

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

André Thibault and Nicholas LoVecchio

Subject: Historical Linguistics, History of Linguistics, Language Families/Areas/Contact

Online Publication Date: Aug 2020 DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.462

Summary and Keywords

The Romance languages have been involved in many situations of language contact. While language contact is evident at all levels, the most visible effects on the system of the recipient language concern the lexicon.

The relationship between language contact and the lexicon raises some theoretical issues that are not always adequately addressed, including in etymological lexicography. First is the very notion of what constitutes “language contact.” Contrary to a somewhat dated view, language contact does not necessarily imply physical presence, contemporaneity, and orality: as far as the lexicon is concerned, contact can happen over time and space, particularly through written media. Depending on the kind of extralinguistic circumstances at stake, language contact can be induced by diverse factors, leading to different forms of borrowing.

The misleading terms *borrowings* or *loans* mask the reality that these are actually adapted imitations—whether formal, semantic, or both—of a foreign model. Likewise, the common Latin or Greek origins of a huge proportion of the Romance lexicon often obscure the real history of words. As these classical languages have contributed numerous technical and scientific terms, as well as a series of “roots,” words coined in one Romance language can easily be reproduced in any other. However, simply reducing a word’s etymology to the origin of its components (classic or otherwise), ignoring intermediate stages and possibly intermediating languages in the borrowing process, is a distortion of word history. To the extent that it is useful to refer to “internationalisms,” related words in different Romance languages merit careful, often arduous research in the process of identifying the actual origin of a given coining. From a methodological point of view, it is crucial to distinguish between the immediate lending language and the oldest stage that can be identified, with the former being more relevant in a rigorous approach to comparative historical lexicology.

Concrete examples from Ibero-Romania, Gallo-Romania, Italo-Romania, and Balkan-Romania highlight the variety of different Romance loans and reflect the diverse historical factors particular to each linguistic community in which borrowing occurred.

1. Romance Languages and Language Contact: A Short Historical Overview

Romance languages are the modern representatives of the evolution of spoken Latin (also called *proto-Romance*, from a comparatist point of view). Given the extension of the territories in which these languages are spoken, both in Europe (often referred to as '*Romania (vetus)*') and overseas (covering an area referred to as '*Romania Nova*'), it is no surprise that they experienced a great deal of language contact, both intra- and extra-Romance. While language contact may lead to various types of linguistic change, this article focuses on lexical borrowings (or *loanwords*) in the following four main Romance blocks: Ibero-Romania (Galician/Portuguese, Castilian, Catalan, etc.); Gallo-Romania (French and *oïl* dialects, Francoprovençal, Occitan and Gascon); Italo-Romania; and Balkan-Romania.

The coming-of-age of Romance languages as “high” languages (in the diglossic scheme of Ferguson, 1959) slowly started with the first written documentation, which dates back to only slightly before the beginning of the second millennium. Therefore, the lexical consequences of language contact that took place in the first millennium (most notably, Germanic influences on the genesis of Romance languages) will not be addressed here.

2. Language Contact and the Lexicon: Theoretical Issues

This section deals with the definition of language contact and lexical borrowings, the problem of false Hellenisms and Latinisms, internationalisms, and the difference between so-called near and remote etymologies.

2.1 What Is “Language Contact”?

A somewhat dated conception of language contact sees it as a situation in which “deux langues . . . sont parlées en même temps dans une même communauté, et à des titres divers par les mêmes individus [two languages are spoken at the same time in a given community, and in various ways, by the same individuals]” (Mounin, 1974, p. 82 (our translation)). In fact, as far as loanwords are concerned, it is not necessary to limit the discussion to spoken language, nor is it necessary to assume that all speakers of a given speech community must be fluent in both languages for “contact” to happen (see Hoffman, 1991, pp. 11–32; Mackey, 1976; Thomason, 2010).

The modern study of loanwords coincides with the larger question of language contact.¹ While seminal works by Haugen (1950) and Weinreich (1953) still form the basis of most theoretical discussions of loanwords, these authors focused primarily on the synchronic

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

effects of language contact in bilingual communities. The same is true for many significant contributions that followed within a sociolinguistic perspective (see Poplack, 2018, for an overview). Some scholars attempted to redress the bias toward synchronic oral studies by reasserting the importance of diachronic approaches—starting, for Romance languages, with Goddard (1969, 1976, 1977) and Hope (1962, 1963, 1971)—but an adequate theoretical integration of both sociolinguistic and philological approaches remains lacking (see LoVecchio, 2018). This is regrettable, since many lexical borrowings are first introduced in each language via translations or other written sources—a fact yet widely acknowledged by etymological lexicographers.

A promising question is to ask *how* languages come into contact. Three main scenarios are discussed in the next subsections: language contact induced by population movements, by geographic proximity, and by cultural influence.

2.1.1 Language Contact Induced by Population Movements

The first thing that language contact suggests is the movement of people across the globe. Due to exploration, conquests, colonization, or just emigration, such movements usually have major consequences on the languages at stake, eventually leading to, in the most extreme cases, language attrition and language death—but they can also simply result in lexical borrowing.

In the Romance world, the two most significant events involving massive population movements, just after the Germanic invasions, were the Arab takeover of the Iberian Peninsula (resulting in almost eight centuries of presence) and the Slavic penetration into the Balkans, which definitively separated the Romanian language from the rest of the Romance-speaking countries. Consequently, Ibero-Romance and Balkan-Romance languages have been subject to the influence of, respectively, Arabic and Slavic.

The colonization of the New World, followed by the sinister tragedy of slavery, also led to massive population movements. Romance languages ended up being in contact with Native American languages, but also with imported African languages, and later with North American English. A second wave of colonization, in the 20th century, brought French and Portuguese to the African continent, giving rise to Africanized varieties of these languages, strongly influenced by African languages.

Finally, the more recent phenomenon of immigration in large metropolitan areas in Europe has created the conditions for further linguistic transfer. This could also be said, for example, of Italian communities in big cities outside Europe (e.g., Buenos Aires, São Paulo, or New York), which contributed many words to, respectively, Argentinian Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, and American English.

2.1.2 Language Contact Induced by Geographic Proximity

Contact can also happen due to geographic proximity or to satisfy commercial, religious, and/or political needs.

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

The distance between languages that come into contact can range from closely related dialects to idioms that have nothing in common genetically, even though they can be close neighbors. Though lexical borrowings from very distant languages tend to stand out the most, borrowings between neighboring dialects and *regiolects* (regional varieties of standardized languages)—while far less visible—account for a significant part of the borrowed lexical stock. In a diglossic situation, lexical transfers between a *Dachsprache* (a “roof” or “umbrella” language, Kloss, 1987) and the less prestigious dialects with which it coexists are particularly frequent. In the Romance world, French, for instance, has adopted and adapted a large number of lexical items that initially belonged to the so-called *patois* (primary Gallo-Romance dialects); conversely, the patois also borrowed massively from French—even though this aspect of the phenomenon is far less studied (see Chambon, 2009 and Kristol, 2009).

2.1.3 Language Contact Induced by Cultural Influence

Since the invention of writing, the influence of a given language has been able to spread throughout time and space and is not determined by proximity. Other inventions, such as print, radio, cinema, television, and the Internet, have made it possible for certain languages to exert their influence regardless of any geographical considerations. Typically, this influence is observed in languages that are the vehicle of a prominent or powerful culture.

As far as loanwords by cultural influence are concerned, translations have traditionally been the main means of transmission (see Lépinette, 1998). To begin with, European languages owe a considerable amount of their lexical stock to Latin and Ancient Greek: during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, every literary, philosophical, or scientific text from antiquity had to be translated, and lexical equivalents were coined. The easiest way was to keep the Latin (or Greek) word and to adapt it superficially. It is not always acknowledged that Latinisms are actual borrowings, but even though Romance languages descended from Latin, a word like *cubitus* (‘ulna’) was at first a foreign body in French and had to be adapted to the linguistic system of that language in order for it to function properly. It is not pronounced the way it was in Latin, nor does it have any declension or inflection. Importantly, Latin and Ancient Greek often acted as intermediaries between Arabic or Hebrew and Romance languages (for instance, in translations of astronomy or algebra treatises, or the Bible).

