

**Chunyi Lei** (South China Normal University, Guangzhou, China)

## VARIATIONS IN VOCABULARY BETWEEN EUROPEAN SPANISH AND LATIN-AMERICAN SPANISH

The official language of most countries in Latin America is Spanish. It was brought to Latin America by the early Spanish colonists in the 15th century. Over hundreds of years, Spanish has developed and changed in accordance with the local history, geography, cultures and customs of Latin America. On the one hand, it has reserved most of the main characteristics of the original Spanish. On the other hand, it has also been influenced by foreign cultures and the rapid development of science and technology occurring nowadays. There are differences in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary between European Spanish and Latin-American Spanish. In the present investigation, we mainly focus on the differences in the vocabulary, based on the cross-cultural perspective, taking into account the etymological, historical, anthropological and, more specifically, linguistic factors. To enhance better mutual understanding, it is necessary and significant to explore the varieties of Spanish in Spain and in Latin America. Besides, the Spanish varieties can reflect the cultural and historical impact on the language. From the linguistic point of view, we collect a number of Spanish expressions used in Spain and Latin-American respectively, and make a corpus according to these data, and then we determine the differences in usage, and try to analyze how differences are caused, i. e. to discuss their origin and motivation. We find out that there are a variety of factors that contribute to their differences.

Firstly, their differences came about partly due to distance and time. As the Spanish began to set out and colonize Latin America, the two cultures were confronted and certain expressions, words, and phrases began to mix with other linguistic influences. Over time, this evolved to create permanent changes in the way the language is used, creating distinct Spanish variations. Secondly, the indigenous people of Latin America exerted a great influence on the Spanish language, and, as a result, differences between the two types of Spanish began to emerge. This was mainly due to the diminishing contact between Latin America and Spain, together with the increase exposure to languages used by the inhabitants of the Americas. Thirdly, other languages and neighboring countries have also affected the Spanish language. American English from the north continues to influence Latin American Spanish vocabulary to this day. Fourthly, the multi-cultural immigrants contribute to the change of Spanish, too. It should also be noted that Chinese and African immigrants also exert some influence on the vocabulary of Latin American Spanish enriching it, which can be observed in various areas where the two varieties are spoken.

**T. N. Fedulenkova** (Vladimir State University, Russia)

## VARIABILITY AND IDENTITY IN PHRASEOLOGY (ON THE BASIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH THE VERB GO)

The problem of variability is considered to be one of the most urgent problems in the field of phraseology because variability is a constant means of development of phraseological stock of the language. The paper is targeted at the study of variability

in English verbal phraseological units (PUs) having the component *go*. The choice of the object for the research is explained by the fact that the verb *go* appears to be one of the most frequent verbs of kinetic semantics in modern English, which has become a center of more than three hundred phraseological units. Selection of language material for research was carried out on the basis of the two phraseological dictionaries: *Bolshoy Anglo-Russkiy Fraseologicheskiy Slovar* edited by A. V. Kunin and the explanatory dictionary of modern English idioms and collocations *Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs* by Rosemary Courtney.

The research is based on the phraseological conception suggested by A. V. Kunin and his disciples. The basic method of analysis we appeal to is the method of phraseological identification. A number of accompanying methods of structural and semantic PU analysis are also used in the paper, namely: the method of phraseological analysis, the method of phraseological description, the methods of structural and quantitative analysis, etc.

Secondly, the problem of variability is one the most important problems in phraseology as it is connected with the problem of identity of the phraseological unit as a linguistic sign. Therefore the paper is targeted at studying variability within a frequent grammatical model of phraseological units with the component *go*: V + Adv + Prep +  $\theta$ . It is a three-component prepositional model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components, where the symbol  $\theta$  stands for a changeable component. The model embraces over 14% of phraseological units in modern English.

Phraseological units embraced by this model comprise a developed row of synonyms and variants: *go on at somebody / be after somebody / be at somebody / be on at somebody / be onto somebody / get after somebody / get at somebody / get onto somebody / keep after somebody / keep at somebody / keep on at somebody (not fml) – “to beg”*; *go on for something / get along for something / get on for something – “to approximate (about a time, a date)”*:

*It's **going on for** midnight, let's go to bed* (Courtney R. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. Harlow: Longman Group Limited, 2000, p. 254).

*It's **getting along for** midnight, let's go to bed* (Там же, p. 211).

*It's **getting on for** midnight, let's go to bed* (Там же, p. 221).

The primary analysis of the components shows us that most phraseological units are subject to different ways of lexical variability:

1) The variability of **verbal** component: *go/ get along with somebody, something – “to agree with someone or something”*, e.g.:

*We'll **go along with** your suggestion, although it's not exactly what we wanted.* (Там же, p. 242).

*Does she **get along well with** your aunt?* (Там же, p. 221).

2) The variability of **adverbial** component: *go back to something/ go down to something – “to stretch, to have a history, retrospective”*; *go across to something/ go over to something – “to change one's opinion, views”*; e.g.:

*A leading politician **went across to** the other party, and is now trying to be elected as its leader* (Там же, p. 241).

*Many people **have gone over to** believing in world government* (Там же, p. 257).

3) The variability of **prepositional** component: *go down to something/go down with something* – “to drown”; *go overboard for something, someone, go overboard for something, someone (not finl)* – “to be exiting, to be crazy (from love)”, e.g.:

*Many teachers **have gone overboard about** the new methods without considering their worth* [4, p. 257].

Grace **has really gone overboard for** that red-haired boy! (Там же, p. 257).

By means of the structural and semantic PU analysis we find out a set of not only lexical variants–verbal, adverbial and prepositional ones as it is shown in this limited abstract–but also a variety of lexical-morphological variants, quantitative and lexical-quantitative variants, syntactic, lexical-syntactic and syntactic-quantitative variants of the phraseological units under study (which are going to be discussed during the conference seminar).

It should be stated that variability of the phraseological units with the verbal component *go* does not deprive the PUs under study of their *identity* as every phraseological unit retains both its structural invariant and its meaning.

The research seems to be perspective from the typological point of view, in the sense that variability is one of the basic features of the language which is considered to be *a universal* and which may be taken into consideration in the would-be **typological passport** (Vladimir D. Arakin’s idea of 1983) of the phraseology of a concrete language.

**M. Garcarz, M. Kuźniak** (Wrocław University, Poland)

#### ENGLISH AS A KILLER-LANGUAGE: ENGLISH BORROWINGS IN CONTEMPORARY POLISH

Without reasons for human contacts, no language could have evolved as a platform of all possible individual and group interactions. If such group contacts have intense and long-lasting nature, the languages involved in it are beginning to shift their course of evolution from coincidental to determined one. In fact, one of those languages in contact – an attribute of the dominating culture, state or the national group – impacts the course of the other one’s evolution. The users of the culture, state or national group are impotent to shake off their oppressor’s dominating role and maintain the oppressed language’s lexicon, syntax, and stylistic conventions according to the oppressor’s language standardized rules of communication.

We take the view that the present-day Polish is undergoing such slow, permanent, and unstoppable mutation of its surface level. English, as this day and age killer-language, demolishes other languages’ communication conventions in multiple ways influencing the language of technology, science, publishing, diplomacy and commerce used today, thereby enhancing globalization tendencies. As a result of this, globalization, in return, has boosted the further spread of the English language on the globe and it has preserved its dominating status.

The observable tremendously significant impact of English as the killer-language on other languages is naturally indisputable. Both lexis and syntax of