

The Influence of English on German: A Morphosyntactic Analysis

Ganić, Mirela

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2015

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:186:202610>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright / Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-02-05**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



University of Rijeka
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English

Mirela Ganić

**THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH ON GERMAN: A
MORPHOSYNTACTIC ANALYSIS**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the B.A. in English Language and Literature and German Language and Literature at the University of Rijeka

Supervisor:

Dr Branka Drljača Margić

July 2015

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE ENGLISH INFLUENCE ON GERMAN	2
2.1. Language contact and types of influence.....	2
2.2. Historical factors.....	2
2.3. Purist phases	4
2.4. Types of the English transfers into German	6
2.4.1. Morphological borrowing	6
2.4.2. Morphemic borrowing	6
2.5. Syntactic transfers.....	9
2.5.1. Syntactic innovation.....	10
2.5.2. Syntactic frequency.....	12
3. METHODOLOGY	14
3.1. Aims.....	14
3.2. Research questions	14
3.3. Corpus.....	15
3.4. Research method.....	15
4. RESULTS.....	17
4.1. Syntactic innovation	17
4.2. Inflectional pattern borrowing	19
5. DISCUSSION	21
6. CONCLUSION	24
BIBLIOGRAPHY	25

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to investigate English linguistic elements in the German grammar. Many linguists (such as Zimmer (1997); Carstensen (1980); and Onysko (2007)) dealt with this topic. The results of their studies revealed some changes in the morphology and syntax of the German language due to the importation of English loan words. This study hopes to offer a different insight into the *Denglish* phenomenon at the level of morphosyntax. The first part of the research offers an overview of the English influence on German, including the explanation of morphemic and syntactic borrowings that might be present in the German language because of the English interference.

In order to see whether some standard German morphosyntactic constructions adopted English grammatical rules, I analyzed the German press language of 16 articles from the *Spiegel online*. The press language tends to show a tolerant attitude toward the English influx into the German language.

In conclusion, the thesis argues that English linguistic elements change neither the German inflectional pattern nor the syntactic constructions. The results of the current study show that the observed syntactic changes in the *Spiegel* articles are predominantly mere stylistic variations or language inherent changes and that the inflectional pattern is borrowed together with anglicisms and it does not appear as a well-entrenched inflectional schema in German.

1. INTRODUCTION

The growing international relevance of English seems to have left its traces on the German language. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the influence of the English language on German has been a crucial field for linguistic research (Onysko 2004).

The aim of this research is to explore the presence of English language elements, namely morphological elements and syntactic constructions, in the German press. In other words, I will examine the English influence on some grammatical rules in the German language. As for the English morphological borrowing, I will deal with the German inflection including inflectionally marked categories such as person, number and case. These may implicate dependence and agreement, which are in the essence grammatical relations. The morphosyntactic analysis of the English influence on German follows the pattern of borrowing according to the linguist Michael Clyne (1980; cited in Capuz 1997). For the purpose of this analysis, I adopted his two types of linguistic borrowing, morphological and syntactic, and applied it to the exploration of the English language elements in German.

The paper comprises six chapters. The first chapter will provide us with a short insight into the topic of this study. In the second chapter, I will shed light on the comprehensive background of the English influence on German, which includes the explanation of the language contact and types of influence, historical factors, purist phases and finally the English morphological and syntactic transfers into German. The methodology of the research is presented in the chapter 3. The chapter 4 will try to answer the question, which English language elements interfere with the German morphological and syntactic system. The chapter 5 includes discussion, which elaborates on and compares the results of the research with the results of previous studies. The last chapter offers some concluding remarks.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE ENGLISH INFLUENCE ON GERMAN

2.1. Language contact and types of influence

There has been a lot of research from a diachronic as well as synchronic perspective in the field of language contact, since it is a phenomenon that is present in all cases where native speakers of a specific language come in contact with speakers of other languages and adopt certain linguistic features. Hock and Joseph (2009: 241) argue “languages and dialects normally do not exist in a vacuum”. Similarly, Thomason (2001: 8) claims that “language contact is everywhere: there is no evidence that languages have developed in total isolation from other languages”. This phenomenon has been given the name *language contact* and the adoption of features is called *borrowing*, whereas the items that are borrowed are named *loans*. Terminology varies significantly in the literature. In addition, as Thomason (2001:1) explains, “in the simplest definition, language contact is the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time”.

Language contact can influence all levels of language – spelling, pronunciation, morphology, syntax and pragmatics (Görlach and Busse 2002). However, as it has been observed, “the most common specific type of influence is the borrowing of words” (Thomason 2001: 10) and “loanwords are easier to establish because they betray their origin directly” (2001: 91). However, in lexical borrowing, units of different size, from morphemes to sentences, can be affected. Sometimes along the insertion of words, other elements are introduced, such as affixes. Indeed, as Hock and Joseph say, “anything can be borrowed: lexical items, roots and affixes, sounds, collocations, and grammatical processes” (2009: 245).

2.2. Historical factors

As mentioned above, the transference of items and elements from a donor into a recipient language is the result of culture contact. Virtually all languages have had periods of large-scale language contact (Clyne 1995).

Manifestations of this in the history of the German language have been the influence of Latin on Old High German and sixteenth-century German, as well as the French influence on Middle High German and eighteenth-century German (Clyne 1995).

Cultural exchange between Britain and Germany has always been intensive. This cultural exchange dates back to the fifth century when the Germanic settlers conquered England and to the eighth century when much of Germany was Christianized by Irishmen and Englishmen. English loanwords in the late Middle Ages were infrequent and restricted only to certain domains (Görlach and Busse 2002). The oldest evidence of contact and influence is in the form of religious borrowings, such as the Old High German terms *gotspell* and *heilago geist* ('the holy spirit') (Viereck 1984; cited in Hilgendorf 2007). Many of these loans are now completely assimilated and almost unrecognizable as loans to the average speaker of German (Görlach and Busse 2002).

