

## Polyglossia through the Prism of Exoglossic Nature of the German Literary Language Development

Yuriy V. Kobenko

Irina V. Sharapova

Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russian Federation  
Email: serpentis@list.ru, sharapiv@mail.ru

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n1s1p500

### Abstract

The article offers an overview of exoglossic situations in the German literary language history, which resulted in exoglossic stratification of the system, presented by foreign lexis layers at the lexical-semantic level of the German literary language, defined as exoglossic strata herein. Strata are "imprints" of the borrowings wave, which intensity is directly proportional to a scale of lexical-semantic groups, thus representing an exoglossic influence. The largest of them includes "imprints" of so-called exoglossia cases in the German language history. The well-known examples of exoglossia are Latin, French and British-American, the latter is still ongoing. State of the language idiom after several exoglossic influences is defined as polyglossia. Evidence of the German literary language functioning in the exoglossic context is discussed. Method of diasystematic analysis of languages and linguistic forms was used for the description. It involves the allocation of diaphastic, diastratic and diafunctional aspects, acting simultaneously as exoglossic aspects. Most arguments are concerning the tendencies in the German literary language system, fixed within the exoglossic language situation in Germany since 1945. The most obvious evidence of exoglossic development in the considered language system is the asymmetry of borrowed and autochthonic language material, which conditions have situationally specified and stylistically differentiated use of the contacting languages – English and German – within the language situation in Germany.

**Keywords:** German literary language; Literary language norms; Exoglossia; Exoglossic language situation; Exoglossic influence; Exoglossic strata; Polyglossia; Allomorphy; Language Development.

### 1. Introduction

Literary languages rarely form and develop without involvement of the other, more prestigious cultures. Undoubtedly, political and economic influence leaves the traces on the language, which system responds to social changes immediately. Such influences we suggest to define as exoglossic (Greek: *exo* = external, *glōssa* = language, speech).

It is important to mention that exoglossic influence is natural for the historical development of the German literary language. Being a superstratum's descendant, this language developed mainly owing to a foreign language material adoption, and this fact has considerably affected its idiom structure. The investigated exoglossic language situation of 1945–2010 is by no means exceptional by its nature. Voltaire wrote the following in Potsdam in 1750: "*I'm in France. Here people only speak French. German only exists for soldiers and horses*" ("*Ich bin in Frankreich. Man spricht nur unsere Sprache. Das Deutsche ist nur für die Soldaten und die Pferde*") [1]. Indeed, then the French language status in Germany greatly exceeded the status of a common foreign language: it was the language of politics, diplomacy, science, education, postal service and book publishing. In the 18th century over 400 works on French grammar were published and only one in the German language – a dictionary of foreign words by S. Roth "*Der Deutsche Dictionarius*". The era of absolutism had the same significant effect on the German language system as periods of Latinization (Golden and Silver), borrowings of which the purists J.H. Kampe, Philipp von Zesen and J.G. Schottel opposed, and it certainly keeps the parity with the Americanization period.

### 2. Exoglossic Strata in Literature Review

Exoglossic influences result in strata of foreign words in the German language structure, scale of which is proportional to the borrowing intensity within the context of some particular language situations. Being a sort of exoglossic influence "imprints", they represent a combination of lexical units, borrowed from a certain donor language and formed into lexical

semantic groups (*Sachgruppen*) in the recipient language, usually in the peripheral spheres, or, as defined by E.G. Riesel, in “functionally and stylistically differentiated layers of lexis” [2]. We suggest calling these lexical layers the *exoglossic strata*. The largest exoglossic strata are the evidence of long borrowing stages, defined as “waves” (*Entlehnungswelle*). *The wave of borrowing is a long-term period in the historical development of a certain language when it was beneficial, prestigious, fashionable and preferable to borrow the units of one donor language invariably.*

## 2.1 Waves of Borrowing and Exoglossia

The notion of the “wave of borrowing” is sometimes related by mistake to the theory of waves by E. Schmidt, a German comparativist (1843–1901), the theory, which is based on the Linguistic paleontology. According to E. Schmidt’s doctrine, dialectal differences arising within boundaries of the Indo-European parent language, radiated from innovative epicentres like waves appearing on the water surface from a thrown stone. Conception of the “wave of borrowing”, typical for works in contactology, is connected with the phase of language material borrowing from some donor language during its expansion beyond the native ethnos territory. Territory of a prestigious donor language spreading as a non-native (foreign) language is equivalent to its popularity in the world.

Two main types of waves should be differentiated in the German language history, specifying its idiom: *moderate waves*, leaving the organized exoglossic strata in it (of Greek, Italian and Dutch origin), and *intensive waves*, or *invasions*, having a significant impact on the language idiom composition (of Latin, Gallic, American English origin). Beside the wave “imprints”, fragmented borrowings from other languages are present in the modern German language vocabulary, without forming separate strata and describing mainly the imported realia of respective cultures: cf. *Reich, Eisen* (from Celtic), *Turban, Pilau* (from Turkish), *Prahm, Doline* (from Slovenian), *Trojka, Pogrom* (from Russian) and other.

