

A typology of English borrowings in Norwegian

Anne Mette Sunde, Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Abstract

English outweighs other languages as a source for linguistic borrowing in present-day Norwegian. The aim of this article is to propose a lucid typology of English borrowings in Norwegian that takes into account phraseological as well as structural borrowing—two borrowing dimensions that have received relatively little scholarly attention, and where multiple terminology is in use. The typology is based on a division between word-level, phraseological and structural borrowing on the one hand and a formal division between direct and indirect borrowing on the other. A second goal is to illustrate the typology with recently emerged loans that can provide an updated picture of the influence exerted by English on the Norwegian language.

Keywords: linguistic borrowing; borrowing typologies; borrowing classifications; language contact; English; Norwegian

1. Introduction

In the postwar period, the dominance of British and in particular American culture has had a considerable impact on how languages change (Gottlieb 2004: 39). This is the case even in remote contact situations, such as in Norway and the Nordic speech communities more generally, where English has become the prime source of loanwords (Sandøy 2007: 130). In Norwegian contact research, most research into English borrowings has considered direct lexical loans, meaning open-class word forms that are based on formal imitation of the English model (e.g. Stene 1945; Graedler 1998, Graedler & Johansson 1997; Sandøy 2013).¹

Direct loans have also gained a great deal of attention from language policy makers (Norsk språkråd 1990; Simonsen 1992; Brunstad 2001). This is not surprising considering the massive import of English words and expressions during the second half of the 20th century. A seemingly

¹ Research papers and recent master theses have also addressed Norwegian-English code-switching, meaning intra- and/or inter-sentential alternation between Norwegian and English in oral and written texts (e.g. Graedler 1999; Andersen 2007; Johannessen 2014; Hanssen 2017).

small portion of the attested loans are indirect borrowings, such as *calques* and *semantic loans*, which are entirely made up by native language material (see Section 2.2.1). A few traces of structural influence have also been attested (Graedler 2002: 60; Johansson & Graedler 2002: 23f). In recent years, ongoing internationalisation processes and technological developments have continued the expansion of English in Norway and enabled a more direct contact with the English-speaking world. Such heightened exposure is likely to speed up the pace and affect the patterns of borrowing, as is evident in a range of new *phraseological calques* (i.e. translated multi-word units; see Sunde & Kristoffersen 2018). Similar developments are observed in other European languages as well, with English affecting multi-word units and morphosyntactic patterns below the lexical surface (see e.g. Fiedler 2017 and several contributions in Furiassi et al. 2012). Compared to direct loans, calques—or indirect borrowings in general—may be viewed as less conscious borrowings since they do not consist of overt English forms but instead entail reorganising native morphemes (see discussion in Sunde & Kristoffersen 2018). Further, the absence of overt English forms makes indirect loans lack the smart connotations assumed to motivate borrowing (Gottlieb 2012: 177). Both of these aspects make indirect borrowing indicate an intensified English influence.

Previous descriptions of English borrowings in Norwegian have largely been restricted to the word level (e.g. Graedler 1998; Graedler 2002; Sandøy 2000). More comprehensive typologies have been proposed for Danish (Gottlieb 2004) and Romance languages (Capuz 1997). However, manifold terminology and classification criteria make it difficult to compare suggested typologies, and the frameworks are not necessarily easily applicable to other contact situations (see Section 2.3). Hence, the aim of this article is to provide a lucid and comprehensible typology of English borrowings in Norwegian that stretches beyond the word level. The typology takes into account direct and indirect borrowing of single words, phraseological units and structural features. The suggested categories thus range from being previously proposed for Norwegian data, to being only superficially described and less agreed upon. Further, the loans chosen to illustrate the typology build partly on previous works (e.g. Graedler 1998; Graedler 2002; Johansson & Graedler 2002; Graedler & Johansson 1997) and mainly on data material retrieved from the Web, with searches limited to pages written in

Norwegian. The motive for using the Web as a source is to be able to account for a wider scope of anglophone features found in present-day Norwegian, which is especially relevant to the category of phraseological calques (this is discussed in Section 3.2). According to Gottlieb (2012: 177), successful English calques, which lack the smart connotation assumed to motivate borrowing, indicate that English influence has come a long way. A similar claim can be made for structural borrowings, which are often held to take place in situations of more intense contact (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 37). As such, the article seeks to systemise and illustrate what may be labelling an advanced stage of the ‘anglicisation’ of the Norwegian language.

1.1 Outline

The article is structured as follows. Section 2 provides the backdrop of the study. First, it offers a brief discussion of borrowing and the closely related phenomenon of code-switching. Next, it presents two borrowing classifications that seem to be part of an established consensus within the field—the distinction between direct and indirect borrowing and lexical and structural borrowing—before addressing two suggested typologies for English borrowings (Capuz 1997; Gottlieb 2004). The typology proposed for Norwegian and its formal criteria are presented in Section 3. Section 4 concludes the article.

2. Borrowing: terms, types and typologies

2.1 Defining and delimiting borrowing

Borrowing is the term most commonly used to describe and discuss language contact phenomena (Curnow 2001: 413). In general, it refers to all kinds of linguistic transfer between a donor or source language (SL) and a borrowing or recipient language (RL) (Matras 2009: 146; Haspelmath 2009: 37). Borrowing is most commonly understood as the result of a diachronic process whereby SL forms or features have been incorporated into an RL. A recurring issue in the field is thus how to separate instances of such completed processes from instances of spontaneous mixing of languages (or linguistic codes or varieties), which is known as code-switching (Matras 2009: 106). The essential basis for distinguishing between the two is whether the incorporated material or

feature is seen as retrieved directly from the SL or indirectly from the RL, where it has been taken up and incorporated as part of the RL system (Haspelmath 2009: 40; Matras 2009: 113f). Still, it may be difficult to separate code-switches from borrowings—especially at the level of single morphemes—and the relation between the two is often seen as a continuum (e.g. Myers-Scotton 1993; 2002; Grimstad et al. 2014). The motivation for assuming a continuum is the belief that all borrowings start out as, and thus constitute the institutionalisation of, code-switching (Larsen 1994: 22, in Gottlieb 2004: 49). In this case, it is challenging to determine by the form whether the inserted item is an established loan or a single switch, and what distinguishes the two is the extent to which the SL item is considered as established either in an individual or in the larger speech community. Different theories use diagnostics such as the speaker's degree of SL proficiency, the degree to which the SL item is considered as included in the standard RL lexicography or the frequency of the inserted item (Zenner & Kristiansen 2013: 4). Myers-Scotton (1993: 204) applies the third solution and counts as established borrowings all forms that are attested three or more times in a corpus of a given size while at the same time admitting that this is an arbitrary number.²

Although this article will not provide a quantitative analysis of the loans attested, I will adopt this approach and count as illustrative items loans that are attested three or more times on the Web. This criterion does not exclude the chances of including potential ad hoc switches, and the selected loans are not easily arranged along the code-switching–borrowing continuum. However, by setting a low number, I am able to cover and illustrate a wide range of new manifestations of the influence exerted by English on Norwegian. (See Section 3.2 for a more detailed discussion of the methodology.)

² This criterion is applied only to the so-called *core loans*—meaning forms for which the RL system has equivalent terms (Myers-Scotton 1993: 169). Loans that denote objects or concepts that are new to the RL system (*cultural loans*) are regarded as instant borrowings (ibid.; see Section 2.2.2).

2.2 Borrowing classifications

2.2.1 Direct versus indirect borrowing

A common way of categorising borrowing outcomes is to distinguish them on the basis of form, meaning here the way in which the SL forms or features are either copied directly or reproduced through native morphemes in the RL. Terms used to capture these processes include *importation* and *substitution* (Haugen 1950), *matter* and *pattern* borrowing (Matras 2009; Sakel 2007) and *direct* and *indirect* borrowing (Pulcini et al. 2012). I will use *direct* and *indirect*.

Direct borrowings refer to loans that are based on formal imitation of the corresponding source form—i.e. form-meaning pairs that are more or less similar to the model. Pulcini et al. (2012: 6f) divide this type of borrowing into *loanwords*, *false loans* and *hybrids*. Loanwords are imported open-class word forms, such as the Italian forms *pizza* and *spaghetti*, which have found their way into most of the world's languages. Depending on the degree of formal and semantic adaptation in the RL, loanwords may show various degrees of “foreignness”. For example, it is not obvious that the Norwegian adjective *taff*, which has conceptually broadened to denote ‘cool’ or ‘trendy’ besides ‘brave’ or ‘challenging’, is borrowed from English ‘tough’.³ False or *pseudo* loans are ‘home-spun’ forms coined by SL material, but unknown to or used with a “conspicuously different meaning” by SL speakers (Pulcini et al. 2012: 7), such as German *handy*, derived from English ‘hand’ and denoting ‘mobile telephone’ (ibid.). Lastly, hybrid loans refer to forms that involve only the partial transfer of an SL lexeme. An example is the Norwegian compound *hårspray* ‘hairspray’, in which only the latter morpheme is directly borrowed.⁴ Adapted, false and hybrid loans show that there is not always a one-to-one relationship between the source item

³ In a description of borrowings in Norwegian, Sandøy (2000) uses the common distinction between *loanword* and *foreign word* (Nor. *lånord* and *fremmendord*) to refer to loans that have and have not been formally adapted to the Norwegian language system, respectively. Because most importations undergo at least slight formal (and/or conceptual) adaptation in Norwegian, it is difficult to maintain a clear distinction between the two subtypes. In this article, I will therefore use the loanword term for both obvious foreignisms and adapted, more covert importations. See Section 3 for some further discussion about adaptation.

⁴ Others classify hybrids as an own category in between direct and indirect loans; Haugen (1950: 215), for example, labels them *loanblends*.

and the replica. As such, the concept of direct borrowing refers first and foremost to loans in which an SL form is detectable (Pulcini et al. 2012: 6) at least initially before (potentially) being formally adapted.