Some “vulgar” languages soon became as influential as their ancient predecessors. The influence of Italian during the Renaissance was so overwhelming that it even caused a backlash against Italianisms in France (e.g., Estienne in Balsamo, 1992; Smith, 1980). Resistance against what is perceived to be an invasion of foreign words is a very common phenomenon; French influence in Spain during the Enlightenment led to the exact same outcome (e.g., Capmany in Étienvre, 1988), not to mention the French reactions against English borrowings in the 20th century (e.g., Étiemble, 1964). However, rejection of loanwords is not the only possible outcome. Romanian, for example, borrowed an enormous number of French words in the 19th and 20th centuries, but the fact that this was seen as a conscious strategy to make Romanian “more Latin” again—a phenomenon called

re-Romanization—seems to have weakened resistance against the French influence (even though some resistance did exist; see Sora, 2006, p. 1730). Spanish also left its imprint on the vocabulary of most European languages, particularly as the main vector for the introduction of Amerindianisms, and without strong resistance. The influence can also remain invisible: in the 19th and 20th centuries, German science imposed itself on the world by means of its terminology (see Roegiest, 2006A, p. 1693); a significant stock of supposedly “international” scientific terms are actually adaptations of words that were initially coined in German, even though etymological and general dictionaries are not sufficiently aware of it (see, for instance, Rainer, 2001). The English language is also, of course, the source of numerous borrowings in the Romance languages, both visible and invisible, a phenomenon that started in the 18th century but reached astronomical heights in the 20th (for recent overviews, see Fischer & Pułaczewska, 2008; Görlach, 2001, 2002). The influence and prestige of English are so strong that many languages have even invented *pseudo-Anglicisms* (see Furiassi & Gottlieb, 2015). Russian is far less important as a lending language, but Romanian has a few hundred words of Russian origin (Buchi, 2010, p. 535).

2.2 What Is a (Lexical) Borrowing?

The term *borrowing* is a metaphor which tends to obscure the fact that so-called borrowings or loans are actually neologisms in a given language, coined as adapted imitations of a foreign model, and display a series of differences—whether phonetic, morphological, semantic, or pragmatic—compared with their model. Even though many loanwords look very similar to, if not the same as, their written model in the source language, there is no such thing as a borrowing without adaptation. The naive view that some borrowed words are “the same” in both source and target languages is due to the overwhelming prominence granted to the written code in many societies.

Let’s consider the example of French *comité* > Spanish *comité*. A quick, superficial look at this loanword could lead to the interpretation that it shows no adaptation. However, the French phoneme /e/ and the Spanish phoneme /e/ at the end of *comité* are two different realities, under the perspective that a phoneme is a set of distinctive features that exists only within a given, language-specific system of oppositions. French /e/ is a /+mid-high/, /+oral/, and /-labial/ phoneme because it is distinguished from /ɛ/, /ẽ/ and /ø/; such phonological features do not apply to Spanish /e/, which is front and mid. Moreover, Spanish polysyllabic words are necessarily stressed on a given syllable—a prosodic feature not shared by French. Stressing French *comité* on the first or second syllable might sound strange, but it would not turn it into a different word; in Spanish, different stress would transform it into another lexical item (already existing or not). As far as morphology is concerned, the plural form *comités* would be pronounced with final [es] in Spanish but final [e] in French (regardless of the spelling). And, finally, a distributional analysis of *comité* in both languages would certainly show semantic and pragmatic differences. In short, a loanword is a new coining in every aspect.

Now the question to answer concerns the kind of adaptation which is at work. There are many existing typologies, and it is outside the scope of this article to list them and evaluate their respective qualities.² Here, it is simply necessary to stress the importance of morphological adaptation among intra-Romance borrowings. Words coined using elements of Greek or Latin origin can easily be reproduced from one Romance language to another since equivalents for all classical morphemes exist across these languages (e.g., French *négritude* [Lat. NEGR(O) 'black' + -ITUDO, abstract suffix] > Spanish *negritud*). The resulting word looks native, its pronunciation and grammatical integration present no problem, and its "foreign" origin is invisible. This invisibility can be a problem for etymologists, as the next section will show.

2.3 "False" Hellenisms and Latinisms

Words made up of Greek or Latin morphemes look like native Romance words. They could have been coined in any given Romance language without necessarily following a foreign (Romance) model. It is necessary to study a word's first attested uses (including dates, meanings, presence in translations, and other pertinent factors) in order to trace its actual origin and the path it took thereafter. To offer an example, let us consider how metric system terminology has been handled by Spanish lexicography, in the Real Academia's *Diccionario de la lengua española*, or DRAE. Spanish *metro* ('meter') is presented there as being of Greek origin: "Del gr. μέτρον, *métron* 'medida'". While this might be true for French *mètre*, in fact, Spanish *metro* is a late (1852) adaptation of the French word rather than a direct loan from Greek. French *mètre* first appeared a few years after the French Revolution (1791, TLF), with a much more precise meaning than just 'medida' ('measure'). The various editions of the DRAE interpret the whole metric system terminology in terms of Greek or Latin morphemes, thus relegating French lexical genealogy to invisibility. By contrast, the Italian dictionary Zingarelli, 2018 (Cannella & Lazzarini, 1993) acknowledges that Italian *metro* comes from fr. *mètre*, as well as *chilogrammo* from fr. *kilogramme*, and so on.

2.4 So-Called "Internationalisms" and "Multiple Etymologies": Reality, or Easy Way Out?

Many lexical types have equivalents in most European languages, a phenomenon sometimes referred to as *internationalisms* (see Wexler, 1969; Braun, Schaefer & Volmert, 2003 is the fullest treatment to date). While this denomination might be valid synchronically, a diachronic approach must identify the various pathways taken by related neologisms in different languages by analyzing a set of clues, both external (e.g., translations) and internal (i.e., formal and semantic characteristics). Some reference works will sometimes talk of "multiple etymologies" as they attempt to identify the exact origin of a given word in each language.

To show that "multiple etymologies," though by no means frequent, are not an impossible scenario, let us consider the following example. French *aromathérapie* (attested since 1926; see Thibault, 2009A, p. 115) became *aromaterapia* in Peninsular Spanish (attested

only since 1993 and synchronically interpreted by the Real Academia as a compound of “gr. ἄρωμα *árōma* ‘aroma’ y -*terapia*”). It is clearly a Gallicism in this variety of Spanish. But when the same word is found in a Miami newspaper (*El Nuevo Herald*, March 28, 1997 < CREA), the chances are good that the word in this particular cultural and geographical context was modeled after English *aromatherapy* (itself a borrowing of the French word), first documented in 1949 (OED online).

2.5 “Etimologia prossima” vs. “remota”: How Far Back Do We Go?

Dictionaries often skip steps in the etymological information they provide, going back to the oldest language that can be documented for a given lexical item, without acknowledging the importance of intermediate stages that must be taken into account in order to understand the formal and semantic properties of a given loanword (see Durkin, 2009, §5.2). A good example of this is the French word *slip* ‘underwear (briefs, panties)’ (attested since 1913, see TLF s.v. *slip*), originally an adaptation of English *slip* in the compound *bathing slips* ‘bathing-drawers’ (1904, OED s.v. *slip*³, II.4.f.), without any direct semantic link to the much more common English meaning ‘an article of women’s attire, formerly an outer garment, later worn under a gown of lace or similar material’ (1904, OED s.v. *slip*³, II.4.c.). The fame and commercial success of the French fashion industry led this word to be disseminated with its French meaning in many other European languages, but (etymological) dictionaries systematically give English *slip* as the etymon, not realizing that this word in modern English refers to a different reality.

For example, (European) Portuguese dictionaries propose only an English origin for this loan: “Do ingl. *slip*” (Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, 2001, s.v. *slipe*); “Do inglês *to slip*, «deslizar»” (GDLP; Teixeira, 2010, s.v. *slip*). These sources give no indication that the meaning of the Portuguese word can be explained only by the existence of the French cognate. Likewise, for Italian: “vc. ingl., da *to slip* ‘scivolare, scorrere’, propr. ‘indumento che s’infila con facilità’; 1935” (Zingarelli, 2018, s.v. *slip*). As for Spanish, it is reassuring to find that the latest edition of the DRAE (2014) finally recognizes the intermediate French etymon—“Voz fr., y esta del ingl. *slip* ‘combinación, enagua’” (“French word, from Engl. *slip* ‘combinación, enagua’”)—unlike previous editions, which had attributed it solely to English. Further examples of this phenomenon can be found in Spence (2004).

3. Linguistic Areas: Bibliographic Overview and Examples

Romance languages owe a very significant portion of their lexical stock to Latin (see Reinheimer Rîpeanu, 2004, for a general outline; Bustos Tovar, 2006, and Dworkin, 2012, for Ibero-Romance, Bork, 2006, for Gallo-Romance, Ernst, 2006, for Italo-Romance and Schlösser, 2006B, for Balkan-Romance; Schlösser, 2006A, for Hellenisms). The reverse is also true: Medieval Latin was strongly influenced by vernacular languages (see Goulet, 2009, on Gallicisms in Medieval Latin). On the other hand, the stock of loanwords of Romance origin in non-Romance languages is huge, too: the English language, for one, owes a ma-

major debt to Latin and Medieval French in the construction of its lexicon (see Durkin, 2009, 2014; Trotter, 2009; cf. Schultz, 2012, for modern Gallicisms in English; see article “Romance in Contact with Germanic”).

The remaining sections provide a brief overview of the most important categories of loanwords in the Romance-speaking world: Ibero-Romania (Section 3.1.); Gallo-Romania (Section 3.2.); Italo-Romania (Section 3.3.); Balkan-Romania (Section 3.4.). (Each section will treat borrowings from different language groups separately and provide major bibliographical references and a few examples.)

