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Traditional models focussing on (German-English) language contact assume that this process primarily leads to the importation of loanwords. Due to the role that is taken by present English in its use as the global lingua franca, the panoply of linguistic contact phenomena, however, may also include further-reaching traces of ‘Englishisation’. Built on a critical evaluation of anglicism research in Germany and applying Muysken’s (2000) taxonomy of code-mixing, this paper will shed light on the creative usage of anglicisms and of other forms of language mixture between German and English. Examples of the various forms of interlingual interaction are drawn from German press language in the context of the Fifa World Cup 2006.

1 INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that current linguistic debates often touch on the question of how the forces of globalisation might shape the linguistic landscapes of the future, and although internationalisation as such is mostly associated with the enormous spread and diversification of English, traditional studies on inner-European language contact with this language, over the years, have shown a relatively stable theoretical outreach so as if the quality of interlingual interaction with English had not changed at all (Onysko 2007:5). This state of contact-linguistic research concerning the impact of English on, say, French and Italian may be explained by the long-standing tradition of language purism in these countries. There is, however, no real equivalent in terms of direct linguistic interventions on part of the German state, where issues like ‘language maintenance’ are preferably dealt with in NGOs like the Verein Deutsche Sprache (Plümer 2000:71-80). Indeed, if one takes into account the specific historical situation in Germany after 1945, the idea that German is the European language most open to linguistic influence from English (Androutsopoulos 2003:83) seems feasible. The expectation that German research on English as a contact language has described the whole radius of possible ways of interaction with English is a fallacy nonetheless: Up to now, the main focus of German research on contact with English has rested nearly exclusively on anglicisms, too.

In general, the lexicon is the linguistic module most susceptible to borrowing (Winford 2003:29-31). Yet, there may be much more to explore than anglicisms (Onysko 2007:5). Above all, scholars focussing on code-switching in non-European contexts (Myers-Scotton 1993; Romaine 1995) along with World Englishes researchers (Kachru 1986; Görlach 1998) have pointed out repeatedly that English, serving as the present European and global lingua franca, may also manifest itself in forms of interlingual contact other than lexicalised anglicisms. In fact, it could be maintained (Androutsopoulos 2003) that English in Germany these days is learnt as a second or third rather than a mere foreign language, as Kachru’s (1986) World Englishes model had claimed.

Against the background of this gradual ‘bilingualisation’, I shall show that a broader
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A framework of analysis is needed so as to include the diverse effects of what Kachru (1994) calls ‘Englishisation’ – a process that is counterbalanced by simultaneous nativisation (= integration) processes.

Within the scope of a case study on language use in German press language, I shall challenge the applicability of a specific code-mixing model as proposed by Pieter Muysken (2000). My argument is based on two hypotheses:

1. I assume that there are different qualities of linguistic contact with English through which diverse discursive effects may be accomplished. Especially occurrences other than lexicalised anglicisms could allow for more creative usage by providing language users with more expressive options (Androutsopoulos 2003; Onysko 2006).

2. I believe that the trend towards a greater linguistic entrenchment of English is especially promoted by the growing number of gradually bilingual speakers (Hamers/Blanc 1983) and that it also reflects itself in the diction of written press language.1

2 PRESS LANGUAGE AS A TESTGROUND FOR MUYSKEN’S TAXONOMY OF CODE-MIXING: A CASE STUDY BASED ON JOURNALIST TEXTS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FIFA WORLD CUP 2006

Sticking to Muysken’s (2000) model, we can distinguish three types of interlingual interaction: insertions, code alternations and congruent lexicalisations. Each of these processes will be discussed and illustrated in the following sections.