Indirect borrowings are loans made up by native forms in the RL, entailing a change or shift in the organisation of native forms. This category is commonly divided into *calques* and *semantic loans*. Calquing denotes the process whereby SL words or expressions are translated into native forms in the RL system, and are subdivided by Pulcini et al. (2012) into *loan translations*, *loan renditions* and *loan creations*. The first category consists of literal, item-by-item translations of poly-lexemic SL units, such as English ‘loanword’ from German *Lehnwort* (Haspelmath 2009: 39). Loan renditions are coined by a translated SL form, and a form more loosely tied to the concept of the borrowed expression, such as Norwegian *etterbarberingsvann* lit. ‘aftershave water’ from English ‘aftershave’ (Pulcini et al. 2012: 8).⁵ Lastly, loan creations are borrowings more freely inspired by a source form or concept. An example is the Norwegian compound *nakkesleng* lit. ‘neck toss’, inspired by English ‘whiplash’ (Graedler 2002: 73). Although loan creations are inspired by an SL, Haugen (1950: 220) claims that their status as calques, or borrowings in general, is not as clear as other loans.

Semantic loans (also labelled *semantic extensions*) are RL forms that are semantically changed or extended due to influence from an often formally related SL form. While calques create new lexical units in the RL, semantic loans typically create homonym expressions (Capuz 1997: 88; Haugen 1950: 219), as is the case in *mus* from English ‘(computer) mouse’ borrowed into the Scandinavian languages (Gottlieb 2012: 176). In other cases, RL forms adopt the polysemy of conceptually related SL forms. An example is the Norwegian noun *album*, which has been extended from denoting ‘book for collecting pictures, stamps, etc.’ to also denote ‘music album’ after the English equivalent form (Graedler & Johansson 1997: 10).

2.2.2 *Lexical versus structural borrowing*

Another line is often drawn between *lexical* and *structural* borrowing. Lexical borrowing typically refers to the transfer of labels for naming

⁵ ‘lit.’ = literal translation.

concepts (Grant 2015: 431), that is, open-class items such as nouns, adjectives and verbs. As such, lexical loans are those that enrich the lexical inventory of the RL. In addition, a large part of a speaker's lexicon consists of *phraseological units* (PUs), meaning ready-made, multi-word items that constitute single choices (Granger & Paquot 2008: 29). Hence, lexical borrowing may also include phrases or even clauses that can merit separate listings in the lexicon (e.g. phrasal verbs and idioms). Structural borrowing, on the other hand, typically refers to loans that affect the grammatical component of the RL, such as phonological, morphological and syntactic traits (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 37). As such, structural borrowing entails the transfer of forms and rules that contribute to the composition of morphemes and word forms into larger units, as well as loans affecting the sound system.

The division between lexical and structural borrowing is not absolute. This regards for instance certain phraseological units, because syntagmatic relations also belong to the domain of syntax. According to Granger & Paquot 2008: 33), the borderline cases usually concern looser and less idiomatic PUs, such as combinations of a lexical word and a grammatical structure (e.g. *important* + infinitive). Most of the PUs illustrated in this article are regarded as relatively rigid in the sense that they are composed by fixed lexemes (see Section 3.4). Derivational morphemes can also be seen as borderline cases. While inflectional morphemes unquestionably belong to the grammar component of a language, derivational affixes are sometimes referred to as lexical morphology since they contribute to word formation (Jarmulowicz & Taran 2013: 58). Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 37, 74f) seem to disregard derivational morphology as a type of structural borrowing. However, since derivational affixes carry grammatical content and must be attached to lexical stems, they are categorised in this article as a type of structural borrowing (see Section 3.5).

It is widely acknowledged that single lexical items—especially nouns—are most prone to being borrowed (Winford 2010: 178; Haspelmath 2008: 7). The reason is that a language's vocabulary is more autonomous and loosely structured and thus easier to adjust than its grammar or sound system, which constitute more resistant parts of a language (Van Coetsem 2000: 58f; Winford 2010: 178). This is evident since lexical borrowing is attested in situations of (relatively little contact, while structural borrowing is held to take place in situations of

long-term cultural pressure and widespread bilingualism (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 37, 50). As for contact with English in Europe, which is still mostly distant, MacKenzie (2012: 31ff) predicts that increased contact with English in Europe may penetrate deeper layers of the language: “[A]s the number of multicompetent L2 users of English in Europe grows, their L1s—and not just the lexis—are probably being slightly Anglicized” (ibid.: 31). This is especially relevant for languages that are typologically related to English, such as Norwegian.

Further, loanwords are commonly categorised based on their semantic-conceptual content and whether or not they bring along a new concept to the lexical inventory of the RL (Myers-Scotton 1993: 169; Haspelmath 2009: 46ff). *Cultural loans* are words for cultural novelties which are objects or concepts that are new to the culture of the RL and for which the RL lacks an adequate term. *Core loans* on the other hand are not connected with new cultural concepts. Instead, these loanwords supplement and sometimes replace parallel expressions in the RL system (Haspelmath 2009: 48). While cultural loanwords are explained by necessity, core borrowings are often held to be motivated by prestige (Matras 2009: 150), which understood as a speaker's need to express belonging to a specific social identity associated with the SL culture (Haspelmath 2009: 48; Myers-Scotton 1993: 172). Other and related motivations are the degree to which the loanwords serve as euphemisms or make known phenomena sound new and ‘catchy’ (Gottlieb 2012: 174).

2.3 *Two suggested borrowing typologies*

Borrowing typologies—here limited to ‘Anglicisms’—may include few categories and be fairly simple, such as Graedler (2002), Walsh (2016) and Pulcini et al. (2012), whose descriptions are largely limited to direct and indirect borrowings at the word level.⁶ Others contain crossings of two or more categories in order to provide a broader and more detailed impression of a given contact situation. Examples of more elaborate

⁶ The term *Anglicism* is broadly defined by Gottlieb (2004: 42) as “any individual or systemic language feature adapted or adopted from English, or inspired or boosted by English models, used in intralingual communication in a language other than English.”

typologies are Capuz (1997) for Romance languages and Gottlieb (2004) for Danish.

Capuz (1997) distinguishes seven categories of Anglicisms based on which level or grammatical sub-system of the RL is affected. These are the formal (both graphic and phonetic), morphological, semantic, lexical, syntactic, phraseological and pragmatic levels. Additionally, Capuz (1997: 84) suggests two internal cross categories that “transcend most of the levels of the main typology”. The first regards the degree of formal modification in the RL; the borrowed item is either imported, substituted or blended (following Haugen 1950; see fn. 4, Section 2.2.1). The second internal category concerns the degree of novelty represented by the borrowed item; *absolute borrowings* include imported or otherwise newly coined words or features that are modelled on English and new in the RL system, while *frequency borrowings* refer to RL forms and features that increase in use due to influence from English, where the feature is more frequent (ibid.: 84). As such, the typology aims to capture both formal traces and pragmatic implications of English influence.

A challenge with Capuz’ (1997) typology is that the category of lexical borrowing is somewhat fuzzy. According to Capuz, lexical borrowings contain direct, hybrid and calqued word level borrowings, but not semantic loans. Based on the definition of lexical borrowing given in Section 2.2.2, semantic loans are thus—it seems—not considered as a type of lexical enrichment.⁷ Furthermore, Capuz claims that phraseological borrowing is only possible as “morphemic substitution” (ibid.: 90), meaning in calqued form. At the same time, however, directly borrowed multi-word units such as formulae, phrases and idioms are included in the category of lexical borrowing (ibid.: 87). Lastly, word-level borrowings span the levels of lexical, semantic and pragmatic borrowing (which includes interjections and adverbials) and multi-word loans are found at the level of lexis, phraseology and pragmatics. Thus, the sorting of Anglicisms in Capuz (1997) depends on the degree to which the loans attested are regarded as being lexical, semantic or phraseological enrichments, or as having pragmatic implications—lines that are not always easy or even possible to draw.

⁷ This is also contrary to the typology offered by Pulcini et al (2012) who place semantic loans under lexical influence.

Gottlieb's (2004) typology of Anglicisms in Danish is built by crossing two distinctive categories. In line with Capuz, Gottlieb separates different language levels. Yet, while Capuz proposes seven, Gottlieb proposes two; *microlanguage Anglicisms* are found below the clause level, entailing phonemes, morphemes and lexemes, as well as "phenomena relating to phraseology and syntax" (ibid.: 47f), while *macrolanguage Anglicisms* are those found at the clause, sentence or text level and range from sentence external tags (e.g. *okay?*) to domain loss situations. Next, Gottlieb distinguishes between features that are adopted or adapted from English (labelled *active Anglicisms*), and native features that are "inspired or numerically boosted" by an English language phenomenon, labelled *reactive Anglicisms* (ibid.).⁸ This makes four categories in total, of which only three are illustrated with examples: (1) active and (2) reactive microlanguage Anglicisms and (3) active macrolanguage Anglicisms (labelled code-shifts).⁹ Hence, Gottlieb also aims to cover a wide scope and different manifestations of English influence, even including structural changes to the larger speech community.

A challenge with Gottlieb's typology is that all three main categories contain numerous sub-categories. The high level of detail makes the typology somewhat hard to follow, especially since the categories are only briefly explained, if at all. Next, it is not always intuitively comprehensible what counts as micro- and macrolanguage influence. For example, the clausal expression *Jeg elsker dig!* '(I) love you!', which Gottlieb claims has become semantically extended to denote 'goodbye' due to English influence, is categorised as a type of boosted microlanguage Anglicism, despite its resembling an independent clause.¹⁰ At the same time, the sub-clausal expression *for your ears only* is classified as a macrolanguage code-shift. According to the definitions of micro- and macrolanguage as below and at or above the clause level,

⁸ Active and reactive Anglicisms correspond, yet are not identical, to Capuz' categories of absolute and frequency borrowing, as Gottlieb includes semantic loans as a type of reactive loans.

⁹ The reason for excluding a further explanation and illustration of reactive macrolanguage influence is that it is hard to prove when entire sentences or text types are inspired by English (Gottlieb 2004: 48).

¹⁰ Here, the reader is forced to conclude that the placement is due to the expression being perceived (and uttered) as a single unit.

the placements of these examples seem contradictory when not accompanied by explanations.

To summarise, both Capuz (1997) and Gottlieb (2004) are able to cover a wide range of English borrowings and paint a nuanced picture of the strong impact of English on Western languages. At the same time, their typologies contain numerous categories and subcategories that are not always intuitively comprehensible. This makes the typologies somewhat hard to follow and apply to other contact situations.