3.1 Ibero-Romania

The Ibero-Romance languages, which can be divided into three main groups: Galician/Portuguese (Section 3.1.1); Spanish (Section 3.1.2.); Catalan (Section 3.1.3), were first strongly affected by intensive contact with Arabic due to eight centuries of presence in the Peninsula (see Montero Muñoz, 2006, for an overview); Occitan and French influence is as old as the *Camino francés* (Way of Saint James) pilgrimage route to Santiago de Compostela. Later, other European languages (Italian, German, English) would leave their imprint on Ibero-Romance vocabulary through cultural influence. The exportation of Spanish to the New World resulted in a considerable stock of words of Amerindian origin that spread from Spanish to other European languages. In the 19th and 20th centuries, as Spanish was spoken more and more in the so-called bilingual regions—Galicia, Basque Country, Catalonia—new borrowings arose through language contact. Likewise, Spanish inherited Italianisms in Argentina and Anglicisms in the United States.

Approximately half of all Arabic loanwords are common to all three major Ibero-Romance languages (Benarroch, 2010, p. 560), but some occur only in one of them (cf. Portuguese *alface* ‘salad’, Sp. *alubia* ‘bean’); many show agglutination of the Arabic article *a(l)-*, but less frequently in Catalan (Port. *armazém*, Sp. *almacén*, but Cat. *magatzem* ‘store’; Port. *açucar*, Sp. *azúcar*, but Cat. *sucre* ‘sugar’). Scholars have been very busy trying to explain regional differences in the adaptation of Arabic loanwords. The in-depth work of Winet (2001, 2006) focuses primarily on the role of the article in Ibero-Romance Arabic loanwords and the factors that might have triggered its agglutination. The most authoritative work on Arabic etymologies in these languages is Corriente’s *Diccionario de arabismos y voces afines en iberorromance* (1999; see Colón, 2000, for a review); for a more recent reference work restricted to Portuguese, see Alves (2013).

3.1.1 Galician/Portuguese

Spanish influence on Galician has been constant and decisive throughout its history due to the political annexation of Galicia. Portuguese, by contrast, has been far less influenced by Spanish, even though hundreds of words can be interpreted as Hispanisms—some of them used only in border areas or in Brazil (see Schmid, 2006, p. 1787).

French influence on Portuguese started in the Middle Ages (along with Occitan at that point in time) and has never really stopped (see Schmid, 2006, pp. 1794–1795). French

borrowings in technical or scientific fields are quite common in Portuguese and often co-exist with corresponding loanwords in Spanish (Messner, 2001) and many other languages. For example, Portuguese dictionaries readily acknowledge French genealogy when it comes to the metric system, contrary to the practice of Spanish dictionaries: “Quilómetro. [De *quil(o)*- + *metro*, atr. do fr. [= through Fr.] *kilomètre*.]” (NDLP). Strictly Portuguese Gallicisms are far less frequent but attested all the same (*abajur* ‘lampshade’ < Fr. *abat-jour*; *chapéu* ‘hat’ < Fr. *chapeau*; *batom* ‘lipstick’ < Fr. *bâton* [*de rouge à lèvres*]). Italianisms in semantic fields such as music or gastronomy are obviously as frequent in Portuguese as they may be in any other Romance language, but more interesting is the existence of slang words of Italian origin in Brazilian colloquial language (Meo Zilio, 1983) due to Italian immigration in the 19th and 20th centuries. Contact between speakers of Spanish and Portuguese in northern Uruguay, close to the Brazilian border, has given birth to a mixed code called *Portuñol* by its speakers (see Lipski, 2009).

Numerous dictionaries give lists of “foreign words” in Portuguese: Alves (2000); Machado (1994); Neves Simas (2016); Rodrigues (2009); Telles Dias Teixeira (2008); Terra, de Nicola, & Menón (2003). Some specialize in borrowings of German and (more so) English origin (Schmidt-Radefeldt & Schurig, 1997; Soares dos Santos, 2006). Buchi (2010) provides exhaustive information on Portuguese borrowings of Russian origin (many of which transited through French).

In the New World, Portuguese encountered Native American languages, resulting in a considerable stock of loanwords (e.g., *meruim* ‘mosquito’ < Tupi-Guarani, *Lingua Geral meru-i*). The importation of African slaves also had linguistic consequences and led to numerous borrowings from African languages (e.g., *quilombo* ‘remote hiding place of fugitive slaves’ < Kimbundu *kilombo*). The most authoritative work on both topics is still Friederici (1947), which provides an abundance of historical data. Some Portuguese words of Amerindian (*piranha*) or African (*banana*) origin have spread to many other European languages (see article “Spanish-Based Creole Languages” in this encyclopedia).

3.1.2 Spanish

Spanish has always been in close contact with the other languages of the Iberian Peninsula; the other major European languages have also left their imprint on its lexicon (see Dworkin, 2012, for an in-depth presentation). Portuguese influence on Spanish is very old, but not always easy to identify; see Dworkin (2017) for a methodological discussion. On the influence of Galician on regional Spanish in Galicia, see García (1976, 1986), Abuín Soto (1977), and Mas (1999). Regional Spanish of the Canary Islands was partially built on a Portuguese substrate; a considerable number of regionalisms in the archipelago are of “Luso” origin (e.g., *fechar* ‘to close’ < Port. *fechar*) (see Corbella, 2017; Corrales & Corbella, 2013; and Lüdtke, 2017). This influence was exported to the New World (see Corbella & Fajardo, 2017; Granda, 1978 on the Portuguese lexical legacy in Latin-American Spanish).

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

Borrowings from Basque are as old as the Spanish language itself and appear in basic lexical fields (e.g., *izquierdo* 'left', DCECH, Corominas, & Pascual, 1980–1991; see article "Romance in Contact with Basque"), but regional Spanish in the Basque Country displays a number of Basquisms that are not necessarily used in the rest of the country (see Etxebarria, 1988; Zárata, 1976).

Catalan is the second most spoken language in Spain. Its influence on Spanish is very old (see Colón, 1967B, 1968, for a historical overview). In more recent years, influence has been growing, due to high rates of bilingualism in Catalonia, the Valencia region, and the Balearic Islands. Badia i Margarit (1978), Casanovas Català (1996A), and Sinner (2004) treat the subject for Cataluña as a whole, but many publications focus on a particular zone: Barcelona (Kailuweit, 1996; Vann, 2001; Wesch, 1992), Valencia (Casanova, 1996), Mallorca (Moll, 1961), Lleida (Casanovas Català, 1996B), or Aragón (Fort Cañellas, 1987).

Outside the Peninsula, French is by far the language that has exerted the most decisive influence on the Spanish lexicon, from the Middle Ages to the 21st century; see Forest (1916) on the oldest borrowings (12th and 13th centuries) and Pottier (1967) for a broad historical overview (as well as Colón, 1967A, 1968, on Occitanisms, for a more complete view of the influence of medieval Gallo-Romance on Ibero-Romance). The importation of Gallicisms reached its peak in the 18th century, when French was dominant everywhere among European elites and French novels as well as scientific treatises were translated in great numbers yet without due care. This triggered a strong purist backlash (see Étiennevre, 1988; Rubio, 1937 on Capmany), of which the famous dictionary by Baralt (1855, 1874) is the most visible representative. Baralt's dictionary seems to have had an inhibitory effect, as inventories of Gallicisms in Spanish started reappearing only at the very end of the 20th century (with the exception of a few doctoral theses, such as Iriñiz Casás, 1957 or Krohmer, 1967). Varela Merino (2009), a rich, exhaustive source of 16th- and 17th-century Spanish Gallicisms, challenges the idea that the Siglo de Oro (Golden Age) was a rather poor period for French borrowings in Spanish. Curell Aguilà (2009) gives a very up-to-date portrait of Gallicisms in contemporary Peninsular Spanish. García Yebra (1999) compiled the only dictionary that deals specifically with "morphological" and "prosodic" influence. The author examines formal irregularities in order to determine whether a given neologism built on the model of Latin or Ancient Greek morphemes has undergone French influence. For instance, Sp. *solidaridad* is not the expected outcome of Sp. *solidario* + *-edad*, which would have given **solidariedad* (cf. Port. *solidariedade* and It. *solidarietà*); it is merely an adaptation of Fr. *solidarité* (on this important work and some of its flaws, see Thibault, 2009B). It would be naive to think that all Spanish-speaking countries share the same Gallicisms; on specifically Latin-American French loanwords, see, for instance, Perl (1981) and Sala, Munteanu, Neagu, and Şandru-Olteanu (1982).