2.1 Insertions

2.1.1 Forms of insertions

2.1.1.1 Anglicisms proper
To begin with, let us address the category of insertions. According to Muysken (2000:3, 60-69), they usually occur as single or two-word switches. As lexical absorptions they have first of all the status of ad hoc-like lexical embeddings, but by and by they get structurally nested in and integrated into the recipient language (here: German). Due to the prestige of present English and the effect of globalisation, this integration often comes about more quickly now than some decades ago. Accordingly, repeated or habitualised insertion processes lead to linguistic appropriation, i.e. to the lexicalisation in the L1. Concordant with the growing lexical diffusion, the initial impression that a moderate form of interlinguistic mixing takes place whenever an English word is activated gets lost in the memory of many speakers. Talking of English-German contact, it can thus be stated that insertion processes may, sooner or later, lead to the implementation of borrowings in the lexicon (Muysken 2000:33), here in the sense of anglicisms proper (Görlach 1994). By ‘anglicisms proper’ I understand common material loanwords with a visible Englishness like, in the context of the football world championships 2006, the old, established loanword Fußball ‘football’, but also simple or compound lexical adoptions such as Fan, Trainer, Teammanager, Coach, Keeper, Ticket, Dribbling or Fitness.

Each of these anglicisms has been orthographically adapted by the use of a capital letter (Plümer 2000:214). Such integration, along with phonetic and morphological adaptations, helps to reduce the degree of linguistic foreignness, although this tendency may also be broken through owing to the high communicative values attributed to present English. However, in the case of verbs, the typical German ending <-en> may be added, as it is visible

---

1 The material for this case study has been drawn from the German news magazine Der Spiegel, but also from the Financial Times Deutschland (FTD, online edition only) as well as the Tageszeitung (TAZ) and the Tagesspiegel (online edition). The period of analysis covers the time around the world football championships 2006. This time span seems appropriate since the high media attention during the Fifa World Cup may also have resulted in the incorporation of fresh English language material.
in *fighten* ‘to fight’. While the adaptation of the infinitive is a widely shared habit, the past participle of verbs imported from English may oscillate between different forms: e.g. *gefightet* vs. *gefighten* ‘fought’ (*Spiegel*, 03.07.2006, p. 146).

Be that as it may, these types of integration are often accompanied by **semantic shifts** in the recipient language (Plümer 2000:230-257, Yang 1990). An interesting example of such a semantic integration is the specialisation of the meaning which effected the word *Public Viewing* (e.g. *Spiegel*, 26.06.2006, p. 146). It was massively used in the context of the Fifa World Cup and is by now almost lexicalised. While the English signification, applying the definition of *Longman’s Dictionary of Contemporary English*, refers to an occasion for a special look at an exhibition etc. open to the general public, the noun, in German use, designates the ‘public watching of large-screen TV broadcasts, e.g. on marketplaces’, here again during the Fifa World Cup 2006.

2.1.1.2 Pseudo-anglicisms – indicators of the nativisation of English?

Probably much more than Anglicisms proper, it is the so-called **pseudo-anglicisms** (Yang 1990:12-14, Onysko 2007:52-55) which prove to us that the L1 users of German are by no means obliged to stick to the practiced usage in the donor language English, but that they may ‘digest’ linguistic material transferred from English into German freely and creatively. Although they are not mentioned by Muysken (2000), I suggest grouping pseudo-anglicisms as phenomena akin to insertions. Yet, they mainly occur as conceptual insertions, i.e. they differ from the structural patterns of lexicalised English words (Onysko 2007:52-55). Classifying them as insertions is cogent at least in cases where the pseudo-loans show high degrees of semantic integration and where they are rather concise. This usually holds true as pseudo-anglicisms may come about when parts of a lexicalised English word are clipped off.