3. Creating a typology of English borrowings in Norwegian

In this section, I will first discuss the criteria selected for the typology of English borrowings in Norwegian (Section 3.1). This is done by drawing on the classifications presented and discussed in Section 2. A note on methodological considerations is presented in Section 3.2, before the typology is presented and explained category by category in Sections 3.3–3.5.

3.1 Typology Criteria

The typology suggested herein is based on crossing two distinct categories. First, I adopt Pulcini et al.'s (2012) twofold classification and separate direct and indirect borrowings. Next, I distinguish between three hierarchical language levels: (1) word-level borrowings, (2) phraseological borrowings and (3) structural borrowings. The rationale behind this division is the conviction that borrowings are more easily sorted when one can separate single- and multi-word units at the one hand, and structural features on the other. Hence, the typology is built by transferring and expanding Pulcini et al.'s (2012) typology to two additional language levels, thereby illustrating that the distinction between direct and indirect borrowing is applicable outside the word level. This gives rise to six categories in total, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Typology categories.

	Direct borrowing	Indirect borrowing
Words	Direct, hybrid and pseudo loans	Calques and semantic loans
Phrasemes	Direct and hybrid phrasemes	Calqued phrasemes
Structure	Bound and free morphemes	Syntactic patterns

The category of word-level borrowings encompasses single words and compounds (Section 3.3). Because compounds contain more than one stem, they are sometimes sorted as phraseological units (e.g. Granger & Paquot 2008: 42ff) and the border between the two categories is indistinct. In this article, however, compounds are assigned to the word level since they constitute single graphic words in Norwegian. Phraseological borrowing includes a wide range of ready-made expressions—constituting two or more graphic words—at both the phrase and clause levels (Section 3.4). Lastly, structural borrowings comprise morphological and syntactic traits (Section 3.5).

Because lexical borrowing stretches beyond the word level to also entail lexicalised phrases and clauses, lexical borrowing is not listed as an own category, pace Capuz (1997). Neither is pragmatic borrowing, which also has the potential to transcend categories. Hence, while interjections, discourse markers and routine formulae may serve pragmatic functions, they are instead sorted according to the language level to which they belong. Furthermore, complete shifts of code and domain loss situations are excluded, as these have more to do with structural changes in the larger speech community and less to do with borrowing—meaning linguistic changes to Norwegian—per se. Frequency borrowings, as defined by Capuz (1997), are also kept out. Since the semantics of the word, phrase or entire sentence of a frequency borrowing remains the same and what changes instead is the frequency of usage, they are not regarded as ‘proper’ borrowings, although they are clearly relevant in the bigger picture.

Hence, the main feature of the typology is linguistic form, and the pragmatic implications of English influence—in terms of both absolute and frequency borrowings—as well as structural changes to the speech community are deemed outside the scope of the present article. Lastly, in order to make the typology broad and easy to follow, the number of subcategories proposed is kept to a minimum.

3.2 Methodological considerations

As mentioned in Section 1, the typology builds largely on data material retrieved from the Web, in order to account for a wide spectre of English loans in contemporary Norwegian. The Web contains a vast amount of stylistically and formally varied texts written by a range of different people. In this sense, the Web is representative of a large population of language users, and differs from many traditional language corpora, which are largely compiled of texts written by professional writers (Schütze 2011: 209). In this way, it is reasonable to assume that features deviating from the normal language standard appears more frequently on the Web than in other corpora. A further motivation for using Web sources is that many attested Anglicisms are new, making even fairly recent and web-based corpora seem outdated. For instance, the *Norwegian Web as Corpus* (NoWaC, Guevara 2010) which is based on all Web documents using the no.-domain from late 2009 to early 2010, has either very few or zero hits for the direct loanword *paye* 'pay' and the calques *sentimentalverdi* 'sentimental value' and *ta dagen av* 'take the day off'. By comparison, Web searches reveal several occurrences of the loans in Norwegian texts. This indicates that the loans might be catching on in Norwegian, and that the Web may be a well-suited source for documenting recent borrowing trends.

However, using the Web as a corpus has some limitations. One of the challenges is that we cannot always know who have produced the specific texts from which an example is taken (Schütze 2009: 152). For instance, it may be difficult to know whether a text is produced by a native speaker or by an L2 learner of Norwegian. Furthermore, the Web contains a large amount of autotranslated pages. Hence, the procedure has been to search for occurrences of a given loan and exclude examples from texts that show signs of poor translation or other types of transfer than the specific Anglicism. Examples were chosen from sources where it was reasonable to assume that the author was a native speaker of Norwegian. As mentioned in Section 2.1, loans that have been attested three or more times have been included. In this context it is important to note that many Anglicisms can potentially be connected to specific linguistic registers or age groups. Some loans may also have been produced by highly English proficient Norwegians who use the language actively on a daily basis, and who are probably more likely to produce English loans than others. These aspects are difficult to measure.

However, the loans were extracted from sources likely to reflect common language usage, such as newspaper articles and “daily life” blogs or discussion forums. Still, it is important to keep in mind that there may be large interspeaker variation at play.

Another methodological concern is that it is difficult to know with certainty that indirect loans are indeed of foreign origin. When English constructions or structural features are applied onto Norwegian forms, the resulting constructions are formally Norwegian, and the influence from English is thus covert and difficult to prove (see discussion in Sandved 2007; Høiner 2018). Fiedler (2012, 247) even states that this may be one of the reasons why this type of influence has received relatively little scholarly attention in international Anglicism research. Furthermore, borrowing is only one possible explanation since languages change without foreign influence (*ibid.*). However, since the constructions attested in this study all have clear English models, while they deviate more or less from what is perceived as traditional Norwegian, it is reasonable to assume that they are English loans—especially when taking into account the massive influence exerted by English on Norwegian. However, we must exercise caution when evaluating the loans, particularly since Norwegian and English are typologically related languages, which means that they have several cognates as well as overlapping mechanisms for word and phrase formation.¹¹

3.3 Word-level borrowing

In what follows, direct and indirect word-level borrowings are presented separately. The loan categories are illustrated by a selection of examples. The sources for each example are provided in the Appendix.

3.3.1 Direct word-level borrowing

The most visible sign of English influence in Norwegian is the direct transfer of open-class word forms (Graedler 2002: 77). As seen in

¹¹ Additionally, one cannot exclude the possibility that the loan constructions in some cases can be connected to idiosyncrasy or dialectal variation.

Section 2.2.1, Pulcini et al. (2012) divide direct word-level borrowing into loanwords, false loans and hybrids. Table 2 offers examples of each.

Table 2: Examples of direct word-level borrowing.

Type	Loan	English model
Loanwords	oute	out
	binge	binge (watch)
	shave	shave
	paye	pay
	limitere	limit
	selfie	selfie
	influencer	influencer
	connection	connection
	location/lokasjon	location
	basic	basic
	random	random
	awesome/åsåm	Awesome
	nice/nais/najs	Nice
	fuck/føkk/fåkk	Fuck
Pseudo loans	bæde	bad-INF ('to lose one's temper')
	stressless	stress less ('recliner chair')
	snaksy	snack-PL + y ('hot')
Hybrid loans	grapefrukt	Grapefruit
	releasefest	release party
	trillebag	rolling ('wheeled') bag
	lightbrus	light ('diet') soda

Looking first at the loanword category, English lexical stems are, as a general rule, structurally adapted to the Norwegian system. This is illustrated below, where English verb (1) and noun (2) stems receive Norwegian inflectional morphology.^{12,13}

¹² The illustrated loans are marked in bold, and the lexical forms are marked for inflection. The sentences are provided with translations that give a sense of the original.

¹³ Abbreviations: DEF = definite, DEM = demonstrative, FEM = feminine, INF = infinitive, MASC = masculine, NEUT = neuter, PAST = past tense, PAST PART = past participle, PL = plural, PRES = present tense, SU = subject.

- (1) Samtidig har jeg lyst til å lage en kjempeplakat som **out-er-PRES** henne
At the same time I want to make a large poster that outs her
- (2) Vi har ikke helt **den-MASC.DEM connection-en-MASC.DEF**
We don't quite have that connection

Exceptions to the rule of inflectional adaptation involve plural marking, as borrowed English nouns tend to retain the English plural affix *-s* in both the indefinite (3) and definite forms (4), a fairly common trend in many contact situations (Myers-Scotton 1993: 62ff).¹⁴

- (3) Det er mange **audition-s-PL** der
There are many auditions there
- (4) De 17 **selfie-s-ene-PL.DEF** er nå godt bevismateriale for politiet
The 17 selfies are now good evidence for the police.

Furthermore, some verbs retain the English past participle affix *-ed* in the adjectival function, as shown in (5). The reason may be that the past participle form is analysed as its own lexical unit (Graedler 1998: 84f), or that the English affix overlaps with one of the Norwegian past participle affixes, *-et*.¹⁵

- (5) Det er så **føkk-ed-PAST PART** nå ...
It's so fucked now ...

Depending on the degree of formal (and semantic) adaptation, the borrowed word form may end up being distant from the model, as illustrated by *tøff* in Section 2.2.1. While complete or elaborate adaptation normally takes a long time (Haspelmath 2009: 42), lexical stems may be instantly adapted by receiving Norwegian affixes, like the

¹⁴ In some cases, the plural marker is analysed as part of the stem, as in muffins 'muffin'. However, this applies mainly to older, well-established loanwords (e.g. pins 'pin', caps 'cap' and klips 'clip').

¹⁵ The *-ed* affix is sometimes even added to stems that are irregularly inflected in English (e.g. *starstrucked* 'starstruck').

verb ending *-ere*, which is attached to the verb stem ‘limit’ (6), and *-sjon*, which replaces the English ending *-sion* in ‘location’ (7).

- (6) Her er litt inspirasjon [...] for andre som må **limit-ere**-INF øvelsene sine
Here’s some inspiration for others who have to limit their exercises
- (7) På vårt lager har vi samme vare på flere **loka-sjon-er**-MASC.PL
At our warehouse we have the same product in several locations

Orthographic adaptation may also take place at an early stage, as is the case with the fairly recent borrowing *åsåm* ‘awesome’, which appears interchangeably with ‘Norwegianised’ orthography—as illustrated in (8).