Italian has also exerted a constant influence on Spanish vocabulary, albeit less so than French; see Terlingen (1943) for a historical panorama and Formisano (2006) for a more recent overview. Rainer (2005, 2011) offers detailed case studies of specific Italianisms. Once again, it must be stressed that Latin America has borrowings of its own, particularly in Argentina, due to intensive Italian immigration in the 19th and 20th centuries (some

examples from Gobello, 1988: *canzoneta* ‘Neapolitan folk song’, *minestrón*, *-one* ‘kind of soup’, *se me ne frega* ‘I couldn’t care less’). A particular variety of colloquial Río de la Plata Spanish, *Lunfardo* (see Gobello, 1994), has incorporated a good deal of Italian words (standard or regional), such as *manyar* ‘to eat’ (< It. *mangiare*), some of which have become common elements of the lexicon. The most extreme case of Italian-Spanish contact can be found in *Cocoliche* (see Anecchiarico, 2012; and Schmid, 2006, p. 1798), which emerged in the speech of Italian immigrants in the early 20th century and has been represented in many theatrical texts (see Engels, 2012; and Golluscio de Montoya, 1979).

A long history of commercial contact with Flanders and Holland, as well as Spanish military occupation of Flanders in the 16th and 17th centuries, explains the existence of a number of Dutch loanwords in Spanish—even though a number of them transited through French (see Roegiest, 2006B).

In modern times, borrowings from English have become increasingly frequent (see, e.g., Alfaro, 1970; Lorenzo, 1996; Medina López, 2004; Pratt, 1980; Rodríguez González, 2017). The influence of the United States in Latin-American countries—where proximity and familial ties due to recent emigration have made the influence of English much more conspicuous than in Spain—has accounted for a substantial number of Anglicisms specific to that context (see Detjen, 2017). One excellent example is the difference between European Spanish *ordenador* (< Fr. *ordinateur* ‘computer’) and Latin-American Spanish *computador(a)* (< Engl. *computer*; DiccAmer, 2010). In the United States, intensive contact between both languages has led to the emergence of a mixed code usually referred to (and often derisively) as *Spanglish* (see Otheguy, 2008; Stavans, 2008).

Slavisms are far less numerous in Spanish, but an exhaustive inventory of Russian loanwords (many of which came through French) can be found in Buchi (2010).

The oldest Spanish borrowing from a Native American language is as old as the “discovery” of America itself: *canoa* ‘canoe’ (< Arawak) first appears in Christopher Columbus’s diary in 1492 (Friederici, 1947; DCECH, Corominas & Pascual, 1980–1991; see article “Spanish in Contact with South-American Languages, with Special Emphasis on Andean and Paraguayan Spanish”). Many other Amerindianisms (such as *tomate* ‘tomato’, *patata* ‘potato’, *maís* ‘corn’, etc.) soon spread to other European languages. However, some countries also have borrowings all their own, for example, Mexican Spanish *escuintle* ‘mongrel dog; (fig.) child’ (< Aztec *itzcuintli*).

3.1.3 Catalan

The literature on borrowings in Catalan is not as comprehensive as for Spanish, but two relatively recent dictionaries stand out: Barri i Masats (1999) for Gallicisms and Gómez Gane (2012) for Italianisms.

The English occupied the island of Menorca from 1708 to 1802. Badia i Margarit (1953, p. 280) explains: “During this time contact between the English officials and the inhabitants of the island was friendly and therefore rather close and resulted in the adoption of many anglicisms . . . conveniently adapted to the phonetics of Catalan”; this article treats

them from a phonetic and semantic point of view. Ortells and Campos (1983) offer a more recent study on the subject and deal with historical and etymological issues. Finally, Buchi (2010) has thoroughly studied Russian loanwords in Catalan.

3.2 Gallo-Romania

In the Gallo-Romance context, lexical transfers between French and its closest cousins—*oïl*, Francoprovençal and Occitan dialects—have played an important role in the configuration of the lexicon, as a quick look at any French etymological dictionary will confirm (*rescapé* ‘survivor’ < Picard; *barrique* ‘barrel’ < Gascon; *chalet* ‘cottage, cabin’ < Francoprovençal; see Trotter, 2006, pp. 1780–1783, on Occitan loanwords in French). Gallo-Romance dialects have also borrowed many French words, but scholarship on this topic is much rarer (see Chambon, 2009, and Kristol, 2009, about French influence on, respectively, Occitan and Francoprovençal).

Loanwords from one regional French variety to another are also notable (e.g., *bardjaquer* ‘to chat’ originated in southeastern France but has spread to Switzerland; see DSR, Thibault, 1997). Some words originally regional in scope may undergo a process of “*déré-gionalisation*”—particularly with the help of the media—and become widely known (e.g., *quésaco?* ‘what is that?’ < Prov. *qu’es aco*, see TLF). Canadian terminologists have coined a lot of French equivalents meant to replace Anglicisms; some of them are somewhat common in European French (*courriel* ‘e-mail’), but Canada’s major contribution lies in the formation of feminized forms, particularly those ending in *-eure*, which have become common in European French (see Thibault, 1996, p. 357).

French in Europe has also been in contact with close neighbors, such as Breton, Alsatian, Swiss German, or Flemish. Von Wartburg (1968, pp. 1–17) gives a list of Celtisms, mostly words of Breton origin used in French and other “*oïliques*” varieties (see Chauveau, 1986, for a critical review). Tappolet (1913) is a study of Swiss-German loanwords in Swiss French; see Knecht (2000) and Thibault (2000) for a sociolinguistic point of view. Rézeau (2015) is not, strictly speaking, a list of Alsatian borrowings in Alsatian regional French, but many of the words treated in this dictionary are actual Germanisms; the same could be said of DSR (Thibault, 1997) for Switzerland. On loans of German and Dutch origin in French, see Roegiest (2006A, 2006B); Baetens-Beardsmore (1971, 1979) treats Flemish loanwords in Belgian French (and particularly in Brussels).

As for other Romance languages, Italian has left the most significant imprint on Gallo-Romance—while simultaneously triggering the strongest backlash—although this was confined mainly to the Renaissance. See Smith (1980) for a critical edition of Estienne’s famous *Deux dialogues du nouveau langage françois italianisé*, a rebuke of the use of Italian or Italianized words. The influence of Italian was not only lexical but affected the whole literary sphere and had enemies as well as supporters (see Balsamo, 1992). For a historical overview of Italian loanwords in French, see Hope (1971; cf. Malkiel, 1975, review); for more recent surveys, see Lemaire (1984) and Stammerjohann, Arcaini, Carta-

go, and Galetto (2008). Rainer (2011, 2014) provides meticulous case studies that stand out for their impeccable research methodology.

Anglicisms are innumerable in modern French and have given rise to considerable scholarship (to cite only a few, see Höfler, 1982; Rey-Debove & Gagnon, 1980; Saugera, 2017; von Wartburg, 1967A); Anglo-American influence on the French language has also been harshly rebuked by some (see Étiemble, 1964, for a paradigmatic example). In North America, the intimate contact between French and English has resulted in numerous borrowings specific to that context; see Poirier (1978) for a historical overview and DHFQ (Poirier, 1998) for lexical monographs on numerous French-Canadian Anglicisms (*cent* 'one hundredth of a dollar', *char* 'car', *chesterfield* 'sofa', etc.). In Moncton (New Brunswick) and the surrounding area, French-English contact has given birth to a mixed code called *Chiac* (see Perrot, 2005; Thibault, 2011).

Buchi (2010) treats Russian loanwords in French exhaustively. For modern Hellenisms, see von Wartburg (1968, pp. 19–23) and Minervini (2012).

Outside Europe, French has been in contact with numerous other languages from which it has borrowed scores of terms. Arveiller (1963) is a fundamental work on the history of "*termes de voyage en français*"; von Wartburg (1967B) is dedicated to what the German tradition calls *Orientalisms* (words of Arabic, Persian, Turkish, or Hebrew origin), as is Arveiller (1999). Kiesler (2006) offers an overview of Arabisms in Gallo-Romance. Minervini (2012) is a historical study of Arab (and Greek) loanwords in the French lexicon of the eastern Mediterranean basin. Naturally, Arabisms are also treated in mainstream French lexicography (see Baiwir, 2014, on the treatment of Arabisms in the TLF); it must be stressed that these often came to French through Spanish or Italian. In North Africa, regional French varieties have Arabisms of their own, not shared by the rest of the French-speaking world. Dictionaries of North African French varieties tend to treat such lexemes with an abundance of details. Standard French has also inherited a few words of sub-Saharan African origin (von Wartburg, 1968, pp. 86–89), but dictionaries of regional African French varieties include hundreds of additional loanwords borrowed from native African languages (for a bibliography of regional French lexicography, see Thibault, 2008). Mixed codes have resulted from intensive language contact between French and African languages (such as *Nouchi*; see Boutin & Kouadio N'Guessan, 2015) or between French, English, Pidgin English, and African vernaculars (*Camfranglais*, see Eloundou Eloundou, 2015, and Féral, 1998).

French Amerindianisms are treated in Arveiller (1963), Friederici (1947), and von Wartburg (1968, pp. 55–85). North American French varieties have Amerindian loanwords of their own, many of which have received comprehensive lexicographical treatment in DHFQ (Poirier, 1998) (*caribou* 'reindeer', *carcajou* 'wolverine', *sagamité* 'Native American stew made from hominy or Indian corn and fat', etc.). A mixed language called *Mitchif* was born out of contact between French-Canadian trappers ("*coureurs de bois*") and indigenous Cree women (see Papen, 2005).

