The wanderlust of German words - and their pragmatic adaptation in English

Article

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.06.005

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

The *wanderlust* of German words – and their pragmatic adaptation in English

This article explores pragmatic aspects of lexical borrowing, based on examples of borrowing from German into British English. While borrowing from English is widely studied, the focus on German sheds light on a more unlikely source language. A cross-linguistic, corpus-based comparative analysis focuses on contrasts in the use of post-1900 loans in the German source language and the British English recipient language. Contrasts in the uses of a number of these loans as well as a detailed analysis of the borrowed prefix *uber-/über-* in English and German show that a recipient language may adopt specific uses that are marginal in the source language and that it can also put the loan to different uses than evident in the source language. Such contrasts are discussed as a result of pragmatic adaptation of the loan into the recipient language. The loan is de-contextualized from its use in the source language and becomes re-contextualised into different uses in the recipient language which reflect the communicative needs and hence the pragmatic interest in the loan from within the recipient language, partly or even entirely irrespective of its uses in the source language.

Keywords: borrowing, pragmatic adaptation, corpus, collocation, cross-linguistic, comparative analysis

1 Borrowing from German

German is an interesting case for a study of loanwords since it has not been employed as a source language for borrowing particularly far and wide. Görlach (2003) asserts that "the international impact of German is now largely historical – much more so than for French, and it is geographically more restricted to Northern and Eastern Europe." (Görlach, 2003: 128) Given that a large number of German loans concern scientific terminology and scholarship, many if not most German loans also tend to be restricted in register and domain. German has at this point in time borrowed far more from English across word classes (cf. Onysko 2007) than vice versa.

Durkin (2014) provides a study of a subset of data from the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) to assess the influence of lexical borrowing on British English. While German ranks fourth overall as SL, the numbers steeply decline after the first three Latin (about 13,000 loans), French (just over 6,000 loans), and Greek (just under 3,000 loans) to just over 1,200 loans from German in his subset. Durkin's timeline for loanwords from German indicates that most Germanisms entered English in the nineteenth century. There are just over 250 loans from between 1800-1849, about 650 between 1850-1899, just over 300 between 1900-1949, declining to about 50 listed from 1950 onwards. His discussion reiterates that most of these borrowings are from the domain of scholarship and scientific terminology, reflecting "the increasing importance of German as a language of culture and knowledge, especially in the latter part of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century." (Durkin, 2014: 361)

This is also reflected in Pfeffer and Cannon's (1994) dictionary of German loans in American English. It lists more than 5,000 words of German origin, including loan translations. Just over a third of these relate to the subject areas Mineralogy, Biology, Chemistry and Geology alone. This is in spite of plenty of language contact through German-English bilingual emigrant communities. Around the mid-19th century, Germans constituted the largest group of

immigrants in Britain, and likewise in the 19th century, there was mass emigration of Germans to the USA. This should not be overlooked, given the evidence that borrowing from German into English peaks in the 19th century. Cannon's (1998) study of post-1949 German loans finds that loans are increasingly from the domain of politics and Social Sciences, followed by other scientific terminology. Based on the OED, Ehlert (2012) identifies an additional 58 Germanisms not listed in Pfeffer and Cannon (1994).

Studies of lexical borrowing are mostly undertaken from the point of view of one recipient language (RL), without accounting for differences in meaning and usage between the source language (SL) and the RL. The results of such studies can be found either in language historical accounts of when borrowing from which language has taken place and to what extent (cf. e.g. Durkin 2014 for English), or in lexicographical documentation of such loans. There are also studies with a one-directional focus on borrowing from one SL into one RL, from the latter's point of view (e.g. Podhajecka, 2013 for Russian into English; Pinnavaia, 2001 for Italian into English; Pfeffer and Cannon, 1994 for German into English; Onysko, 2007 for English into German). Görlach (2002) provides an overview of loans from English into a number of European RLs with a one-directional focus from the latter's point of view. Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009) provide an overview of borrowing in 41 languages around the world with typological interests relating to the intensity of borrowing in individual languages and to the borrowability of lexical items.

The *Dictionary of European Anglicisms* (Görlach 2001) provides an account of borrowed English lexis in 16 European languages, mainly in the years between 1945 and 1990. The Dictionary allows contrastive insight across languages in that it demonstrates a) the extent to which the 16 European languages share English loans, b) which loans occur in some but are lacking in other languages, and c) whether or to what extent English loans are used in similar ways across the RLs. Based on the work for the Dictionary of European Anglicisms, Görlach (2003) offers a preliminary study of French and German loanwords across twenty-two European languages. There are German loanwords in English in which other languages have also taken an interest either for their conceptual value (*kitsch*, *ersatz*, *hinterland*) or for their association with 'typically German' phenomena (*beer*, *blitzkrieg*, *lebensraum*). Görlach finds that German loans across languages constitute a "strange mix" and "extreme scatter" (Görlach, 2003: 161) which is difficult to group across domains. For the 200 German words that he considers, only their occurrence in these twenty-two languages is established with the help of informants and dictionaries, which does not provide many insights into their actual use.

Loanwords have mostly been investigated for lexicographical documentation, classification of different types of borrowing, accounts of language history, in the context of language typology, and sociolinguistic studies of language contact as well as code switching (cf. Treffers-Daller 2010). The term 'borrowing' is widely used and will be used here despite criticism of the notions of ownership and boundaries that it implies (Matras 2009; cf. also Johansson 2002). Matras (ibid.) therefore uses 'borrowing' to refer to "the activity of employing an item, in context, in order to achieve a communicative goal" and to "the *replication* of a linguistic structure, of any kind, in a new, extended set of contexts" (146;

italics in the original). More poignantly, "[t]he goals that speakers pursue when integrating foreign vocabulary items in conversation are oriented toward the communicative interaction and the effect that language use will have on the interlocutor." (151) The emphasis on both communicative goals and context puts borrowing into the focus of interest for pragmatics. The recent 'pragmatic turn' in the study of borrowing aims to shift "its *locus* from the borrowed lexemes per se" (Andersen et al., 2017: 71) to various aspects of their use. In the following, I will argue and seek to demonstrate that a cross-linguistic comparison of the uses of loanwords in the SL and the RL can provide clues about pragmatic motivations behind borrowing.

2 Pragmatic aspects of lexical borrowing

The aim of this article is to further recent interest in loanwords from a pragmatic perspective. Andersen (2014: 22) differentiates between pragmatic borrowing on the one hand, and the pragmatics of lexical borrowing on the other. Pragmatic borrowing concerns the borrowing of discourse markers – interjections, expletives and focus-making devices – as investigated e.g. by Terkourafi (2011), Peterson (2017), Mišić Ilić (2017) and Balteiro (2018). While Andersen (2014) argues for an enhancement of studies of lexical borrowing to include discourse markers, this study focuses on the more 'classical' lexicological concerns. However, it seeks to foster investigations into the pragmatics of lexical borrowing, following on from studies such as Andersen's (2017) study of the English loan *jobb* in Norwegian and from Onysko and Winter-Froemel's (2011) analysis of anglicisms in German. It takes up the challenge to pursue "an empirical, cross-linguistic approach" in order to "explore the range of discourse functions and the attitudinal significance attributable to individual forms in the SL as well as the RL" (Andersen, 2014: 18). Because "(i)t has been well established that lexical borrowing often involves only the partial copying of the semantic content of a SL word and frequently does not include the whole range of functions/meanings of an item in an SL", he writes with a view on discourse markers that "there is a need for comparative studies that explore the range of discourse functions and the attitudinal significance attributable to individual forms in the SL as well as the RL." (Andersen, 2014: 18). This need was to some extent addressed by (XXX) and will be further pursued in comparative analyses below.