The contact between Germany and England started to increase in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. The British innovation and achievement in the domains of politics, literature, and science had a substantial influence in German-speaking Europe. Consequently, contact with the English language also spread to these domains of use, thus bringing the language to a level of national significance for the first time. The literary achievements of the English Enlightenment evoked even greater interest in England. Through the translations of Pope and Swift, new anglicisms were introduced into German such as *Nonsense* and *Held* (Hilgendorf 2007).

In the Industrial Age (the nineteenth century), the presence and impact of English grew further. During this period, England again became an important model for politics, this time with respect to democratic movements. Under the British influence, Germans adopted words such as *Demonstration*, *radikal* and *Imperialismus*. By the end of the century, English had gained such status that the language eventually challenged the long-standing position of French as the code of social prestige. Borrowings, which illustrate the high social status of English, particularly in the city of Berlin, include *Gentleman*, *Snob*, *Whisky*, *Dandy* and *Club* (Hilgendorf 2007).

After 1945, as elsewhere in Europe, the impact of English, in British or American, became massive. In western Germany, this can partly be explained as a reaction to the xenophobic

Nazi system, which had tried to be largely self-sufficient economically, linguistically and culturally. Since the immediate post-war phase and especially since the 1990s the huge impact of American culture and its linguistic elements have become more intense. Worldwide communication via the Internet, globalization of national economies and commercial television have led to a new dimension of lexical borrowings and code-switching, at least in the technical languages of business, advertising and youth language (Görlach and Busse 2002).

2.3. Purist phases

By the end of the nineteenth century, English had gained such prominence that it drew the attention of language purists for the first time, who until then had focused their efforts for centuries on curbing the influence of Latin and French. Among the first critics of the growing influence of English was the educator Hermann Dunger, who in 1899 first appealed *Wider die Engländerei in der deutschen Sprache* [Against the Englishism/Englandizing in the German language] (Hilgendorf 2007). Hermann Dunger's pioneering works *Wörterbuch von Verdeutschungen entbehrlicher Fremdwörter* [Dictionary of the Germanizations of unnecessary foreign words] in 1882 and *Engländerei in der deutschen Sprache* [English in the German language] in 1909 were indicative of the growing concern among German linguists that English language elements were infiltrating the language (Onysko 2004).

The most famous group of purists in the nineteenth and the early twentieth century was the *Allgemeine Deutsche Sprachverein* (ADSV), founded in 1885 with the aim of, as the regulations of the ADSV read: "1) promoting the cleansing of the German language from unnecessary foreign elements, 2) preserving as well as re-establishing the true spirit and proper essence of the German language from unnecessary foreign elements, 3) thereby strengthening the general national consciousness in the German nation" (Spitzmüller 2007: 267). Until the First World War the general tenor was purist, but not nationalistic and chauvinistic, as it later came to be, epitomized in Engel's dictionary entitled *Entwelschung* 'De-alienization' (1918) (Görlach and Busse 2002). However, these differences were in degree, rather than in kind, as Görlach and Busse claim. Ethnic or even racist tenor, of which Engel is an extreme example, starts dominating in the 1920s (2002).

In the 1930s the Nazi ideology saw the impact of American lifestyle, mainly in the fields of music, literature, and liberal thought, as particularly “dangerous to the German psyche” (Görlach and Busse 2002: 16). However, the Nazis put an end to the activities of the ADSV, which was banned by a so called ‘Führererlass’ (Führer’s edict) (Spitzmüller 2007). The Nazi rulers were well aware of the force of foreign words for the purposes of propaganda, and with the decree of 11 November 1940 Hitler himself prohibited “the witchhunt of foreignisms” (Görlach and Busse 2002: 17).

Consequently, purism was stigmatized as a vehicle of nationalism after 1945. The younger generation started intensively scrutinize the history of the Nazi period, and most German people did not want to have anything more to do with (external) purism, at least officially (Spitzmüller 2007). However, the growing impact of Anglo-American language and culture has in 1997 led to the foundation of a new purist society, *Verein zur Wahrung der deutschen Sprache* (now renamed *Verein deutsche Sprache*) (Görlach and Busse 2002). Over the last few years, the VDS purists annually name and shame a *Sprachpanscher des Jahres* [‘language adulterator of the year’], which is an anti-award for what the VDS sees as the worst and most unnecessary use of English in German (Hohenhaus 2002).

The purist attitude, which holds that some or most transfers are unnecessary, is now uncommon in German-language countries (Clyne 1995). German speakers are more tolerant of English loans than some of their European neighbors, particularly French speakers. Many contemporary loans from English are related to technology and the Internet, but these are by no means the only groups of loan words used by native German speakers. At least informally, the term *Denglisch* (a portmanteau of the words *Deutsch* ‘German’ and *Englisch* ‘English’) is used to refer to the increasingly strong influx of English into German (Lane 2012). Moreover, the presence of the English vocabulary in the German language is generally perceived as a modern and normal linguistic phenomenon (Fink 1996; cited in Hilgendorf 2007).

However, there is also the other side of the current attitude towards English language elements in Germany. Nowadays, language criticism in Germany (as in the past) generally focuses on the English loan words and there is a call for equivalent German words (Hohenhaus 2002). In addition, the famous German linguist Dieter Zimmer refers to linguistic levels other than that of lexical items. The VDS, in agreement with Zimmer, claims that German lost its *Assimilationskraft* or a capacity for integrating loans, and that the very core of

German, namely its ‘Tiefencode’ (inflection, word order; grammar) is under threat (Hohenhaus 2002).