- (8) Her er et snes (20) **åsåm(m)-e**-PL spelledamer
Here’s a score (20) of awesome female artists

Regarding the categorisation of loanwords as either cultural or core forms (cf. Section 2.2.2), several of the older English loans are typically cultural forms, as they can be connected to specific lexical fields such as sport, entertainment, fashion and music (Graedler 1998: 21ff). Many of the newer attested loans also belong to special fields—such as Facebook and gaming terminology (e.g. Sunde 2016)—while others are of more ‘everyday language’ character, like the verbs *oute* ‘out/snitch’, *binge* ‘binge watch’, *crave* ‘crave’ or *face* ‘face’ or the noun *influencer* ‘influencer’, which have in common that they lack simple synonymous terms in Norwegian. Other recent loans resemble core borrowings in that they duplicate parallel Norwegian lexemes, such as the verbs *shave* ‘shave’ for *barbere* or *paye* ‘pay’ for *betale*—the latter shown in (9).

- (9) Hvor mye **pay-er**-PRES du i året?
How much do you pay each year?

Although overlapping with Norwegian forms, the imported loans may develop into carrying certain semantic-conceptual aspects that the native forms lack. In addition, since core borrowings are held to be motivated by prestige, the choice of an SL form over an RL form may be semantically but not necessarily pragmatically redundant (Matras 2009:

150). As such, it is challenging to speak about true core borrowings or true Norwegian synonyms, a point that applies to loans in general.

Further, Table 2 shows a selection of pseudo borrowings which are forms that are coined by English material but lack clear English models. The number of pseudo Anglicisms in Norwegian are relatively few (Andersen 2015: 124), and most of the pseudo loans above are well established in the language. Examples are *stressless* ‘stress less’—originally a brand name—used to refer to a type of reclinable armchairs (ibid.: 125f) and the adjective *snaksty* ‘good looking/neat’ derived from English ‘snacks’ and the adjectival suffix *-y* (Graedler 2002: 77). Of more recent origin is the verb stem *bæde*, derived from English ‘bad’, which means ‘to lose one’s temper/become sad’ or ‘experience a bad trip from drugs’ (Andersen 2015: 126), as illustrated in (10).¹⁶

- (10) hun **bæd-er**-PRES på at hun ikke også var jomfru
she’s sad/angry for not being a virgin too

Lastly, hybrid loans encompass word forms that are made up of a combination of borrowed and native morphemes, such as *passord* ‘password’, *grapefrukt* ‘grapefruit’ and *releasefest* ‘releaseparty’. Such hybridisation is highly productive in Norwegian (ibid.: 124). Some hybrids are more loosely connected to equivalent English expressions. Examples are *trillebag* ‘rolling bag’ (Eng. ‘wheeled bag’) and *lightbrus* ‘light soda’ (Eng. ‘diet soda’). These examples illustrate that established English loans are included in productive word formation in the same manner as native forms, a point that may explain why hybrids are indeed so frequent.

3.3.2 Indirect word-level borrowing

As seen in Section 2.2.1, indirect borrowings are divided into calques and semantic loans. Table 3 offers a selection of well-established indirect borrowings and a few more recent ones.

¹⁶ Graedler (2002: 77) further lists the hybrids *collegegenser* ‘college sweater’ (a specific type of sweater) and *joggedress* ‘jogging dress’—meaning ‘tracksuit’—as pseudo loans. Although both compounds are coined by English loanwords and lack English models, it is possible to view these forms as products of normal word formation in Norwegian.

Table 3: Examples of indirect word-level borrowing.

Type	Loan	English model	Adopted meaning
Semantic loans	kjøpe	buy	‘accept’
	adressere	address	‘approach/discuss’
	realisere	realise	‘understand’
	stresse	stress	‘emphasise’
	album	album	‘music album’
	karakter	character	‘sign’
	opsjon	option	‘choice/alternative’
	het	hot	‘pretty/handsome’
	let	light	‘low fat’
Calques	kringkaste	broadcast	
	replassere	replace	
	velferdsstat	welfare state	
	frynsegode	fringe benefit	
	kroppssbygger	body builder	
	bestselger	best seller	
	kollisjonspute	airbag	
	lydplanke	sound bar	
	røpealarm	spoiler alert	
	offerklandring	victim blaming	
	sideeffekt	side effect	
	sentimentalverdi	sentimental value	
	prisløs	priceless	

As explained in Section 2.2.1, semantic loans are native forms that are semantically changed due to influence from an (often formally) overlapping source form, thereby creating homonym or polysemic expressions in the RL system. Examples of well-established semantic loans in Norwegian is the verb *kjøpe* ‘buy’, which has become semantically extended to denote ‘accept’ in line with the English lexeme (Graedler 2002: 79), and the noun *karakter*, which has taken up the meaning ‘sign’ after English ‘character’ (Graedler & Johansson 1997: 10).

Semantically changed words of more recent origin are the verbs *adressere*, *stresse* and *realisere*. *Adressere* is extended from denoting the process of writing names and addresses of postal consignments to also denoting the action of contacting or simply addressing someone or something. *Stresse* ‘stress’—which was first borrowed as a direct loan

denoting the condition of being under psychic stress—is increasingly attested as denoting ‘emphasise’ in line with the English word form.¹⁷

Lastly, *realisere* has become semantically extended from denoting ‘carry out’ or ‘implement’ to include ‘understand’ or ‘see’ after English ‘realise’, as illustrated in (11).

- (11) Føresetnaden for å kunne ta grep er å **realisere** at noko ikkje stemmer.
The prerequisite for taking action is to realise that something is not right.

A semantically extended noun of recent origin is *opsjon*. While traditionally denoting ‘pre-emptive right’, *opsjon* is attested as denoting ‘alternative’ or ‘choice’ after the English form. This is illustrated in (12).

- (12) Men det er ingen **opsjon** å la være å skrive.
But it is not an option to not write.

In the same manner as formally adapted direct loans may co-exist with their non-adapted versions (e.g. *nais* and *nice*), some indirect loans may co-exist with a directly borrowed form. Examples are the semantically extended adjectives *het* ‘hot’, which is extended to denote ‘pretty’ or ‘handsome’ besides ‘warm’, and *lett* ‘light’, which is extended to denoting ‘low fat’ besides ‘simple’ or ‘lightweight’. Both are used interchangeably with the English forms in Norwegian (Graedler 2002: 79).

As seen in Section 2.2.1, calquing takes different shapes. Most of the examples in Table 3 are literal, item-by-item translations of English word forms, such as the well-established compound *frynsegode* ‘fringe benefit’ (Graedler & Johansson 1997: 10). Others are more freely inspired by English, such as *nakkesleng* (mentioned in Section 2.2.1) and

¹⁷ Graedler and Johansson (1997: 405) categorise *stresse* ‘emphasise’ as a direct loan. Nevertheless, the verb is by far mostly used to denote the condition of being busy or bothered by stress (as is evident from NoWaC, where only 2 of 200 randomised hits for *stresse* denote ‘emphasise’). Because *stresse* already exists as a frequent verb in Norwegian, the changed usage—which appears to be catching on in Norwegian—is regarded in the present study as a semantic extension.

kollisjonspute, lit. ‘collision pillow’ from ‘air bag’ (Graedler 2002: 79). Several well-established calques are the result of a conscious policy to replace direct loans with Norwegian substitutes (Graedler 2002: 62).¹⁸ While it may be difficult to know which calques have and have not been promoted by professional bodies, it is likely that promoted calques are those that accompany cultural novelties, such as the fairly recent *ropealarm* ‘spoiler alert’, which is listed by The Language Council of Norway as a recommended substitute.¹⁹ Other calques that replace fairly recent direct loans—and for which Norwegian lacks adequate terms—are *lydplanke*, lit. ‘sound plank’ from English ‘sound bar’ and *offerklandring* from ‘victim blaming’. The latter is illustrated in (13).

- (13) Det er en kjent sjargong, en **offerklandring** som jeg blei lei av.
It's a known jargon, a victim blaming that I became tired of.

Examples of calques that resemble core borrowings are the verb *replassere* from English ‘replace’ and the nouns *sentimentalverdi* and *sideeffekt* from English ‘sentimental value’ and ‘side effect’, respectively. Examples of *replassere* and *sentimentalverdi* are shown in (14–15).

- (14) Det ble foretatt et inngrep der meniskene i kjeveleddet ble tatt ut og **replassert**.
An operation was performed where the jaw joint menisci were taken out and replaced.
- (15) De har en høy **sentimentalverdi** for ham.
They have a high sentimental value for him.

All three calques have equivalent Norwegian terms (*erstatte* ‘replace’, *bivirkning* ‘side effect’ and *affeksjonsverdi* ‘sentimental value’). As such, these calques can be described as ‘unnecessary’ loans. But again, it is

¹⁸ Successful substitutions include *datamaskin*, lit. ‘data machine’ for ‘computer’ and *ferdsskriver*, lit. ‘flight writer’ for ‘flight recorder’, which have given the direct forms healthy competition, even if they have not made them disappear.

¹⁹ The Language Council of Norway has a list of suggested substitutions for English expressions on their website: <http://www.sprakradet.no/sprakhjelp/Skriverad/Norsk-for-engelsk/Avloeyesarord/>

challenging to speak about true core borrowings, especially since also indirect loans may be conceptually adapted in the RL. Through a corpus analysis, Gottlieb (2004: 51ff) shows that the calque *sideeffekt* has become conceptually narrowed in Danish to encompass neutral or positive spin-off benefits, while the traditional Danish form *bivirkning* “typically belong[s] to the realm of medicine and carr[ies] a negative semantic load” (ibid.: 51). Thus, English loans do not always replace native forms. Instead, they may coexist with and possibly develop as complementary terms to existing RL forms.

3.4 *Phraseological borrowing*

Phraseology has been broadly defined as “the study of the structure, meaning, and use of *word-combinations*” (emphasis added, Cowie 1994: 3168) which are also known as *phrasemes*, *multiword lexemes* or *phraseological units* (PUs) (Fiedler 2017: 90). Phrasemes are heterogeneous, and there is still no agreed set of phraseological categories. However, researchers generally agree that the central feature of a phraseme is semantic and syntactic stability (Pulcini et al. 2012: 13; Fiedler 2017: 90) and that the various types can be situated along a continuum with the most fixed and opaque units at one end and the less fixed and more transparent ones at the other (Granger & Paquot 2008: 28; see Granger & Paquot 2008 for a discussion of the field).

