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## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWb</td>
<td><em>Anglizismen-Wörterbuch</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE</td>
<td><em>Chambers Dictionary of Etymology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMT</td>
<td><em>Commissions ministérielles de terminologie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD</td>
<td><em>The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAE</td>
<td><em>Diccionario de argot español</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td><em>A Dictionary of European Anglicisms</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td><em>Duden Rechtschreibung</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAE</td>
<td><em>Diccionario de la Real Academia Española</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EiE</td>
<td><em>English in Europe</em> (dictionary project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDU</td>
<td><em>Grande dizionario italiano dell’uso</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td><em>Grand Larousse Dictionary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLFF</td>
<td><em>Grand Larousse de la langue française</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td><em>Institut für Deutsche Sprache</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td><em>International Phonetic Association</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ital.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>Languages for Specific Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td><em>Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEL</td>
<td><em>The Oxford Companion to the English Language</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td><em>Oxford English Dictionary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port.</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>source language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDSV</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift des deutschen Sprachvereins</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In September 2006, scholars from several European countries met in Regensburg at a conference called Anglicisms in Europe 2006, in order to exchange their thoughts and the results of their research regarding the influence of the English lexis on other European languages in various fields of discourse, social attitudes towards this phenomenon and its reflections in recent lexicographical work. The present volume contains some of the papers read at the conference, thus making an intercultural and interdisciplinary contribution to this complex and topical theme. It links linguistic aspects with psychological, social, political and cultural issues, tracing relationships and differences between the respective research interests and findings. Its aim is to put the influx of anglicisms into languages other than English into a wide perspective encompassing the European heterogeneity of cultures, traditions and developments.

The present volume opens with an introduction by Roswitha Fischer, including basic information on the sociological, historical, political, and linguistic background for the studies discussed herein as well as defining the terminology applied. The following four parts of the volume reflect the particular foci of interest in the recent research on anglicisms in the languages of Europe.

PART I: Cognitive and Semantic Approaches to Anglicisms

This section comprises three articles that deal with the cognitive, communicative and semantic motivation for contact-induced innovation.

The article by Esme Winter-Froemel summarizes the past and current theoretical approaches and classifications pertaining to borrowing, assimilation and integration processes, and proposes a new classification based on criteria that account for the cognitive processes involved in the introduction of new contact-induced lexical items. The author presents the main strategies pertaining to contact-induced lexical innovations, such as importation of a word from the source language, analogical innovation and
independent innovation, and their further subdivisions based on the degree of adaptation and the presence of word-formation processes or semantic change. The fundamental issues discussed are the contexts of use which promote these different strategies, the speaker-related and hearer-related cognitive operations involved in each of them and the cognitive and communicative aspects which determine later uses of the resulting contact-induced items. Finally, the author discusses the ease of learning and memorization of these items for different types of learners and the implications of particular strategies for international communication.

The paper by Nevena Alexieva tries to answer the question why many anglicisms deviate lexically from their English source words, and argues that the traditional treatment of borrowings as foreign words in the receptor language fails to answer this question convincingly. The author offers an alternative approach which recognizes the active role of the borrowing language. This role is interpreted as an ability to create close lexical copies of the respective model words in the source language; the loanwords created in this way share with the rest of the receptor language lexicon the structural and semantic potential for dynamic development leading to the creation of further new meanings and words. This approach is supported with an analysis of the independent lexical development, often along similar lines, of some anglicisms in the Dictionary of European Anglicisms.

This issue of the creation of linguistic difference between the source and recipient languages, rather than their greater linguistic homogenization, as a result of processes related to lexical borrowing, reappears in John Dunn's article. Examples quoted come mostly from Russian, but it is suggested that the principles governing these processes apply to a greater or lesser extent to all European languages. Semantic, formal, cultural and "creative" factors involved in producing linguistic difference are amply discussed. Quite in line with Alexieva's view, Dunn's article demonstrates the paradox that linguistic globalization is often at the same time linguistic fragmentation, which has the somewhat unexpected consequence of leading to a more complex and varied linguistic landscape.

