Methods and Findings of the Dictionary of European Anglicisms (DEA, Oxford: UP, 2001)

Manfred GÖRLACH

The expansion of the English language has been dramatic after 1945, and the trend still continues without any sign that it may be slowing down. This process is clearly visible from the steadily increasing number of its speakers, especially as a foreign language in countries which were not so much affected in preceding generations, such as those in Eastern Europe and Southeast/East Asia. The unbroken prestige of English, in particular its pragmatic value in providing "a window to the west" and its usefulness in international communication have meant that the growth of the world language was not even hindered by historical reservations (to say the least) such as attitudes in Communist Vietnam, still grappling with the traumatic effects of the American war.

One very spectacular consequence of this linguistic globalization is the impact of English on other languages on all linguistic levels, ranging from spelling, pronunciation, word-formation, syntax to the lexis of the affected languages (not to mention stylistic and pragmatic features).The intake of English loanwords (= anglicisms) in particular has caused great concern among many nations – even though this may well be a reflection of a more general dislike of (the negative aspects of) American culture. Purist movements directed at too liberal borrowing of loanwords have more recently opposed anglicisms in particular, where the concern is often (unacknowledgedly) about unreflected 'sloppy' code-switching and code-mixing, producing texts in a hybrid language, such as in advertising. The fear that entire registers and text types may come to be in English (e.g. banking, scholarly publications) is more serious – the full range of functions establishing a national language that was gained with great effort by replacing Renaissance Latin and 18th-century French in many European societies could be ultimately lost.

The linguistic change effected by the borrowing from English has been documented in many individual European languages quite well (French, German) or not at all (Albanian), but apart from a few thematically restricted studies contrasting two languages there has been very little comparative research indeed. Thus scholars had no objective means of deciding how well-founded the complaints of self-appointed word-watchers were regarding the massive influx of anglicisms, which is often seen as endangering the expressiveness, beauty or general character of the individual language.

An empirical data base for such comparisons was obviously a desideratum. From the late 1980s I therefore thought about means and ways of how the situation could be remedied. The following conclusions seemed to be obvious:

1) With regard to feasibility, a comparative dictionary of some 10-20 languages could not possibly be based on corpora: these did not exist for many languages to be

„Philologica Jassyensia", An III, Nr. 1, 2007, p. 195-199

BDD-A821 © 2007 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:42:39 UTC)

covered (and the representativeness of such corpora is always debatable), and the dynamic character of the data called for a 'snapshot' method, documenting the evidence within a narrow time frame. It was therefore necessary to base the data collection on the competences of language-conscious collaborators, preferably of linguists teaching in universities in their countries. This method also allows us to elicit the stylistic/usage value of words – and is well established in traditional dialectology. I tested the method with word lists handed out to a great number of German students in 1988-1990 and found the results quite reliable.

2) The languages chosen ought to share much of the cultural historical background to make comparisons of the borrowing meaningful. Accordingly, 'exotic' languages such as, say, Haussa, Hindi, and Vietnamese were excluded, since language contacts with E. here drastically diverge from those with European languages. Also, close-contact languages had to be excluded as receiver languages, since borrowing here drastically diverges from distant-contact ones: as a consequence I excluded Welsh and Maltese, and for the same reason close-contact varieties of those selected, such as Quebec French, Puerto Rican Spanish and Pennsylvania German. Finally, the choice of languages admittedly most significantly depended on my finding collaborators willing to join the team and work – without payment – for seven years, being fascinated by the project. Some had done 'national' dictionaries of anglicisms so that their data formed part of the evidence for the DEA.

The final set of 16 languages looks more orderly than I could have aimed at: I was greatly pleased to arrive at a representative survey of four languages each for four groups, which also reflect the geographical position in Europe: Germanic (NW), Slavic (NE), Romance (SW) and others, mainly Balkanic (SE). Inside the groups, the same geographical iconicity holds. The choice provides as many contrasts as possible, not least that of the East:West division of Europe before 1990 (e.g. Romanian being the only, and major, Romance language in the East). The grid of the 16, inserted in some 870 entries, is excellently suited to show the areal distribution, at a glance, of anglicisms in Europe in the early 1990s, the cut-off date for the collection being 1995.