On the whole, pseudo-anglicisms can be legitimately seen as one of the most prominent indicators of Englishisation, bearing in mind that, as Kachru (1986) explains, Englishisation itself is often ensued and counterbalanced by L1-internal **nativisation** processes. In fact, frequent words like *handy*, appearing in an article expressing its amazement in view of the relaxed and peaceful atmosphere in the German football stadiums, which was also underlined by the free exchange of mobile numbers (*Spiegel*, 19.06.2006, p. 84), are based on English material. Still, they are not lexicalised in standard English, the L1 equivalent being *mobile phone/cell phone*. Similarly, the compound noun *Profikicker* (*TAZ*, 20.03.2006, p. 13) consists of two German pseudo-anglicisms, which, in isolation or in other lexical combinations, were particularly frequent in the context of the football world cup 2006 as well. More specifically, the word is a compound based on the clipped form of the English noun *professional player*, i.e. *Profi*, and the pseudo-loan *Kicker* ‘football player’, which derives from the English verb *to kick*.²

2.1.1.3 German surrogates: loan translations, loan renditions and loan creations

Talking of processes of integration, one should, however, not leave out of sight either that vital recipient languages like German are also capable of finding a **native quasi-equivalents**

² Indeed, pseudo-anglicisms can be regarded as creative formations of Germans. Unless we trace them back to imperfect learning, we may regard them as signs for the ability and readiness of German speakers to adapt imported linguistic material to their specific linguistic needs and habits irrespective of the usage in standard English. Note that on an international level, pseudo-loans do not necessarily hamper communication with native speakers, since possible difficulties in understanding each other may be overcome by discursive on-line solutions. The prescriptive stance according to which the transfer of English elements into German should either entirely respect the rules of the English language (however they can be fixed in view of the pluricentric standards proposed by the World Englishes model) or ought not take place at all, is thus out of place. Indeed, the English language even shows stunning variation between its British and American varieties as groups of the inner circle of the World Englishes model (Kachru 1986). To that end, rhetorically denying a language from Kachru’s (1986) extended circle the right to go ways of its own as to the manner it appropriates English, comes close to the use of double standards.
for imported anglicisms proper and may use them either competitively or alternatingly with a repeatedly inserted English ‘original’ (Plümer 2000:266). In contrast to Muysken (2000:273-274), who only mentions literal word-by-word translations, I propose classifying similar forms of nativised equivalents of anglicisms proper as conceptual (and simultaneously structural) insertions, too.

Nativised equivalents of anglicisms may show different gradations of linguistic ‘imitation’ (Yang 1990; Plümer 2000:47-89): First, borrowings may be replaced by loan translations, where a literal translation is realised, like in the case of substituting an (infrequently encountered) anglicism such as penalty kick by the German word Strafstoß (TAZ, 11.07.2006, p. 1). Secondly, we may find freer loan renditions. In the context of sports terminology, Elfmeterpunkt (TAZ, 26.06.2006, p. 16) can work as an example. Here the literal translation of penalty spot – in German Strafpunkt – is avoided by specifying the distance to the goal (11 m) from which the ball must be kicked off.3 The third type of German quasi-equivalents of anglicisms is formed by loan creations. They represent substitutes for English words which do not show any lexemic similarity and thus usually only a vague structural (maybe a morphological) congruency with the English original so that they are merely semantically based on the actual model word. For instance, Zeitlupe (TAZ, 11.07.2006, p. III), in literal back-translation ‘time lense’, serves as a surrogate for slow motion, here referring to a TV broadcasting of a football match.

2.1.1.4 Nonce loans
Of course, not all anglicisms can get listed in the German lexicon after they have been inserted into or activated in a specific discursive context. Quite on the contrary, journalist texts, especially articles in the German news magazine Der Spiegel, may be flavoured with diverse nonce loans, too (cf. also Onysko 2007:37), which can, but need not establish themselves as listed anglicisms later on.

The highly mediatised time around the Fifa World Cup 2006 was also fruitful as to such spontaneous insertions. Indeed, it produced some ad hoc formations open to lexicalisation in standard German such as Fan-Corner (Tagesspiegel, 22.06.2006, FIFA World Cup supplement), designating special areas for fans where to chill, but also a wording like City-Dressing (FTD, 17.05.2006, http://www.financial-times.de/sport/74402.html). Again, German realises a shift in meaning here, as in City-Dressing there is no general reference to the act of embellishing a city as in English use, but rather to the German practice during the Fifa World Cup 2006 to put the German flag on their cars, their house fronts, in the streets etc.