**PART II: Attitudes towards the Influx of Anglicisms**

The articles in this section deal with various national attitudes towards anglicisms, and their reflection in the respective languages. Apart from the issue of the possible Anglo-Saxon cultural dominance, the motivation and success of institutional attempts to influence the influx of anglicisms are discussed.
The section begins with an article by Irene Doval, who relates the history of organized activities aimed at the purification of German from Anglo-Saxon influences in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The article demonstrates a historical continuity of fears regarding foreign influence and of purist language ideology, as well as meager practical effects of this ideology on the German language in the said period.

Nowadays, of all European countries it is France that is probably most widely heard of as a site of organized and institutional purism directed against the influx of anglicisms, and it is a belief held by many that these attitudes considerably affect the French language. This picture is examined critically in the article by John Humbley, who questions the view of French as less susceptible to Anglo-Saxon influence than many other European languages. The author presents data on the influx of lexical anglicisms in French, German, Italian, Spanish and Rumanian, quoting the results of comparative studies and focusing in particular on the methods and sources available for such an examination.

Whichever the official policies, the area which reflects social attitudes to language and culture held by broad masses of national populations is the naming conventions. Roswitha Fischer argues in her article that modernization, globalization and mass tourism may incur social changes resulting in positive attitudes to Anglophone values, which in turn affect the choice of names given to the newly-borns. The aim of the study is to compare the naming practices of various European countries with regard to names that originate from or are associated with the Anglophone societies. The author discusses theoretical and methodological problems related to investigating first names. After summarising the existing research in the field, she presents the results and evaluation of a questionnaire about English first names conducted in Poland, and suggests that modernization and globalization may be accompanied by the tendency to vivify old cultural values.

In the article by Pertti Hietaranta, a stance is taken against the excessive concern of a part of the public regarding the current considerable influx of anglicisms in Finnish. The unwarranted purism, the author argues, should be replaced by the analysis of the rationale for using such linguistic innovations. The communicator's social and economic intentions, such as maintaining professional credibility, confirming social expectations and compliance with the conventions of a given genre, are discussed as the rational motivation behind the lexical choice in favour of contact-induced items. Finally, the role that other pragmatic factors, such as technical and time-saving considerations in the process of translation, may play in such choices is briefly pointed out.
PART III: The Use of Anglicisms in Specialized Discourse

Articles in this section focus on particular practices and domains such as business, sports, the sciences, and on language varieties used in communication within particular subcultures. They also discuss whether, and to what extent, the adopted technical vocabulary imported from English has become institutionalized, and what the attitudes are regarding this process.

The Winter Olympic Games in Turin in 2006 gave Victoria Pulcini the opportunity to observe how the Italian language reacts to being used in the international context by the increased use of English elements in the vocabulary of winter sports. The article focuses on several winter sports represented in the Olympics and their related semantic fields, and presents the analysis of a corpus of newspaper articles dealing with the Olympic Games published during the event.

Heiko Girnth and Sascha Michel note the scarcity of studies dealing with the use of loan-shortenings from English in German, and contribute to filling this research gap by analysing the use, status and function of loan-shortenings from English in the media of the German Police and the Armed Forces. Their diachronic and synchronic corpus analysis is based on newspapers and magazines dated between 1965 and 2005. It is suggested that an analysis applying the notion of a linguistic prototype can systematize and enrich the study of English shortenings used in German.

Angelika Bergien's article on English elements in German company names discusses considerations involved in giving names to business ventures and presents a socio-onomastic survey conducted in Saxony-Anhalt (Germany). The aim of the survey was to find out the reasons for the use of foreign elements in the names of companies based in Germany, and the consumers' response to such names. The study reveals how the use of foreign - in particular English - elements in company names is regarded by company owners as a means of creating positive connotations and making products more successful by giving them the aura of international renown. Attitudes of different consumers' age groups are examined separately and generational contrasts indicated.

While the principles of French language policy and its limited success are discussed in the earlier article by John Humbley (outlined above), Tibor Orsi chooses to focus on the etymological aspects of eliminating anglicisms from French. His article is concerned with the techniques applied in the process of "frenchification" on the example of the special vocabulary of informatics. Various strategies used in the process of replacement are illustrated with copious examples. The author discusses
contact-induced motivation for the forms of French equivalents, such as phonological or graphemic similarity to English source items, and transparency of semantic relationships as another type of motivation for replacements. Another aspect discussed is the role of Greek and Latin in providing non-English alternatives.

