UDC 811.111'42:81.36/37

LINGUISTIC DEVIATIONS OF THE PROFESSIONAL LANGUAGE EUROLECT IN THE ENGLISH DISCOURSE

Yehorova O.I., Candidate of Science in Philology,
Associate Professor at the Department of Germanic Philology
Sumy State University

Bila O.Y., Student
specialization "Philology"
Sumy State University

The article focuses on analysing Eurolect as a linguistic phenomenon of the EU legal discourse. Special attention is given to reasoning its scientific labelling given to the phenomenon. Considering Eurolect a separate language system in the process of formation, its lexico-semantic and morphological features are studied in terms of its comparative analysis with the donor-language (English).
Key words: eurolect, professional language, EU legal discourse, deviation, lexico-semantic shift, nominalization.

Статья посвящена анализу лингвистического явления правового дискурса ЕС – евролекта. Внимание концентрируется на проблеме обоснования научного титулования явления. Рассматривая евролект как отдельную языковую систему в процессе становления, авторы анализируют ее лексико-семантические и морфологические особенности путем компаративного сопоставления с языком-донором (английский).
Ключевые слова: евролект, профессиональный язык, правовой дискурс ЕС, девиация, лексико-семантический сдвиг, номинализация.

Єгорова О.І., Біла О.Ю. МОВНІ ДЕВІАЦІЇ ФАХОВОЇ МОВИ ЄВРОЛЕКТ В АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ
Стаття присвячена аналізу мовного явища правничого дискурсу ЄС – євролекту. Фокусується увага на проблемі обґрунтування наукового титулування явища. Розглядаючи євролект як окрему мовну систему в процесі становлення, автори аналізують її лексико-семантичні та морфологічні особливості шляхом компаративного зіставлення з мовою-донором (англійською).
Ключові слова: євролект, фахова мова, правничий дискурс ЄС, девіація, лексико-семантичний зсув, номіналізація.

Introduction. Nowadays, when the European integration is a key and stable foreign policy priority of Ukraine, the European Union is one of the main interests for the whole Ukrainian community whose attention is focused not only on the EU as a geopolitical phenomenon but also on the cultural and language matters concerning the member countries. Despite the linguacultural variety and heterogeneity of the member countries within the EU, the European Community has managed to find common language, both figuratively and literally. Eurolect has become such a kind of supranational language.

Considering the general character of the European integration tendencies in the economic and socio-cultural spaces of modern Ukraine, ever more attention should be given to the matters of systemic organization of the EU legal language continuum as long as integration and adjustment to this legal framework is one of the foreground long-term tasks of the Ukrainian national legal system.

Analysis of recent research and publications. As a linguistic phenomenon Eurolect has been put under consideration in a number of foreign and inland researches. The issue of the Eurolect's impact on other EU languages has been especially highlighted within such projects as L. Mori's *Eurolect Observatory* or Ł. Biel's *Polish Eurolect*. In their studies, A. Trosborg and P. Jesenska are severely critical of Eurolect as a linguistic phenomenon that hampers the understanding of the EU texts. On the contrary, I. Jedrzeowska approaches Eurolect as a *lingua franca* for the whole European community and the author of the term *Eurolect* himself, Rodger Goffin, emphasizes the professional character of its application on the terminological and conceptual levels.

Eurolect has long been primarily in the focus of terminological studies (S. Chirimbu, E. Radai-Kovacs, O. I. Cherednichenko, V. I. Romanchenko, A. L. Hidora etc.); however, the ways of lexical harmonization of the EU legal texts in the course of their translating into other lan-

guages have also drawn attention of both theorists and practitioners of translation. Thus, the Slovak researcher Klaudia Bedharova-Gibova in her studies provides reasoning for discriminating between translating common legal texts and EU legal texts, whereas Ł. Biel, R. Corre, A. L. Kjaer, M. Kajzer, D. Koźbiał, A. Tosi, E. Wagner, K. Wasilewska, D.S. Kasianenko etc. have been investigating into the Eurolect's influence on the language of national law and the issues of adequate rendering the EU law acts in other languages.