2.4. Types of the English transfers into German

As already mentioned in the first chapter, the transfers of the English language elements into German can occur not only on the widely studied lexical level, but also on the morphological and syntactic level (Clyne 1977; cited in Capuz 1997).

2.4.1. Morphological borrowing

Morphological borrowing is an uncertain category, since some scholars have denied the possibility of direct transference of morphemes. Several scholars, from H. Schuchardt on, have stated that borrowing of morphemes is only possible by indirect means: certain borrowed morphemes are felt to be particularly common within the mass of loanwords introduced into a given language. Thus, the speakers of that language analyze these loanwords, identify these morphemes, and become acquainted with them; later on, these morphemes become productive or generative in the receiving language (Capuz 1997). Michael Clyne (1980; cited in Capuz 1997) distinguishes morphemic (transference of bound morphemes) and morphological borrowing (transference of morphological patterns). An example of the morphemic borrowing is the interference in the formation and use of singular and plural (Capuz 1997). The English interference in the German derivational pattern represents a morphological borrowing. Since one of the aims of this study is to analyze the German inflection influenced by the English language, I will introduce the morphemic borrowing in the section below.

2.4.2. Morphemic borrowing

The formation of plural is an example of the English morphemic borrowing. Usually German nouns are pluralized with the addition of *-n* or *-en*, but there is variation. Occasionally there is a change in the vowels in the stem, or the suffix added is *-e* or *-er*, or some combination of a suffix and a vowel change. It is also possible that there is no change in the noun itself when it becomes plural. For most loan nouns, the plural is either formed by adding *-s*, or the noun remains unchanged: *das Team, die Teams; der Teenager, die Teenager* (Lane 2012).

The English plural *-s* applies to the nouns in plural, which are not regular for the nouns in German ending in a consonant or in *-er*: *Streiks* and *Posters*. Görlach (2002) pointed out that *-s* is regular for German words ending in a vowel. As an example, he took the word *Uhu+s* (*owl+s*). However, the plural form *-s* is frequent in German as a dialect feature in the north (*Jungs* ‘boys’); the takeover of the English pattern can therefore be interpreted as strengthening an existing category.

Other aspects of the German inflection that are assumed to be under English influence are:

1) Nouns with the genitive case in German are usually marked with an *-s* at the end. Some anglicisms follow the German system of case marking such as *the airport (des Airports)*. However, other masculine and neuter English loan nouns might lack this kind of genitive case marking: *des Aktienresearch* (which should be *des Aktienresearches* in line with regular genitive suffixation) (Onysko 2004).

2) The inflectional morphology of German adjectives is strongly influenced by the nouns they modify. Predicative adjectives do not decline and do not undergo any morphological changes, while attributive adjectives require a suffix that indicates the case, gender, and number of the noun they modify (Lane 2012).

While most German adjectives are declined as a result of the case, number, and gender of the nouns they modify, there are some exceptions. Most notably, the adjectives *rosa* ‘pink’ and *lila* ‘purple’ are indeclinable, taking no endings, even when other adjectives in the same position would be declined (Lane 2012). The following is an example of the possible declension of the adjective *lila*:

- (1) a. ein lila Rock
b. * ein lilaer Rock
‘a purple skirt’

Given the inflectional patterns of most German adjectives, the expected forms of *lila* in (1)a would be *ein lilaer Rock (1)b, with *lila* taking the masculine ending *-er* because of the masculine noun *Rock* ‘skirt’. The grammatical form, however, does not have any adjectival suffix at all (Lane 2012).

It is worth noting that both *rosa* and *lila* are loan words, though they were introduced to German several hundred years ago and do not come from English (Barbe 2004; cited in Lane 2012). Furthermore, the problems with dropping of case, gender and number markings on adjectives already exist within German (cf. *ein super Leben* vs. **ein superes Leben*) (Hohenhaus 2002).

3) Some German verbs have prefixes, either inseparable or separable. When the verbs with inseparable prefixes are conjugated, the prefix is unaffected and the suffix indicating the subject and tense is attached to the stem of the verb. When separable prefix verbs are conjugated, the prefix separates from the stem of the verb and moves to the last position of the sentence (Lane 2012).

The past participle in German is formed with either a suffix or a circumfix, depending on the verb. For verbs with no prefixes, the circumfix *ge-* *-t* or *ge-* *-en* is added to the stem of the verb. If there is an inseparable prefix, only the second part of the circumfix is added to the stem, either *-t* or *-en*. If there is a separable prefix, the first part of the circumfix *ge-* is inserted between the prefix and the stem, and the second part of the circumfix is added to the end of the stem (Lane 2012).

English loan verbs form the past participle in the same way, both as verbs with no prefixes and as those with separable prefixes (*Wir haben ausgeloggt.*; 'We have logged out.')

 (Onysko 2007; cited in Lane 2012). In some cases, it is unclear whether a loan word functions as a verb with a separable or inseparable prefix. The verb *downloaden* 'to download' is an accepted loan, but there is uncertainty about the past participle form of the verb (2) (Lane 2012):

(2) a. Updates warden gedownloadet.

'Updates are downloading'

b. Updates warden downgeloadet.

'Updates are downloading'

In (2)a, *downloaden* is functioning as a verb without a prefix, since the circumfix *ge-* *-t* is attached to the stem *download-*. In (2)b, however, *downloaden* is functioning as a verb with a

separable prefix, as demonstrated by the circumfix *ge-* *-t* attaching to the verb between the prefix *down-* and the stem *load-*. Both of these forms are grammatical, but there is no consensus among native German speaker about which form is the “correct” one (Lane 2012: 22). Moreover, similar difficulties of separation occur in some verbs of German origin (e.g. *bausparen*, ‘to invest in a building society’) (Clyne 1995).