The paper by Hanna Pułaczewska reports the findings of comparative research on anglicisms in major German and Polish hip-hop magazines. The differences in the German and the Polish use of lexical anglicisms and code switching in both languages are quantitatively analysed. The interpretation of the data touches upon the role of English expressions as signs of interest in maintaining close links to the American source model in the respective two communities. The ongoing critical discussion on anglicisms within the German hip-hop community is interpreted as a sign of emancipation from the earlier dislike of language purism, which used to be regarded as a symbolic expression of German nationalism.

Finally, Félix Rodríguez González scrutinizes the many anglicisms that form part of Spanish male homosexual terminology, including general concepts related to the homosexual condition and more specific concepts pertaining to particular sexual orientations, as well as communicative and sexual practices of the members of the homosexual minority. The data used in this work have been drawn from various sources: homosexual magazines with a wide circulation, gay novels, specialized glossaries, chats on the internet, and oral interviews. Examining English influence on vocabulary used in this field, the author refers to the context in which this influence has taken place, which leads him to give an account of the role played by English speaking countries, notably the United States, in shaping gay culture.

PART IV: Anglicisms in Dictionaries

A practical consequence of the rising influx of anglicisms into other languages are dictionaries of English loanwords and bilingual dictionaries of special languages. In many European languages considerable efforts have been taken to produce such wordbooks. The three articles comprising this final section deal with the existing dictionaries of anglicisms in European languages and provide a future-oriented perspective by making suggestions and recommendations regarding future lexicographic works.

The first article by Ulrich Busse is concerned with the Dictionary of European Anglicisms (DEA) edited by Manfred Görlach in 2001, a pioneering comparative work which records the usage of anglicisms in sixteen European languages. Important concepts in the theoretical and
practical approach represented in *DEA* are *usage, acceptance* and *integration*. The article offers a closer look at these concepts and the ways they intersect. The methodology and the categories applied in *DEA* are scrutinized in the light of review articles, and suggestions are made on how to improve the second edition of the dictionary.

The aim of Marcin Kilarski & Marcin Ptaszyński's article is to examine the extent to which the adaptation of English loanwords in receptor languages is reflected in selected dictionaries of anglicisms. With their focus largely confined to spelling, phonology, and inflection, they investigate and compare the presence or absence of linguistic data concerning particular issues within each of these areas in the *Dictionary of European Anglicisms* with three other contemporary dictionaries of anglicisms in Polish, German and Norwegian. Led by these insights, the authors come up with tentative suggestions for improvement in representing the adaptation of English loanwords in future dictionaries of anglicisms.

The closing article by Cristiano Furiassi aims at quantifying the impact of non-adapted anglicisms in Italian with the aid of frequency counts. The study is based on a sample list of non-adapted anglicisms retrieved from a vast Italian corpus of newspaper texts. Their analysis shows that, even though the number of anglicisms in Italian dictionaries may be regarded as considerable, the extent to which they are used in newspaper texts - a genre which has been traditionally recognized by linguists as prone to including borrowings in general and specifically anglicisms - amounts to much lower percentages. It is argued that while marketing strategies force publishers and editors to maximize the number of entries in dictionaries of borrowings, especially anglicisms, only corpus-based frequency counts, which testify their actual usage, should be considered meaningful. The author suggests that threshold frequencies should determine which anglicisms should be included in monolingual general and special purpose dictionaries, both for Italian and other languages; corpus linguistics may help to provide such tentative frequency scores.
INTRODUCTION
STUDYING ANGLICISMS
ROSWithA FISChER

Languages respond to the changing needs of communication, following changes in the world and ways of living. The growing influence of English on the languages of Europe is an example of a linguistic change under contact conditions. It can be traced back to political, economic and technological developments, which have been taking place at a growing pace in the past few decades. In Europe, the countries are nowadays working closely together, and the European Union has expanded to 27 nations. English functions as the interlingual medium of European communication and has played a key role in the growing together of the European West and East in recent years.

An interlingual means of communication certainly has its merits but also involves a number of problems, such as disadvantages for lack of language proficiency, the diversity of cultures and their history, and the different structures and meanings of the various languages. In addition, national languages form national identities, and a nation may fear being foreignized by means of the Anglophone culture represented by the English language.