1) The decision of which words should be accepted in a dictionary is every lexicographer's burden. Since I had to formulate a clear definition for all collaborators by letter – organizing a conference was financially out of the question – I chose to accept as an anglicism a permanent loanword/ lexical unit that has something E. in its form (in spelling, pronunciation or inflexion) in at least one of the 16 languages. This excluded:

3a) code-switches not felt to be part of the receiver language, but rather ad-hoc uses, often used as eye-catchers or as a consequence of linguistic sloppiness;

3b) names (such as *Amnesty International*);

3c) transparent compounds (such as those formed with *–shop* or *–look* as a second element);

3d) obsolete words (such as *rookery* 'slum' in 19th-century German)

3e) neo-Latin/Greek items, unless pronounced the E. way;

3f) too specialized jargon (of, say, physics or computer science, but also of sports such as golf): my advice was to exclude words not likely to be found in a daily newspaper). The initial list of 1,500 words was expanded to 3,800 in the process of further reflexions and items found in any of the other languages (see below). We

BDD-A821 © 2007 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:42:39 UTC)

decided to include also words not attested in E., but made up of E. elements (e.g. *handy** 'mobile phone' only in German)

2) Procedure: An initial word list was drawn up by myself and my Polish contributor, E. Manczak, who had just completed a dictionary of Polish anglicisms. These provisional lemmata were then accompanied by rudimentary explanations and sent out to all the contributors, asking them to give evidence on the status of all items in the list (minimally: a - indicating 'not known') and also to mention anglicisms not yet listed, because of oversight or reflecting regional restriction. This process was repeated four times, so that authors had plenty of opportunity of reading proof of their own data. For this, a very strict timetable had to be drawn up, in order not to lose any time, and this advice was followed with great reliability.

The individual entry was to contain the following information: the lemma in BrE spelling, word class and sense(s) to be taken over from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* wherever possible. Some 25% of the words were accompanied by a 6-10 line description and a 'grid' in which the currencies of the words were indicated by black (non-existent), hazed (marginal) and white fields (fully accepted). This was followed by linguistic information on the 16 languages in fixed sequence (non-existence indicated by absence of mention – minimally evidence for only one language being entered). We recorded differences from E. in spelling and pronunciation and data on part of speech, inflexion, approximate date of acceptance, way of transmission, meaning(s) and degree of integration/currency. Calques, if doubtlessly based on E., were listed, with their relative frequency to the loanword indicated. Finally, non-E. derivations (such as new adjectives in Slavic languages) were listed at the end .

1) Deficiencies: It is essential to realize that such a huge project will have inadequacies, some of them unavoidable:

5a) The cut off date for the collection being at the end of 1995, more recent loanwords cannot be expected to be included, as also the status of many anglicisms of the early 1990s was still somewhat uncertain at the date. This should be remedied in a second edition.

5b) Since we did not use any corpora, no statistics on token frequencies are possible. However, wherever newspaper corpora are available, it will be easy to search occurrences of anglicisms such as *airbag* and *computer* and their national replacements, year by year – in the language of the press. So far we can only guess that the high overall frequency of anglicisms in French, and the great number of marginal items in this figure, is explained by the fact that these items have become marginalized by the Loi Toubon directed against them. Also, the comparative frequency of anglicisms in individual languages does not allow us to make any predictions on how many, or how few, anglicisms we might expect per page.

5c) The reliability of the data provided by the collaborators was impossible to check in general – even though second readers, where available, tended to reduce subjective statements or mistakes. It is likely that with regard to the supply of additional items two contrary errors occurred: on the one hand, there must have been oversights (*pickpocket* was not mentioned for French and is thus not lemmatised); on the other, the number of highly technical words added may be considerable, although these should have been excluded according to point 3f) above.