In 2017, a special issue of Journal of Pragmatics focussed on the pragmatics of borrowing for the first time. In their introduction to the issue, the editors outline the pragmatic interest in borrowing phenomena to comprise motivational factors, products of pragmatic borrowing and post-hoc effects (Andersen et al., 2017). This article is mostly concerned with post-hoc effects and seeks to provide evidence that borrowing may lead to "new opportunities for variation and innovation within the receiving speech community", "adding to the native repertoire as opposed to replacing elements within it", (Peterson and Beers Fägersten, 2018: 106). Onysko and Winter-Froemel (2011) have demonstrated this for lexical borrowing from English into German by pointing out a range of pragmatic functions of borrowed lexis and in particular by drawing attention to the range and pragmatic meanings of "non-catachrestic innovations" which are "characterized by the existence of a semantic near-equivalent" (Onysko/Winter-Froemel, 2011: 1555). Demonstrating the pragmatic meanings of these loans is an important contribution to the study of lexical borrowing, given that they trigger

considerations of 'necessity' and apprehensions about replacing 'native' with 'foreign' words. Onysko and Froemel-Winter also emphasise that pragmatic functions "have to be conceived of as dynamic characteristics that can change over time" (2011: 1563). Overall, therefore, a pragmatic view on borrowing is well-prepared to take into account that it might lead to "unpredictable outcomes" (Peterson and Beers Fägersten, 2018: 106).

The crucial emphasis will be on the notion that "the RL constitutes the dominant matrix into which elements of the SL are integrated" (Onysko, 2007: 14). This means that the RL may not respect the full integrity of the word in the SL, but may adapt it into different contexts to suit its own communicative needs which may trigger a development of increasing difference to the SL. This is what is entailed in the notion of pragmatic adaptation. The present article will demonstrate these aspects by taking a cross-linguistic, comparative and usage-based perspective on lexical borrowing. Based on large corpora of both the German SL and the English RL, the analyses will focus on contrasts in the use of borrowed words between the SL and the RL.

While it has been noted that the process of borrowing might involve changes in the semantic profile of the borrowed word upon entering the RL – such as specialization, generalization, shift, reduction and extension (Görlach, 2003) – it is one thing to observe and register such modification, but it is a step further towards a pragmatic view on lexical borrowing to explain them as a result of pragmatic adaptation. That is, semantic differences result from the interest that the RL takes in the loan. This interest can be traced with an investigation of the possibilities for usage 'brought-along' (cf. Auer 1992, 26) by a loan word from the SL in contrast to the uses 'brought about' in the RL. The present study will provide some examples for discarded 'brought-along' and new 'brought-about' uses of loans so as to discover "systematic patterns and constraints on use" in order to "detect pragmatic functions that have been transferred, functions that are not transferred and new functions that may have emerged post hoc in the RL." (Andersen 2014: 23).

In line with a corpus-based approach, its central premise that the meaning of a word can only be found in its usage (cf. Stubbs, 2001; Sinclair, 2004; Teubert, 2010) is shared here, too, in addition to its focus on patterns of co-occurrence and the notion that words are embedded in extended units of meaning. This means that observable differences not only in the function, but also in the semantic profiles between the SL and the RL are a result of usage in the RL, which can best be traced with the aid of corpora and corpus analysis tools. The use of a loan in an RL is motivated by the opportunities it perceives in the loan to suit its own needs. These opportunities may not, or certainly not entirely, mirror the full usage profile of the borrowed form in the SL, hence the need for cross-linguistic, comparative research. Differences will be regarded as a result of choices as to what the RL wants to do with the loan, thereby possibly giving preference to some 'brought along' uses and discarding others, hence the above quoted notion that borrowing might lead to 'unpredictable outcomes'.

Furthermore, pragmatic adaptation of loans can be seen as akin to the process of recontextualization described by Bernstein (1990), which so far has mostly been taken up in the field of Critical Discourse Studies (cf. e.g., Wodak, 2000; Krzyżanowski, 2016). When a word gets borrowed, it gets de-contextualized from its uses in the SL and re-contextualized

into new uses the RL, be they similar or (increasingly) different from the SL. Bernstein's concerns are rather different from lexical borrowing, focussing on constitutive discourse formation and discursive practices in pedagogy. However, he describes pedagogic discourse as a practice of relocating elements from other discourses and ordering them "according to its own principle of selective reordering and focussing" (Bernstein 1990: 184), which is also described in terms of appropriation (189, 192). The delocation and relocation of the original discourse entails removing its social basis and a "complex transformation from an original into a virtual/imaginary discourse" (185). What is at play in this process are various shifts in terms of selecting elements for relocation from an original discourse, and changes in relations with surrounding elements. The relocated matter might have been modified, e.g. simplified, condensed or elaborated, it shifts position itself and is inserted with a possible consequence of shifting positions and relations at the point of destination as well. Much reduced to the level of lexis, a usage-based, cross-linguistic comparative investigation into lexical borrowing could consider to what extent post-hoc contrasts are a result of de-contextualization and re-contextualization of the loan by the RL's own principles of 'selective reordering and focussing'. Sections 4 and 5 will describe the use of loans from German in English in these terms.

3 Methodology

The comparatively well-documented loans from German into British English provide the basis for empirically underpinning the points made in the previous section. The digital subscription platform of the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) allows filtering all entries classified as of German origin and ordering them by date, i.e., the point of first evidence according to the OED. Filtering for all words of German origin with the aid of the OED subscription platform yields 3,607 entries (retrieved 17/05/2021). Loans from Yiddish are included in the results but where applicable, the entries specify Yiddish origin, so that it is possible to differentiate. The author will rely on this information since discussing in detail the origin of each loan would be beyond the scope of this article. Because it is useful for this study to both reduce the number of loans to consider and to focus on more recent, more easily traceable and distinguishable loans, the time span was limited to post-1900 loans with the help of the OED database, which yields 1,146 (retrieved 17/05/2021) loans marked as of German origin.

These include words of Yiddish origin, which are excluded for the purposes of the present study. Since this study is concerned with pragmatic adaptation, reference to specific objects such as *dachshund* or *lederhosen* was also excluded to further reduce the number of examples for consideration and because such words seem less likely to undergo much adaptation and to therefore end up with contrasting uses. Having said this, though, *lederhosen* provides an immediate example to contradict this assumption since outside of German it evokes the traditional folk dress in southern Germany, whereas inside German it includes reference to any trousers made of leather, including bikers' gear and subcultural dressing styles. Subject-specific terminology borrowed from German – often created using Latin or Greek elements – such as *antibody*, *melanocratic*, *transitivism*, *kallidin* is also excluded. The semantics of subject-specific terminology is more strictly defined, and its use is limited in domain and register, which makes the kind of pragmatic adaptation which is the focus of this study less likely. However, there are instances of loans that originate as subject-specific terms but might

then take on more general functions, e.g., *Gestalt* as originally a name of a German school of Psychology. In such cases, the borrowings were retained and investigated further.