1. Research Fields

The study of lexical borrowings has a long tradition going back at least to the historical comparative language studies of the 19th century and extending over all philologies. While the comparison of languages and their history was the focus of language studies in the 19th century and descriptive-structural approaches prevailed until the middle of the 20th century, the cognitive-semantic view has achieved wide acceptance nowadays, with prototype semantics having paved the way. Research on anglicisms concentrates on several main areas. First of all, a number of empirical-descriptive studies should be mentioned, mostly based on print
media as general text corpora (cf. Görlach 2002a). Then there is the lexicographical preoccupation with anglicisms, with the dictionaries of Broder Carstensen, Manfred Görlach and Ulrich Busse leading the way (Carstensen, Busse and Schmude, eds. 1993-1996, Görlach, ed. 2001). The many popularized collections of neologisms and anglicisms will only be briefly mentioned here. Furthermore, some historical studies deal with the increase of the influence of English, accompanied by research on attitudes towards anglicisms and on language policies. Opinions range from an open disparagement of anglicisms to a differentiated assessment of facts and problems, pointing to solutions and future perspectives (cf. Spitzmüller 2005, Görlach, ed. 2002). In addition, anglicisms have been explored with respect to certain language registers and technical languages. While anglicisms in news language and in the language of advertisements have been extensively studied for several decades, other specialized discourses have gained in importance in European research since the 1990s, for instance the language of computer technology, business or medicine.

The preoccupation with anglicisms always involves the consideration of English in a global context, which, at least indirectly, influences the borrowing of English words or word elements into other languages. Nevertheless, English dominates only in certain subject areas. Three main functional dimensions can be distinguished: English as a lingua franca, as a learner language, and as a technical language (Fischer 2007: 149-62). The use of English as a lingua franca and as a learner language leads to a growing familiarity with the English language, which has a positive effect on the spread and the integration of English words into the receiver language.

2. The Spread of Anglicisms

Scholars involved in Görlach's lexicographical project observed that English was distributed relatively unevenly in the vocabulary of European languages, and vacillated rather strongly (Görlach, ed. 2002). Moreover, a large majority of the loans often seem to have a distribution restricted to particular topics or subject areas. The English technical terms can often be attributed to the written medium. They are only used occasionally and do not belong to the common word stock of a language. In addition, English colloquialisms tend to occur in advertising, in journalism and in youth language, carrying a certain prestige in these discourse types.
When a word has been borrowed, it becomes integrated into the receiver language with varying extent. Görlach distinguishes three main degrees of acceptance:

a) The word is fully accepted - either the word is not (or no longer) recognized as English, or is found in many styles and registers, but is still marked as English in its spelling, pronunciation or morphology.

b) The word is in restricted use.

c) The word is not part of the language - it is either a calque or a loan creation, or mainly known to bilinguals, or used only with reference to British or American contexts. (Görlach 2002b: xxi-xxiv)

When an English word finds its way into another language, mostly only one or a couple of the individual meanings of the (polysemous) English word are borrowed. After the borrowing process has taken place, the word may lose or change its meaning(s) or develop new meanings in the receiver language. Borrowings are generally eligible for the same type of semantic changes as native words, i.e. metonymic extension, metaphorical shift, polysemous extension, or loss of a polysemous meaning. There may also be changes in style or connotation. Therefore, at least in theory, we have to distinguish between the borrowing process as such, i.e. when the borrowing enters the receiver language, and consecutive processes, i.e. when the newly borrowed word undergoes further changes in the language of which it has now become a part. The original English meaning may then also become opaque. These subsequent changes have become the crucial factor for cognitivists: they assume that the status of a borrowing is, strictly speaking, not a replica but a new linguistic concept.