In this typology, I apply a simplified version of the typology suggested by Cowie (1988; 1994) and distinguish between phrase-level and clause-level phrasemes (see also different proposals by e.g. Burger 1998; Mel’čuk 1998; Granger & Paquot 2008). Phrasal phrasemes function as sentence constituents and have referential or otherwise propositional functions (Cowie 1988: 134), such as phrasal verbs, collocations and figurative or idiomatic expressions. Clausal PUs consist of routine formulae that have speech act functions (such as greetings, invitations or compliments) and formulae that have discourse-structuring functions (PUs used to organise messages or turn-taking or indicating speaker attitude) (ibid.: 133; Granger & Paquot 2008: 36). For simplicity and in order to avoid proposing a fixed set of categories, phrasal phrasemes are listed in the typology according to the grammatical phrase they constitute (VP, NP, etc.). Clausal phrasemes are tentatively described as serving either speech act or discourse-structuring functions.

3.4.1 Direct phraseological borrowing

Table 4 offers a selection of direct English phrasemes attested in Norwegian. As mentioned in Section 2.3, Capuz (1997) does not include overt English phrasemes in the category of phraseological Anglicisms—indicating that larger, direct chunks are instead analysed as code-switches. Similarly, Gottlieb (2004, 47) categorises active, macrolanguage Anglicisms as code-shifts. Based on the definition of borrowing used in the present study, however, there is no reason to disbelieve that direct phrases or clauses may also be borrowed into the RL in the same manner as word forms or indirect PUs. Hence, I continue to count three or more attestations as the limit for borrowing while keeping in mind that there may be large interspeaker variation at play.

Table 4: Direct phraseological borrowing.

Type		Loan	English model
Phrasal PUs	VP	paye off	pay off
		tune in/inn	tune in
		speede up/opp	speed up
	PP	from/fra the top of my head	from the top of my head
		off topic	off topic
		down to earth	down to earth
		tough guy	tough guy
	NP	rookie mistake	rookie mistake
		worst case scenario	worst-case scenario
		walk in the park	walk in the park
		work in progress	work in progress
		business as usual	business as usual
	AdvP	still going strong	still going strong

Clausal	what's up	what's up
PUs	go for it	go for it
	no problem	no problem
	shit happens	shit happens
	fair enough/nok	fair enough
	never mind	never mind
	as if	as if
	in your face	in your face
	LOL	LOL ('laughing out loud')
	ASAP	ASAP ('as soon as possible')

The verb phrases in Table 4 are all phrasal verbs. Because of the close kinship between Norwegian and English, many prepositions have parallel forms and functions in the two languages (Graedler, 2002, 71). This may contribute to explaining why several of the phrasal verbs are attested with both the original English and a translated Norwegian preposition; the latter cases are regarded as hybrid borrowings. This alternation is illustrated in (16–17).

- (16) I dag har jeg bare **chilla**-PAST PART **out**.
Today I have only chilled out.
- (17) ... Chill hjørnesofa der man kan virkelig **chille**-INF ut
... Chill cornersofa where one can really chill out

Worth noting in (16) is that while the English preposition is kept, the verb stem *chille* still receives Norwegian inflectional morphology.

Among the attested PPs is *down to earth*, which has an adjectival function either in NPs (18) or in predicatives (19).

- (18) Og for ei **down to earth**, herlig jente!
And what a down-to-earth, lovely girl!
- (19) Han er **down to earth** og har ingen stjernenykker
He is down to earth and has no star ego

Because the phraseme is used as an adjective, and since it is interchangeably attested with a hyphen, this phraseme resembles a word-level borrowing. Given that a central feature of multi-word units is precisely that they constitute single choices, it is placed in the category of phraseological borrowing in the present study.

The NPs in Table 4 include lexical collocations, meaning preferred syntagmatic relations between two lexemes (Granger & Paquot 2008, 43), such as *rookie mistake* and *tough guy*, as well as longer, fixed expressions like *business as usual* and *walk in the park*. Just like the phrasemes in (18–19), they behave like single words.

Turning to clausal phrasemes, the line between formulae that have speech act and discourse-structuring functions is not always easy to draw and depends on contextual information. Phrasemes recognised as belonging to the first category are for instance the expressions *go for it*, *no problem* and *what's up*—the latter illustrated in (20)—which serve as invitations, responses (to thanks or apologies) or greetings, respectively.

- (20) **What's up** folkens?
What's up people?

Clausal phrasemes having more discourse-structuring functions include *fair enough*—also attested with the Norwegian preposition *nok*—*as if* and *in your face*—illustrated in (21)—which have in common that they signal speaker attitude.²⁰

- (21) Haha. **In your face**, brannfolk.
Haha. In your face, Brann [soccer team] people.

What should be noted is that also single lexical items can be categorised as formulaic phrases when they form an entire expression (Brink 2006, 43). Examples are the expressions *So?* and *Sweet!*, which signal speaker attitude. Also borrowed English acronyms—many of which are associated with computer- or SMS-related language—can be regarded as phrasemes. Examples are *LOL* ('laughing out loud'), *LMAO* ('laughing my ass off') and *ASAP* ('as soon as possible').

²⁰ The use of SL formulae resembles what is referred to as tag-switching in the code-switching literature (e.g. Muysken 2000; Poplack 1980), that is, the insertion of fixed expressions.

3.4.2 Indirect phraseological loans

A selection of indirect phraseological loans attested in Norwegian is presented in Table 5. As with indirect word-level borrowings, indirect PUs are often more challenging to notice since they appear in local guise. Moreover, indirect loans can be said to penetrate deeper layers of the language. Therefore—and due to the fact that there are relatively few descriptions of indirect phrasemes in Norwegian—the number of illustrated examples is higher in this category than in the others.

Indirect phrasemes are normally the product of calquing. Examples of well-established phraseological calques are the phrasal verb *ta av* ‘take off’ (e.g. *Flyet tok av i tide* ‘The plane took off in time’) (Hellevik 1963: 23) and the more figurative expression *sitte på gjerdet* ‘sit on the fence’ (Sandved 2007: 8). In other cases, it may be more reasonable to analyse indirect phrasemes as semantic extensions, as is the case with *være familiær med* ‘be familiar with’, which has been extended from denoting ‘being related to’ to ‘being acquainted with’ after the English expression (*ibid.*). The remaining loans have, to the author’s knowledge, not been discussed in previous literature and appear to be of more recent origin.

Table 5: Examples of indirect phraseological borrowing.

Type	Loan	English model	
Phrasal Pus	VP	<i>ta av</i>	take off
		<i>stå ut</i>	stand out
		<i>henge ut</i>	hang out (‘be together’)
		<i>gå ned</i>	go down (‘happen’)
		<i>hate på</i>	hate on
		<i>møte med</i>	meet with
		<i>gi opp på noe(n)</i>	give up on someone/thing
		<i>ha et svakt punkt for noe(n)</i>	have a weak spot for someone/thing
		<i>rulle med øynene</i>	roll one’s eyes
		<i>falle i forelskelse</i>	fall in love
		<i>ringe inn syk</i>	call in sick
		<i>stå opp for seg selv</i>	stand up for oneself
		<i>ha tid på ens hender</i>	have time on one’s hands
		<i>sitte på gjerdet</i>	sit on the fence
		<i>være familiær med</i>	be familiar with
		<i>være opp for</i>	be up for

		komme opp med	come up with
		komme full sirkel	come full circle
		være ens kopp te	be one's cup of tea
		være opp ens gate	be up one's alley
		gjøre matten	do the math
		kalle det en dag	call it a day
		ta dagen av	take the day off
		holde det ekte	keep it real
		miste det	lose it
		feile miserabelt	fail miserably
NP		episk feil	epic fail
		dag inn og dag ut	day in and day out
PP		for nå	for now
		i min mening	in my opinion
		fra toppen av hodet	from the top of my head
		over og over igjen	over and over again
AdvP		når det kommer til	when it comes to
Clausal		ta vare	take care
PUs		her går det	here it goes
		gjett hva	guess what
		hør meg ut	hear me out
		mine ord eksakt	my words exactly

Most of the phrasemes in Table 5 constitute verb phrases. The examples in (22–24) show a selection of indirect phrasal verbs—meaning complex verbs that contain a verb and an adverbial particle.

- (22) Moteklær for unge menn som liker å **stå ut**
Fashion clothes for young men who like to stand out.
- (23) Vi [skal ha] et skikkelig flyttesalg ... Det hele **går ned** neste søndag
We are having a real moving sale. It all goes down next Sunday
- (24) Kan vi ikke **henge ut** uten å drikke en dag?
Can't we hang out without drinking one day?

While the words that constitute these verb phrases may occur naturally with a literal meaning in Norwegian, they are in the examples above used with the same lexicalized meaning as the English verb phrases on which they are modelled.

(25–26) show examples of borrowed prepositional verbs—meaning verbs that contain a verb and a preposition—*hate på* ‘hate on’ and *møte med* ‘meet with’, respectively.

- (25) Jeg kan sitte her resten av dagen å [sic] **hate på meg selv**
I can sit here all day and hate on myself
- (26) Våre eksperter er tilgjengelig for å **møte med** deg og vurdere dine problemer
Our experts are available to meet with you and evaluate your problems

Both *hate* and *møte* are traditionally transitive verbs in Norwegian, and the addition of the preposition have clear English models.

Other verbal phrasemes include fairly transparent expressions, such as *gi opp på noe(n)* ‘give up on someone/something’ (27) and *rulle med øynene* ‘roll one’s eyes’ (28), which both have similar expressions in Norwegian (*gi noe(n) opp* ‘give someone/thing up’ and *himle med øynene* ‘roll one’s eyes’, respectively.)²¹

- (27) Bør jeg komme meg videre eller ikke **gi opp på han?**
Should I get on with my life or not give up on him?
- (28) Jeg **rullet med øynene** og snudde meg mot Marie og Bahare.
I rolled my eyes and turned towards Marie and Bahare.

Similarly, also *falle i forelskelse* ‘fall in love’ (29) and *ha et svakt punkt for noe(n)* ‘have a weak spot for someone/thing’ (30) are examples of figurative expressions in which semantic content is related to its literal meaning.