3.3 Italo-Romania

Italy's political unification came quite late, in 1861. The spread of standard Italian to all parts of the country and across social classes is a very recent phenomenon; consequently, dialects remain much more strongly rooted in Italy than in France, and so is their influence on the standard language. Some Italian words of regional origin have even become widespread in many other European languages, such as *grappa*, *mascarpone*, *osso buco*, and *panettone*, all of which are Italian adaptations of words from the Lombard dialect.

Greek influence began with Hellenisms in Latin but continued in the form of Modern Greek borrowings in Italian (see article "Greek in Contact with Romance,"; Cortelazzo, 2006).

Among Romance languages, French is the one that has exerted the strongest influence on Italian. For a historical sketch of the situation, see Bezzola (1924) and Hope (1971). Cella (2000) is a study of medieval Gallicisms based on the TLIO textual database. Ansalone and Félix (1997) offer a recent lexicographic survey. On the handling of French borrowings in the most comprehensive etymological dictionary of Italo-Romance, the *Lessico Etimologico Italiano* (LEI, still in progress; Pfister & Schweickard, 1979–), see Pfister (1997) and Lubello (2002). Thomassen (1997) and Pierno (2009) are case studies dedicated, respectively, to the vocabulary of culinary arts and dance. As elsewhere, the impact of French culminated in the 18th century (see Bernardoni, 1812, for an example of puristic backlash, and Della Valle, 1993, pp. 72–73, for a discussion of the anti-puristic reactions by lexicographers throughout the 19th century).

Spanish influence on Italo-Romance reached its peak in the 16th century, following on Spanish political expansion in Sicily and the Kingdom of Naples; see Beccaria (1985) and Formisano (2006). German borrowings are rather numerous in northern Italo-Romance dialects due to geographic proximity (Swiss cantons of Tessino and Graubünden; Südtirol) or particular political events (Austro-Hungarian Empire domination in the north), but they are far less frequent in the standard language (see Morlicchio, 2006). English loanwords are treated in Amato, Andreoni, and Salvi (1990); Klajn (1972); and Rando (1987); for Italian Russisms, see Buchi (2010). Variano (2016) provides an exhaustive study of Amerindianisms in Italo-Romance, presented in the same format as an LEI entry. Such borrowings would not have resulted from direct contact with speakers of Native American languages but mostly through translations of texts originally written in Spanish, Portuguese, or French.

3.4 Balkan-Romania

Slavic influence is tied to the very genesis of Romanian, as Slavic acted as a superstrate ("on peut dire sans exagération que l'ancien slave méridional a rempli pour le roumain le rôle que l'ancien bas francique a joué dans la constitution du français" [it would be no exaggeration to state that Old South Slavic fulfilled the same role for Romanian as Old Low Frankish did in the construction of French], Buchi, 2006, p. 1628 (our translation)). Old Church Slavonic, a variety of Old Slavic used by the Orthodox Church, was introduced in

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

the region in the 10th century and used until the mid-17th century, which resulted in a massive influence in the development of the abstract lexicon. Turkish, the language of the Ottoman Empire, also left its imprint on the Romanian lexicon (Suciu, 2006), as did Modern Greek (Dahmen, 2006).

Toward the end of the 18th century, French influence on the Romanian lexicon emerged and grew steadily, with French soon becoming the main source of lexical expansion. It is not always easy to demonstrate the French origin of a word, particularly when it comes to scholarly terms that could be Latinisms, Romanian neologisms coined out of Greek or Latin morphemes, Italianisms, Germanisms, or even Anglicisms; a number of factors have to be considered, such as morphology or oxytonic stress. Nevertheless, the percentage of Gallicisms in modern Romanian has been evaluated at almost 40% by various authors (Sora, 2006, p. 1728). On French loanwords in Romanian, see DILF (Costăchescu, Dincă, Dragoste, Popescu, & Scurtu, 2009–2010).

Italian is the second most important Romance language when it comes to loanwords in Romanian. Its influence culminated around 1800 and affected mainly technical and scientific terminology. The precise identification of Italianisms presents the same problems as with Gallicisms, as they could be interpreted as Latinisms or internationalisms of other origin.

Finally, the Soviet era resulted in a stock of Russian loanwords that were added to the already existing Slavisms (see Buchi, 2010 and Costăchescu, 2018).

Links to Digital Materials

CREA = *Corpus de referencia del español actual*, 1975–2004.

DRAE = *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*.

TLF = *Trésor de la langue française informatisé*.

TLIO = *Tesoro della Lingua Italiana delle Origini* (the textual database is **available here**).

OED = *Oxford English Dictionary*.

Further Reading

Benarroch, M. (2010). L'emprunt arabe dans l'Ibéroromania: éléments d'une synthèse. *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 74, 549–564.

Ernst, G., Glessgen, M.-D., Schmitt, C., & Schweickard, W. (Eds.). (2006). Sprachkontakte und Migration [Contacts linguistiques et migration]. In *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1558–1906). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Hickey, R. (Ed.). (2010). *The handbook of language contact*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Thibault, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Gallicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique*. Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

References

Abuín Soto, M. (1977). El castellano hablado en las Rías Bajas gallegas. *Archivum*, 21, 171-206.

Academia das Ciências de Lisboa. (2001). *Dicionário da língua portuguesa contemporânea* (DLPC 2001). 2 vols. Lisbon, Portugal: Verbo.

Alfaro, R. J. (1970). *Diccionario de Anglicismos* (2nd ed.). Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Alves, A. (2000). *Dicionário de expressões estrangeiras: correntes na língua portuguesa*. São Paulo, Brazil: Atlas.

Alves, A. (2013). *Dicionário de arabismos da língua portuguesa*. Edited by P. Fonseca Pimenta. Lisbon, Portugal: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda.

Amato, A., Andreoni, F. M., & Salvi, R. (1990). *Prestiti linguistici dal mondo anglofono: una tassonomia*. Rome, Italy: Bulzoni.

Anecchiarico, S. A. (2012). *Cocoliche e lunfardo: l'italiano degli argentini. Storia e lessico di una migrazione linguistica*. Milan, Italy: Mimesis.

Ansalone, M. R., & Félix, P. (1997). *I francesismi in italiano. Repertori lessicografici e ricerche sul campo*. Naples, Italy: Liguori.

Arveiller, R. (1963). *Contribution à l'étude des termes de voyage en français (1505-1722)*. Paris, France: D'Artrey.

Arveiller, R. (1999). *Addenda au FEW XIX (Orientalia)*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. (2010). *Diccionario de americanismos (DiccAmer)*. Madrid, Spain: Santillana.

Badia i Margarit, A. (1953). Anglicisms in the Catalan language of Menorca. *English Studies*, 34(6), 279-282.

Badia i Margarit, A. (1978). Notes sobre el castelláparlat per catalans. In *LlenguaiCultur-aalspaïos catalans*. Barcelona, Spain: Edicions 62.

Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (1971). *Le français régional de Bruxelles*. Brussels, Belgium: Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles.

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (1979). Les contacts des langues à Bruxelles. In A. Valdman (Ed.), *Le français hors de France* (pp. 223–247). Paris, France: Champion.

Baiwir, E. (2014). Les arabismes dans le TLF: tentative de classement historique. *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 78, 367–402.

Balsamo, J. (1992). *Italianisme et anti-italianisme dans les lettres françaises de la fin du XVI^e siècle*. Geneva, Switzerland: Slatkine.

Baralt, R. M. (1855). *Diccionario de galicismos*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Gil.

Baralt, R. M. (1874). *Diccionario de Galicismos o sea de las voces, locuciones y frases de la lengua francesa que se han introducido en el habla castellana moderna*. Madrid, Spain: Librería de Leocadio López.

Barri i Masats, M. (1999). *Aportació a l'estudi dels gallicismes del catalá*. Barcelona, Spain: Institut d'Estudis Catalans.

Beccaria, G. L. (1985). Tra Italia, Spagna e Nuovo Mondo nell'età delle scoperte: viaggi di parole. *Lettere Italiane*, 37, 177–203.

Bernardoni, G. (1812). *Elenco di alcune parole oggidì frequentemente in uso, le quali non sono ne' vocabolari italiani*. Milan, Italy: Bernardoni.

Betz, W. (1949). *Deutsch und Lateinisch: Die Lehnbildungen der althochdeutschen Benediktinerregel*. Bonn, Germany: H. Bouvier.

Bezzola, R. R. (1924). *Abbozzo di una storia dei gallicismi italiani nei primi secoli (750–1300)*. Zurich, Switzerland: A. Forni.