2. 5. Syntactic transfers

Syntactic borrowing always takes the form of morphemic substitution because, as some scholars state, syntactic borrowing deals with relations, not with mere words. Syntactic borrowing is sometimes difficult to separate from “morphological borrowing”: as we have already seen, the latter implies the transference of morphemes and morphological patterns; “syntactic borrowing”, on the contrary, takes into account grammatical relations, especially those of order, agreement, and dependence, (Weinreich 1968, cited in Capuz 1997). Thus, syntactic borrowing might imply the borrowing of syntactic constructions. Scheler (1973: 26; cited in Carstensen 1980: 38) defined a syntactic construction as: „die Verschmelzung von gewöhnlich zwei oder mehr in einem festen Beziehungsverhältnis zueinander stehenden Redeteilen zu einer elementaren Satzbaueinheit. Sie ist nicht (wie die Redewendung) an die Begriffsbedeutung ihrer Einzelteile gebunden und stellt nur eine Art Modell oder Schema dar, das zum Aufbau eines jeden beliebigen Satzes verwandt werden kann (...), [a combination of usually two or more sentence elements, that are very closely related to each other, into a basic syntactic unit. Syntactic unit does not (as an idiomatic phrase does) depend on the meanings of the individual sentence elements, but rather represents a kind of model or schema, that can be used to build any sentence (...)].

According to the Scheler’s definition of the syntactic constructions, the borrowed idiomatic expressions such as *Wir sitzen alle im selben Boot* (*We are all in the same boat*) do not belong to the borrowed syntactic constructions. These idiomatic phrases, in contrast to the syntactic construction *in Deutsch* (according to the English model *in German*), do not represent a model or schema, that one can use to build whatever syntactic construction. For instance, the construction *in Deutsch* can serve as a model for other syntactic constructions such as *in Russisch*, *in Englisch* (Carstensen 1980). In addition, clausal intra-and intersentential codeswitches do not implicate a process of syntactic borrowing. They do not interfere with the syntactic projections of the German construction but function as stative descriptors and

nominals. They emerge as nearly lexicalized catch phrases and are loosely connected as non-obligatory additions to German sentences (Onysko 2007).

Division within this category is established by virtue of the degree of novelty of the foreign element, in this case, the foreign construction.

Following Pratt, one can distinguish between “syntactic innovation” and “Syntactic frequency“. „Syntactic innovation” means that the construction is completely unknown in the recipient language (1980; cited in Capuz 1997). For instance, this might be the English influence on the transitivity of verbs, which are usually intransitive in the German language. “Syntactic frequency“ implicates that this construction was known in the recipient language, but it was not very common or was limited to certain distributional contexts (Pratt 1980; cited in Capuz 1997). That could be the case of the excessive use of the imperfect tense in German due to English influence. Carstensen’s examples of the transference of the English syntactic rules according to the above-mentioned division of syntactic borrowing are as follows (1980).

2.5.1. Syntactic innovation

1) the transitivity of verbs in environments where this is unusual for German: *Ich fliege Lufthansa* (following the English sentence model: *I fly Lufthansa*) instead of: *Ich fliege mit der Lufthansa*.

2) the early placement of the genitive in phrases such as *Hamburgs Bürgermeister* (using the English pattern *Hamburg's mayor*) instead of: *Der Bürgermeister von Hamburg* or *Hamburger Bürgermeister*.

3) the placement of the genitive before the superlative: *Europas größtes Versandhaus* [*the largest mail-order house in Europe*]. The German version is the reverse order of the genitive and superlative: *das größte Versandhaus Europas*.

4) the use of the preposition *von*, that indicates genitive case, for quantity: *Hilfe brauchen alle von ihnen*. [*All of them need help*]. Unlike the ungrammatical construction *alle von ihnen*, *sie alle* ‘all of them’ is considered a correct syntactic construction in German.

3) the loose addition of the age designation in newspaper articles:

Johann Müller, 51, wurde gestern zum Bürgermeister gewählt [Johann Müller, 51, was elected mayor yesterday] instead of: Der 51-jährige Johann Müller(...).

4) the use of *immer* (according to the English ‘ever’) with the interrogative pronouns such as *wer, wann, wo, was, wie* (who, when, where, what, how) in generalizations: *Längst liebe ich sie alle: Heidi, Flavia, Verena, Kathrin und wie immer sie heißen. [I love them all for a long time: Heidi, Flavia, Verena, Kathrin, and however they are called.] instead of: (...) wie auch sie heißen.*

5) the use of the English grammatical construction *beide(s) ... und ... [both ... and...]* instead of the usual German syntactic construction: *sowohl... als auch...: Beide, Köpcke, und Stephan, sind ja auch als Meister des erotischen Romans bekannt. [Both Köpcke and Stephan are also known as experts in writing the erotic novels.] instead of: Sowohl Köpcke als auch Stephan sind (...).*

6) the *in Deutsch* prepositional construction instead of the common German version: *auf Deutsch; in deutscher Sprache [on German; in the German language].*

7) the use of the phrase *in anderen Worten [in other words]* instead of *mit anderen Worten.*

8) the use of the preposition *für* ‘for’ in the German phrases, which denote a time period, that extends from the past until the present: *(...)Lucille Ball, die mit ihrem Programm “I love Lucy” schon für zwei Jahrzehnte im amerikanischen Fernsehen ein sehr beliebter Star ist. [(...) Lucille Ball, who is popular in the American television with her program “I love Lucy” for two decades.]* The adverb *schon* indicates the past-to-present extension, thus the preposition *for* is a redundant element within this type of a time phrase.

