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A dictionary of Anglicisms in Danish by Knud Sørensen is the first dictionary of English loanwords in Danish, and was published in the same year as the first dictionary of anglicisms in Norwegian (Graedler – Johansson 1997; for a review, see Kilarski 1999). Professor Sørensen is the most qualified author to deal with English influence on Danish. His 1973 book is still the standard source, particularly in his description of various aspects of loanword adaptation. He has also written a number of articles (see the bibliography) and more recently an overview of English influence (Sørensen 1995).

The dictionary consists of the following parts: an abstract (p. 2), a preface (pp. 3-8), three lists of abbreviations (pp. 9-11), followed by a brief bibliography (p. 11), and the dictionary entries (pp. 13-405). In the preface the author provides a description of dictionary entries and a classification of loanwords employed in the dictionary, together with a brief description. Here he also deals with some aspects of loanword adaptation, primarily syntax. The choice of English as the language of the dictionary is dictated by the fact that it targets a more international audience – as the author states in the preface, “[t]he Dictionary caters for those who take an interest in how a world language influences a minority language” (p. 3). This lexical influence is illustrated by over 6000 headwords, based on examples collected by the author over a period of over 30 years. In the figures that Sørensen gives for the lexical categories (p. 4), nouns dominate overwhelmingly: 4685 nouns account for 80.39% of entries (these include also noun phrases, hybrid nouns, prepositional phrases, abbreviations and acronyms). The figures for the other categories are as follows: adjectives = 518 (8.88%); verbs (including verb phrases and prepositional verbs) = 553 (9.48%); adverbs, interjections, prepositions and pronouns = 72 (1.23%); and finally 352 idioms, proverbs and phrases, which gives a total of 6,180. At this point it is worthwhile to contrast the dictionary with the Norwegian dictionary, which is based on three large corpora of neologisms and anglicisms. Such different approaches to the compilation of the dictionaries result in differences involving the number of examples, and particularly in the way that they capture the degree of vacillation and the range of derivative forms. That the number of loans is comparable testifies to the meticulous work undertaken by Sørensen.

Sørensen allows for a wider definition of an anglicism, which apart from direct loans also includes loan translations, hybrids, semantic loans, pseudo-anglicisms, as well as idioms, phrases and proverbs. Such an extensive presentation of covert influence is in my
opinion the most interesting aspect of the dictionary. As Sørensen rightly points out, “[i]t is true that the direct loans are in the majority: for every 10 direct loans there are about 4 indirect loans. But as these figures show, the indirect loans are very far from being negligible, and to leave them out of account would produce a lopsided picture of the extent of English influence.” (p. 3). The ratio of direct loans to loan translations and semantic loans for plain members of the categories is as follows: 2,549 out of 3,864 nouns (65.9%), 277 out of 410 adjectives (67.5%) and 343 out of 439 verbs (78%) (p. 4). This confirms that loan nouns are the most likely to be conveyed by native lexical material. In contrast, the Norwegian dictionary is mainly restricted to direct loans. Graedler – Johansson (1997:11) pointed out that such indirect influence is more difficult to detect – it appears then that in this sense Sørensen’s dictionary presents a more complete account of English influence.

In his typology of loanwords Sørensen distinguishes 11 types; in the following I’ll present them in a slightly different order from that given by the author in the preface. The first group consists of direct loans, including partially adapted loans and citation forms. Among direct loans we also find geographical names, which often nicely illustrate how non-English phenomena are now presented in an English guise (cf. Larsen 1982 for more examples). The case of Vistula also reflects the grim reality in the Poland of the 1980s:

... occas. inappropriate use of the E geographical name instead of normal D Weichsel (JP §8) Han blev senere kastet i et vandreservoir ved Vistula-floden. 'He was later thrown into a reservoir near the Vistula.'

Particularly interesting here are also some examples of pronouns, which typically resist borrowing, e.g., *himself* and *herself* found in jocular usage, as well as *hamselv* (from *himself*), as in *den mystiske Altmann, der ofte anlæges for at være statsministeren hamself ‘the mysterious Altmann, who is often assumed to be the Prime Minister himself’. We may also include here phrases (NP, VP, PP), abbreviations (e.g., *ADB, IBM*) and acronyms (e.g., *AIDS, ALGOL*). In addition, “formal adaptations” can also be classified as new loans. They involve a change in the form of a Danish word under the influence of the English equivalent, e.g., *mineudlægger > minelægger* (E *minelayer*), *rekordindehaver > rekordholder* (E *record-holder*).