Bork, H. D. (2006). Sprachkontakte: Latein und Galloromania. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1582–1590). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Boutin, A. B., & Kouadio N'Guessan, J. (2015). Le nouchi c'est notre créole en quelque sorte, qui est parlé par presque toute la Côte d'Ivoire. In P. Blumenthal (Ed.), *Dynamique des français africains: entre le culturel et le linguistique* (pp. 251–271). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Braun, P., Schaefer, B., & Volmert, J. (2003). *Internationalismen II: Studien zur interlingualen Lexikologie und Lexikographie*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Buarque de Holanda Ferreira, A. (1985). *Novo Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa* (NDLP). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Nova Fronteira.

Buchi, E. (2006). Contacts linguistiques: langues slaves et langues romanes. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/His-*

toire linguistique de la Romania (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1627–1639). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Buchi, E. (2010). *Bolchevik, mazout, toundra et les autres. Dictionnaire des emprunts au russe dans les langues romanes. Inventaire, Histoire, Intégration*. Paris, France: CNRS Éditions.

Bustos Tovar, J. J. de (2006). Contactos lingüísticos: latín e Iberorromania. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1591–1600). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Cannella, M., & Lazzarini, B. (Eds.). (1993). *Vocabolario della lingua italiana di Nicola Zingarelli: Lo Zingarelli 2018* (Zingarelli 2018) (reissue of 12th ed.). Bologna, Italy: Zanichelli.

Casanova, E. (1996). El castellà de València. In A. Briz, J. Gómez & M. J. Martínez (Eds.), *Pragmática y gramática del español hablado: Actas del II Simposio sobre análisis del discurso oral* (pp. 293–298). Valencia, Spain: Universidad de Valencia.

Casanovas Català, M. (1996a). Algunos rasgos propios del español en las comunidades de habla catalana: fonética, morfosintaxis y léxico. *Analecta Malacitana*, 19(1), 149–160.

Casanovas Català, M. (1996b). El contacto lingüístico en Lleida: Algunas consecuencias en el léxico español de los catalanohablantes. *Sintagma*, 8, 57–63.

Cella, R. (2000). I gallicismi dell'italiano antico alla luce del corpus testuale del TLIO. *Bollettino dell'Opera del Vocabolario Italiano*, 5, 357–383.

Chambon, J.-P. (2009). Prolégomènes à l'étude historique des emprunts de l'occitan au français. In A. Thibault (Ed.), *Gallicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique* (pp. 45–69). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

Chauveau, J.-P. (1986). Remarques sur quelques étymons bretons du FEW. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 102, 108–124.

Colón, G. (1967a). Occitanismos. In M. Alvar, A. Badía, & R. de Balbín (Eds.), *Enciclopedia de Lingüística Hispánica* (Vol. 2, pp. 153–192). Madrid, Spain: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Colón, G. (1967b). Catalanismos. In M. Alvar, A. Badía, & R. de Balbín (Eds.), *Enciclopedia de Lingüística Hispánica* (Vol. 2, pp. 193–238). Madrid, Spain: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Colón, G. (1968). Acerca de los préstamos occitanos y catalanes del español. *ACILR*, 11(4), 1913–1925.

Colón, G. (2000). Review of Corriente (1999). *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 64, 217–220.

Corbella, D. (2017). Portuguesismos en el español canario: historia e identidad. In D. Corbella & A. Fajardo (Eds.), *Español y portugués en contacto. Préstamos léxicos e interferencias* (pp. 151–179). Berlin, Germany: Mouton De Gruyter.

Corbella, D., & Fajardo, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Español y portugués en contacto. Préstamos léxicos e interferencias*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Corominas, J., & Pascual, J. A. (1980–1991). *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico* (DCECH). 6 vols. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Corrales, C., & Corbella, D. (2013). *Diccionario Histórico del Español de Canarias (DHECan)* (2nd ed.). La Laguna, Tenerife: Instituto de Estudios Canarios.

Corriente, F. (1999). *Diccionario de arabismos y voces afines en iberorromance*. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Cortelazzo, M. (2006). Contatti linguistici: greco e italiano. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1618–1627). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Costăchescu, A. (2018). Les soviétismes en roumain et dans les langues romanes. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 134(1), 219–248.

Costăchescu, A., Dincă, D., Dragoste, R., Popescu, M., & Scurtu, G. (2009–2010). *Dicționar de împrumuturi lexicale din limba franceză (DILF)* (Vols. 1–2). Craiova, Romania: Editura Universitaria.

Curell Aguilà, C. (2009). *Diccionario de galicismos del español peninsular contemporáneo*. Edited by A. Thibault. Strasbourg, France: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.

Dahmen, W. (2006). Sprachkontakte: Griechisch und Rumänisch. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1611–1618). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Della Valle, V. (1993). La lessicografia. In L. Serianni & P. Trifone (Eds.), *Storia della lingua italiana*. Vol. I: *I luoghi della codificazione* (pp. 29–91). Turin, Italy: Einaudi.

Detjen, H. (2017). *Anglizismen in Hispanoamerika: Adoption und Integration, Nivelierung und Differenzierung*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton De Gruyter.

Durkin, P. (2009). *The Oxford guide to etymology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed words: A history of loanwords in English*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dworkin, S. (2012). *A history of the Spanish lexicon: A linguistic perspective*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dworkin, S. (2017). Algunos presuntos lusismos en el castellano medieval: cuestiones analíticas y metodológicas. In D. Corbella & A. Fajardo (Eds.), *Español y portugués en contacto. Préstamos léxicos e interferencias* (pp. 3–18). Berlin, Germany: Mouton De Gruyter.

Eloundou Eloundou, V. (2015). Camfrançais et français populaire au Cameroun: convergences et divergences du point de vue linguistique. In P. Blumenthal (Ed.), *Dynamique des français africains: entre le culturel et le linguistique* (pp. 273–286). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Engels, K. (2012). *Cocoliche als Mediensprache: die Darstellung einer Lernervarietät im Theater des Río de la Plata-Raums*. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Germany: Rombach.

Ernst, G. (2006). Sprachkontakte: Latein und Italo-romania. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1563–1582). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Étiemble, R. (1964). *Parlez-vous français?* Paris, France: Gallimard.

Étienvre, F. (Ed.). (1988). *Antonio de Capmany, Centinela contra franceses*. London, UK: Tamesis.

Etxebarria, M. (1988). Aspectos léxicos del español hablado en el País Vasco. *Letras de Deusto*, 18(40), 81–91.

Féral, C. de (1998). Français oral et “camfrançais” dans le sud du Cameroun. In A. Queffelec (Ed.), *Alternances codiques et français parlé en Afrique* (pp. 205–212). Aix-en-Provence, France: Publications de l’Université de Provence.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325–340.

Fischer, R., & Pułaczewska, H. (Eds.). (2008). *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic diversity in a global context*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Forest, J. B. de (1916). Old French borrowed words in the Old Spanish of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. *Romanic Review*, 7, 369–413.

Formisano, L. (2006). Contatti linguistici all’interno della Romània: lingue romanze e italiano, sardo. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1758–1776). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Fort Cañellas, M. R. (1987). Algunas influencias léxicas del catalán en el castellano de Aragón. In M. Ariza, A. Salvador Plans, & A. Viudas Camarasa (Eds.), *Actas del I Congre-*

so *Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española, Cáceres, 30 de marzo-4 de abril de 1987* (pp. 833-843). Madrid, Spain: Arco/Libros.

Friederici, G. (1947). *Amerikanistisches Wörterbuch*. Hamburg, Germany: Cram, de Gruyter.

Furiassi, C., & Gottlieb, H. (Eds.). (2015). *Pseudo-English: Studies on false Anglicisms in Europe*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

García, C. (1976). Interferencias lingüísticas entre gallego y castellano. *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 6(2), 327-343.

García, C. (1986). El castellano en Galicia. In M. Alvar (Ed.), *El castellano actual en las comunidades bilingües de España* (pp. 48-64). Salamanca, Spain: Junta de Castilla y León.

García Yebra, V. (1999). *Diccionario de galicismos prosódicos y morfológicos*. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Gobello, J. (1988). *Diccionario de voces extranjeras usadas en la Argentina*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Fundación Guillermo Bracht.

Gobello, J. (1994). *Nuevo diccionario lunfardo*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Corregidor.

Goddard, K. A. (1969). Loan-words and lexical borrowing in Romance. *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 33, 337-378.

Goddard, K. A. (1976). Quelques tendances et perspectives dans l'étude des mots d'emprunt dans les langues romanes. In M. Boudreault & F. Möhren (Eds.), *Actes du XIII^e Congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes, tenu à l'Université Laval (Québec: Canada) du 29 août au 5 septembre 1971* (Vol. 2, pp. 425-431). Québec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Goddard, K. A. (1977). Some linguistic considerations affecting loan-words and lexical borrowing in Romance. *Semasia*, 4, 101-114.

Golluscio de Montoya, E. (1979). *Étude sur le cocoliche scénique: et édition annotée de Matéo d'Armando Discépolo*. Toulouse: France-Ibérie Recherche.

Gómez Capuz, J. (1998). *El préstamo lingüístico. Conceptos, problemas y métodos*. Valencia, Spain: Universitat de València.