Though it is often claimed that anglicisms are increasing more and more in the European languages, it is not so easy to verify this statement. Some studies of anglicisms trace English borrowings and their numbers in dictionaries or newspapers over several decades, collecting, counting and categorizing the words. With respect to anglicisms in German, studies by Busse and Onysko show that anglicisms are indeed on the rise, though not to a large extent, compared to the overall number of everyday words. By comparing the editions of the German Spelling Dictionary from 1880 and 1986, Busse found that in the 1880 edition the percentage of English words amounted to 1.36% (= 385 anglicisms out of 28,300 entries),
compared to 3.46% (= 3,746 anglicisms out of 108,100 entries) in 1986. Even if the 5,000 mark may be passed in the next century - or has already been passed -, there is, according to Busse, no danger of a possible foreign infiltration of German through English. After all, this number only accounts for a fraction of the amount of words that the German language has borrowed in the course of its history, mainly from French and Latin/Greek (cf. Busse 2005: 57-70, Onysko 2007). Though the numbers of anglicisms in languages other than German may differ from the ones found by Busse, foreignization of other languages through English seems unlikely, at least not in the face of the prevailing restrictedness of the usage of anglicisms.

3. Attitudes towards Anglicisms

The increasing international influence of English has been welcomed by many, but criticized by many others. While some appreciate its political, economic and cultural advantages, others are sensitive to a possible threat to other languages and cultures. However, complaints about a take-over or at least an infiltration through foreign words are nothing new. Until the 19th century this critique was mainly aimed at French; later English became the focus of attention. From the viewpoint of linguistics, lexical borrowing is a natural process which has been going on since the beginning of languages and language-induced contact. In view of the fact that more than half of the English vocabulary today originates from French, it has a certain ironical tinge that French commissions nowadays try to ban the English element from the French word stock. That the borrowing from foreign languages facilitates and enriches communication cannot be denied. Sooner or later the foreign words that happen to stay in a receiver language will be integrated into the existing language structures to such an extent that they will not be recognized as foreign any more.

But the critique of the anglicisms is not so much about the fact that language is a means of communication, but rather about language being a symbol of the national and cultural identity of a speech community. Anglicisms embody Anglophone or American social and cultural structures and values, which can be perceived as a threat to one's own values.

In order to avoid the negative connotations of English borrowings, Juliane House distinguishes between languages of communication and languages of identification (House 2005: 53-65). The advantage of this distinction is that English and one's own national language are not perceived as competitors but rather as complementary possibilities of
communication. Accordingly, anglicisms should function as a means of communication and not of identification. But there lies the rub: many people do not perceive the transfer of certain English or even "pseudo-English" words into their language through the advertising media or the entertaining industry as a meaningful kind of communication, but rather as an attempt to take over their national and cultural values.

4. Terminology

Since the study of borrowings has had such a long tradition in the linguistic area not just of one culture but of many, the terminology found in the vast number of studies is very mixed. In addition, different linguistic approaches have generated differing concepts and terms. The following section aims to shed some light on issues of terminology.

4.1. Types of Lexical Change

First of all, a useful distinction is the one between onomasiological and semasiological types of lexical change (including lexical semantics). Word-formation and borrowing are onomasiological changes, while meaning changes belong to semasiology. The semasiological changes can be further divided into denotational meaning changes, such as narrowing, widening, metonymy and metaphor, and connotational meaning changes, such as pejoration and amelioration. Consider the following table (following Geeraerts 1997):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Onomasiological</th>
<th>Semasiological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denotational Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-formation</td>
<td>Narrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the integral phase of borrowing, the borrowing process implies an onomasiological change. In addition, however, a semasiological change is also taking place, since not all meanings of the word in the source language are generally taken over into the target language. In the
post-integral phase, further semasiological changes and also onomasiological changes (e.g. new compounds or derivatives) are likely to happen. Thus in borrowing onomasiological and semasiological changes are closely intertwined.

4.2. Types of Borrowing

But what exactly is a borrowing? Though phonological, morphological and syntactic borrowing also exists, the term is usually applied to words and their meanings. Borrowing denotes the process as well as the object. As a process it typically refers to the importation of a word or its meaning from one language into another. As an object, it denotes the form and/or the meaning of the item that originally was not part of the vocabulary of the recipient language but was adopted from some other language and made part of the borrowing language's vocabulary.

A second cause for the fuzziness of the term borrowing is its use for a subgroup of borrowing, namely lexical borrowing, in contrast to semantic borrowing. Lexical borrowings are also called loan words or loans. Both the form and (parts of) the meaning of a foreign word become imported, not only the meaning as is the case with semantic borrowing. Some scholars also equate lexical borrowing with direct or integral borrowing, i.e. a borrowing whose form is transferred directly from the source language, and not via another language. The latter case is usually called indirect borrowing.