The exclusion of Yiddish words, reference to concrete objects and subject-specific terminology as a first step resulted in a list of 76 words. These were considered a pool of German loans for further investigation in that they could potentially exhibit contrasts in usage between the SL and the RL. For a rough indication, the pool comprises political terms, including references to war and Nazi Germany (*Gleichschaltung*, *Lebensraum*, *Realpolitiker*, *Übermensch*, *Wirtschaftswunder*). Nazi vocabulary is not used in British English with the same limitations as subject-specific terminology – Schröter (2018) demonstrates that its use in English is not limited to historiography and that it gets used in a wider range of contexts. Words designating concepts constitute another grouping (*Sachlichkeit*, *Erlebnis*, *Gedankenexperiment*, *Drang*, *Weltbild*), as well as words that could be used in a wide range of contexts, such as *quatsch*, *treff*, *kitsch*, *nix*, *Schatz*, and *uber-* (prefix). From a contrastively informed point of view, such ordering is tricky, since it begs the question whether they should be ordered due to their uses in the SL or RL. For example, *Lebensraum* in current German would translate as habitat, and the use of the word by the Nazis is only very marginally reflected. In English, the use of *lebensraum* is entirely based on the word as Nazi vocabulary; but applied to other contexts as well (cf. Schröter, 2018; Schröter/Leuschner, 2013). The full list of words that form the pool of examples is included in Appendix 1 – not all of them can be discussed in this article.

In a second step, the dictionary entries for these words were checked, to see if these already provide clues about possible contrasts. Subsequently, a large corpus of English was checked to establish the occurrence and frequency as well as possible compounds and derivations of the candidates in the pool. For this purpose, but also for the comparison with usage in current German, the TenTen web-corpora (Jakubíček et al., 2013) were used. These are provided by the Sketchengine corpus analysis platform (Kilgarriff et al., 2014) for English (enTenTen15) and German (deTenTen13). They offer comparability due to the method for corpus compilation and the material contained in the corpora as well as their availability for analysis with the same corpus analysis tools provided by Sketchengine. Another advantage of the TenTen corpora is that they reflect current and general language use. Unlike some of the examples provided in dictionary entries, they can provide illustration of recent uses of loanwords. Some loans from German as they are registered in the OED are not evident in the enTenTen15 corpus, such as *schwarm* ('crush') and *quatsch* ('nonsense, rubbish'). They appear 213 respectively 33 times, nearly always as part of proper names and titles of cultural products.

The large and fairly comparable corpus sizes (enTenTen 15 comprises 15,703,895,409 words, deTenTen13 16,526,335,416 words) help with the analysis and comparison of usage. Some loanwords may not be frequent in the RL. The larger the corpus, the more likely it is that it provides enough examples to observe patterns in usage. The TenTen web-corpora were compiled from online sources through a web crawling software irrespective of text types. In contrast to purpose-built corpora, the corpora are neither genre-specific nor topic-specific, but they will entail more web-related content than a lot of other corpora, e.g. from IT user

forums. Compared to other general corpora, some genres such as literary texts are under-represented. One disadvantage of the enTenTen15 corpus is that it is not possible to disaggregate the English corpus into British and other varieties of standard English. However, taking the OED as a starting point of this study provides reassurance that the word is used in British English, even if not every example of its usage in the corpus can be ascertained as British English usage. Similarly, German texts in deTenTen are not restricted to .de domains but include Austrian (.at domains) and Swiss standard German (.ch domains) sources. For the present purposes, further differentiation would have dispensed with the other advantages of these existing corpora and comparability noted above, and it also would have severely complicated the queries and the presentation of the results.

In a third step, loans are checked for collocations and concordances in the RL and SL corpora to establish whether or in what respect their usage contrasts across both languages. Concordances display the search word in its immediate context, while collocations are displayed as a list of individual words that co-occur with the search word in statistically significant frequency (cf. e.g., Stubbs, 2001; Baker, 2006). Collocation span is set at five words to the left and to the right of the search word. As there is no particular focus on (non-)frequent items in the vicinity of the search word, log likelihood was used as the statistical measure for indicating the degree to which the co-occurrence of the search word and co-occurring words is not due to chance (cf. McEnery et al., 2006). When detailing findings, the following conventions apply: Loanwords under consideration will be set in italics and capitalisation of nouns as well as umlauts will be retained when the word is referred to in relation to the German SL; the spelling otherwise follows the OED entries. Collocations will be introduced in single inverted commas and spelled as they appear in the corpus analysis software. Other words that need to be set apart from the surrounding text will occur in italics as well. When quoting concordances, the searched word(s) will appear in bold letters.

There is not enough space in this article to discuss the findings for each word in detail, so only a few more general findings pertaining to contrasts that highlight aspects of pragmatic adaptions will follow in section 4. These will be followed by a detailed contrasting analysis of the prefix *uber-/über-* in English and German in section 5.

4 Findings

Firstly, not all of the borrowed items are high-frequency words in German. This applies, for example, to *Wanderlust*, *blitzen* (verb), *Diktat* and *Übermensch*, none of which occur more than 5 times per million words in the SL. Among the low frequency words in German, the frequency of the use does in some cases not vary much between SL and RL. This is the case for *diktat* (0.19 times per million words in enTenTen15, 1.93 times per million words in deTenTen13) and *blitzkrieg* (0.24 times per million words in enTenTen15 vs. 0.25 in German). What is useful to note here is that an RL can take an interest in words that are relatively marginal in the SL. The process of selecting items for relocation can involve attention to quite specific forms and does not necessarily require a quantitatively large amount of stimulus.

Indeed, *wanderlust* occurs the in English RL more often than in the German SL (0.38 vs. 0.16 times per million words). It is used in a similar way in English and German, relating to an

inclination for travelling and exploring the world, including a state of restlessness. Interestingly, among the German collocations we find other words borrowed into English: 'kindergarten', 'wunderkind', 'poltergeist' and 'weltschmerz'. This phenomenon also occurs specifically in the German corpus where collocations of *Blitzkrieg* yield other words that have been borrowed into English ('Sauerkraut', 'Schadenfreude', 'Weltschmerz', 'rucksack'). They indicate metalinguistic awareness and a metadiscourse among German speakers about the fact that *Wanderlust* and *Blitzkrieg* are some of those German words borrowed into English, where this metadiscourse does not occur.

Apart from this aspect, *Blitzkrieg* in German – setting aside reference to an album titled *Blitzkrieg Bob* by the band Ramones – is restricted to the context of the Second World War. In English, *blitzkrieg* can be used in the context of public relations, media and marketing. The following concordance lines from enTenTen15 illustrate these uses (cf. Schröter, 2018; Leuschner/Schröter, 2013):

(1) forthcoming Apple Watch to replace electronic car keys and fobs. Apple's **marketing blitzkrieg** for the upcoming Apple Watch has made it to the pages of
(2) Riding on a wave of an advertising and **marketing blitzkrieg**, anybody can sell a good product or service.
(3) Kandeh Yumkella has unofficially begun the campaign, hence his tacit approval of the **media blitzkrieg** commenced in his name.
(4) People are propping up flashy websites, going for a social **media blitzkrieg** with the sole aim of grabbing the eyeballs of an internet-savvy population.

Here, the RL sees a potential for metaphorical use for which there is hardly any precedence in the SL. That the use of this Nazi word is more varied in English than in German is surprising, because it is the other way around with words such as *Anschluss*, *Blitz* and *Lebensraum* where the use in the RL is limited to the context of the Third Reich. As noted above, *Lebensraum* in German would translate as habitat. Collocations refer to nature, environmentalism and biology. The use of *Lebensraum* as a historicism referring to the Third Reich is only marginal in German, but exclusively the case in the RL. Similarly, *anschluss* and *blitz* (noun) are nearly exclusively related to the annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany in 1938 and the bombing raids on Britain during the Second World War. In German, they predominantly occur in the meaning connection (*Anschluss*) and lightning or flash (*Blitz*) and reference to their uses as Nazi vocabulary is again marginal.