BDD-A821 © 2007 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:42:39 UTC)

5d) A great number of complementary studies will be necessary to deal with stylistic, social and areal differences. As regards the latter, it will be fascinating to find out what divergence exists between French and Dutch in their homelands as against Belgium, what between German in Germany, Austria and Switzerland (and possibly Alsace, Southern Tyrol and Luxemburg), what between Romanian in Romania and Moldova, etc.

5e) The scheme is open to supplementation by other languages. Does Swedish and Danish agree with Norwegian (less likely: Icelandic)? Some time ago, I suggested to members of the Moscow Academy to compile a similar contrastive dictionary of anglicisms in the major languages of the former Soviet Union, united by linguistic/ cultural transference up to 1990, and likely to have borrowed independently thereafter. (My suggestion does not appear to have been taken up).

I have discussed (and have done so in print in Görlach 2003) the feasibility and need of similar comparative dictionaries. Two are very urgent, but not started to date – one documenting the impact of neo-Latin/Greek, and the other of French, especially after 1700, since these influences are or were cross-cultural impacts similar to that of E. By contrast, the lexical influence of German seems to be too diverse to permit insightful comparisons across languages.

The DEA has won great acclaim (and was even awarded the prize of the best book of 2002 by the British Association of Applied Linguistics, most reviewers agreeing on the fact that completing the DEA within a very short time – necessary because of the constantly changing evidence – did not allow any alternative to the snapshot method developed by myself – based on linguists' individual competences (complemented by colleagues' and friends' judgements where necessary).

A second edition, organized by U. Busse of Halle University, is going to be out in due course. In addition to the dictionary proper, three more books were published to add to the evidence and conclusions published in the DEA:

1. Manfred Görlach, ed., *An Annotated Bibliography of European Anglicisms*. Oxford: UP, 2002a.

2. Manfred Görlach, ed., *English in Europe*. Oxford: UP, 2002b.

3. Manfred Görlach, *English Words Abroad.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ziele und Methoden des *Dictionary of European Anglicisms*

Die besonders seit 1945 weltweit expandierenden Funktionen der Weltsprache Englisch haben zu vielfältigen Kontaktphänomenen mit den Nehmersprachen geführt, darunter auch als Reaktion der Sprecher weit verbreitete Reaktionen gegen die Übernahme englischer Wörter und Ausdrücke. Es gab aber keine empirisch begründete und statistisch relevante vergleichende Darstellung dieses Einflusses auf verschiedene Sprachen. Mein Forschungsprojekt (1988-2001) sollte hier Abhilfe schaffen. Es wurde bestimmt durch

Überlegungen zur Machbarkeit,

Die Wahl der 16 Nehmersprachen,

Die Kriterien für die Aufnahme der Wörter,

Die Struktur der angestrebten Wörterbucheinträge,

Die technische Durchführung der Datenerhebung und Minimierung der Fehlerquellen,

Erkenntnisse in die Grenzen der Methode und Überlegungen zur Vervollständigung der Ergebnisse.

BDD-A821 © 2007 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:42:39 UTC)

Der ständige Wandel der Daten machte eine „Schnappschussmethode“ nötig. Die Resultate wurden leider durch die vierjährige Verzögerung der Veröffentlichung (Abschluss der Datensammlung 1995) durch den Verlag beeinträchtigt.

Als Ergänzung des Wörterbuchs dienen eine Forschungsbibliographie (OUP 2002a), ein Aufsatzband mit zusammenfassenden Darstellungen des Einflusses auf die 16 Sprachen (OUP 2002b) und ein Band, der die methodischen Probleme des Unternehmens kritisch beleuchtet (Amsterdam: Benjamins 2003).

Das Wörterbuch wurde von der BAAL zum „Buch des Jahres 2002“ gewählt.

University of Köln
Germany

BDD-A821 © 2007 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:42:39 UTC)

BDD-A821 © 2007 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:42:39 UTC)