Semantic borrowing can be further subdivided into loan meaning and loan formation. Loan meaning refers to the borrowing of a meaning through meaning extension of a word in the recipient language. An example is German Maus for a small hand-held input device used to move a cursor on the computer screen. By analogy with the English mouse in computer science, the new meaning of the word mouse was also extended to German Maus. Three further subcategories of semantic borrowing can be subsumed under the term loan formation: loan translation (calquing, loan shift), i.e. the (complete) translation of a borrowing (e.g. German Bildverarbeitung < English picture processing); loan rendition (loan rendering), i.e. the partial translation of a borrowing (e.g. German Taktfrequenz < clock frequency); and loan creation, i.e. free translation (e.g. German Klimaanlage < air conditioning).

A mixture of lexical and semantic borrowing results in hybrid formations, also called mixed compounds, semi-calques or loan blends, denoting a word or word combination that consists of elements of both source and receiver language. Sometimes the expression total substitution
is used for semantic loans, and *partial substitution* for hybrid formations. Lexical borrowings in this terminology are not substitutions but importations. A German example of a hybrid is *Soundkarte*, from English *sound card*.

Finally, there are *pseudo-borrowings*, or *pseudo-loans*. These are words or word elements in languages other than English that were borrowed from English but are used in a way native English speakers would not recognize. Pseudo-anglicisms often take the form of blends, combining elements of multiple English words to create a new word. A German example is *Showmaster* from English *show + master*; a *Showmaster* is in British English a *compère* (borrowed from French) and in American English an *emcee* (a spelling pronunciation of the initial letters of *master of ceremonies*). Pseudo-borrowing can happen on the formal and on the semantic level. The German word *beamer* is a lexical pseudo-loan: the word was coined on the basis of the English word *to beam* and -er formations (common in both German and English), but does not exist in English. An example of a semantic pseudo-loan is German *flirt*, denoting an event, and not a person as in English.

The following Table 4-2 gives an overview of the various types of borrowing. Not only may the terminology vary (cf. the alternative terms given above), but also other categorizations are possible, and differ from scholar to scholar. While, for instance, Yang subsumes *lexical borrowing*, *hybrid formation*, and *pseudo-borrowing* under one group, Onysko believes that *pseudo-borrowing* is actually no borrowing at all and that Yang's categorization blurs the important distinction between lexical and semantic borrowing (Yang 1990, Onysko 2007). Note that the authors in this volume were allowed to use their own terms, as long as there were no overall contradictions.

### Table 4-2 Types of Borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Lexical borrowing</th>
<th>Loan meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Semantic borrowing</td>
<td>Loan formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. *Anglicism* and Related Terms

The term *anglicism* was first used in the 17th century and refers to an expression from English used in another language (cf. *Oxford English Dictionary*). Further, it can also mean a characteristic or fashion deriving from England, such as cricket or afternoon tea in Pakistan; or a feature of the English language peculiar to England, such as the working-class phrase *feelin' proper poorly* ('feeling really ill') (cf. *Concise Oxford Companion to the English Language*). For our topic, the two latter meanings are not relevant, and therefore we will restrict ourselves to the first meaning of *anglicism*. Today the term is commonly associated with the increasing influx of English borrowings from WW II onwards, related to the international role of mainly the United States, and to English as a *lingua franca*. Opponents of anglicisms often use the term derogatively.

Though *anglicism* is connected to the word *England* etymologically, it is generally not only used for anglicisms from England, but also for English loans from all varieties of the English language. Sometimes, in order to specify the origin of an anglicism, the term *Americanism* is also used for borrowings originating from the United States, this then being a subordinate of the term *anglicism*.