Gestalt in the OED is described as "[f]requently attributive, as Gestalt psychology n. a school of psychology" (OED, 05/05/2020). Collocations in English such as 'psychotherapy', 'psychology', 'functionalism', 'structuralism', 'phenomenological' confirm this usage. In German, *Gestalt* is used more widely to translate 'figure', denoting the shape of a person, but especially when this shape is ambiguous, as reflected in collocations such as 'zwielichtige' (shady), 'zombieähnliche' (zombie-like) and 'vermummte' (masked). *Diktat* is a similar case which in German does not only refer to "a severe settlement, especially one imposed by a victorious nation upon a defeated nation" (OED, 28/05/2020). In the RL, it is only used in the sense of an imposed measure or policy, reflected especially in collocations across the board that oscillate between imposition '(top-down', 'omnipotent', 'imposing') submission ('subordinating', 'succumb', 'conform') and defiance ('defied', 'resist'). In German, *Diktat* can

be used in this way, but this occurs only marginally. It is mostly used with regard to transforming spoken word into written text either as a task in school (reflected in a collocation such as 'Fehlerzahl' – number of mistakes) or professional settings, or with technological aid, the latter reflected in collocations such as 'Diktiergerät' (dictaphone) or 'Spracherkennung' (language recognition).

The examples considered so far can be noted as examples of semantic narrowing. However, they also indicate that among the wider uses of a word in the SL, it can be the rather marginal and very specific uses that are selected for relocation into the RL, whereby the more common SL uses may be discarded. The example of *blitzkrieg* shows that post-borrowing, the word can be relocated into contexts for which the SL does not provide precedence. Additionally, *blitzkrieg* undergoes further development in the RL independently of the SL in that it is shortened to *blitz* and converted into a verb.

The way in which *blitz* is used as a verb is in English is specific to the RL and different from the German SL. In German, it is an impersonal verb that means either to flash (lightning, or in photography) or to sparkle (something is so clean or shiny that it sparkles). In English, it is used for blending food with a liquidiser, or for doing something very rapidly, both of which does not occur in German. It is even questionable whether German can be considered the SL for *blitz*, since *blitz* (verb) is arguably not borrowed from German, but a post-hoc modification. The use of *blitz* (verb) in English is illustrated in the following examples from the enTenTen15 concordances:

(1) holding her dolly tightly against her and her face scrunched in a scowl. I totally **blitzed** through the first four books in Kristen Proby's With Me in Seattle series back in April
(2) you now have the opportunity to pursue more cultural pursuits and still **blitz** the shopping. Robin sent through this search string for Google
(3) I'm way behind on these (my apologies) so I'm going to try and **blitz** through a number of them here today. My neighborhood is bounded on two sides by 6 lane
(4) all you need is a squat rack and these 8 exercises from Ashley Horner to **blitz** your whole body and get out of the gym in no time.
(5) but I'm just as 'Organizationally challenged. We have to grocery shop and **blitz** the front part of the house today (we've invited a few unmarried soldiers

The verb *strafen* has been decontextualized from the SL and recontextualized differently in the RL. In English, it comes along with collocations such as 'bombed', 'gunships', 'airfields', 'machine gun', 'napalmed', 'dive-bombing', 'rocketed', 'war planes'. In German, *strafen* co-occurs with words such as 'zivilrechtlich', (according to civic law), 'Bußgeldverfahren' (monetary fine proceedings), and 'Strafprozessrecht' (law of criminal procedure). In enTenTen15, the word occurs 5,155 times, with concordances such as the following:

(1) the only unmarked aircraft in Israel's arsenal.The fighter bombers **strafed** the ship with their cannons, and dropped conventional munitions
(2) entering the ship and leaving a thirty foot exit hole when it exploded. Then the torpedo boats began **strafing** life rafts in the water– an international war crime
(3) Task Force Crombez moved out from friendly lines to the south and headed north to reach Chipyong-ni. Planes **strafed** and bombed enemy positions along the route
(4) manufacturer of medicines and vaccinations in Sudan. And he **strafed** the Serbs in 1999. Stateside, Bill butchered seventy-six men, women

While *strafen* is still synonymous with *punish*, in both cases the contexts are strongly patterned and notably different in the SL and RL. In the SL, *strafen* is used in the context of criminal justice and, more marginally, in the context of religion (punishment by God). In the RL, *strafen* is done with weapons in the context of armed conflict. Here, the selected item for relocation is recontextualised and, in Bernstein's terms, removed from its social basis and relocated into contexts that are without precedence in the SL.

Another case for a loan that is used without precedence in the SL is the use of *nix* as verb in English. Its meaning is described in the OED as "to cancel, reject, forbid, refuse (a thing or person); to deny (a request); to criticize (a film, book etc.)" and/or "to get rid of, put paid to" (OED, 09/06/2020). It is a particularly interesting case, since it is based on German pronoun *nichts* and its colloquial and phonetically more convenient shortening to *nix*, which translates *nothing*. Pronouns are a closed set not open to lexical innovation and borrowing of pronouns is rare (Tadmor, 2009). This is confirmed by the observation that *nix* does indeed not add to the class of pronouns in English, but features as verb, which is a marked departure from its use in the SL. Having said this, there is certainly a semantic link; to nix implies the process of turning something (back) into nothing. The following concordance lines illustrate the use of *nix* (verb) in English:

(1) one user complained. It wasn't only men who wanted the article **nixed**. LOL, my thoughts exactly.
(2) lawmakers are not planning to try and override. Her decision to **nix** the bill that would allow the simulcasting of OTB events
(3) the gains made in Britain since Kyoto in reducing emissions had been **nixed** by increased carbon loss from soils
(4) BuzzFeed News reported recently that crowdfunding site Kickstarter was **nixing** its unlimited vacation policy, in part because workers were not sure

What each of the briefly discussed examples above indicate is first of all that items chosen for relocation may not be ubiquitous in the SL. Secondly, the RL might proceed with an item's usage that is marginal in the SL, and more common SL uses of the item in question may be ignored. Finally, the loan might be put to new uses in the RL which are unprecedented in the SL either upon relocating it, or post-hoc. These findings relate to the notion that recontextualization involves removing the social basis of one discourse by slotting elements into other discourses. This notion may be transferable to the way in which prevalent, or indeed any, contexts of the SL might be set aside when borrowing, in favour of an 'imaginary' view on the loan's possible uses in the RL which is driven by the pragmatic interest that the RL takes in the loan. In the following, this point is pursued further with a more detailed comparative analysis of the prefix *uber-* in English.

5 Analysis of the use of uber (prefix) in English and German

In German, *über* is a free morpheme as well as a prefix. As free morpheme, it is a preposition (over, above) and as prefix it combines predominantly with verbs. These derivations can be nominalised. It combines with nouns to a lesser extent, as in *Übergewicht* or *Übergepäck* (excess weight and excess baggage). More rarely, it combines with adjectives such as

überglücklich (extremely glad), *überlang* (too long) or *übernatürlich* (supernatural). Some of the verb-based derivations are not transparent anymore. While *übertragen*, to transfer, can still be derived from its elements, literally to carry over, *überlegen* (to consider, to think about, to deliberate) and *überzeugen* (to convince) are intransparent. However, all of these have been established in the German lexicon for some time and the prefix *über-* is at present not very productive.