2.1.2 Discursive functions of insertions
At any rate, these three subcategories of insertions, in my (slightly adapted) interpretation of this concept, share at least one point: They result from a (seemingly unidirectional) process of absorption of a lexical element (Muysken 2000:60-95) into the L1, be it in a form oriented at the English original, in a form suggesting Englishness only (pseudo-loans) or in shape of a free German substitute (loan creations).

As such, the term insertion implies that ad hoc loans, established anglicisms or their replica words may fill lexical gaps in the recipient code (Weinreich 1953:58). Thus, insertions often serve referential functions: They often give names to objects that have been imported with their respective designations from Anglo-American culture, like almost the whole football terminology and many words relating to the realms of the media, music and commerce.

On the other hand, insertions, i.e. nonce loans, anglicisms or their German substitutes may also fulfil specific socio-semantic functions. Above all, it is widely known that angli-

---

3 Rendering penalty spot into Strafpunkt would have been ambiguous because Punkt in German, depending on the context, either corresponds to the English noun spot, designating the geometrical item meant here, or to the English word point, i.e. a mark or unit for counting (suggesting a ‘penalty point’).
cisms may be used as quasi-synonyms (Plümer 2000:266-269). For instance, *Job*, having expanded its semantic range in German in recent years, may serve as a short, hackneyed term for all kinds of work, not only for low-paid employments any longer. Therefore, it usually has got a different connotation than the German quasi-equivalents *Arbeit* or *Anstellung* (Yang 1990:126-133): Attesting that a football player did a good job (‘*einen guten Job*’) is thus an idea that cannot be expressed by simply replacing *Job* by *Arbeit*, as this would not convey the notion of passion or personal involvement, but rather that of mere professionalism or routine.

Also, anglicisms proper provide languages like German with euphemisms (Weinreich 1953:58). For example, *gehandicapt* ‘handicapped’, referring to a sportsman, appears to be less discriminating and thus politically more correct than talking of a *Behinderung* ‘disability’ (*TAZ*, 03.04.2006, p. 18).

Additionally, anglicisms (proper) frequently create further nuances in meaning, as has been explained above by the example centred around the gradual meaning extension of the anglicism *Job* (Weinreich 1953:59; Yang 1990:126-130).

Another factor which seems to make German speakers favour anglicisms is that they are often short, i.e. sometimes only mono- or bisyllabic, whereas German is known for its long compounds (Yang 1990:123-126). This, however, does not mean that German, in principle, is entirely unable to devise shorter equivalents of anglicisms proper.

Moreover, Anglicisms may provide a text with a specific local colour (Plümer 2000:59), e.g. when a German journalist adorns a text with elements from American English in a report about the harsh American training methods introduced in the German national football team in 2005/06 (*Spiegel*, 29.05.2006, p. 64-67). This way a specific sociolinguistic colour (Plümer 2000:59) becomes evident as well, for the named article about the Americanisation of German football by Klinsmann evokes an almost military-like atmosphere. Alternatively, a sequence of lexicalised single-word switches may give an expert sound to a text (Plümer 2000:59, Yang 1990), for instance in an article about football containing many technical or strategic ‘insider’ expressions such as the English-based loan translations *Elfmeterschießen* ‘penalty shootout’, *gelbe/rote Karte* ‘yellow/red card’, *Platzverweis* ‘sending-off’, etc (*Spiegel Special* 2/2006, p. 138-142).