As with any neologism, an anglicism may undergo certain phases of integration into a language. At first, it is still very new and not known to many speakers. Eventually, it may spread and take part in a process of institutionalization. This process is brought to a close when the word has become part of the common core of the language (Fischer 1998: 16), by which time, ideally, the anglicism will not be recognized as such any more, and as a consequence, should not be called an anglicism any longer. Since it is often difficult to decide whether an anglicism has become a fully accepted word of the vocabulary of a language, especially when only decades and not centuries have passed by, many scholars include all English borrowed expressions in their analysis. However, this procedure is not really satisfying because it goes against the native speaker's intuition.
Another possibility is to base one's judgement on one's own instinctive feel for the native tongue, which, however, is subjective and therefore also a rather dubious method. A way out of this dilemma may be to check whether an anglicism is listed in a dictionary of foreign words of the language concerned, or whether it already occurs in a common monolingual desk dictionary. Furthermore, it is also possible to sample out new words that have been coined recently and whose source and date of origin is known. The problem of selecting anglicisms is not easily solved, and is also dependent on the focus and the data of a study.

A non-established borrowing is also sometimes called a *foreignism*, but only if it is a lexical and not a semantic borrowing. Foreignisms are said to be used for a particular purpose, for instance to make a connection with a specific culture by means of its language. An obvious example is the association of a certain subject matter (*love - amour*) with a certain culture (*French*). In written language, *foreignisms* mostly occur in parenthesis or in italics. There tends to be a gradation from more to less foreign, depending on the background and attitude of the speaker, the distribution of the word, and the variety of a language. However, any word can be used for a particular purpose, so the boundary between *foreignism* and *lexical borrowing* is indistinct. Since the two concepts cannot be kept strictly apart, it seems best to avoid the technical term *foreignism* altogether.

Whether a word is perceived as new (or foreign) or not is also related to its degree of *adaptation* or *nativization*. Both terms refer to the adjustment of spelling, pronunciation and/or morphology of loan words to the native structure of the receptor language. Though institutionalization does not necessarily go hand in hand with adaptation, it often does. The degree of adaptation also reflects the closeness of the contact and attitudes of the affected speech community. *Adaptation* is sometimes distinguished from *adoption*, which is defined as mainly unmodified borrowing (cf. Hock ²¹⁹⁹¹: ⁴⁰⁸). However in practice, many scholars use *adaptation* and *adoption* synonymously, since few completely non-adjusted borrowings exist, at least regarding pronunciation. Since many exhaustive studies on the adjustment of borrowings exist already, and since they mostly deal with language-internal structural matters, we decided from the very beginning to exclude from this volume contributions that primarily focussed on this matter. Instead we focussed on more current interests in anglicisms in Europe, such as cognitive and semantic issues, language policies and attitudes, technical languages, and dictionary compilation (cf. ¹).

Another question is whether *pseudo-anglicisms* should be viewed as anglicisms, since they are not true borrowings. Nevertheless, most scholars
at least deal with pseudo-anglicisms in connection with anglicisms, since the influence of English is obvious. Moreover, many pseudo-formations lend themselves to study because they are so impressive and extraordinary.

Some scholars also distinguish between anglicisms and internationalisms, for instance the editor Görlach in his Dictionary of Anglicisms (Görlach, ed. 2001: xix). According to Görlach, internationalisms are words of Latinate or neo-Greek origin and have nothing English in their form or pronunciation. This is why they should be excluded from the category of anglicisms. However, whether the form of a word looks or sounds English often depends on the differences or similarities of the linguistic structures of the source and the target language. For this reason Görlach also included internationalisms if an English pronunciation was at least attested in one of the 16 languages documented. This solution is not quite satisfactory, because it does not seem reasonable to say that a word is an anglicism in one European language, while it is not in another. - Again, the choice is the author's.

Another decision to make is whether to include cases of code-switching or not. The term has mainly been used for the mixture of the elements of two languages in conversations among bilinguals. While code-switching is a syntactic process retaining the structural markings of the source language, borrowing is said to be a lexical process, structurally integrating lexical units. Moreover, code-switching mostly consists of multi-word sentential units, in contrast to borrowings, which are usually considered mono-lexical. However, these distinctions fail to account for the possibility of single-word code-switches and multi-word borrowed units. It is probably best to consider code-switching and borrowing as a cline of usage (cf. Onysko 2005).