In terms of semantics, two uses can be distinguished. One relates to spatiality (over, above, across), including a directional process which would be reflected in the English prefixes trans- (translate, transgress – *übersetzen*, *übertreten*) or sur- (survive, surpass – *überleben*, *übertreffen*). The other one refers to quantity (excess) and would be reflected in the English prefixes over-, super- or ultra- (overlong, super talented, ultra conservative). Word formation with *uber-* in English only rely on the latter. In contrast to German, derivations occur with adjectives and nouns, but not verbs. Table 1 below shows the most frequent derivations with the prefix *uber-* in English, with noun- and adjective bases.

nouns	adjectives
uber-geek (287)	uber-cool (842; + 5 noun)
uber-rich (143 x noun, 88 x adjective)	uber-popular (231; + 1 noun)
uber-luxury (85)	uber-talented (315)
uber-nerd (69)	uber-wealthy (172; + 18 noun)
uber-producer (60)	uber-trendy (114)
uber-villain (42)	uber-successful (114)
uber-elite (31)	uber-powerful (90; + 8 noun)
uber-biker (6)	uber-sexy (77)
uber-legend (5)	uber-conservative (76; + 28 noun)
	uber-stylish (74)
	uber-awesome (71)
	uber-efficient (47)
	uber-connected (38; + 5 noun)
	uber-capitalist (19; + 12 noun)
	uber-quick (16)
	uber-right (14; + 13 noun)

Table 1: Evidence for derivations with the prefix *uber* from enTenTen15

The numbers in Table 1 are given in raw frequencies because taken individually, the occurrences are too rare so that the normalised frequency per million words does not allow for much differentiation. The figures in Table 1 include the number of times that the derivations occur with hyphen, with a space in between and spelled as one word. In each case the most frequent occurrence is hyphenated and the least frequent occurrence is as one word. Some adjectives occur nominalised. Where this is the case, respective numbers are provided for the nominalised adjective. The case of *Übermensch* should be mentioned, which pre-dates the borrowing of *uber-* as prefix. The OED notes 1902 as first evidence of *Übermensch* and 1962 as first evidence of *uber-* in English. *Übermensch* occurs 343 times with umlaut and 227 times without. Only the latter occurs hyphenated, and only 13 times. Both occur with a space between *über* and *mensch* only 21 times. Both the German base and the predominant spelling as one word (as in German) would indicate that *Übermensch* was borrowed as one word rather than with *uber-* as prefix. *Übermensch* may have helped as a pattern-provider for derivations with *uber-*; but note that noun derivations are clearly less

common than adjective derivations, which contrasts with German, as noted above. Therefore, the borrowing of *Übermensch* and *uber-* should be considered as separate and largely unrelated occurrences.

It should be noted that Table 1 does not constitute a complete list of all combinations, since they are too varied. The purpose of Table 1 is to provide evidence of patterns of derivation with *uber-* in English, and to point out more and less frequent ones. The variety of combinations is interesting in itself, indicating that the prefix is used flexibly in English, and not with a limited number of specific bases. This is illustrated in Table 2 which shows a range of combinations of *uber-* with words beginning with the letter 'b'. Table 2 includes low-frequency combinations that illustrate the variety and the flexibility with which the prefix is applied, in addition to some of the more common patterns noted in Table 1. Of the combinations with words beginning with the letter 'b', uber-busy is the most frequent one with 19 occurrences.

nouns	adjectives
uber-biker	uber-Blairite
uber-boy	uber-brilliant
uber-business	uber-Boston
uber-beginner	uber-busy
uber-baddy	uber-bureaucratic
uber-box	uber-British
uber-bloviator	uber-blonde
uber-bureau	uber-branded
uber-bigwigs	uber-bland
uber-banishment	uber-ballistic
uber-ball	uber-beautiful
uber-badguy	uber-broke
uber-blogger	uber-brisk
uber-boss	uber-boring
uber-babe	uber-balmy
uber-be-all	uber-bad
uber-booksnobs	uber-bombastic
uber-bubble	uber-brawny
uber-bigot	uber-bright
uber-bitch	uber-busty

Table 2: Prefix uber- combined with words beginning with 'b' in enTenTen15

The letter 'b' was picked randomly as there are too many occurrences of combinations with *uber-* in both languages to investigate all of them. The picture for combinations of *über-* with words beginning with the letter 'b' in German is quite different from the RL. All nouns are lexicalised and *über-* does not function as an intensifier. The most common one is *Überblick* (overview). In *Überbelastung* (over-burdening), the notion of excess is apparent, but it is lexicalised as well and unlike in the RL, there is no noun combination that refers to an excess of quality in a person. There is no combination with adjectives, only with past participle verbs that can be used as adjectives (*überbezahlt* – overpaid, *überbacken* – with a roasted topping, *überbevölkert* – overpopulated), or verbs or nouns that can be derived into adjectives (*überbrückbar* – reconcilable; *überblicksartig* – in the manner of an overview, *überbetrieblich* – concerning more than one business/plant). Only *überbeschäftigt* and *uber-busy* can be used

similarly, but some of the uses in English refer to busy traffic, which is not possible for *beschäftigt* in German.

Some of the combinations in Table 1 occur in German as well, but occur mostly to a lesser extent. Both *geek* and *nerd* have been borrowed into German (occurring 7,595 resp. 16,795 times), but they occur less with the prefix *über-*: *Nerd* 44 times, and *Geek* only 19 times. However, if we take the most frequent equivalent in German, *Nerd*, and search for nerd with the prefix *super-*, there are 85 occurrences in German, more than with *über-*. This is the same in English with *nerd* (*super-nerd* occurs 574 times in English), but *geek* occurs more frequently with *uber-* in English (287 times) than with super- (173 times).

Überproduzent (*uber-producer*) can be found in the German corpus 145 times, and *Überbösewicht* (*uber-villain*) 48 times, both including hyphenated and non-hyphenated forms and various word endings that can occur in German. *Uber-rich* occurs in English as a noun more than an adjective, but *überreich* in German occurs only as adjective or adverb, where it means 'excessive(ly)' and does not refer to material wealth In order to refer to excessively rich people, we have to consider *Superreiche* (noun) in German, which occurs 7,308 times. Similarly, *Überluxus* occurs only 12 times in German, *Superluxus* 91 times.

This means that of the noted combinations with nouns listed in Table 1, only *Überproduzent* and *Überbösewicht* occur in the SL more often than in the RL – the other patterns seem possible in the SL, but are rarely realised. For the nouns, then, it would seem that the prefix *uber-* provides a possibility of usage that is realised in the RL more than in the SL. This picture becomes clearer in contrasting the most frequent adjective patterns with *uber-*.

