
| Contact variants | **12** (13) | **51** (52) |
| Substandard means | **9** (9) | **13** (14) |
| Quotation expressions | **4** (12) | **4** (16) |

 * Numbers in brackets indicate the number of communications including single-coded communication

### 3.1

The statistical research has shown that in terms of lexical units (rarely also syntactical links) used in the SMS semi-communication are the most frequented the special-purpose borrowings, followed by contact variants and substandard means, which were solely expressions of the regional Silesian dialect used on both sides of the Czech-Polish borders, and the least used were quotation expressions. The analysis also demonstrates that the contact variants are the most common and the most frequent means, by which the writer tries to achieve understandability of the message. A variety of the contact variants, however, is much lower than in the case of the special-purpose borrowings. Thus, it could be concluded that the contact variants are the most characteristic means of semi-communication, writers use them with a high level of consciousness, repeating them in their communiqués, getting used to them as a means of convergence of their native language-code with the closely related language-code of the recipient. In comparison with the special-purpose borrowings, which number is in our research much higher, the contact variants are embedded in the linguistic consciousness of the writer to a higher degree (they are repeated more often in messages), while the application of the special-purpose borrowings derives more from the extra-linguistic reality that consequently motivates the writer, therefore they are repeated in SMS texts relatively much less.

Both Polish and Czech authors of SMS messages used elements of the Silesian dialect, which is used on both sides of the Czech-Polish state borders. Based on the analysis, we believe that the respondents did not know the dialect actively, but passive knowledge of some elements of the dialect are skilfully exploited in their text messages. Some elements of the dialect mingle with the contact variants.

Four different quotation expressions were used in the researched semi-communications four times. However, it is significant that the quotation expressions are a popular means of single-coded Czech-Czech communication. Influence of the Polish language environment supported, even openly instigated the Czech communicants to speed up the communication with one another, simplified it and made it more straightforward. The reason was to save space and time while writing the messages (shorter lexemes) and more explicit denotation (identification of an object or phenomenon in the Polish language environment).

### 3.2

Selected and categorized language means of the researched texts shows that their application was mostly intentional. The purpose of their use has been improvement and transparency of the text messages. We recognize, however, that in some messages presented here, some of the language elements were used unconsciously and as such, they fall into a category of linguistic transfers (negative). In other SMS

messages, Czech-Slovak and Slovak-Czech, lexemes or phrases to beautify/enrich the communication were used. However, it cannot be explicitly backed up, that application of such a linguistic phenomenon was intentional. We conclude, that this is rather a transfer and not a semi-communication intent, on the basis of our own frequent participation in the West Slavic languages communication environment, where the semi-communication is realized, but also on the basis of purely linguistic analysis – structure lexeme, semantic and formal comparison to foreign languages mentioned in this writing, to equivalents in the language of the sender, and so on.

### 3.3

The semi-communication over electronic devices, especially via SMS, is a perspective area of research which indicates a new progressive phenomena in language and ability of this phenomena to assert itself in (relatively) spontaneous communication, shows the direction of development of adaptation phenomena in closely related languages, and it is good source and a means of research for convergence of the colloquial language in its written form.

## References

Braunmüller, Kurt (2007) "Receptive Multilingualism in Northern Europe in the Middle Ages: A Description of a Scenario." [In:] Ludger Zeevaert, Jan D. ten Thije (eds.) *Receptive Multilingualism. Linguistic Analyses, Language Policies and Didactic Concepts*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins; 25–47.

Budovičová, Viera (1982) "Dvojjazyková komunikácia v slovenčine a v češtine." [In:] J. Mistrik (ed.) *Studia Academica Slovaca 11. Prednášky XVIII. letného seminára slovenského jazyka a kultúry.* Bratislava: Alfa; 49–64.

Buzássyová, Klára (1993) "Kontaktové varianty a synonymá v slovenčine a češtine." [In:] *Jazykovedný časopis* 38 (2); 92–107.

Gooskens, Charlotte (2006) "Linguistic and Extra-Linguistic Predictors of Inter-Scandinavian Intelligibility." [In:] Jeroen van de Weijer, Bettelou Los (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 101–113.

Greń, Zbigniew (2008) "Dialog językowo mieszany na pograniczu wirtualnym słowiańskich języków blisko spokrewnionych." [In:] Irena Masojć, Romuald Naruniec (eds.) *Tożsamość na styku kultur*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Pedagoginis Universitetas; 316–328.

Greń, Zbigniew (2011) "Tożsamość na pograniczu blisko spokrewnionych etnosów – przypadek w trójkącie polsko-czesko-słowackim." [In:] Jan Machnik, Irena Stawowy-Kawka (eds.) *Prace Komisji Środkowoeuropejskiej*. PAU XIX; 57–71.

Haugen, Einar (1966) "The Language Gap in Scandinavia." [In:] *Sociological Inquiry* XXXVI (2); 280–297.

Horecký, Jan (1979) "Vymedzenie štandardnej formy slovenčiny [Starting points for a theory of standard language]." [In:] *Slovenská reč roč* 44 (4); 221–227.

Hrbáček, Josef (1971) "Citátové výrazy a jiné periferní lexikální prvky cizího původu v slovní zásobě češtiny." [In:] *Slovo a slovesnost* 32 (1); 26–34.

Lipowski, Jarosław (2005) *Konvergence a divergence češtiny a slovenštiny v československém státě*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Lipowski, Jarosław (2012) "Paralele w semikomunikacji użytkowników języków północnogermańskich i zachodniosłowiańskich." [In:] *Slavia Occidentalis* 69; 147–156.

Lipowski, Jarosław (2013a) "Semikomunikace mezi uživateli západoslovanských jazyků." [In:] Oldřich Richterek, Miroslav Půža (eds.) *Dialog kultur VII*. Hradec Králové: Pedagogická fakulta UHK. Garamon; 11–19.

Lipowski, Jarosław (2013b) "Półkomunikacja w przypadku pokrewnych języków na przykładzie Polaków, Czechów i Słowaków." [In:] Dorota Siwor (ed.) *Czuli barbarzyńscy. O kulturze czeskiej w XX wieku*. Bielsko-Biała: Kolegium Nauczycielskie; 103–111.

Mooberg, Jens, Charlotte Gooskens, John Nerbonne, Nathan Vaillette (2007) *Conditional Entropy Measures Intelligibility among Related Languages. Proceedings of the 17th Meeting of Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: LOT; 51–66).

Morel, Étienne, Claudia Bucher, Simona Pekarek-Doehler, Beat Siebenhaar (2014) "SMS Communication as Plurilingual Communication. Hybrid Language Use as a Challenge for Classical Code-Switching Categories." [In:] Louise-Amélie Cougnon, Cédrick Fairon (eds.) *SMS Communication: A Linguistic Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 111–139.

Nábělková, Mira (2008) *Slovak and Czech in Contact: The Continuation of the Story*. Praha: Veda.

Tworek, Artur (2010) *Redundanzmechanismen im Deutschen an ausgewählten Beispielen aus der Phonetik und aus der Morphologie*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Zábranský, Lukáš (2012/2013) "K jazykové stránce deseti projevů Václava Klause u příležitosti státního svátku České republiky." [In:] *Čestinář* 23 (5); 129–141.

Zeevaert, Ludger (2007) "Receptive Multilingualism and Inter-Scandinavian Semicommunication." [In:] Ludger Zeevaert, Jan D. ten Thije (eds.) *Receptive Multilingualism. Linguistic Analyses, Language Policies and Didactic Concepts*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins; 103–135.