9) the loss of the definite article, especially, in the headlines: *(...)nahm Tenisspieler Björn Borg Revanche.[(...) tennis player Björn Borg took revenge].*

10) the use of the definite article in front of the surname of a family: *(...) für die Johnsons [(...) for the Johnsons].*

11) the use of the definite article in phrases, which commonly do not have any article in German, such as: *mit der Hilfe von* [*with the help of*].

12) the use of ‘kein’ with gerund: *Kein Kochen* [*no cooking*]. The appropriate grammatical construction in the German language would be *the gerund + ist unnötig* [*unnecessary*], *überflüssig* [*superfluous*], *(nicht) möglich* [*(im)possible*] or *Sie brauchen nicht zu + a verb* [*You do not have to + a verb*].

13) the repetition of the auxiliary verb: *Hatte die Armee geputscht? Sie hatte nicht, (...)*. [*Had the army rebelled? It had not.*] This syntactic construction is not as common as in the English syntax. In German, one would rather say *Nein, es war nicht so* (*no, it was not that way*), *es war nicht der Fall* [*that was not the case*] or use a mere negation.

14) the use of ‘the mediopassive or personal passive voice’. Carstensen gave the example of the verb *verkaufen* [*to sell*], which has a personal subject in German. However, following the English pattern of voice, the object being sold acts as a personal subject in the German language: *Die ‘BZ’ verkauft 160 000 Exemplare*. [*‘BZ’ sells 160 000 copies*].

2.5.2. Syntactic frequency

1) the use of the preposition *in* within year phrases in German. Usually there is no preposition within year phrases or the preposition *im* (the abbreviation of *in dem*) is used: *im Jahre 1979* or *1979*. Carstensen points out that the preposition *in*, which precedes the year number, is an obsolete grammatical construction, which now seems to have been “revived”.

2) the use of the preposition *an* (that corresponds to ‘at’ in English) in the phrases that contain words such as *Easter* in German: *an Ostern* ‘at Easter’. This prepositional construction, as Carstensen highlights, is frequent as a dialect feature, particularly in the south.

3) the frequent use of the imperfect (preterite tense) instead of the perfect tense in newspaper. Carstensen sees the reason for the tense variation in the shorter form of the imperfect tense. However, Carstensen assigned the frequent use of the preterite tense not only to the English

past simple tense, but also to the possible imitation of the dialect in the south Germany, which uses in the essence imperfect tense.

4) the use of the imperative constructions in the advertising language, for instance *Gewinnen Sie...!* [*Winn...!*]. The common German construction in advertisements would be (...) *zu gewinnen* [*to win*] or *Sie können (...) gewinnen* [*you can get(...)*].

5) the preposition + gerund construction, which is not usual for the standard German grammar: *Er ist am Arbeiten* 'he is at work'. However, Carstensen drew one's attention to the fact that this syntactic construction is common in some German dialects.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Aims

The aim of this study is to explore the English influence on German syntactic constructions and inflection. More precisely, I will investigate whether English disrupted the German ‘Tiefencode’ (grammar, inflection) or it remained in the essence untouched. Thereby, I will focus on the possible well-entrenched English inflectional patterns and syntactic innovations in German, or as Scheller (1973: 26; cited in Carstensen 1980: 38) said, to “the language unit that represents a schema, that can be used to build any [word or] sentence”.

I would like to consider German standard language, instead of dialects and colloquial language, such as youth language. The standard language is characterized by the prescribed rules. When these rules, which are considered the backbone of a language, are disrupted, they might imply actual and authentic structural changes in the language. In addition, due to the hypothesis that the press language tends to be an area where the number of English transfers is especially high, I chose it for my examination of the English interference in the German syntax and morphology. The press might provide my study with a deep insight into changes in the grammar of the German language due to the English impact, if there are any.

3.2. Research questions

The main target of this research is to answer the following questions:

- 1) Is the *Tiefencode* disrupted due to the English influence?

- 2) Are there any changes in the inflectional pattern of German due to the importation of English morphological units?

- 3) Do the instances of the English syntactic interference represent a) well-established grammatical changes, b) stylistic variants of the written press language in German, or c) language-inherent changes?

3.3. Corpus

The news magazine *Spiegel online* served as the corpus of the investigation. Its tolerant attitude towards the use of English seems to have provided this study with a valuable perspective on the morphological and syntactic integration in German. One of the pioneering researchers in the field, Broder Carstensen has pointed out that *Der Spiegel* is very similar to the American news magazines *Time* and *Newsweek* (Onysko 2004). Therefore, *Der Spiegel* appears to serve as one of the best examples of news magazines in German that introduce new lexical, semantic and syntactic transfers from English into the German language.

The general impact of anglicisms in *Der Spiegel* is emphasized by the fact that it functions as a role model for other press publications, that „it enjoys a reputation as a long standing and prestigious German newsmagazine“, and that „it reaches a substantial number of readers“ (Carstensen 1965: 23; cited in Onysko 2004: 99). Besides, it has been asserted that *Der Spiegel* is „tonangebend für wesentliche Teile des deutschen Funks“ [sets the tone for the language policy of three-quarters of the German press and substantial sections of German radio and TV] (Carstensen 1965: 24, cited in Clyne 1995: 208).

3.4. Research method

According to Margret Altleitner (2007; cited in Kontulainen 2008), articles are divided into following subject areas: politics and current affairs, economy and business, and entertainment and lifestyle. The results of the Altleitner's study gained on the basis of three magazines showed that the fewest anglicisms were found in the politics and current affairs news genre, whereas the largest impact of anglicisms was found in the lifestyle. This is the reason why I included the lifestyle news genre into my study.