5. Anglicisms - A Challenge for Europe?

The aim of this conference - and also of this volume - was to have a representative range of studies from all over Europe, representing the languages of Northern, Western, Southern and Eastern European countries. When setting out our call for papers, the applications from Eastern European countries were comparatively numerous, which may also have been related to the fact that special funding for Eastern European countries was available due to various partnerships between Regensburg University and universities in Eastern Europe. Nevertheless it caught our attention that applicants from Northern and Western European countries were underrepresented. It seems to be the case that in countries like Denmark, Sweden, Norway and the Netherlands the influx of English
terms has been widely accepted for decades and considered as a natural phenomenon, contrary to countries like Poland, the Czech Republic or Bulgaria, where anglicisms have been gaining ground especially since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, this having eventually become a major topic in Eastern European linguistic studies.

The attitude towards anglicisms seems different from country to country: the history of the respective country plays a role, its connections with the Western world or with the United States, and also its size and its closeness of contacts. Countries with less than 10 million native speakers like Sweden, Finland or Denmark, are perhaps more flexible than others, since they are more concerned about the exchange with other countries than nations with 50 or 80 million speakers (cf. Patxi Juaristi: 47-72).

Another psychological aspect may be the degree of self-esteem. Warnings about future language death due to English influence may also be motivated by strong nationalist feelings in certain contexts.

The majority of the members of the conference see themselves as mere observers of the usage of anglicisms in Europe. The borrowings arise from language contact causing various linguistic changes, which are accompanied by certain attitudes and state policies. Anglicisms are accepted as a simple fact of modern life and are not perceived as positive or negative per se. Some presentations also revealed that the receiving languages and their users dealt with the English borrowings in a creative way, transforming them into words in keeping with their own lexicon. A conclusion was that borrowing was altogether not a good term for what had become part of one's own language and culture. In an illuminating article about Anglo-Finnish contacts Kate Moore and Krista Varantola put it like this:

As long as a language can assimilate the linguistic loan, play with it and mould it to fit its own patterns, there is no danger. On the contrary, the changes are normal developments in language contact. What would be worrying, however, is if Finnish speakers began to underestimate the status

---

1 But note the Würzburg Declaration on European Language Policy, which was agreed upon at the conference European Language Policy, Würzburg, Germany, 2002 (Ahrens 2003: 435). In this declaration, the participants of the conference agreed on the maintenance of the cultural and linguistic diversity of the European countries and on more intense language teaching programmes. Although English as a lingua franca was expected to foster transnational communication, it should not replace linguistic diversity as a tertiary language. It was expressed that "only an active and intensified language policy corresponding to the cultural diversity of the European countries can guarantee the future of the European Union." The author of this introduction supports the Würzburg Declaration.
of the language spoken in their own country and instead began to overestimate their skills in English. (Moore/Varantola 2005: 150)

This imagined situation, however, seems to be far away. As Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers write, there is little doubt that most Europeans do not want their national language replaced by English (Anderman and Rogers 2005: 9). Both a lingua franca and a national language are wished for. While English is seen as a foreign language, serving as a useful means of communication with the outside world, the national language is used within one's own speech community. Sandra Mollin's dissertation has also clearly shown that no "Euro-English" variety exists, because there is no European speech community, but rather different speech communities within Europe (Mollin 2006).

The motto 'unity in diversity' of the European Union accounts for these needs and desires. The mother tongues of Europe are perceived as a source of wealth and as a bridge to greater solidarity and even mutual understanding. The Union's objectives are to respect and promote the rich cultural and linguistic diversity of Europe, and to safeguard and enhance Europe's cultural heritage, as expressed in Article 1-3 in the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe, as well as in other documents (http://eur-lex.europa.eu, cf. Arzoz ed. 2008: 231-60). Since the 1990s many actions have been undertaken to improve communication and increase individual multilingualism among European citizens. In 2005 a new framework strategy for multilingualism was developed, promoting the learning of at least two foreign languages, i.e. not only English but also another language apart from one's mother tongue. All these activities, which are apparently deemed necessary, signal a challenge for Europe: the challenge that economic, political and juridical convergence does not facilitate cultural streamlining.

Not only anglicisms and English as an international means of communication but also the increasing interconnectedness and confluence with all parts of the world should be regarded as a necessary incentive to concerning oneself with one's own cultural identity and heritage, leading to its appreciation, promotion and protection.
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