- (29) Jeg fant disse formene på Jernia og **falt i forelskelse**
I found these cake tins at Jernia [hardware store] and fell in love
- (30) Vi **har et svakt punkt for** nordiske serier.
We have a weak spot for Nordic series.

²¹ The verb *himle* is derived from *himmel* ‘sky’. The expression *himle med øynene* thus means to direct one’s eyes towards the sky.

Expressions that are regarded as less semantically transparent are for instance *komme full sirkel* ‘come full circle’, *være ens kopp te* ‘be one’s cup of tea’, *være opp ens gate* ‘be up one’s alley’, *kalle det en dag* ‘call it a day’, *ta dagen av* ‘take the day off’ and *miste det* ‘lose it’ (meaning to become emotional in either a positive or negative manner), all of which carry a more idiomatic content. Examples of the latter four are given below.

- (31) Låta «Bitch better have my money» er veldig **opp min gate**.
The song «Bitch better have my money» is very up my alley.
- (32) Og jeg vil gjerne ha minst en god runde før **jeg kaller det en dag**.
And I would like to have at least one good round before I call it a day.
- (33) Jeg bestemte meg for å **ta dagen av**.
I decided to take the day off.
- (34) Jeg **mista det** helt da jeg fikk beskjeden
I totally lost it when I got the message

While some of phrasemes in Table 5 have closely related or overlapping expressions in Norwegian, such as *skille seg ut* ‘separate oneself out’ in (22), and *være svak for noe(n)* ‘be weak for someone/thing’ in (30), others lack overlapping expressions, like *komme full sirkel* and *stå opp for seg selv*. Hence, as with word-level loans, borrowed phrasemes may also be categorised roughly into cultural and core borrowings.

Attested lexical collocations are the verb phrase *feile miserabelt* ‘fail miserably’ and the noun phrase *episk feil* ‘epic mistake’. Another attested NP is *dag inn og dag ut* ‘day in and day out’—illustrated in (35).

- (35) Jeg har sovet **dag inn og dag ut**
I have slept day in and day out

This expression already exists in Norwegian, but in reversed order (*dag ut og dag inn* ‘day out and day in’) (see Gottlieb 2012: 181).

Among the prepositional phrases attested are *for nå* ‘for now’ (36), *over og over igjen* ‘over and over again’ (37), *i min mening* ‘in my opinion’ (38) and *når det kommer til* ‘when it comes to’ (39). The last example stands out by being highly frequent in Norwegian (see Høiner 2018).

- (36) Det du har gjort har gitt gode resultater og [...] er godt nok
for nå.
What you’ve done have given great results and is good enough for now.
- (37) **Over og over igjen** ventet jeg på at det skulle ta slutt
Over and over again I waited for it to end
- (38) **I min mening** er dette et interessant synspunkt
In my opinion this is an interesting view
- (39) Oljebransjen er sidrumpa **når det kommer til** ny teknologi
The oil industry is slow when it comes to new technology

While the first one lacks a synonymous expression in Norwegian, (37–39) replace the Norwegian expressions *om og om igjen* ‘around and around again’, *etter min mening* ‘after my opinion’ and *når det gjelder* ‘when it concerns’, respectively.

Borrowed clausal routine formulae attested in Norwegian are *ta vare* ‘take care’ and *utrop til (noe/n)* ‘shoutout to someone/thing’, as shown in (40–41).

- (40) **Ta vare** kjære Guri
Take care dear Guri
- (41) **Utrop til** Niclas som har laget denne tøffe plakaten!
Shoutout to Niclas who has made this cool poster!

Clausal phrasemes serving more discourse-structuring functions are *her går det* ‘here it goes’ (with the verb in the second place), *gjett hva* ‘guess what’, *hør meg ut* ‘hear me out’ and *mine ord eksakt* ‘my words exactly’ (42–44).

- (42) Ok, **her går det**; Jeg var hos en venninne av meg på fest.
Ok, here it goes; I was at a friend of mine at a party.
- (43) Men **gjett hva**, de kommer alltid til å finnes der.
But guess what, they will always exist there.
- (44) Hehe ...**mine ord eksakt**
Haha ...my words exactly

Again, some calques have overlapping Norwegian expressions, (e.g. *ta vare på deg selv* 'take care of yourself' (40), while others like *utrop til* (41), which is used for addressing or applauding someone, and *gjett hva* (43) lack overlapping Norwegian expressions.

Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that highly idiomatic phrases like *opp ens gate* 'up one's alley' and *være ens kopp te* 'be one's cup of tea' are more conscious borrowings than expressions like *dag inn og dag ut* and *gi opp på noen*, which have closely overlapping Norwegian versions.

3.5. Structural borrowing

As seen in Section 2.2.2, structural borrowing was defined broadly as the transfer of phonological, morphological and syntactic traits. In this article, I address English-origin grammatical morphemes and syntactic patterns. Phonetic and phonological borrowing are kept out, as there are few traces of English influence on the Norwegian sound system.²²

Compared with the lexical component, a language's structural features are more stable and less susceptible to change. For this reason, the number of structural borrowings in contact situations like the one in the present study will typically be low. As with the category of word-level and phraseological borrowing, structural borrowing is divided into direct and indirect borrowing. Because of the low number of attested loans, both categories are summarised in a single table (Table 6).

²² Graedler (2002: 59f) gives a few examples of non-English origin names and loanwords that are pronounced in line with English patterns for pronunciation.

Table 6: Examples of structural borrowing.

Category	Type	Loan	Example	English model
Direct	<i>Infl. morph.</i>	plural <i>-s</i>	temas	topics
	<i>Deriv. morph.</i>	<i>-isj/-ish</i>	støvel-isj	boot-ish
Indirect	<i>Syntactic patterns</i>	indef. article	være en bonde	be a farmer
		wh-clause + INF	hva å gjøre	what to do

3.5.1 Direct structural borrowing

Direct structural borrowing from English in Norwegian is visible in the transfer of grammatical morphemes. As mentioned in Section 2.2.2, also derivational morphemes are classified as structural loans in this article since they carry grammatical content.

Morphological borrowing commonly happens by indirect means, when grammatical affixes that are borrowed along with lexical loanwords become productive in the RL. The first structural loan in Table 6 is the attested use of the English plural affix *-s* with Norwegian nouns. Based on the insight that the plural *-s* tended to become analysed as part of the stem (as mentioned in fn. 15, Section 3.3.1), Stene (1945: 158) claimed that this suffix was not connected with plurality in Norwegian. Over 70 years later, however, this is no longer true, as it is fairly common for direct English nouns to be inflected with the plural *-s*. Regarding the inflection of Norwegian nouns, Graedler (2002: 60, 69) claims that the English plural affix is not found except in situations where it is used for humorous effect. While this effect or intention is difficult to measure, observations nevertheless indicate that the plural *-s* is tending to become productive for Norwegian nouns—or more accurately, nouns that are not borrowed from English, as illustrated in (45–54).

- (45) USB ladestasjon til **nettbretts**
USB chargers for tablets
- (46) Eg hatar å fylle ut **skjemas**.
I hate filling out forms.

- (47) Send oss gjerne noen mer eller mindre aktuelle **temas**, takk!
Send us somewhat current topics, please!
- (48) Det er for politikken jeg er her, ikke for mine personlige **opphengs**
I am here for the politics, not for my personal hangups
- (49) Slapp av nettavisen er et konkursbo og trenger **klikks**
Relax, Nettavisen [online newspaper] is bankrupt and needs clicks
- (50) Med dette har vi fått kanalisert vekk porno-snutter, morsomme **klipps** ...etc.
With this, we have drained away porn cuts, funny clips, etc.
- (51) Den består av diverse **videosnutts** jeg fant rundt om på nettet.
It consists of different video clips I found on the internet.
- (52) Har sett mange **forums** som er mye verre!
Have seen many forums that are much worse!
- (53) Laget muffins til **kollegas**
Made cupcakes for colleagues
- (54) Det vil si **datas** som fra før er samlet inn av noen andre.
Meaning data that have previously been collected by others.

The attested examples suggest that the plural *-s* is most likely to occur with neuter nouns (45–50). In Norwegian, neuter nouns typically do not receive inflectional affixes in the indefinite plural form, something which may facilitate the use of English *-s* as a plural marker. It must further be noted that the use of plural *-s* in (49) and (50) may have been triggered by the existence of the overlapping English forms ‘click’ and ‘clip’, respectively. Although not of English origin, the nouns may have been perceived and inflected as if they were. The examples in (52–54) contain well-established Latin loanwords that are traditionally irregularly inflected. As the ‘correct’ declensional class or form may be challenging to recall on the spot, the choice of the English plural affix may be a means of avoiding the need to choose a declension class. As such, although potentially used consciously—either as an avoidance strategy or to achieve a humorous affect—the English plural affix may indeed be catching on in Norwegian.

The next direct structural loan in Table 6 is the derivational affix *-ish*. Norwegian has already borrowed the adjectival affixes *-y* and *-minded* (Graedler, 1998: 195f), of which the latter seems to be most productive in Norwegian, as in *ferieminded* ‘vacation-minded’ and *fartsminded* ‘speed-minded’. Of more recent origin is the derivational morpheme *-ish* (also written *-isj*), which denotes ‘circa’ or ‘similar to’. The morpheme is studied by Nilssen and Kinn (2017; see also Nilssen 2015) who find that the use of *-ish* has steadily increased in frequency since 2000 (Nilssen and Kinn: 2017, 141).²³ *-ish* can be attached to adjectival and nominal expressions to form adjectival constructions (55-56) (denoting either ‘like X’ or ‘similar to X’) or to nominal expressions that are either adjectival or nominal (57).

- (55) Lysbrytere og kontakter i **rødisj** farge med blomster ...
Light switches and contacts in reddish colour with flowers ...
- (56) Du må blande salt, vann og tannkrem til en tynn, **kaffeish** konsistens
You have to mix salt, water and toothpaste to a thin coffee-ish consistency
- (57) Sangen er **ballade-ish**.
The song is ballade-ish.

In these cases, *-ish* can be said to replace Norwegian suffixes like *-aktig* (*rødaktig* ‘reddish’, *balladeaktig* ‘ballade-ish’), *-ete* (*guttete* ‘boy-ish’) and *-lignende* (*støvellignende* ‘boot-ish’). Additionally, *-ish* can be attached to nominal expressions to refer to hour or year, as shown in (58).