Despite a vast number of profound studies on different aspects of Eurolect, there is still no unanimity between the researchers as to discriminating the notions and the corresponding phenomena of *Eurolect, Eurojargon, Eurospeak, Eurobable, Eurofog*. In the focus of these studies, little attention so far has been given to describing lexical and lexico-grammatical deviations of English Eurolect from its prime donor-language.

Setting the objectives. This article aims at defining language deviations of Eurolect from the norms of the standardized British English. Thus, this research features both identification and analysis of lexico-semantic and lexico-grammatical deviations of Eurolect in the context of the English-speaking continuum.

Results and discussion of the research. Despite the EU multilingualism policy, i.e. the legal equality of all twenty-four official EU languages, the efficient and well-coordinated work of all EU institutions seems impossible providing the use of all official languages at once. An immediate response to the challenges of today requires reducing the numbers of the languages actively used in legal context. Over the decades, English, French and German have established themselves as such procedural languages in the discourse of the EU law-making. A particular role here plays English which is not only a tool of global and "intra-European" communication between the nations, but also a medium of information exchange among the EU institutions, and their communication with those of the non-member countries (EU applicants as well).

Such dominant position of English in the language continuum of the EU authorities has made this language the heart of the most noticeable linguistic phenomena studied within Eurolinguistics. We claim that the English used in the EU legal context should be considered a separate variant of the language marked by idiosyncrasies. Close collaboration of the officials, coming from different member states, gave rise to a kind of "interlingual assimila-

tion" [11, p. 106]. In the case of legal English used in the EU, it has become affected by other European languages. Such kind of linguistic behaviour is called linguistic shifts as they represent the language deviations from the norms of English on the various language levels. Accumulation of such differences has made for defining a kind of EU legal English language called in this study Eurolect but also termed in different sources as *Eurospeak, Eurojargon, Eurolanguage, Euro-rhetoric, Euro-legalese, Euromorphology, Union legalese, EUese, EU legal language, eurofog*, [2, p. 76], *euro-bable, euro-waffel* etc.

The terms *Eurofog, Eurobable* and alike highlight the communicative value of the language in the EU legal discourse. Being derogatory in their semantics, they underline the lack of its clarity for both outsiders (specialists not from the Commission or other EU institutions) and the general public. In scientific works and media, such terms are frequently used for denoting the worst kind of bureaucratese to which the EU institutions have responded by the *Fight the Fog* campaign [5] aimed at making the drafting of EU legal texts clearer and more comprehensive to all their potential beneficiaries.

European researchers have still not reached unanimity as to how to treat the phenomenon. Many researchers tend to use the term *Eurojargon* for labelling the specific language of the EU legal discourse. In her studies, M. Kajzer refers to Eurojargon as a variety of language augmented by the terms used specifically in the EU context and terms that in the EU context acquire a new meaning; a variety, which is open to lexical and phraseological innovations and is strongly influenced by EU official languages [8, p. 468]. To some extent synonymous term *Eurospeak* also touches the lexical aspects of the Euro-English as such "coined to describe European Union inventions and concepts which have no exact parallel at national level" [5].

Many researchers hold the opinion that the term *Eurolect* defines the language of all EU legal documents but, considering the fact that the EU has twenty-four official languages and its legal acts are not published in one language, such definition cannot be considered accurate [1, p. 401]. The Slovak linguist P. Jesenska regards *Eurolect* as the accumulation of terms and official word-combinations that are used by the EU clerks [7, p. 401] and the Greek scientist V. Sosoni defines Eurolect as a specific language of the EU law with its own conceptual system [10, p. 213].

Taking into account R. Goffin's neutral approach to defining *eurolect* and M. Dobkiewicz's neat remark that "eurojargon has not shaped its own grammar, which is a definitional criterion of a language" [4, p. 297], in this paper we refer to Eurolect as to a geopolitical variant of the English language that has developed and is being used in the administrative environment of the EU and is marked by a specific vocabulary and morphology (though in the process of formation).

In its formation, functioning and development Eurolect primarily rests on English, especially its vocabulary. On appearing in a new conceptual and linguistic environment, these transplanted lexical units acquire new meanings due to the necessity to refer new unique objects and phenomena. Such change of semantics is called semantic shift.