Gómez Gane, Y. (2012). *Gli italianismi nel catalano: dizionario storico-etimologico*. Rome, Italy: Aracne.

Görlach, M. (2001). *Dictionary of European Anglicisms*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Görlach, M. (2002). *English in Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

- Goulet, M. (2009). Les gallicismes du latin médiéval. In A. Thibault (Ed.), *Gallicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique* (pp. 17–44). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.
- Granda, G. de (1978). Acerca de los portuguesismos en el español de América. In G. de Granda (Ed.), *Estudios lingüísticos hispánicos, afrohispanicos y criollos* (pp. 139–156). Madrid, Spain: Gredos.
- Haspelmath, M., & Tadmor, U. (Eds.). (2009). *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
- Hoffman, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. London, UK: Longman.
- Höfler, M. (1982). *Dictionnaire des anglicismes*. Paris, France: Larousse.
- Hope, T. E. (1962). Loan-words as cultural and lexical symbols. *Archivum Linguisticum*, 14, 111–121.
- Hope, T. E. (1963). Loan-words as cultural and lexical symbols (continued). *Archivum Linguisticum*, 15, 29–42.
- Hope, T. E. (1971). *Lexical borrowing in the Romance languages: A critical study of Italianisms in French and Gallicisms in Italian from 1100 to 1900* (2 vols). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Iriñiz Casás, N. (1957). *Gallizismen in der spanischen Sprache Uruguays* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria.
- Kailuweit, R. (1996). El castellano de Barcelona en torno a 1800. La formación de un dialecto terciario. In A. Alonso González, L. Castro Ramos, B. Gutiérrez Rodilla, & J. A. Pascual Rodríguez (Eds.), *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española (Salamanca, 22–27 de noviembre de 1993)* (pp. 737–746). Madrid, Spain: Arco/Libros.
- Kiesler, R. (2006). Sprachkontakte: Arabisch und Galloromania. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1648–1655). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Klajn, I. (1972). *Influssi inglesi nella lingua italiana*. Florence, Italy: Leo S. Olschki.
- Kloss, H. (1987). Abstandsprache und Ausbausprache. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics [Soziolinguistik]* (Vol. 1, pp. 302–308). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Knecht, P. (2000). Les germanismes lexicaux dans la Suisse latine: idéologie et réalité. In D. Latin & C. Poirier (Eds.), *Contacts de langues et identités culturelles* (pp. 45–53). Québec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

Kristol, A. (2009). Contact des langues et emprunts. L'influence du français sur les parlers galloromans de la Suisse romande. In A. Thibault (Ed.), *Galicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique* (pp. 71–91). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

Krohmer, U. (1967). *Gallizismen in der spanischen Zeitungssprache (1962–1965)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universität Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany.

Lemaire, G.-G. (1984). *Italianismes*. Paris, France: C. Bourgeois.

Lépinette, B. (1998). La traduction de textes scientifiques français au XVIII^e siècle en Espagne. In M. Ballard (Ed.), *Europe et traduction* (pp. 117–136). Arras, France: Artois Presses Université.

Lipski, J. M. (2009). Searching for the origins of Uruguayan *Fronterizo* dialects: Radical code-mixing as “fluent dysfluency.” *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, 8(1), 3–44.

Lorenzo, E. (1996). *Anglicismos hispánicos*. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

LoVecchio, N. (2018). Review of Poplack (2018). *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 82, 521–525.

LoVecchio, N. (2019). *L'emprunt linguistique dans le lexique des homosexualités. Étude historique et comparative des internationalismes en français, italien, espagnol, anglais et allemand* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sorbonne Université, Paris, France.

Lubello, S. (2002). Il LEI e le parole straniere: i francesismi. In G. Holtus & J. Kramer (Eds.), *Ex traditione innovatio. Miscellanea in honorem Max Pfister septuagenarii oblata* (Vol. 2, pp. 79–89). Mainz, Germany: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

Lüdtke, J. (2017). La entrada de los portuguesismos en el español de Canarias. El testimonio de las datas de Tenerife. In D. Corbella & A. Fajardo (Eds.), *Español y portugués en contacto. Préstamos léxicos e interferencias* (pp. 181–198). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Machado, J. P. (1994). *Estrangeirismos na língua portuguesa*. Lisbon, Portugal: Notícias.

Mackey, W. (1976). *Bilinguisme et contact des langues*. Paris, France: Klincksieck.

Malkiel, Y. (1975). Review of Hope (1971). *Language*, 51(4), 962–976.

Mas, I. (1999). El intercambio de los verbos *sacar* y *quitar* en el castellano de Galicia. In R. Álvarez & D. Vilavedra (Eds.), *Cinguidos por unha arela común. Homenaxe ó profesor Xesús Alonso Montero* (Vol. 1, pp. 655–675). Santiago de Compostela, Spain: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.

Medina López, J. (2004). *El anglicismo en el español actual*. Madrid, Spain: Arco/Libros.

Meo Zilio, G. (1983). *Jergalismos italianos en la giria brasileña y su relación con el lunfardo argentino*. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Messner, D. (2001). Los caminos de las nomenclaturas: desde Francia hasta España y Portugal. In M. Bargalló Escrivà, E. F. Berdet, C. G. Escribano, A. Rubio, & J. Schnitzer (Eds.), *Las lenguas de especialidad y su didáctica: Actas del Simposio Hispano-Austriaco* (pp. 31–40). Tarragona, Spain: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Minervini, L. (2012). Les emprunts arabes et grecs dans le lexique français d'Orient (XIII^e–XIV^e siècles). *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 76, 99–198.

Moll, F. de B. (1961). El castellano en Mallorca. In *Homenaje ofrecido a Dámaso Alonso por sus amigos y discípulos con ocasión de su 60.º aniversario* (Vol. 2, pp. 469–474). Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Montero Muñoz, R. (2006). Sprachkontakte: Arabisch und Iberoromania. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1655–1667). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Morlicchio, E. (2006). Contatti linguistici: tedesco e ItaloRomania/Alpi orientali. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1677–1685). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Mounin, G. (1974). *Dictionnaire de la linguistique*. Paris, France: P.U.F.

Neves Simas, R. M. (2016). *De abajur a zumba: estrangeirismos no português = loan-words in Portuguese*. Vila Nova de Gaia, Portugal: Calendário de Letras.

Oksaar, E. (1972). Bilingualism. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current trends in linguistics*, vol. 9: *Linguistics in Western Europe* (pp. 475–511). The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton.

Ortells, V., & Campos, X. (1983). *Els Anglicismes de Menorca: estudi històric i etimològic*. Palma de Mallorca, Spain: Moll.

Otheguy, R. (2008). El llamado espanglish. In H. López-Morales (Ed.), *Enciclopedia del español en Estados Unidos* (pp. 222–247). Madrid, Spain: Instituto Cervantes.

Papen, R. A. (2005). Le mitchif: langue franco-crie des Plaines. In A. Valdman, J. Auger, & D. Piston-Hallen (Eds.), *Le français en Amérique du Nord: état présent* (pp. 327–347). Québec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Perl, M. (1981). La influencia del francés y del francés criollo en el español del Caribe. *Islas* (Santa Clara, Cuba), 68, 163–176.

Perrot, M.-È. (2005). Le chiac de Moncton: description synchronique et tendances évolutives. In A. Valdman, J. Auger, & D. Piston-Hallen (Eds.), *Le français en Amérique du Nord: état présent* (pp. 307–326). Québec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

Pfister, M. (1997). Les éléments français dans le LEI. In G. Kleiber & M. Riegel (Eds.), *Les formes du sens. Études de linguistique française, médiévale et générale offertes à Robert Martin à l'occasion de ses 60 ans* (pp. 303–311). Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium: Duculot.

Pfister, M., & Schweickard, W. (1979). *Lessico etimologico italiano* (LEI) (14 vols). Mainz, Germany: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

Pierno, F. (2009). Les gallicismes de l'italien dans le champ sémantique de la danse. In A. Thibault (Ed.), *Gallicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique* (pp. 93–106). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

Poirier, C. (1978). L'anglicisme au Québec et l'héritage français. *Travaux de Linguistique Québécoise*, 2, 43–106.

Poirier, C. (1998). *Trésor de la Langue Française au Québec: Dictionnaire historique du français québécois: monographies lexicographiques de québécismes* (DHFQ). Québec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Poplack, S. (2018). *Borrowing: Loanwords in the speech community and in the grammar*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pottier, B. (1967). Galicismos. In M. Alvar et al. (Eds.), *Enciclopedia de Lingüística Hispánica* (Vol. 2, pp. 126–151). Madrid, Spain: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Pratt, C. (1980). *El anglicismo en el español peninsular contemporáneo*. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Rainer, F. (2001). Frz. *résonateur*: ein Germanismus des 19. Jahrhunderts. *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 7, 67–70.

Rainer, F. (2005). Esp. *agio*: ¿galicismo o italianismo? *Revista de Filología Española*, 85, 113–131.