Given this, Winford (2003: 59) thinks that ‘lexical borrowing [and processes of nativisation related to it – SK] must be seen as […] one aspect of a creative process of lexical change [and enrichment, SK] under contact’

### 2.2 Code alternations

#### 2.2.1 Forms of code alternation

#### 2.2.1.1 Word-internal code-switching

While inserted ad hoc loans consist of English material only, the interpolation of which, due to their non-lexicalisation, still evokes some foreignness or exotism in a text otherwise more or less dominated by German, the press data also revealed cases in which speakers realised non-lexicalised word-internal switches. They make part of Muysken’s (2000: 96-121) second category, the code alternations. Among other things, one may encounter hybrid compounds which are spontaneously formed on the basis of a German lexical morpheme and an English one, in whatever sequence. Yet, the ad hoc character of a hybrid switch does not rule out the possibility that it may enter the German lexicon later on, which is also facilitated by the similar word-building procedures in English and German. A candidate for lexicalisation could be *Fanmeile* (e.g. *Spiegel*, 19.06.2006, p. 69). This wording was coined during the Fifa World Cup 2006 to denote the fan zones which often extended over vast areas in greater German cities.

---

4 Contrariwise, in English, *handicapped* is usually replaced by the word *disabled* now.
2.2.1.2 Classical code-switches
The majority of code alternations are, however, syntactically more extended intra- or inter-sentential code-switches. To underline the duality of languages, Muysken (2000: 97) speaks of an ABA structure. Here, A stands for German which forms the morphosyntactically dominant matrix code (Myers-Scotton 1993). B stands for English in its use as the embedded language, while there are no structural relations between A and B. Owing to the inner stability of recipient languages like German, which seek to maintain their grammatical frames, it is evident that code alternations appear less frequently than insertions. Yet, for pragmatic reasons and in view of the fact that many German speakers with a command of English may be said to have a gradually bilingual competence, this blocking of longer English stretches within a German text can be broken through.

Remarkable examples with a thematic connection to the Fifa World Cup 2006 are slogans like *A Time To Make Friends* ([Spiegel Special 2/2006](#)). Even more worth looking at is, however, the 2006 advertising motto of Coca Cola, running *It’s your heimspiel* ([Spiegel, 26.06.2006, p. 84](#)). It is interesting because its overall structure is English while the text also contains a German ad hoc loan: *Heimspiel* ‘home match’. The example illustrates the bidirectionality of code-switching. Additionally, it underlines that a German word embedded into a sequence of English terms (where English forms the morphosyntactic frame) may work as a *shibboleth* and give readers a sense of home.

2.2.2 Discursive functions of code alternations
Unlike insertions, code alternations are not structurally nested in the matrix language (Muysken 2000: 97). Also, there is a much higher degree according to which, in this case, the English language is psycholinguistically activated (Muysken 2000: 8). Code alternations therefore have got the potential to provide a discourse with a greater amount of Englishness, and they permit a greater variety of potentially creative forms of use.

For instance, they may create the impression of internationality or increase the authenticity of a text, e.g. when anglophone football players are quoted or English invectives and dummy words like *actually* and *you know* ([Spiegel, 03.07.2006, p.137](#); Muysken 2000:31) are used to give readers an idea of the real scenery (Onysko 2006).

Another motivation for the use of code-switches may reside in the journalist’s wish to highlight an idea which had already been expressed at greater length in the preceding text. In the case of such a meta-comment (Onysko 2006), English proverbs or sayings may occur. For instance, I spotted the exclamation *shake it, baby, shake it* in a letter to the editor. It was sent by a reader who identifies himself as a Latino who has lived in Germany since his childhood. He wants to encourage the Germans to keep their patriotism awakened during the Fifa World Cup ([Spiegel, 26.06.2006, p. 10](#)).

Additionally, irony may be engendered by the use of code-switching (Onysko 2006). I found a press text where the French pronunciation of English words as uttered by a footballer’s wife was imitated: ‘You lookä beautiful’ ([Spiegel, 12.06.2006, p. 63](#)).