Wave is not the same as exoglossia. The latter serves more as an orientation for the spontaneous processes, defined as “waves of borrowings”, and usually exceeds the wave in length, comparing the studies of the British-American influence on the German language made by W. Viereck, who only specifies three major waves of borrowings in the 20th century: prior to WWI, during the war and after 1945 [3]. Cases of Latin and Gallic exoglossia also include several waves of borrowings in the German language history. Latinization started long before the formation of a supradialectal system of the German literary language and continued till the Humanism period. Three major waves are specified within the Latinization period: 1) 50 B.C. – 500 A.D. (period of Golden Latinism), 2) 500–800 A.D. (period of Silver Latinism), 3) the 14th century – second half of the 15th century (the Humanism). In continuation of the Latin exoglossia, gallization also includes three waves of borrowings in the German literary language: 1) the 12-13th centuries (the age of chivalry), 2) the 16–17th centuries (the period of Early Absolutism), 3) the 18th century (the French Revolution) [4].

## 2.2 Definitions of Exoglossia, Diglossia and Polyglossia

As it was mentioned above, the exoglossic strata can represent either formed lexical-semantic groups, borrowed from a donor language (navigation vocabulary from the Dutch language, fashion language from French, and nowadays from the American English), or particular units, which formed in the lexical-semantic groups of the German literary language. A steady indication of exoglossic strata in the German literary language is *diglossia* (a functional stylistic differentiation) of borrowed and autochthonous units synchronically, and *polyglossia* relatively of the other borrowed strata diachronically.

Diglossia stratifies its own (assimilated) language material of the German language and usually not more than one exoglossic strata in its structure, formed due to borrowing units from a certain donor language. *Polyglossia* (resource heterogeneity) is some “residual” phenomenon, observed during a synchronous analysis of the recipient language composition and assuming the coverage of language material of all exoglossic forms, which have ever had an effect on the German literary language. Thus, diglossia describes a functional and stylistic separation of contact languages (vertical), when polyglossia describes the language idiom structure after exoglossic influences.

Diglossia may have a social nature, and that is one more fact proving necessity to involve extralinguistic data in the analysis. For example, diglossia of the kind “American English vs. the German literary language” is described by H. Lengauer, an Austrian linguist, in the following way: “Borrowing of English words by the German language doesn’t promote understanding of foreign culture phenomena, as it used to, but rather a social separation” [5].

However, when separating the Native and Foreign, the autochthonous and borrowed, diglossia creates additional stylistic possibilities. For instance, if an autochthonous word reveals serious negative connotations, the borrowing helps to “whiten” the denotation: cf. “*der Chef der Regierung*” (*Bundeskanzler*) instead of “*der Führer der Regierung*”.

Thus, development of the German literary language occurs according to the following scheme: *exoglossia* → *diglossia* → *polyglossia*, where exoglossia means the German language system functioning during the period of

xenization (diafunctional aspect), diglossia – the system at the moment of exoglossic means increment (diaphasic aspect), and polyglossia – description of the German language idiom upon such increment (diastratic aspect).

Usually those languages are inclined to exoglossic development, formed under the influence of exoglossic impulses. Repeating exoglossic language situations with different donor languages lead to polyglossia of the recipient language in time. In its turn, the symptom of polyglossia in the German language is the heterogeneity of its literary idiom structure, able to complicate its codification significantly due to historical inhomogeneity of the norms, or, as M.I. Issayev explains this phenomenon, by "a different scale of usage spheres of the native and borrowed material" [6].

Stylistic and functional bipolarity of the German language system norms within the described language situation is a result of heterogeneous language material confrontation in the German language system: *norms of exoglossic pole, characterized by the permissiveness* (Lat.: *permissio* = permission, allowing), *pluricentrism and polyvariance, and norms of autochthonous (endoglossic) pole, differing by prescriptiveness* (Lat. *praescriptio* = prescription, resolution), *monocentricity and restrictiveness*. The antagonistic nature of two poles in the language situation is explained by a genetic stratification of the recipient language material, which is required to provide a versatile functioning of its idiom. Specifically this heterogeneity, conditioned by existence of two parallel poles – the "native and foreign" ("*einem nativen und einem fremden System*"), induced H.H. Munske to define the German language as a "mixed language" ("*Mischsprache*") [7]. P. von Polenz also detects "a mixed nature of the German literary language or multilingualism" ("*Mischsprache oder Mehrsprachigkeit*") as a result of the American influence since 1945. [8].