This study includes 16 *Spiegel online* articles from the year 2011 until 2015. I chose articles predominantly from the year 2014/2015 because I would like to compare the current findings with the results of the Carstensen's study, which dealt with the English syntactic transfers into German in the time period from 1945 until 1980. The results will show whether some English elements that Carstensen found in his previous study are still present in German, and if they are, whether they are actual syntactic changes or only marginal language variants.

When analyzing, I focused primarily on the well-entrenched syntactic and morphological structures in the articles. I carefully read all articles and analyzed them in order to see whether some grammatical structures are used as schemas for building every German word and sentence. Besides, I analyzed whether some inflectional patterns were used only to build English imported words or the German native words as well.

4. RESULTS

This chapter includes two sections, one on the syntactic innovation and the other one on the inflectional pattern borrowing. The first section comprises the results of the study on the English loan syntax phenomenon in German. The second part of the research on the English instances of interference in German inflectional pattern is delineated in the second section.

4.1. Syntactic innovation

The analysis of the 16 articles covered prepositions, number phrases, adverbial accusative, genitive case, articles, tense, passive voice, ellipsis and inversion. The following results shed light on the alleged English interferences in the German syntax.

The *Spiegel* articles revealed that common German prepositions were used. Firstly, the preposition (*für* ‘for’) was not used to indicate the present perfect tense, but rather the preposition *seit*: *SPIEGEL-TV-Reporterin Maria Gresz kennt den Designer seit 30 Jahren* [*SPIEGEL-TV-reporter Maria Gresz has known the designer for 30 years.*] (Spiegel 1.3.2015). Secondly, the analysis of the articles showed that a German common preposition within year phrases was *im*, and not the English preposition *in*: (...) *im Jahr 2030 könnten es acht Millionen sein* [(...) *there could be eight million [smokers] by the year 2030*] (Spiegel 7.7.2015). Finally, the construction *in Deutsch* seems not to be adopted into the German language. The German press language uses the common preposition *auf*. The following example from a *Spiegel* article confirms this: *Dozenten müssen auf Französisch unterrichten.* [*Teachers must teach in French.*] (Spiegel 22.5.2013).

As for number phrases, age in articles is designated with a hyphen and the word *jährig*: *Es handelte sich um einen 65-Jährigen.* [*It was a 65-year-old [man]*] (Spiegel 6.7.2015). However, the German press language also reveals an English pattern: (...) *sagt Hotelberater Helmut Gräßle, 58 (...).* [(...) *says the hotel consultant Helmut Grässle, 58 (...)*] (Spiegel 17.11.2014).

The use of a noun in the accusative case as an adverb in German, which Carstensen calls adverbial accusative, displays an English influence. However, the adverbial accusative was

not found in the German *Spiegel* articles. A common nominative case is used with the nouns that indicate years: *Jedes Jahr sterben sechs Millionen Menschen an den Folgen vom Rauchen*. [Six million people die every year because of smoking.] (Spiegel 7.7.2015).

There is a variation in the usage of the genitive case in the German press language. A headline from an article from the analysis can serve as the best example of the genitive variation: *Londons höchstes Hotel* [London's tallest hotel] (Spiegel 25.4.2014). The sentence demonstrates the English placement of the genitive in front of the superlative. The introduction of the article contains the usual German construction with the genitive case (genitive-follows-the-noun schema): (...) *das höchste Hotel Europas* [(...) Europe's tallest hotel] (Spiegel 25.4.2014). In addition, the syntagma *Im Londoner Wolkenkratzer* [The London's skyscraper] from the same article indicates that the names of towns in genitive are marked with the German ending *-er*, and not with *-s*, which is a common English pattern.

The headlines and sections in the *Spiegel* articles signal the loss of articles due to the English influence. For example, the headline from the above-mentioned article on the hotel does not contain a definite article in front of the word *Zimmer*: *Londons höchstes Hotel: Zimmer mit Weitblick* [London's tallest hotel: room with panoramic view] (Spiegel 25.4.2014). The analysis showed that the loss of articles was reserved only to the headlines and sections, because within the article body, definite and indefinite articles were used according to the German model. As for the articles in collocating phrases, they do not indicate an English influence because there is no definite article used within the phrase: *Mit Hilfe von "The Rock" (...)*. [With the help of "The Rock" (...)] (Spiegel 12.6.2015).

Shorter forms are very frequently employed in the *Spiegel* articles. The past tense in the articles is in the essence articulated with the shorter form of the preterite tense. This tendency to write using a shorter form is also present in the passive constructions. The complex and long passive constructions such as *Maßnahmen sind getroffen worden* and *Schritte sind unternommen worden* tend to be avoided. The shorter preterite passive (*wurden*) is used more than the longer version of the perfect passive (*ist worden*) in order to indicate the past tense: *Zusätzlich wurden Cholesterin, Herzfitness und die Länge der Telomere gemessen (...)* [In addition, cholesterol, the heart health and the length of the telomers were measured] (Spiegel 6.7.2015). Moreover, the German press language tends to use mediopassive voice as well:

Zwei aktuelle Bücher klären über die unendlichen Möglichkeiten der Nudel auf. [Two recent books explain the endless possibilities of preparing noodle.] (Spiegel 13.6.2015).

The *Spiegel's* tendency to write in a shorter version, which seems to be modeled on the English news magazine *Time* is also reflected in the frequent usage of ellipsis. There are many examples of the ellipsis that the articles yielded, and one such example is the following sentence: *Von oben wirkt alles klein und nichtig. Und durch die Ordnung wie ein abstraktes Gemälde.* [From the top, everything looks small and insignificant. And through the order like an abstract painting.] (Spiegel 26.11.2014).