Rainer, F. (2011). "Totalitario," "totalitarismo": origine italiana e diffusione europea. *Studi di lessicografia italiana*, 28, 319–326.

Rainer, F. (2014). Le rôle de l'italien dans la formation de la terminologie cambiale française. *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 78, 57–86.

Rando, G. (1987). *Dizionario degli anglicismi nell'italiano postunitario*. Florence, Italy: Leo S. Olschki.

Reinheimer Rîpeanu, S. (2004). *Les emprunts latins dans les langues romanes*. Bucarest, Romania: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Rey-Debove, J., & Gagnon, G. (1980). *Dictionnaire des anglicismes: les mots anglais et américains en français*. Paris, France: Robert.

Rézeau, P. (2015). *L'Alsace au fil des mots. Dictionnaire des régionalismes du français en Alsace*. Strasbourg, France: Vent d'Est.

Rodrigues, S. (2009). *What língua is esta?: estrangeirismos, neologismos, lulismos e outros modismos*. Lisbon, Portugal: Gradiva.

Rodríguez González, F. (2017). *Gran diccionario de anglicismos*. Madrid, Spain: Arco/Libros.

Roegiest, E. (2006a). Contacts linguistiques: allemand/néerlandais et français. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, 1685–1695). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Roegiest, E. (2006b). Contacts linguistiques: allemand/néerlandais et ibéroroman. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, 1695–1698). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Rubio, A. (1937). *La crítica del galicismo en España (1726–1832)*. Mexico City, Mexico: UNAM.

Sala, M., Munteanu, D., Neagu Tudora, V., & Şandru-Olteanu, T. (1982). *El español de América*, vol. 1: *Léxico*. Bogotá, Colombia: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

Saugera, V. (2017). *Remade in France: Anglicisms in the lexicon and morphology of French*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Schlösser, R. (2006a). Sprachkontakte: Gelehrte Gräzismen in den romanischen Sprachen. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, 1601–1610). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Schlösser, R. (2006b). Sprachkontakte: Latein und Rumänisch. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, 1558–1563). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Schmid, B. (2006). Contactos lingüísticos interrománicos en la Península Ibérica. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, 1785–1800). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Schmidt-Radefeldt, J., & Schurig, D. (1997). *Dicionário dos anglicismos e germanismos na língua portuguesa*. Frankfurt, Germany: Teo Ferrer de Mesquita.

Schultz, J. (2012). *Twentieth century borrowings from French to English: Their reception and development*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

Sinner, C. (2004). *El castellano de Cataluña. Estudio empírico de aspectos léxicos, morfosintácticos, pragmáticos y metalingüísticos*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Smith, P. M. (1980). Critical edition of Henri Estienne, *Deux dialogues du nouveau langage François: italianizé et autrement desguizé principalement entre les courtisans de ce temps: de plusieurs nouveutez qui ont accompagné ceste nouveuté de langage: de quelques courtisanismes modernes et de quelques singularitez courtisanesques*. Geneva, Switzerland: Slatkine.

Soares dos Santos, A. (2006). *Dicionário de anglicismos: e de palavras inglesas correntes em português*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Campus.

Sora, S. (2006). Contacts linguistiques intraromans: roman et roumain. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, 1726–1736). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Spence, N. (2004). Le français véhicule des emprunts à l'anglais. *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, 68, 95–103.

Stammerjohann, H., Arcaini, E., Cartago, G., & Galetto, P. (2008). *Dizionario di italianismi: in francese, inglese, tedesco*. Florence, Italy: Accademia della Crusca.

Stavans, I. (2008). *Spanglish*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Suciu, E. (2006). Contacts linguistiques: turc et roumain. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, pp. 1673–1677). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Tappolet, E. (1913). *Die alemannischen Lehnwörter in den Mundarten der französischen Schweiz*. Basel, Switzerland: Universitäts-Buchdruckerei Friedrich Reinhardt.

Teixeira, G. (Ed.). (2010). *Grande dicionário. Língua Portuguesa (GDLP). Acordo ortográfico*. Porto, Portugal: Porto Editora.

Telles Dias Teixeira, M. (2008). *A entrada de estrangeirismos na língua portuguesa*. Lisbon, Portugal: Cosmos.

Terlingen, J. (1943). *Los italianismos en español desde la formación del idioma hasta principios del siglo XVII*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.

Terra, E., de Nicola, J., & Menón, L. (2003). *1001 estrangeirismos de uso corrente em nosso cotidiano*. São Paulo, Brazil: Saraiva.

Thibault, A. (1996). Québécoisismes et helvétismes: éclairages réciproques. In T. Lavoie (Ed.), *Français du Canada, Français de France. Actes du quatrième Colloque international de Chicoutimi* (pp. 333–376). Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Thibault, A. (1997). *Dictionnaire suisse romand (DSR)*. Genève, Switzerland: Zoé.

Thibault, A. (2000). Le traitement des emprunts dans le DSR: Aperçus théoriques et méthodologiques. In D. Latin & C. Poirier (Eds.), *Contacts de langues et identités culturelles, perspectives lexicographiques* (pp. 69–84). Québec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Thibault, A. (2008). Lexicographie et variation diatopique: le cas du français. In M. Colombo & M. Barsi (Eds.), *Lexicographie et lexicologie historiques du français* (pp. 69–91). Monza, Italy: Polimetrica International Scientific.

Thibault, A. (2009a). Le traitement des gallicismes dans le *Diccionario de la lengua española* de la Real Academia Española. In A. Thibault (Ed.), *Gallicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique* (pp. 107–131). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

Thibault, A. (2009b). Le *Diccionario de galicismos prosódicos y morfológicos* de Valentín García Yebra et la théorie des emprunts. In A. Thibault (Ed.), *Gallicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique* (pp. 133–145). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

Thibault, A. (2011). Un code hybride français/anglais? Le chiac acadien dans une chanson du groupe Radio Radio. *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, 121, 39–65.

Thomason, S. (2010). Contact explanations in linguistics. In R. Hickey (Ed.), *The handbook of language contact* (pp. 31–47). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Thomassen, H. (1997). *Gallizismen im kulinarischen Wortschatz des Italienischen*. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Trotter, D. (2006). Contacts linguistiques intraromans: roman et français/occitan. In G. Ernst, M.-D. Glessgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (Vol. 23, part 2, 1776–1785). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Trotter, D. (2009). L'apport de l'anglo-normand à la lexicographie de l'anglais, ou: les "gallicismes" en anglais. In A. Thibault (Ed.), *Gallicismes et théorie de l'emprunt linguistique* (pp. 147–168). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

Vann, R. (2001). El castellà catalanitzat a Barcelona: perspectives lingüístiques i culturals. *Catalan Review*, 15(1), 117–131.

Varela Merino, E. (2009). *Los galicismos en el español de los siglos XVI y XVII* (2 vols). Madrid, Spain: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Variano, A. (2016). *L'elemento amerindio nella lingua italiana: lessico, etimologia, storia*. Strasbourg, France: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.

von Wartburg, W. (1967a). *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 18: *Anglizismen*. Basel, Switzerland: Zbinden.

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

von Wartburg, W. (1967b). *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 19: *Orientalia*. Basel, Switzerland: Zbinden.

von Wartburg, W. (1968). *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 20: *Entlehnungen aus den übrigen Sprachen*. Basel, Switzerland: Zbinden.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact*. New York, NY: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Wesch, A. (1992). Grammaticische und lexikalische Aspekte des Spanischen von Barcelona. *Iberoromania*, 35, 1-14.

Wexler, P. (1969). Toward a structural definition of "internationalisms." *Linguistics*, 48, 77-92.

Winet, M. (2001). Der arabische Artikel *al-* und die Arabismen der iberoromanischen Sprachen: intra- und extralinguistische Lösungsansätze. *Asiatische Studien*, 55(4), 1069-1076.

Winet, M. (2006). *El artículo árabe en las lenguas iberorrománicas (aspectos fonéticos, morfológicos y semánticos de la transferencia léxica)*. Córdoba, Spain: Universidad de Córdoba.

Zárate, M. (1976). *Influencias del vascuence en la lengua castellana a través de un estudio del elemento vasco en el habla coloquial del Chorierrri-Gran Bilbao*. Bilbao, Spain: La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca.

Notes:

(1.) For a critical overview of the study of loanwords, see LoVecchio (2019, pp. 14-95).

(2.) Most loanword typologies still rely in large part on the one defined originally by Haugen (1950, following Betz, 1949) on the basis of *importation* versus *substitution* and largely focussing on formal aspects. However, this classification, articulated from a limited corpus of several European languages, should hardly be considered universal (Oksaar, 1972, p. 494). For an overview, more synthetic than critical, of some of the different typologies proposed, see Gómez Capuz (1998); see also Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009) for an overview of the phenomenon in the world's languages.

André Thibault

Universite de Paris Sorbonne

Nicholas LoVecchio

Universite de Paris-Sorbonne