Adjectives with uber- in English	occurrences in German
uber-cool (842)	über(-)cool (279)
uber-popular (231)	über(-)populär (14); über(-)beliebt (9)
uber-talented (315)	über(-)talentiert (89)
uber-wealthy (172)	über(-)reich* (3,423), über(-)wohlhabend (0)
uber-trendy (114)	über(-)trendy (4)
uber-successful (114)	übererfolgreich (34)

Table 3 comparison of the most frequent adjectival derivations with uber-

It is notable that all of these combinations occur less frequently in the SL than in the RL. As noted above, *überreich* occurs in German as adjective and adverb, but does not refer to material wealth. *Wohlhabend* is a synonym of the adjective *reich* (rich, wealthy), but it does not combine with *über-* at all. It is therefore marked with an asterisk in Tables 3 and 4 to indicate that it is not a semantic equivalent to English *uber-wealthy*. The most frequent equivalent derivation in German is *übercool*. However, all of the German adjectives in Table 3 combine with both synonymous prefixes *super-* and *mega-* more often than with *uber-*, as shown in Table 4 below. The numbers provided in Table 4 include variations of spelling with or without hyphen and as one word or separately, although the latter only applies to *uber-* in English and does not occur in German because of the ambiguity it would create with the preposition *über*. *Mega* and *super* do occur spelled separately in German about as often as spelled in one word. *Beliebt* would be a more common translation of *popular* in German, so it was added to the search.

Adjectives with über- in German	Adjectives with super- in German	Adjectives with mega- in German
cool (279)	cool (8,347)	Cool (2,963)
populär (14); beliebt (9)	populär (60); beliebt (103)	populär (28); beliebt (56)
talentiert (89)	talentiert (274)	talentiert (49)
reich* (3,423)	reich (17,112)	reich (183)
trendy (4)	trendy (347)	trendy (100)
erfolgreich (34)	erfolgreich (1,394)	erfolgreich (838)

Table 4: adjective derivations with uber-/über-, super- and mega- in German

The prefixes *super-* and *mega-* combine with the same adjectives as *uber-* in English, too. Here, *super-* outweighs *uber-*, whereas *mega-* does not in every case, as shown in Table 5.

Adjectives with uber- in English	Adjectives with super- in English	Adjectives with mega- in English
cool (842)	cool (9,433)	cool (114)
popular (231)	popular (1,412)	popular (277)
talented (315)	talented (1,459)	talented (89)
wealthy (172)	wealthy (1,351)	wealthy (121)
trendy (114)	trendy (251)	trendy (6)
successful (114)	successful (604)	successful (144)

Table 5: adjective derivations with uber-/über-, super- and mega- in English

The findings in Tables 1-4 clearly indicate that *uber-* is a productive prefix in English which competes with *super-* and *mega-*. It functions as intensifier and is based on the meaning "outstanding, extreme, pre-eminent" (OED; for *uber-* as noun-prefix) and/or "to a great, extreme, or excessive degree" (OED; for *uber-* as adjective-prefix). In German, the intensifying function is possible and *über-* does occasionally occur as an alternative to *super-* and *mega-*, although we have already discovered that *über-* in German does not combine with *rich* and *wealthy* as it does in English. Another case in the point of contrast to be made here is the combination *uber-powerful*, which occurs 90 times in enTenTen15, such as follows:

(1) the incarnation of Wu-Feng will appear (the 10th last card of the ghost deck), which is effectively an **uber-powerful** ghost that will test you at a likely critical point
(2) Product Name: Social Viral Video. Social Viral Videos is an **UBER-POWERFUL** utility that allows your customers to get the best out of Youtube
(3) And now, we get to the part that gamers LOVE the most: the cheat codes! Some of these cheats unlock **uber-powerful** teams; maps you can't easily access;
(4) Overall, engineers across the world are beginning to understand that the intuitive and **uber-powerful** computing that the future calls for is possible only by
(5) I must say, I've never really felt like putting in the necessary effort to make **uber-powerful** artifacts as an alchemist. The sheer tedium of scumming for corpse after corpse

Again, these examples illustrate the meaning of 'excess' in English. In German, an obvious equivalent would be *übermächtig* (43,425 times in deTenTen13). However, *übermächtig* is an adjective based on the noun *Übermacht*, and it does not merely mean a large or excessive quantity of power, it means the ability to overpower, e.g. an opponent in conflict or a competitor in sports. This is reflected in collocations such as 'Gegner' (opponent), 'Feind' (enemy), and 'Konkurrenz' (competition), and in concordances such as the following:

(1) gemeinsam vor Gericht gezogen sind, um den Opfern der **übermächtigen** Ölindustrie nach Jahrzehnten Recht zu schaffen. [*jointly went to court to provide justice after decades to the victims of the **overpowering** oil industry.*]

(2) die unterschiedlichen Strategien und Projekte der Auflehnung und Selbstermächtigung gegenüber diesen **übermächtigen** uneinholbaren Vorgaben", so Brigitte Felderer. [*the different strategies and projects of resistance and self-empowerment in the face of these **overpowering** unachievable directives", according to Brigitte Felderer.*]

(3) aber ein Einzelner hat doch nicht die Macht so etwas zu erreichen. Die Politiker, Manager, Banker usw. sind doch so **übermächtig**, da hat man keine Chance. [*but an individual does not have the power to achieve something like this. The politicians, managers, bankers etc. are so **overpowering**, you don't have a chance.*]

(4) Eine Totalreform ist überfällig, aber auch hier passiert das Gegenteil: **Übermächtige** Lobbies drängen unter dem Vorwand der Terrorabwehr auf die Festplatten unserer Kinder. [*A complete reform is overdue, but here, too, the opposite happens: **Overpowering** lobbies push themselves on our children's hard drives under the pretence of terror prevention.*]

(5) Der Kampf gegen einen **übermächtigen** und brutalen Gegner wird über das Schicksal der ganzen Welt entscheiden. [*The battle against a **superior** and brutal enemy will determine the fate of the entire world.*]

The contexts also differ; most of the English concordances relate to IT tools and to fantasy-worlds of computer games more than to the real or physical world, whereas the German concordances predominantly relate to real-world struggles. Therefore, *übermächtig* would better be translated as *overpowering* or *superior* than *uber-powerful*. It is notable that the derivations in English suggest popular culture contexts, which might explain the productivity of uber- in English. This is hardly mirrored in German. It is also an unusual context for borrowing from German. The OED lists merely two loans from German since 1990, which are *Wessi* and *Passivhaus* and generally, German loans tend to either be terminology or serious and conceptual matter (*weltschmerz*, *dasein*) or cultural along the lines of *bierhaus*, *dirndl* and *lederhosen*, or political, where especially militaristic matter prevails. That is, borrowing from German is neither current, nor in any way 'cool'.

That *uber-* slots into popular culture contexts is surprising for the reasons just mentioned, but also because its use in the SL does not provide much precedence for the uses in the RL. Firstly, in German, *über-*+adjective in the sense of 'excess' occurs to a notably lesser frequency than in English. Secondly, in German, alternative synonymous intensifying prefixes are clearly more common. Thirdly, in German, *über-* as prefix is a lot more common in partly lexicalised combinations with verbs and their nominalisations – which does not occur in English. Finally, *über-* as a prefix in German is more common in other meanings (trans-, sur-, over-) than 'excess'. All of this suggests that German is not a very profound pattern provider for the use of *uber-* as intensifier: In the SL, the use that dominates in the RL is broadly overshadowed by other uses. Considering the scale and the speed of borrowing from English in German (cf. Onysko 2007; Steffens/al-Wadi 2014), it even seems not unlikely that the occurrence of *übercool* in German is due to English influence.

Therefore, these findings would indicate that the use of *uber-* in English is taking its own path. The element is de-contextualised from the range of more common uses in German and re-contextualised to compete with *super-* and *mega-* as intensifiers, combining with adjectives and nouns rather than, as in German, verbs. The main point here is that contrasts are a result of pragmatic adaptation, not of copying; this is not what German does with *über-*, it is what English wants to do with *uber-*.