Another German syntactic construction that is influenced by the English news magazine *Time* is inversion (Carstensen 1980). The analyzed articles confirmed Carstensen's claim: *In London ist der Luxusmarkt hart umkämpft (...).* [In London is the luxury market highly competitive (...).] (Spiegel 25.4.2014).

4.2. Inflectional pattern borrowing

The analysis on the inflectional pattern borrowing included the genitive case assignment, the pattern of plural formation, and the adjectival and verbal inflection.

The plural marker *-s* was found with the English borrowed words in the *Spiegel* articles. Some anglicisms that were found marked with *-s* for plural are: *Supermodels* and *Gays*, such as in the following sentence: *Es folgten Supermodels, Starfotografen und die Gays.* [This was followed by *supermodels, starphotographs and gays.*] (Spiegel 23.3.2015). However, no German native word was marked with *-s* for plural. Instead, they have been primarily marked with *-e* or *-en*, but also with *-er*. The German nouns that end in *-er* or *-el* stayed unmarked as usual.

Anglicisms resist genitive inflection on the root and function as zero-marked genitive nouns in German: *Ausgerechnet der Pionier des Free Jazz bewies (...).* [The pioneer of the free jazz was the very one who proved (...)] (Spiegel 11.6.2015). This is not applicable to the words of the German origin. The articles from the *Spiegel online* revealed the regular genitive case inflection with all German neuter and masculine nouns.

Many English loan adjectives are characterized by a lack of grammaticalization in its inflection in the attributive position in a sentence. Therefore, many adjectives remain restricted to predicative functions, where they are not inflected. The sentence *Deutsch ist in Kopenhagen einfach hip*. [*German is simply hip in Copenhagen.*] (Spiegel 7.2.2015) shows how the hesitation about the appropriate inflection of the adjective *hip* is solved by using the adjective in the predicative position. Apart from the English loan words, there are also some words in German that undergo zero-inflection, such as the adjective *super*: *Nur wenig Konkretes ist bekannt über die Super-Batterie von Tesla-Gründer Elon Musk*. [*Little was known about the super battery from the Tesla founder Elon Musk.*] (Spiegel 22.4.2015).

In the area of the verb inflection, past participles of the imported English regular verbs seem to be completely accommodated morphologically. The verbs of the English origin are inflected according to the German schema of the past participle formation, such as the verb *layout*: *Der Gestalter hat (...) die Verpackung eines "Deadly Utility Truck" als Kinderspielzeug gelayoutet*. [*The designer has layouted the packaging of a "Deadly Utility Truck" as a child's toy.*] (Spiegel 9.8.2014). The verb *layout* was also used in the same pattern in an older article, as an element of the passive construction: *(...) das Endresultat also von meinen Abnehmern und Kunden gelayoutet oder anderweitig bearbeitet wird*. [*(...) the outcome is layouted or edited by my customers and clients.*] (Spiegel 24.12.2011).

5. DISCUSSION

One of the most influential studies on the German grammar being changed due to the influence of the English language is *Der Einfluss des Englischen auf das Deutsche: Grammatische Probleme* [*The Influence of English on German: Grammatical Problems*] by Broder Carstensen. Carstensen's research of the newspaper articles revealed English interference in the German grammar. He investigated many news magazines in the time period from 1945 until 1980. One of them was *Spiegel*. He catalogued and elaborated upon many grammatical constructions that appeared to be modeled according to the English grammatical pattern.

The results of the current research demonstrate English influence in the German press language. However, the German grammar or syntactic grid is not endangered; English does not affect grammatical relations in German. The English influence is in the essence reflected in the writing style of the German press language and its stylistic variations. An actual syntactic change and a complete adoption of it did not take place.

The loss of articles, the usage of inversion and shorter syntactic constructions, such as preterite tense, preterite passive and ellipsis appear to indicate features of the press style of writing, such as simplicity, shortness, clarity, modernity and "catchiness".

There are two different ways of designating age in the German press language. Some *Spiegel* articles use the German style (with the hyphen and the word *jährig*), other articles use the English style (the age designation behind the name of the person). Mere stylistic variations seem to have been best indicated when two different styles of writing of the genitive took place in the same article. As we have already seen in the above analysis, the headline of the article on the London's tallest hotel contained the English genitive pattern, whereas the common German placement of the genitive after the noun was used in the article body below the headline. Therefore, I agree with the Kuhn's (1971: 184-187; cited in Carstensen 1980: 53) claim that 'die Englische Entsprechung verstärkt die stilistische Variante' [the English equivalent reinforces a stylistic variation] and that this usage of the genitive is 'kaum vollwertiges Beispiel von Lehnsyntax' [hardly an authentic example of the loan syntax].

The results of the current study display that the adverbial accusative and all prepositions found in the *Spiegel* articles are not used in the alternating English-German manner, but rather in the regular German manner. The analysis of the recent articles did not produce any evidence of the English modeled prepositional constructions, which was particularly evident in the usage of prepositions within year and present-perfect-tense phrases.

Mediopassive, which Carstensen considers the English interference, seems to be in the essence a language inherent feature. The personal passive seems to have already existed within German. The construction, which consists of the verb *öffnen* ('open') and an impersonal noun, tends to be used as a frequent personal passive in German. Thus, the usage of the mediopassive can be considered as strengthening an existing voice in German, because mediopassive is not anymore used exclusively with the verb *öffnen*, but also with other verbs and impersonal nouns, such as the already above-mentioned verb *explain* and the impersonal noun *book*.