The following groups consist of various forms of indirect loans (covert English influence on Danish has been dealt with in several studies – see, e.g., Larsen 1982, 1994; Sørensen 1987, 1989; Hansen – Lund 1994; and most recently Szubert 1998, 1999). These are loan translations, including compound nouns, e.g., *fryngesegder < fringe benefits, troværdighedsklaft < credibility gap*, also borrowed from phrases (e.g., *ansigtstab < loss of face, dødslys < kiss of death*), as well as units of adjective/participle + noun (e.g., *enarmet tyveknægt < one-armed bandit, flyvende tallerken < flying saucer*). In the case of hybrids, it is usually the English element that comes first (e.g., *gentlemanaftale < gentleman's agreement, grapefrugt < grapefruit*), less usually it comes second (e.g., *hjernetrast < brains trust, nathklub < nightclub*). And finally, Sørensen has collected numerous examples of semantic loans: nouns, e.g., *duer ‘doves* or *høge ‘hawks*; verbs, e.g., *se in the meaning of ‘to meet or pay a visit to*; adjectives, e.g., *nylig as ‘recent* instead of the usual adverbial *for nylig* or *nyligt*; and pronouns, e.g., *du in generic use, instead of, or alongside man*. The range of possibilities among prepositions is enormous, e.g., *med ‘with* instead of *for in kebe med – prepositions typically convey a wide range of meanings, and in some of them the semantic association is often reinforced by formal identity. These last examples demonstrate that we’re dealing with phenomena on the borderline between lexicon and syntax.

Pseudo-anglicisms are forms composed of borrowed morphemes, which are not however used as such in English. Here we have forms which involve semantic change,
e.g., sixpence ‘cloth cap’, speeder ‘accelerator’; forms with both formal and semantic change, e.g., joykiller ‘killjoy’, stationcar ‘station wagon’ and clippings, e.g., airconditioning, slowfox < slow foxtrot. A related group is composed of “indirect anglicisms”, defined as analogical formations with no equivalent in English; e.g., a kartoffelwestern (lit. ‘potato western’) is a western made in Denmark, as opposed to a spaghettiwestern ‘a western made in southern Europe’. In addition to hooliganer, we also have in Denmark peaceful spectators – rotiganer (from rolig ‘quiet’ + hooligan). These forms have given rise to further analogical formations, e.g., fulligan ‘boozers’ (De danske fulligans lavede hele hallen om til en kampefest ‘The Danish boozers turned the entire hall into the scene of a gigantic celebration.’), as well as telefonigan and Seouligan, which shows that -igan has established itself as a productive suffix (cf. Sørensen 1989: 293). For simplicity these could be classified as pseudo-anglicisms; in addition, the term “indirect” should be used in contrast to “direct”, i.e. semantic loans and loan translations (Larsen 1997a: 190).

The last group comprises idioms and proverbs. In some cases they are taken over directly, e.g., anything goes, business as usual, but the vast majority are loan translations, of which Sørensen has collected an astonishing number. Examples include: få det på begge madero ‘have it both ways’, få enderne til at mødes / få begge ender til at mødes ‘make (both) ends meet’; græde over spildt melk ‘cry over spilt milk’; løve i en familie ‘run in a family’.

Dictionary entries contain information on spelling, pronunciation, lexical category, followed by inflection, etymology, type of loan, meaning, notes on usage, and finally examples with an English translation, and cross-references. The spelling given conforms to Retskrivningsordbogen (1986), and so the dictionary is not so much concerned with variation in spelling; while it appears in the examples, it is not given in the spelling part (e.g., in phrases spelled with or without a hyphen). The transcription used follows an approximation to IPA in Hansen (1990). Pronunciation is given for unadapted and adapted loans, and “for semantic loans if their form is identical with or similar to the English word” (p. 7), e.g., administration (‘government’, trad, ‘administering’). Particularly interesting is the occurrence of /w/ in loanwords, which may then be regarded as a secondary phoneme in Danish (cf. Larsen 1997b: 195-196). The author also notes the competing English and French pronunciations in, e.g., glamour [glamΛ - gla'mu:R] (p. 7).

Turning to the morphology of loanwords, the dictionary provides several examples of “double plurals”, where the English pl. form is treated as sg., with the pl. ending reinterpreted as part of the stem. Examples include: ansjos (c., pl. -er) ‘anchovy’, clips/klips (c. or n., zero pl.) ‘paper clip’, drops (n., zero pl.) ‘boiled sweet’, slips (n., zero pl.) ‘tie’. The case of kiks – as a common gender noun in the meaning of ‘cake’ or with neuter gender in the meaning of ‘milk’ – illustrates the divergent assignment of gender to homonyms to denote a distinction in meaning. For reasons given above, the dictionary does not reveal the vacillation in the morphology of loanwords, e.g., in the case of def.sg., and indef.pl. and def.pl. forms of nouns.