6 Conclusions

The aim of this article is to complement more recent studies of borrowing from a pragmatic perspective, which comprises an interest in pragmatic borrowing, i.e., the borrowing of discourse markers, as well as an interest in pragmatic aspects of lexical borrowing. This article provided evidence for the latter, focussing on post-hoc adaptations of loans with a usage-based investigation of contrasts between SL and RL, following the "need for comparative studies" of "individual forms in the SL as well as the RL" stated by Andersen (2014: 18). An investigation of a) corpora and not only dictionaries and b) the use and not only the documentation or mere frequency of German loanwords, provided evidence for contrasts between the SL and the RL. Such contrasts were discussed as the result of a process of pragmatic adaptation through de- and re-contextualising loans, whereby some, or even the most prominent brought-along SL uses of the loan can be discarded – as in the case of *uber-*, *Anschluss*, *Lebensraum*, *blitz*, *diktat*, and *Gestalt* – and potentially new uses, brought-about after borrowing, can be added – as in the case of *nix*, *strafe*, *blitz* (noun), and *blitz* (verb).

While *nix*, *uber-* and *blitz* (verb) and *strafe* have parallel expressions in the RL, these are, however, "not full equivalents in the pragmatic sense, since they lack the special conversational effect that is evoked by the loanword." (Matras, 2009: 150). They could therefore be considered "non-catachrestic innovations" that are "characterized by the existence of a semantic near-equivalent" and that are "typically used to express additional pragmatic meanings" (Onysko/Winter-Froemel 2011, 1555). In the case of *strafe*, it became clear that it is borrowed despite the existence of the verb 'to punish', but it specifically entails the notion of going after others with military means, for which the SL provides no precedence. Similarly, the use of *blitzkrieg* is partly different from the SL, the use of *blitz* (noun) largely unrelated to the SL and the use of *blitz* (verb) unprecedented in the SL. This is what speakers of the RL have decided they can and want to do with *blitz(krieg)*. Finally, the analysis of *uber-* showed that its function as intensifier in competition with *super-* and *mega-* is largely an 'imagined' one without much precedence in the SL.

Post-hoc adaptation can lead to changes in semantics, but also extend into word class (*nix* – verb, *blitz* – verb) and word formation patterns (discarded use of *über-* as verb prefix, preference for prefixing adjectives with *uber-*). Post-borrowing shifts in word class somewhat complicate the consideration of word class borrowability and would suggest that SL constraints may be ignored in the relocation and adaptation process. This study therefore highlights that changes in word class and post-borrowing word formation processes should be included in considerations of pragmatic adaptation of loanwords, when so far most of the attention to post-borrowing contrasts has focussed on semantics and formal, phonological and orthographic integration.

The current spread and use of English as lingua franca and resulting language contact means that the influence of English on other languages prevails in the contemporary study and documentation of borrowing, including pragmatic borrowing. The focus on loans from German sheds light on a more unlikely SL – unlikely both in its limited and declining influence on other languages and in the way it is used as an SL, which should be noted, as follows. Given the language contact opportunities especially during the 19th century, English speakers do not make much use of as German as an SL for borrowing. In the light of this, some findings of this

study are particularly interesting and have implications for considering the impact of language contact scenarios on lexical borrowing: Firstly, in addition to the fact that German has provided subject-specific terms more than anything else, some of the words that English borrowed from German are not frequent in German at all (e.g., *Wanderlust* and *Diktat*). This means that borrowing does not necessarily rely on frequent encounter with the lexical matter at hand. Secondly, the borrowing language might overlook or ignore more common uses of lexical matter and pick it up based on more marginal meanings (*Anschluss*, *Lebensraum*, *Diktat, uber*-) which are far outweighed by other uses in the SL, or indeed pick it up on potential meanings (*strafe*). These points would indicate that much borrowing from German into British English cannot be explained with SL speakers spreading around lexical matter in the RL in natural language use situations. Finally, research on borrowability (cf. Field, 2002; Matras, 2009; Tadmor, 2009) unanimously finds that nouns are the most borrowable items, and this picture emerges for loans from German into British English, too. However, the occurrence of a loan verb like *strafe*, a pronoun like *nix* and a derivational prefix like *uber*- would suggest more intense influence of German on English than is at hand. The "importance of German as a language of culture and knowledge" (Durkin, 2014: 361) is reflected in borrowing from German and to some extent stereotypical imaginations of Germans and German culture, too (cf. Jucker, 1996; Stubbs, 1998; Demleitner, 2009). Overall, however, it is difficult to explain the occurrence of German loans in British English based on natural language contact scenarios, and the choice of borrowed matter appears to be based on some, rather expert, RL speakers taking an interest in the potential of a specific selected SL item – or indeed a (potential) aspect of it – rather than native SL speakers spreading it into the RL.

Contrastive analyses like these could be used as a counter argument in the face of linguistic purism, which is at times rife in some speaker communities, not least in Germany: If speaker communities can to some extent deal with loans as they please, then they are not 'overpowered' by another language. Choices that speaker communities make might suit themselves more than an 'imperialist' other. As noted before, the outcomes can be unexpected.

More in-depth and possibly diachronic analyses would be necessary in order to trace in more detail the processes of pragmatic adaptation that lead to the contrasts noted here, similar to the analysis that Andersen (2017) has undertaken for *jobb* in Norwegian. Pre-1900 loans could be included in a further, more diachronic study – *spiel* and *ersatz* are two examples of pre-1900 loans that are used differently in German and in British English. Finally, it would have also been desirable to consider more than one corpus for each language to achieve a better spread across genres and time.

Bibliography

Andersen, Gisle, 2014. Pragmatic Borrowing. In: J. Pragmat 67, 17-33.

Andersen, Gisle, 2017. A corpus study of pragmatic adaptation: The case of the Anglicism [*jobb*] in Norwegian. In: J. Pragmat. 113, 127-143.

Andersen, Gisle, Furiassi, Cristiano, Mišic Ilić, Biljana, 2017. Editorial: The pragmatic turn in studies of linguistic borrowing. J. Pragmat. 113, 71-76.

Auer, Peter, 1992. Introduction: John Gumperz' Approach to Contextualization. In Auer, Peter, Luzio, Aldo Di (Eds.): Contextualization of Language. John Benjamins Amsterdam, Philadelphia, pp. 1-37.

Baker, Paul, 2006. Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis. Continuum, London and New York.

Balteiro, Isabel, 2018. *Oh wait*: English pragmatic markers in Spanish football chatspeak. In: J. Pragmat. 133, 123-133.

Cannon, Garland, 1998. Post-1949 German loans in written English. Word 49:1, 19-54. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00437956.1998.11673877, last access 12/06/2020.

Demleitner, Elisabeth, 2009. Gentlemen und Nazis? Nationale Stereotype in deutschen und britischen Printmedien. Würzburger elektronische sprachwissenschaftliche Arbeiten. Vol. 8. http://d-nb.info/1003205844/34, last access 18/05/2021.

Durkin, Philip, 2014. Borrowed Words. A History of Loanwords in English. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ehlert, Christoph, 2012. Das Wandern ist des Wortes Lust: Germanismen im britischen Englisch. German Loanwords in British English. Tradition, Hamburg.

Field, Frederic, 2002. Linguistic borrowing in bilingual contexts. John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Görlach, Manfred, 2001. A Dictionary of European Anglicisms: A Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen European Languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Görlach, Manfred (Ed.), 2002. English in Europe. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Görlach, Manfred, 2003. English words abroad. John Benjamins, Amsteram and Philadelphia.