A detailed look at the morphological grounds for the verbal inflection in German shows no variances in the formation of the past participle. German verbs are inflected as they are commonly inflected. In addition, the press language of *Spiegel* signals a regular pattern of the past participle formation of the English loan words. The results of the current study show discrepancies compared with the Zimmer's study, which showed that there were great uncertainties about the past participle construction in German. He (1997, cited in Sanford: 1998) took many examples, one of these was a verb *layout* and its multiple past participle formations *gelayoutet*, *outgelayed* and *outgelayt*. However, as we have seen, the verb *layout* appeared in the same past participle form in the two *Spiegel* articles. Hence, this study reveals that English loan verbs, in particular regular verbs do not show any ambiguity in its past participle formation.

The current research also found that the zero-inflectional pattern was present in the usage of English loan adjectives, such as *hip*, mentioned in the chapter above. The incomplete integration into the German language might be the reason why English adjectives undergo zero-inflection. Furthermore, this study did not find any German adjective that was not inflected, except from *super*. It is worth noting that the German adjective *super* is in the essence a loan word, which comes from Latin (<http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/super>). The fact that the loss of markings on adjectives is only the case of anglicisms, and not of

German native words, leads us to the conclusion that English does not interfere in the German schema of adjectival declension.

The German case system of nominative, genitive, dative and accusative shows a certain amount of syncretism; nouns can appear with equivalent suffixes and determiners. Feminine nouns do not show any root inflection in the singular, while case markers (determiners and nominal inflection) merge in the plural for all three genders. The genitive of neuter and masculine nouns is the only case, which is marked on noun stems in the singular (Onysko 2007). This grammatical rule is still present in all German masculine and neuter nouns, which the results of the analysis confirmed. As we have seen, the loss of the genitive ending *-s* is common in the anglicisms that are not assimilated into the German language. The Onysko's study *Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching* also found that the genitive case marking is used only with nominal anglicisms (Onysko 2007).

Apart from the genitive case assignment, Onysko's and the current study demonstrate the zero-adoption of the English schema of plural marking into the German language. Leaving aside phonological changes by umlaut, Duden postulates five plural morphs of German (*-e*, *-er*, *-en* and zero plural morph). These are considered to be German regular plural morphemes, whereas plural *-s* merely accounts for 4% of all plural endings in German, and this is the case only of unassimilated borrowings, onomatopoeic words, acronyms, pluralized names, eponyms and lexicalized phrases (Onysko 2007). The results of the current research on anglicisms confirm the usage of common plural marking in German with *-e*, *-er*, *-en* and zero ending. The plural marker *-s* is borrowed together with its English basis and does not appear as an inherent marker of plural in German, since it is not used with German native nouns.

To conclude, the results of the current study gave answers to the research questions. English did not change neither the German inflection nor the function of the sentences. The new morphosyntactic features found in the *Spiegel* articles are predominantly stylistic variations, language inherent changes or a matter of unassimilated borrowing.

6. CONCLUSION

The language contact between England and Germany dates back to the fifth century. After the Second World War, there was a massive importation of English linguistic elements into the German language. The massive transference of English elements continued until the present, and the language contact between Germany and England resulted in the borrowings at many different levels, such as the borrowing of sounds, lexical items and grammatical processes. The Germans' attitude towards the borrowing of the English elements became tolerant after the Second World War, which resulted in the emergence of the Denglish phenomenon. Apart from the linguists who consider *Denglish* as a normal linguistic phenomenon, there are other linguists such as D. Zimmer, who see the accumulation of English language elements in the German language as a threat to the German grammar, also called *Tiefencode*. The aim of the current study was to see whether some aspects of the German grammar were changed due to the grammatical pattern imported together with the English borrowed words. In order to find an answer to this question, I chose 16 articles from the *Spiegel online* for the morphosyntactic analysis. The analyzed articles revealed that the grammar of the German standard language was not under threat. The novelties in the syntactic grid are dual stylistic functions of the press language, intra-linguistic developments and an incomplete morphological integration of anglicisms into the inflectional paradigms of German.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carstensen, Broder. 1980. „Der Einfluss des Englischen auf das Deutsche: Grammatische Probleme.“ *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* Vol. 5: 37-63.

Clyne, G. Michael. 1995. *The German Language in a Changing Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gomez Capuz, Juan. 1997. „Towards a Typological Classification of Linguistic Borrowing. Illustrated with Anglicisms in Romance Languages.“ *Alicante Journal of English Studies* Vol. 10: 85-90.

Hilgendorf, Suzanne K. 2007. „English in Germany: Contact, Spread and Attitudes.“ *World Englishes* Vol. 26: 132-135.

Hock, Hans Henrich & Brian D. Joseph. 2009. 2nd rev. ed. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hohenhaus, Peter. 2002. „Standardization, Language Change, Resistance and the Question of Linguistic Threat: 18-th Century English and Present-Day German.“ in Linn, Andrew. R. & Nicola McLelland (eds.), *Standardization. Studies from the Germanic Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 160-167.

Kontulainen, Erika. 2008. *Anglizismen im Deutschen. Eine Untersuchung des Nachrichtenmagazins Der Spiegel*. Stockholm University: D. Phil. thesis.

Lane, Mary. 2012. *English Loans in German and the Borrowing of Meaning*. Swarthmore College: D.Phil. thesis.

Onysko, Alexander. 2004. „Anglicisms in German: from iniquitous to ubiquitous?“ *English Today* 77 Vol. 20: 59-61.

_____. 2007. *Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Spitzmüller, Jürgen. 2007. „Stalking the claims of identity: Purism, linguistics and the media in post-1990 Germany.“ *Journal of Sociolinguistics* Vol. 11: 267-268.

Görlach, Manfred. 2002. *English in Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact. An Introduction*. Edinburgh: University Press.

Ulm Sanford, Gerlinde. 1998. *Amerikanismen in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart*.
Webpage.<<http://www.inst.at/trans/3Nr/sanford.htm>> Accessed 20th May 2015.

<<http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/super>> Accessed 9th July 2015.