The etymology is provided for entries borrowed before 1900. Only a few loans are dated before 1700, e.g., blæk ‘ink’ (from OE blæc), hird ‘household’, kirke ‘church’, kime (vb., from chime ‘to sound a bell; to ring a doorbell violently’, late medieval), daggert/dagger(t) (from OF dague or E dagger ‘a short stabbing weapon with a pointed blade, 1550-1700). A rise can be seen from mid-18th century, with 79 words listed for the 18th century, which grows to 319 words in the 19th century. As in the rest of Scandinavia, the vast majority are 20th century loans, borrowed especially after 1945, first from British, then mainly American English. Two problems noted by the author (p. 6) concern establishing the source language (e.g., in dok, borrowed from Du dok, LG Docke or E dock) and the link languages (e.g., in approach and entertainer possibly borrowed through Swedish or Norwegian).
This is followed by a definition, taken from standard dictionaries of English, including a few more specialised dictionaries like dictionaries of neologisms; in some cases they are provided by the author. The use of such definitions has its advantages, but some are rather unfortunate — the following ones for *modem* and *RAM* could well be replaced with shorter ones:

... 'a device for connecting two computers by a telephone line, consisting of a modulator that converts computer signals into audio signals and a corresponding demodulator' (Collins)

... acronym, from *r*(andom) *a*(ccess) *m*(emory) 'computer memory available to the user for creating, loading or running programs and for the temporary storage and manipulation of data, in which time of access to each item is independent of the storage sequence' (Random House)

Examples are taken from the following sources: newspapers (national and local), weeklies, periodicals, and standard Danish dictionaries. As was noted above, due to limitations placed on the corpus, the examples — while illustrative of the form’s usage — cannot testify to the full range of vacillation in formal and semantic adaptation. A few examples are hardly instructive, e.g., under *laptop* we read:

> han fortalte begejstret at han havde fået en “laptop” (hvad det så er) derhjemme og var ved at samle en “database” med eksempler på konjunktivsætninger. ‘He related enthusiastically that he had acquired a laptop (whatever that may be) at home and was organizing a database containing examples of sentences with the subjunctive.’

And finally, cross-references are provided, e.g., between direct loans and their indirect counterparts, between synonymous versions of an English form; and between abbreviations and full forms.

Sørensen devotes a separate section to syntactic influence (p. 6), but these are in fact individual developments — either semantic loans or loan translations. Among nouns we find examples of Danish nouns that are traditionally used in the sg., and which are now used in the pl. under the influence of the English equivalent, e.g., *tjenester* ‘services’, *økonomier* ‘economies’ (cf. also Sørensen 1987:140-141). A range of developments are recorded among verbs. Here we are dealing with a large number of phrasal and prepositional verbs; examples of such indirect loans include: *komme op* (from *come up* ‘to arise, be mentioned’), *komme op imod* (from *come up against* ‘to be faced with’), and *komme op med* (from *come up with* ‘to produce’). In addition, native verbs may develop new uses under the influence of English equivalents, e.g., from transitive verbs to prepositional verbs (e.g., *kommentere på*), also in the opposite direction (*influere på*), or when reflexives drop the pronoun (e.g., *koncentrere*). That we can now fly a plane (*flyve*) can be attributed to the new transitive use of the verb (as a semantic loan from *fly*, as in *flyv BEA til London* ‘fly BEA to London.’). And finally, the author gives examples of notional passives, e.g., *fiske* (from *fish* ‘of water: to provide (good or bad) sport for anglers’, as in *Gudenaen fisker darligt i øjeblikket*. ‘At the moment the Gudena fishes badly.’), *fotografere* (from *photograph* ‘to be photographed or be suitable for being photographed in some specified way’) and *sælge* (from *sell* ‘to be in demand on the market’).

In my review of the Norwegian *Anglicismeordboka* (Kilarski 1999), I commented on the popular reaction to borrowing from English, and the fear about future developments in Danish and Norwegian. I believe there is no convincing evidence for the “degeneration” of Danish (as suggested by, e.g., Jarvad 1995; for a review see Larsen 1995). The metaphor used in the subtitle of Haberland (1991) (“Om sprogøderi med dansk som livret” — About language eating with Danish as the favourite dish) is certainly eye-catching, but it ignores the complex reality behind bilingualism and language contact. I
would like to argue instead that both in Norway and in Denmark, as well as in the rest of Scandinavia, we’re dealing with a more balanced interaction of English and the Scandinavian languages. The result of the cultural domination of English should rather be interpreted in terms of linguistic enrichment, as was the case with Low German earlier in the history of the languages. A dictionary of Anglicisms in Danish by Knud Sørensen has successfully presented several aspects of this enrichment, both overt and covert. The dictionary is a must for anyone with an interest in recent developments in the Scandinavian languages and the study of language contact.
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