

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 fml)* – “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

contemporary languages are undergoing noticeable changes, and especially in writing, the lexical borrowings and the syntactic calques from English start the chain mutation of the non-English languages' nativity, which in the long run will impact those languages' communicational DNA. As an effect, non-English languages will start to become denativized through the omnipresence of English wordstock and English syntactic constructions in their users' cognitive 'language minds', that is in the national *compléments cognitifs*. Similarly to the Copernicus Law stating that in any circulating currency "good" money becomes dominated by the "bad" money, vocabulary and syntactic communication conventions (the "good" norms and rules) typical of a given non-English language will become dominated by the "bad" ones – recognized in English or having the English language provenance.

Our primary goal here is to shed more light on reasons and mechanisms of "overborrowingization" of the English lexis into contemporary Polish, basing our claims on citation evidence.

W. Griebhaber (Sprachenzentrum der WWU Münster, Germany)

REPLACING MORPHEMES BY PREPOSITIONS: FROM THE OPERATIVE FIELD TO THE SYMBOL FIELD

In German L1 acquisition, it takes a long period of time for the case inflections to be acquired completely. The polysemic nature of case inflections is considered to be one reason for this. The inflectionary morpheme *-er*, for example, can indicate nominative (masculine), genitive (feminine) or dative (feminine). The difficulty of phonetic differentiation is considered a further problem (Szagun 2006; Hoffmann et al 2017). In L2 acquisition, the fact that the languages spoken within the family may be very different typologically is a further hurdle in acquiring German cases.

Inflection plays a particular role with reference to two-case prepositions (e. g. *an, auf, in*) as the case defines their meaning. *An* with accusative (*ein Bild an die Wand hängen* 'to hang a picture on the wall') is target-oriented, with dative (*das Bild hängt an der Wand* 'the picture hangs on the wall ') it is static. If *zu* refers to an object in a target-oriented way, then it is always governed by the dative, whereas directional *in* followed by an accusative includes the interior of the target object as final point. With L2 learners, it appears that in connection with the movement verb *gehen* 'to go' there is a tendency to use the two-case preposition *in* less in favour of *zu* (see Table 1).

<i>to go ...</i>	<i>in</i> + accusative	mistakes	<i>zu</i> + dative	mistakes
German (GER)	26,5%	0%	14,7%	20%
Turkish (TRK)	8,8%	17%	13,2%	22%
Serbocroatian (SCR)	14,8%	0%	29,6%	0%

Table 1: Frequency of *in* and *zu* with regard to the movement verb *gehen* 'to go'; Data basis: 121 narrative texts written by 4th-year primary school pupils on the basis of a visual impulse