To analyse the character of semantic shifts of the Eurolect units we organized a sample of the 88 most widespread lexical units found in eurotexts. The guide *Misused English Words and Expressions* by Jeremy Gardner [6] served as the main source of sampling.

Analysis of the sample proves metaphorization to be the most typical form of semantic shift. The context of English Eurolect primarily features metaphorical shifts that are based on likeness of functions or actions (transplantation of meaning from some field of human activity into the field of EU activity): *actor* (a person whose profession is acting on the stage, in movies or on television→ a person, that is generally involved into any activity within the definite field), *modulation* (a process of changing from one tonic or tonal center to another → increase or decrease), *dean* (the person with significant authority over a specific academic unit → the President of the Court of Auditors).

Metaphorical shifts are frequently the results of meaning transfers based on model "concrete" ↔ "abstract" and contrariwise. Examples of such metaphoric lexico-semantic transpositions are such linguistic units as *to elaborate* (to develop, to think smth. thoroughly → to make a plan, a draft etc.) and *to externalize* (to be expressed externally → to co-operate with an outsourcing company for providing some work).

Semantic shifts on the basis of absolute change of the denotatum form one more group of semantic changes. Thus, being transplanted English language units appear in a new conceptual environment where they start verbalizing the concepts different from the conceptual worldview peculiar to that of the donor-language. One of the reasons for this is seen in the influence exerted on English by other European languages, primarily French and German. For example, under the influence of German and French languages *(Instanz, instance)* the noun *instance* has developed the meaning "executive body" along the general meaning "example, a particular situation, demand". Another example is the adjective *eventual* which under the influence of the semantic load of the German lexeme *eventuell* developed the meaning of "possible".

Two more types of semantic changes found in Eurolect are generalisation (expansion of meaning) and specialisation (narrowing of meaning). For instance, the noun *note* ("small office memo") features expansion of meaning in eurotexts where it refers to any official letter regardless of its volume.

Specialisation is a type of meaning change opposite to generalization. Examples of this kind of semantic shifts are such lexical units as *actual* (existing, real → present-day), aid (help → (pl) subsidies), enterprise (business activity → firm, company) etc.

The examples of semantic changes featuring horizontal shift are not frequent but still can be found in the system of Eurolect. A. Blank defines horizontal shift as a blurred conceptual motivation for the semantic change. Speakers make transfers without being aware of it, because their knowledge about the limits of these concepts and the respective categories is momentarily or permanently blurred [3, p. 77]. An example of such a type of horizontal shift in Eurolect is a language unit *contractual*, used in particular in the word-combination *contractual agents* with the meaning "[the workers who work] under the contract". In English the adjective *contractual* is used to denote objects bound by a type of agreement or contract but it never refers to people.

The professional sub-language of the EU is constantly developing as it is used for drafting the EU acts. It suggests the idea that the grammatical organization of the language is undergoing changes and development as well. As long as Eurolect is used in public speeches and official writing, certain grammatical means function for achieving textual cohesion. One of such means, according to eurolinguists, is the phenomenon of nominalisation.

In grammar, nominalisation is defined as a kind of word-building tool realising a change of lexico-grammatical class of the word (mainly verb) toward substantivisation. The supporters of transformational grammar also consider transforming of a verb into a noun group an instance of nominalisation [9, p. 69], e. g. *to use → to make use.*

For this research we took two legal texts in English: *Council conclusions on the role of early childhood education and primary education in fostering creativity, innovation and digital competence* as an example of the EU legal discourse and *Childcare Act 2016* as the case of Great Britain. Both texts were scanned for nominalisation cases. The analysis revealed 41 unique examples of nominalisation in the eurotext comparing to 28 examples in the British legal act. The comparative analysis also proved that the text performed in Eurolect accumulates more verbal noun groups (22 linguistic units in comparison with 15 ones). These are mainly introduced by the units *to promote, to provide, to contribute: to promote the use ← to use, to promote fulfillment ← to fulfill, to provide approach ← to approach, to contribute to improving ← to improve, to give consideration ← to consider*. Although nominalisation is criticized by the organizers and supporters of *Fight the Fog campaign*, this approach to text organisation is still extensively in drafting eurotexts. We believe that this situation is stipulated by several reasons.