- (58) Så at «Homeland» skal starte [...] tirsdag morgen klokka **fem-ish**.
I saw that «Homeland» will start Tuesday morning at five-ish.

Here, the morpheme replaces the free words *cirka* ‘circa’ or *rundt* ‘around’ and hence changes the traditional Norwegian phrasing.

²³ The morpheme also occurs as a free morpheme (e.g. *Jeg har ish samme rumpe* ‘I have ish the same bum’); however this usage is not elaborated in this article.

3.5.2 Indirect structural borrowings

A possible indirect structural borrowing from English in Norwegian regards the increased use of the indefinite article *en*-MASC/*ei*-FEM/*et*-NEUT ‘a(n)’ in nominal predicates in specific contexts. In Norwegian, the realisation or omission of indefinite articles depends on whether the predicate is to be interpreted as an identifying or a characterising/evaluating property of the subject (Faarlund et al. 1997: 733ff). For example, in the sentence *hun er leder* ‘she is a leader’ (meaning ‘manager’), the absence of the indefinite article traditionally demands a reading where the predicate is interpreted as an objective property of the subject: i.e. the subject referred to works or holds a position as a manager. In *hun er en leder*, on the other hand, the realisation of the indefinite article facilitates a more subjective evaluation made by the speaker. Here, the subject is interpreted as carrying certain aspects denoted by or associated with the predicate; for example, the woman has management skills.²⁴ In English, however, this distinction does not exist, and the indefinite article is realised in both cases. In recent times, the indefinite article is attested in contexts where it normally is omitted, as illustrated in (59–60) (examples are taken from Norli 2017, 1).

- (59) Hvordan kan jeg vite at jeg er **en kristen**?
How can I know whether I am a Christian?
- (60) Candace er ikke egentlig en barnepike; hun er **en sykepleier**.
Candace is not really a nanny; she is a nurse

Hence, the potential expulsion of this distinction in Norwegian has a clear English model, and a change is therefore likely to be due to increased knowledge of, and exposure to, English.

The last example in Table 6 involve changes in the usage of wh-clauses. In Norwegian, wh-clauses—even embedded ones—traditionally require finite verbs and overt subjects, as in *Jeg vet hva jeg-SU skal-PRES*

²⁴ The realisation or omission of the indefinite article depends on additional conditions; for example, the article is obligatory in factual reading when the predicate contains a relative clause. A full discussion of the predicate structure is omitted here for brevity.

gjøre ‘I know what I shall do’. This criterion does not apply to English wh-clauses, which may contain both finite and infinite verbs. The loan was first noted by Johansson and Graedler (2002: 23), and the Web reveals numerous examples of the structure in use, as illustrated in (61–62).

- (61) Føler meg helt alene akkurat nå, aner ikke **hvem å spørre** til råds
I am feeling all alone right now, I don't know who to ask for advice
- (62) Ingrid og Kåre Magnus lærer deg ALT om **hvordan å stelle seg** til jul!
Ingrid and Kåre Magnus teach you ALL about how to get ready for Christmas!

The structure is found with all wh-words (i.e. *hvem* ‘who’, *hva* ‘what’, *hvilken* ‘what/which’ and *hvordan* ‘how’), except for *hvorfor* ‘why’. The reason may be that the ‘why’ is typically followed by the present continuous in English rather than an infinitive.

It should be noted that wh-clauses containing the adverbials *hvorfor* and *hvordan* may appear in the infinitive form in Norwegian, but without the infinitive marker. This construction appears to be most common in headlines (or other elliptic constructions) like *Hvordan lage wok* ‘How (to) make wok’. Since it is only possible in adverbial wh-clauses, it is not related to the English loan. However, the existence of this construction in Norwegian may facilitate the borrowing of the other kind.

4. Concluding remarks

Borrowing definitions vary, as do ways of classifying borrowing outcomes. The lines between related terms and concepts are difficult to draw, and it is challenging—if not impossible—to arrive at universally valid typologies that can cover the broad and nuanced spectre of the linguistic influence exerted by a source language on a recipient language. As I have shown in this article, there are varying ways of tackling the task, and the end product depends on terminological definitions as well as the range of borrowings and types of influence one wants to include. The motivation behind the typology suggested in the present study is to

keep the various categories wide and transparent enough to provide a comprehensible frame that is easily applicable to other contact situations. The internal subcategories of the main typology are kept to a minimum, yet can be revised or expanded further within the given frame. By limiting the typology to linguistic borrowing, certain aspects covered by other typologies are ruled out, such as the pragmatic implications of borrowing and domain loss situations. These areas of linguistic influence are clearly relevant in the bigger picture, but are better studied outside a typology.

As regards the Norwegian contact situation, it is difficult to make predictions about future developments. However, it is likely that greater intensity of contact will result in more borrowing, especially between typologically related languages. MacKenzie (2012: 27, 39) predicts that the growing English proficiency among Europeans is likely to affect borrowing patterns, with intensified code-switching among the anticipated changes. As discussed, the difference between ad hoc switches and established loans is challenging to measure, and the recently emerged loans illustrated here are not easily arranged along the code-switching–borrowing continuum. However, although not all innovations will lead to change, the conditions for new borrowings to gain acceptance and diffuse in Norwegian are more likely in a situation of intensified contact and growing English skills. Together with increased code-switching, indirect and structural borrowing are seen as signs of more intense contact (Gottlieb 2012: 177; Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 37). Hence, the manifestations of cross-linguistic interaction discussed in this article are indicative of increasing English proficiency in the Norwegian society.

List of sources

The internet sources were checked 8th December 2018.

- (1) <https://forum.klikk.no/foreldre/topic/144197049-mannen-min-var-utro-veien-videre-s%C3%A5mange-motstridende-f%C3%B8lser/>
- (2) <https://forum.babyverden.no/threads/kjenne-skikkelige-spark-morkaka-framme.1120477/>
- (3) <https://www.ung.no/oss/arbeid/183539.html>

- (4) <https://www.abcnyheter.no/video/2015/01/19/216028/tok-selfies-med-tjuvgodset-ble-fersket-avicloud>
- (5) http://hverdagspresset.blogg.no/1481103853_det_er_s_fkke_d_n.html
- (6) <http://www.fredrikgyllensten.no/2010/06/05/improviserende-trening/>
- (7) <https://community.visma.com/t5/Diskusjon-i-Mamut-One/Lokasjon/td-p/16190>
- (8) <https://www.facebook.com/fridaann/posts/1596261683733339>
- (9) <https://vgd.no/forbruker/jobb-og-utdanning/tema/1783688/tittel/bi-handelshoeyskolen>
- (10) <https://vgd.no/helse-sex-og-livsstil/samliv-generelt/tema/1303319/tittel/hva-syns-jenter-omgutter-som-er-seksuelt-uefarne>
- (11) <https://alreit.no/systemisk-nlp-og-trump/>
- (12) <https://journalisten.no/2017/11/kjetil-stormark-fikk-tyn-bruk-av-anonyme-kilder>
- (13) <https://www.dagsavisen.no/innenriks/navn-i-nyhetene/er-flest-fine-menn-1.766636>
- (14) <https://www.tb.no/tjome/nyheter/pasientgruppen-som-ikke-blir-trodd/s/2-2.426-1.7437854>
- (15) <https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/innbruddstyven-rotet-stjal---og-etterlot-en-snodig-beskjed/68695013>
- (16) http://shally.blogg.no/1246831919_06jul2009.html
- (17) <https://freak.no/forum/showthread.php?t=244643&page=2>
- (18) <http://brahverdag.no/sjekk-den-rumpa/>
- (19) <https://www.nordlys.no/kultur/angrer-pa-at-jeg-ikke-snudde-meg-for-peter-estdahl/s/1-79-5954988>
- (20) http://emmasofias.blogg.no/1473872519_is_wednesday_still_hu.html
- (21) <http://www.klikk.no/forum/foreldre/topic/10692430-haha-in-your-face-brannfolk/>

- (22) <https://www.180.no/bransje/bazaar-trondheim/1.htm>
- (23) <https://www.instagram.com/p/BVcm1bCBAHU/?taken-by=jennyskavlan>
- (24) <https://www.dagbladet.no/kultur/du-kan-ikke-vi-henge-ut-uten-a-drikke-en-dag/63014610>
- (25) <https://lunach.psykmagasinet.no/stikkord/selvhat/>
- (26) <http://www.vn.no/produkter/transportband>
- (27) <https://www.ung.no/oss/forelskelse/81451.html>
- (28) <http://denye.no/hverdagsrasisme/>
- (29) http://hendoriasdigg.blogg.no/1349989762_minifest_muffins.html
- (30) <https://www.facebook.com/tv2sumo/posts/10153329886358796>
- (31) <https://p3.no/musikk/jeg-har-dromt-om-henne/>
- (32) <https://www.medier24.no/artikler/pal-korneliussen-53-gar-av-som-publisher-i-intrafish-og-fiskeribladet-gir-seg-etter-18-ar-med-sjomatjournalistikk/435074>
- (33) http://krisssy.blogg.no/1480332396__vre_litt_normal.html
- (34) https://www.nrk.no/kultur/_heimebane_-har-gitt-mersmak-for-emma-bones-1.14026376
- (35) <https://www.nettavisen.no/sport/golf/--jeg-har-sovet-dag-inn-og-dag-ut/1429696.html>
- (36) <https://helseinspirator.com/2017/03/01/slankeoperasjon-eller-livsstilsendring/>
- (37) <https://www.seher.no/kjendis/jeg-ble-seksuelt-misbrukt-til-jeg-var-14-ar/69321186>
- (38) <https://forskning.no/2016/12/tidsskrift-publiserte-falsk-forskning>
- (39) <https://sysla.no/offshore/oljebransjen-er-sidruppa-nar-det-kommer-til-ny-teknologi/>
- (40) http://nuedetnok.blogg.no/1386445581_nils_kommer.html
- (41) <https://www.facebook.com/PrebzOgDennis/photos/a.263589303763947.58158.260445180745026/444717438984465/>