Grant, Anthony P, 2015. Lexical Borrowing. In The Oxford Handbook of the Word. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 431-444.

Haspelmath, Martin, Tadmor, Uri (Eds.), 2009. Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin and Boston.

Haspelmath, Martin, 2009. Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues. In Haspelmath, Martin, Tadmor, Uri (Eds.): Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook. De Gruyter Mouton Berlin, Boston, pp. 35-54.

Jakubíček, Miloš, Kilgarriff, Adam, Kovář, Vojtěch Rychlý, Pavel, Suchomel, Vít, 2013. The TenTen corpus family. 7th International Corpus Linguistics Conference CL, July 2013, 125-127.

Johansson, Lars, 2002. Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contact. Routledge, London and New York.

Jucker, Andreas, 1996. Das Fremde in der eigenen Sprache. Fremdwörter im Deutschen und im Englischen. In Bredella, Lothar, Christ, Herbert (Eds.) Begegnungen mit dem Fremden. Ferber, Giessen, pp. 233-247.

Kilgarriff, Adam, Baisa, Vít, Bušta, Jan, Jakubíček, Miloš, Kovář, Vojtěch, Michelfeit, Jan, Rychlý, Pavel, Suchomel, Vít, 2014. The Sketch Engine: ten years on. Lexicography 1, 7-36.

Krzyżanowski, Michał, 2016. Recontextualisation of neoliberalism and the increasingly conceptual nature of discourse: Challenges for critical discourse studies. Discourse & Society 27(3), 308-321.

Matras, Yaron, 2009. Language Contact. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

McEnery, Tony, Xiao, Richard, Tono, Yukio, 2006. Corpus-Based Language Studies. An advanced resource book. Routledge, London and New York.

Mišić Ilić, Biljana, 2017. Pragmatic borrowing from English into Serbian: Linguistic and sociocultural aspects. In: J. Pragmat. 113, 103-115.

Onysko, Alexander, 2007. Anglicisms in German. Borrowing, lexical productivity and written codeswitching. De Gruyter, Berlin and New York.

Onysko, Alexander, Winter-Froemel, Esme, 2011. Necessary loans – luxury loans? Exploring the pragmatic dimension of borrowing. J. Pragmat. 43, 1550-1567.

Oxford English Dictionary. Online. https://www.oed.com/, last access 18/05/2021.

Peterson, Elizabeth, 2017. The nativization of pragmatic borrowings in remote language contact situations. In: J. Pragmat. 113, 116-126.

Peterson, Elizabeth, Beers Fägersten, Kristy, 2018. Introduction. Special issue: Linguistic and pragmatic outcomes of contact with English. J. Pragmat. 133, 105-108.

Pinnavaia, Laura, 2001. The Italian Borrowings in the Oxford English Dictionary. A Lexicographical, Linguistics and Cultural Analysis. Bulzoni, Roma.

Pfeffer, Alan/Cannon, Garland, 1994. German Loanwords in English. An Historical Dictionary. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Podhajecka, Mirosława, 2013. Russian Borrowings in English. A Dictionary and Corpus Study. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, Opole.

Schröter, Melani, 2018. How Words behave in other languages. The use of German Nazi vocabulary in English. Pragmatics & Society 9 (1), 93-118.

Schröter, Melani, Leuschner, Torsten, 2013. Historical Germanisms in British Newspapers. A discourse-analytic approach and four corpus-assisted case studies. Angermion. Yearbook for Anglo-German Literary Criticism, Intellectual History and Cultural Transfers / Jahrbuch für britisch-deutsche Kulturbeziehungen 6 (1), 139-171.

Sinclair, John, 2004. Trust the text. Language, corpus and discourse. Routledge, London and New York.

Steffens, Doris, al-Wadi, Doris. Neuer Wortschatz. Neologismen im Deutschen 2001-2010. Institut für deutsche Sprache, Mannheim, 2 vols.

Stubbs, Michael, 1998. German loanwords and cultural stereotypes. English Today 1: 19-26.

Stubbs, Michael, 2001. *Words and Phrases. Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Tadmor, Uri. 2009. Loanwords in the world's languages. Findings and results. In Haspelmath, Martin, Tadmor, Uri (Eds.): Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin and Boston, pp. 55-75.

Terkourafi, Marina, 2011. *Thank you*, *Sorry* and P*lease* in Cypriot Greek: What happens to politeness markers when they get borrowed across languages? J. Pragmat. 43, 218-235.

Teubert, Wolfgang, 2010. Meaning, Discourse and Society. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Treffers-Daller, Jeanine, 2010. Borrowing. In Fried, Mirjam, Östman, Jan Ola, Verschueren, Jef (Eds.): Variation and Change. Pragmatic Perspectives. John Benjamins Amsterdam, Philadelphia, pp. 17-35.

Wodak, Ruth, 2000. Recontextualisation and transformation of meanings. In Sarangi, Srikant, Coulthard, Malcom (Eds.): Discourse and Social Life. Longman, London, pp. 185-207.

Appendix

Pool of examples to check for SL-RL contrasts, derived from OED – list of words of German origin narrowed down as follows: a) limited to 1900ff, b) excluding word originating from Yiddish, c) excluding subject-specific terminology, and d) excluding reference to specific objects. The words appear in alphabetical order and the spelling (with or without capitalisation or umlaut) is the one provided in the OED main entry.

Abwehr, noun

ambivalent, adjective

Anschluss, noun

anschluss, verb

Antifa, noun

Aufgabe, noun

autobahn, noun

blitz, noun

blitz, verb

Blitzkrieg | blitzkrieg, noun

diktat, noun

Drang, noun

echt, adjective

einfühlung, noun

Erlebnis, noun

Führer, noun

Galgenhumor | galgenhumor, noun

Gebrauchsmusik, noun

Gedankenexperiment, noun

Gemeinschaft, noun

Gesellschaft, noun

Gesamtkunstwerk, noun

Gestalt, noun

Gleichschaltung, noun

grossdeutsch, adjective

Judenrein, adjective

kamerad, noun

kitsch, noun

klatsch, noun

kleindeutsch, adjective

Lebensraum, noun

Lebenswelt, noun

Lumpenproletariat, noun

Machtpolitik, noun

malerisch, adjective

meisterwerk, noun

Mitbestimmung, noun

Mutti, noun

Nazi, noun & adjective

nix, noun[2]

nix, interjection and noun[1]

Ostpolitik, noun

Putsch, noun

Putzfrau, noun

Quatsch, noun

Rassenschander, noun

Realpolitiker, noun

Rechtsstaat, noun

Sachlichkeit, noun

salonfähig, adjective

Schatz, noun

Schimpfwort, noun

Schlamperei, noun

Schrecklichkeit, noun

Schriftsprache, noun

Schwarm, noun

Schwerpunkt, noun

Schwung, noun

Sitzkrieg, noun

Sonderweg, noun

Spielraum, noun

Sprachgefühl, noun

Stimmung, noun

strafe, verb

sympathisch, adjective

Torschlusspanik, noun

treff, noun

uber-, prefix

Übermensch, noun

Umwelt, noun

Unding, noun

untermensch, noun

Verstehen, noun

wanderlust, noun

Weltbild, noun

wertfrei, adjective

Wehmut, noun

Wirtschaftswunder, noun

Zugzwang, noun