From the point of view of syntactic organisation of the text, nominalisation is an efficient way to make the syntax more "compact" and avoid complex sentences. Stylistically, the use of nominalisation allots officialism and abstract character to the drafted text. Moreover, the use of nominalised structures is supposed to highlight the described phenomena rather than actors or actions connected with these phenomena. Hence, due to nominalisation, texts implement the concepts of speech economy and formalism.

Alongside nominalisation Eurolect features some other grammatical deviations both on the morphological and syntactic levels. They are noticeably less frequent, but still represent quite striking deviations from the standards of the English language. The most typical grammatical feature of Eurolect is the change of the category of number of nouns. The study of grammatical shifts in the system of eurolect exposes instances of pluralisation of non-count nouns – the case common tin non-native-speaker Englishes: *competency → competencies, aid → aids, precision → precisions, verification → verifications* etc.

In our opinion, the main reason of such deviations in the category of number is the multicultural environment of the EU and the influence of other languages, primarily German and French. In this way, the language unit *aid* in the meaning of "help, support" is a non-count in English. Influenced by the French norms where it is a countable

noun (*aide – aides*), lexeme *aid* in eurolect also assumes the role of a countable noun. The same applies to the nouns *competences (*from French *competence – competences), verifications (*from German *Überprüfung – Überprüfungen), prefinancing (*from German *Vorfinanzierung – Vorfinanzierungen)*. Thus, the intralingual changes of grammatical behaviour of Eurolect lexemes are greatly caused by the outer factors.

Conclusions. English, being the dominant procedural language of the EU, has also become the core donor-language for providing namings for the newly coined concepts of the EU reality. Taking into account the fact that the EU operates in different languages, English used in this context is under a constant influence of other European languages. This new form of the English language is considered a separate variety of English used in the EU legal context. This variety is stipulated by a number of lexico-semantic and lexico-grammatical deviations from the standardized variants of English found on different language levels.

Most obvious lexico-semantic changes are the results of meaning shifts (metaphorisation, change of denotatum, generalisation, specialisation etc.). Among grammatical deviations nominalisation seems to obtain the most potent features as to organising both syntax and style of the eurotexts. The EU language pluralism has affected the grammar norms of the English spoken in the legal context of the EU as one of the most striking features of it is the shift in the category of number of countable and uncountable nouns.

Thus, unique linguistic character of Eurolect stipulates importance of studying its deviations on all language levels to provide a faithful interpretation of eurotexts in other languages and to ensure alignment of EU law with the norms of national law systems of both member states and applicants to the EU.

REFERENCES:

1. Чередниченко О.І. Євролект і проблеми його перекладу. Мовні і концептуальні картини світу : збірник наукових праць. Вип. 41. Київ: Видавничо-поліграфічний центр «Київський університет», 2013. С. 400–405.

2. Biel L. Lost in the Euro-Fog. The Textual Fit of the Translated Law. The Journal of Specialised Translation. Issue 25. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014. P. 275–277.

3. Blank A., Koch P. Why do new meanings occur? A cognitive typology of the motivations for lexical semantic change. Historical Semantic and Cognition. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1999. P. 61–91.

4. Dobkiewicz M. Eurożargon. Czy istnieje europejska now-omowa? Przegląd Zachodni. Numer 346. Poznan: Kolegium Europejskie w Gnieznie, 2012. P. 297–309.

5. Fight the Fog. How to write clearly / ed. by Directorate-General for Translation European Commission. Brussels, 2003. 13 p.

6. Gardner J. Misused English words and expressions in EU publications. European Court of Auditors: Luxembourg, 2015. 59 p.

7. Jesenska P. Eurospeak and ELF. English as a global Lingua Franka. Slovakia: Matej Bel University, 2007. 21 p.

8. Kajzer M. Translation of Eurojargon as a Source of Neologisms in Polish. A Corpus-Based Stdy. Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University, 2009. P. 467–479.

9. Leech G. A Glossary of English Grammar. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. 144 p.

10. Sosoni V. Law and Language in the EU. Language and Nations: Crossroads and Connections. Münster: Waxmann Verlag, 2016. P. 213–241.

11. Wills W. Translation and Interpreting in the 20th Century: Focus on German. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1999. 256 p.