- (42) <http://forum.kvinneguiden.no/topic/231723-forelsket-i-god-venninedet-gir-ikke-slipp/>
- (43) https://www.nrk.no/ytring/sophie-elise-svarer-_skam_-skuespiller-ulrikke-falch-1.13892672
- (44) <http://forum.babyverden.no/threads/her-bor-vi-bilder.563065/>
- (45) <https://www.123elektronikk.no/usb-lader/usb-ladestasjon-til-nettbretts-5x2.4a.asp>
- (46) Radioresepsjonen (Radio show, NRK P3, 07.11.12)
- (47) <https://www.facebook.com/NRKP13/videos/942919239074015/>
- (48) <https://www.adressa.no/pluss/magasin/2016/05/28/Anarkist-i-bl%C3%A5-skjorte-12793629.ece>
- (49) <http://forum.kvinneguiden.no/topic/1165042-nettavisen-og-trump/>
- (50) <https://www.digi.no/artikler/na-kan-du-teste-din-ip-telefonlinje/281784>
- (51) <https://freak.no/forum/showthread.php?t=57393>
- (52) <https://skolediskusjon.no/Forums/Thread.aspx?id=252>
- (53) <http://730.no/blog.aspx?newsId=6582>
- (54) <https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2406805/Bachelor5030SOS2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- (55) http://ultrababe.blogg.no/1352137780_var_dette_s_lurt_da.html
- (56) http://mythbuster.blogg.no/1415394003_kviser_er_smittomt.html
- (57) <http://vgd.no/musikk-tv-og-film/musikk/tema/1437332/tittel/navn-paa-laar>
- (58) <http://forum.kvinneguiden.no/topic/239703-jaja-sisteordet/?page=6784>
- (59) (Norli, 2017, 1)
- (60) (Norli, 2017, 1)
- (61) <http://forum.kvinneguiden.no/topic/357508-kan-dere-gi-meg-r%C3%A5d-v%C3%A6r-s%C3%A5-snill/>
- (62) <https://www.facebook.com/NRKUnderholdning/videos/1333819593337453/>

References

- Andersen, Gisle. 2015. "Pseudo-borrowings as cases of pragmatic borrowing." In Cristiano Furiassi & Henrik Gottlieb (eds.), *Pseudo-English. Studies on False Anglicisms in Europe*, 123–144. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Andersen, Pia Høgmo. 2007. "Oh bloody hell sir æ åsså tar æ av mæ kappa." *En undersøkelse av engelske innslag i rollespill*. MA thesis, University of Tromsø.
- Brink, Lars. 2006. "Den fraseologiske terminologi." *Nordiske Studier i Leksikografi*, 8, 39–52.
- Brunstad, Endre. 2001. *Det reine språket. Om purisme i dansk, svensk, færøysk og norsk*. PhD thesis, Universitetet i Bergen.
- Burger, Harald. 1998. *Phraseologie: eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt.
- Capuz, Juan Gómez. 1997. "Towards a typological classification of linguistic borrowing." *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 10, 81–94.
- Cowie, Anthony P. 1988. "Stable and creative aspects of vocabulary use." In Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy (eds.), *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*, 126–137. London: Longman.
- Cowie, Anthony P. 1994. "Phraseology." In Ronald E. Asher (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics: 6: [Pac to Qur]*, 3168–3171. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 2001. "What language features can be 'borrowed'?" In Alexandra Aikhenvald and Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance*, 412–436. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie and Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Fiedler, Sabine. 2012. "Der Elefant im Raum... The influence of English on German phraseology" In Furiassi et al. (2012), 239–260.
- Fiedler, Sabine. 2017. "Phraseological borrowing from English into German: Cultural and pragmatic implications." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 113, 89–102.
- Furiassi, Cristiano, Virginia Pulcini and Félix Rodríguez González (eds.). 2012. *The Anglicization of European Lexis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Gottlieb, Henrik. 2004. "Danish echoes of English." *Nordic Journal of English studies*, 3(2), 39–65.
- Gottlieb, Henrik. 2012. "Phraseology in flux. Danish Anglicisms beneath the surface." In Furiassi et al. (2012), 169–198.
- Graedler, Anne-Line. 1998. *Morphological, Semantic and Functional Aspects of English Lexical Borrowings in Norwegian*. PhD thesis, University of Oslo.
- Graedler, Anne-Line. 1999. "Where English and Norwegian meet: Codeswitching in written texts." In Hilde Hasselgård and Signe Oksefjell (eds.), *Out of Corpora. Studies in Honour of Stig Johansson*, 327–343. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Graedler, Anne-Line. 2002. "Norwegian." In Manfred Görlach (ed.), *English in Europe*, 57–81. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graedler, Anne-Line and Stig Johansson. 1997. *Anglismeordboka. Engelske lånord i norsk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Granger, Sylviane and Magali Paquot. 2008. "Disentangling the phraseological web." In Sylviane Granger and Fanny Meunier (eds.), *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*, 27–49. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Grant, Anthony P. 2015. "Lexical borrowing." In John R. Taylor (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Word*, 431–444. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grimstad, Maren Berg, Terje Lohndal and Tor A. Åfarli. 2014. "Language mixing and exoskeletal theory: A case study of word-internal mixing in American Norwegian." *Nordlyd*, 41(2), 213–237.
- Guevara, Emiliano Raul. 2010. "NoWaC: a large web-based corpus for Norwegian." In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 Sixth Web as Corpus Workshop, Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1–7.
- Hanssen, Veronika. 2017. *Norwegian-English Code-switching in 3rd and 5th Grade in a Norwegian Elementary School*. MA thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. "Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability." In Thomas Stolz, Dik Bakker and Rosa Salas Palomo (eds.), *Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes*, 43–62. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 2009. "Lexical borrowing: concepts and issues." In Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook*, 35–54. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. "The analysis of linguistic borrowing." *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
- Hellevik, Alf. 1963. "Lånord-problemet. To foredrag i Norsk språknemnd." Småskrifter 2. Oslo: Cappellen.
- Høiner, Erlend Klouman. 2018. *Norsk utenpå og engelsk inni? En tverrlingvistisk studie av engelske fraseologiske oversettelselån og betydningslån i norsk*. MA thesis, University of Agder.
- Jarmulowicz, Linda and Valentina L. Taran. 2013. "Lexical Morphology: Structure, Process and Development." *Top Lang Disorders*, 33(1), 57–72.
- Johannessen, Maria Boer. 2014. "Alt er awesome i mitt liv". *Social motivations for Norwegian-English code-switching*. MA thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Johansson, Stig and Anne-Line Graedler. 2002. *Rocka, hipt og snacksy. Om engelsk i norsk språk og samfunn*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.
- Larsen, Fritz. 1994. "More than Loan-words: English influence on Danish". *RASK: Internationalt tidsskrift for sprog og kommunikation*, 1, 21–46.
- MacKenzie, Ian. 2012. "Fair play to them: Proficiency in English and types of borrowing." In Furiassi et al. (2012), 27–42.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1998. "Collocations and lexical functions." In Anthony P. Cowie (ed.), *Phraseology. Theory, Analysis and Applications*, 23–53. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Nilssen, Signe. 2015. "Ei raudgrøn-ish dame som meg". *Grammatisk og semantisk om det engelske (-)ish brukt i norsk*. MA thesis, University of Bergen.
- Nilssen, Signe and Torodd Kinn. 2017. "A chameleon abroad: English -ish and ish used in Norwegian." *Maal og Minne*, 1, 123–143.
- Norli, Andreas F. 2017. "Han er en klovn": en studie av den ubestemte artikkelen i predikasjoner og språklig endring. MA thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Norsk språkråd. 1990. Aksjonen for språklig miljøvern. Informasjonshefte utgitt av Norsk språkråd.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581–618.
- Pulcini, Virginia, Cristiano Furiassi and Félix Rodríguez González. 2012. "The lexical influence of English on European languages: From words to phraseology." In Furiassi et al. (2012), 1–24.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. "Types of loan: matter and pattern." In Yaron Matras and Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 15–29. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sandøy, Helge. 2000. *Lånte fører eller bunad? Om importord i norsk*. Oslo: Cappelen akademisk forlag.
- Sandøy, Helge. 2007. "Avissspråket i Norden—ei jamføring." In Bente Selback and Helge Sandøy (eds.), *Fire dagar i nordiske aviser. Ei jamføring av påverknaden i ordforrådet i sju språksamfunn, Moderne importord i språka i Norden* 3, 127–155. Oslo: Novus forlag.
- Sandøy, Helge. 2013. "Linguistic globalization: Experiences from the Nordic laboratory." In Eline Zenner and Gitte Kristiansen (eds.), *New Perspectives on Lexical Borrowing: Onomasiological, Methodological and Phraseological Innovations*, 225–249. Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Sandved, Arthur O. 2007. Engelske lån som leksikografisk problem. *Språknytt*, 35(1), 7–11.
- Schütze, Carson T. 2009. "Web searches should supplement judgements, not supplant them." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 28, 151–156.
- Schütze, Carson T. 2011. "Linguistic evidence and grammatical theory." *Advanced Review*, 2, 206–221.

- Simonsen, Dag F. 1992. "Fra hair design til vill-lokk—om Norsk språkråds aksjon mot anglonorsk." *Språkbruk*, 1, 8–13.
- Stene, Aasta. 1945. *English Loan-words in Modern Norwegian: A Study of Linguistic Borrowing in the Process*. PhD thesis, University of Oslo.
- Sunde, Anne Mette. 2016. "'Inspect kniven i inventoryen min.' Språklig praksis i et nytt domene." *Norwegian journal of Linguistics*, 34, 7–34.
- Sunde, Anne Mette and Martin Kristoffersen. 2018. "Effects of English L2 on Norwegian L1." *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 41(3), 275–307.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. California: University of California Press.
- Van Coetsem, Frans. 2000. *A General and Unified Theory of the Transmission Process in Language Contact*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Walsh, Olivia. 2016. "State language planning in France and Quebec." In Olivia Walsh (ed.), *Linguistic Purism: Language Attitudes in France and Quebec*, Impact studies in language and society, 35–95. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Winford, Donald. 2010. "Contact and borrowing." In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact*, 170–188. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Zenner, Eline and Gitte Kristiansen. 2013. "Introduction: Onomasiological, methodological and phraseological perspectives on lexical borrowing." In Eline Zenner and Gitte Kristiansen (eds.), *New Perspectives on Lexical Borrowing. Onomasiological, Methodological and Phraseological Innovations*, 1–18. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.