2.3 Congruent lexicalisations

2.3.1 Characteristics of congruent lexicalisations

---

5 Taken altogether, one could get the impression that code alternations are less frequent than insertions exactly because longer switches put a high mental load on the producer and the (anticipated) hearer or reader. However, the sites at which classical code switches occurred in the press material under examination here gave no evidence of this; rather, switching often comes about in a smooth fashion (Myers-Scotton 1993), especially in the German news magazine *Der Spiegel*, the original role model of which was the *Time Magazine*. Code-switches can also be habitualised (Winford 2003). When this happens, even more anglicisms may occur. Reversely, a sequence of anglicisms may also have kind of a signal value, which helps to trigger longer code-switches.
The third interaction type in Muysken’s model is formed by so-called congruent lexicalisations (Muysken 2000:122-153). They represent the most ‘intimate’ and, apart from some insertions, also the, linguistically speaking, most economic and, at the same time, the most creative category of interlingual contact.

In fact, a congruent lexicalisation exploits structural equivalences between the contact languages, here between English and German, and fills the structural gaps with material from either language. Omitting instances where an abstract grammatical structure (e.g. similar agent structures of a verb or word-building patterns in the L1 and the L2, Muysken 2000: 146) is shared, congruent lexicalisations, as a rule, can be made out in cases where at least a partial interlingual homonymy (usually a homophony) occurs.

2.3.2 Examples and discursive functions of congruent lexicalisations

For instance, in the context of the Fifa World Cup 2006 there was constant talk about the Klinsmänner (Spiegel, 03.07.2006, p. 145), referring to the German football team led by Jürgen Klinsmann. Here the formative –mann from the proper name Klinsmann gets morphologically productive. Literally, it hints to the players’ belonging to the German team, yet it also emphasises ‘clean’ play, viz. the absence of violence and drug abuse.

This ambiguity, again, opens a window to supplementary meanings and to a creative, non-linear play with words across language boundaries. In the case of the Klinsmänner, this double entendre is, self-evidently, facilitated by the homophony of <Klin-> with the English adjective clean. Therefore, a German waste company in Dortmund transformed this wording by putting in clean, notably in English writing, in the first part of the word, making it adjectival. Talking of Cleansmänner this way (TAZ, 10.07.2006, p. 17) declared cleanness to be a German mission for the football championship and beyond and made the company’s employees appear as team players, too.

Similarly, the German press celebrated the form of a German player named Philipp Lahm during the Fifa World Cup 2006. Reporting on the Wireless Lahm phenomenon (Tagesspiegel, 24.06.2006, http://archiv.tagesspiegel.de/archiv/24.06.2006/2618037.asp), journalists attributed Lahm a sheer endless power, so as if he did not need any break for recharging or recovery – a capacity somewhat comparable to what an inexhaustible Wireless LAN connection to the web is able to do. Again, this additional meaning only comes into being because the acronym LAN, which is rendered as /lan/ in German, is phonetically quasi-congruent with the proper name Lahm. Given that the proper name, as such, in translation means ‘lame’, the word play initiated here in view of the success of Lahm & Co. can be said to invalidate the nomen est omen thinking.

Admittedly, the use of congruent lexicalisations, which can be regarded as highly condensed word plays, presupposes a high metalinguistic awareness on the part of the producer and on that of the reader or listener. Accordingly, they represent rather a rare phenomenon in press texts and may be favoured by journalese texts centred on (international) events which attract the particular attention of the media – just as the Fifa World Cup 2006. At any rate, they amount to very interesting examples of language mixture.

3 Conclusions

To conclude, the following statements can be made:

(1) Contact linguistics focussing on the impact of English as a donor language should corroborate its models by including phenomena other than lexicalised anglicisms to account for the growing intensity of Englishisation that even shows up in strong European languages like German, especially in the context of a popular media culture (Androutsopoulos 2003). This shift of attention to more inclusive approaches should come about in the awareness that certain phenomena may be rarer than others.

(2) Muyken’s (2000) proposal can be rendered fruitful in search of more inclusive contact
models. The model helps us to describe creative instances of gradual bilingual use like some
types of code alternation and nonce loans plus congruent lexicalisations, which are based on
close interlingual interactions.
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