### 2.3 Exoglossic Phase vs. Endoglossic Phase

Heterogeneity can be implicit (unconscious) in the exoglossic phase and expressed in interlingual variability of borrowed and autochthonous units. The endoglossic phase of language evolution deals with such variability by means of functional and stylistic separation, which results in "dissolution" of the exoglossic pole by new effective means integration in the recipient language system.

However, inclusion of the exoglossic material, formed as a stratum (style, substyle, primacy, etc.), in the continuum of normalizing processes in the German literary language, as it was stated above, might be connected with a number of difficulties, due to foreign "look" (the exoglossic nature) of borrowed units. Consequently, "exoglossity" of the borrowed material, expressed in its incomplete adaptation to the recipient language system, serves as a necessary condition for saving the functional and stylistic, semantic, phonetic and other differentiation, or *asymmetry of the Native and Foreign* in the German language system. This condition also causes the polyglossia development in the German literary idiom, which is sometimes called «*sprachliche Überfremdung*» (Ger.: *domination of foreign in the native language*) by educated people of Germany [9]. Th. Niehr highlights semantic and pragmatic significance of the Native vs. Foreign asymmetry in the German literary language: "*The central cognition is that communication should be relevant to both the situation and intention of the speaker. Therefore, the other standards function in the advertisement in comparison to sermon*" [10].

## 3. Features of Exoglossia

The analysis of the language situation in Germany since 1945 till 2014 allows us to select four integral characteristic phenomena of exoglossia: 1) multi-level asymmetry of the integrated and autochthonous language material, 2) a high degree of donor-language citation by German native speakers, 3) interference caused by the borrowed exoglossic units in the German language, leading to the formation of a stable standard correlate (the Exoglossic pole), and 4) the German language hybridization (the contacting languages mixing in the system of the recipient language). The integral evidence refers to a general property of exoglossia, valid for all exoglossia cases, as opposed to differential evidence, which separates the exoglossia phases in the history of one literary language or separating the exoglossia and endoglossia phases.

The exoglossic aspects of the German language development are as follows: diaphasic (historical), diastratic (structurally-functional), diafunctional (sociolinguistic). *Diaphasic* aspect objectifies a certain diachrony period, in which the tendency for the exo- or endoglossy was set. *Diastratic* aspect covers all intralingual language sublevels: grammatical, graphic, lexico-semantic and pragmatic. *Diafunctional* aspect explicates sociolinguistic features of the language functioning and it is limited by the language situation frames.

### 3.1 Multilevel Asymmetry

Multilevel asymmetry of the integrated and autochthonous lexical material is the main evidence of the exoglossic nature

of the German literary language development for the given period and goes back to a different chronological depth of cultural and linguistic processes in the contacting languages, and obviously to non-equivalent information exchange between them. It is necessary to distinguish the following basic levels of the donor and the recipient language asymmetry: diafunctional, diastratic, and diaphastic.

*Diafunctional asymmetry* is expressed in the mismatch of the basic speech production mechanisms, used structures, operating linguistic categories, cognitive stereotypes etc. Everything that defines the Humboldt's "emanation of a people's spiritual and historical experience" makes the language identity and causes the genetic asymmetry. The homology of the contacting linguistic forms does not indicate that the abovementioned features are lacking. Contact of the natural languages will assume this type of asymmetry anyway. Even in the language forms with a high degree of artificiality the presence of characteristic specifics cannot be excluded. Diafunctional asymmetry is also a mismatch of the contacting languages typological features: status of an exoglossic component not lower than the literary language in the German linguistic situation is the key to its social prestige.

We consider the pivotal moment of the *diastratic asymmetry* to be the discrepancy of functional and discursive nominal, observed in the adopted and autochthonous linguistic units. Diastratic differentiation, which mainly determines the need to borrow, and therefore it is inseparable from diaphastic asymmetry, which in its turn uses the differences of the borrowed language units from different periods of time and can be seen in a number of heterolingual variants: *die Frau und ihr Liebhaber* (autochthonous variant)  $\neq$  *die Frau und ihr Ritter* (French)  $\neq$  *die Frau und ihr Kavalier* (French, Italian)  $\neq$  *die Frau und ihr Gentleman* (Eng.)  $\neq$  *die Frau und ihr Boyfriend* (Eng.) etc. Each unit in bold and italics, in addition to the functional-stylistic differences, contains information about the *diaphastic* features of the exoglossic material, borrowed into the German literary language at different stages of its historical development.

Diastratic asymmetry is also a consequence of the naturalistic interpretation of the English units and phrases, as a result of translator's workload and the absence of an adequate term or a functional equivalent for the translated unit. For example, it is now acceptable to put a translation "care" in the phrase "intensive care" as "intensive Pflege" instead of "ausgeprägter Effekt, wirkungsintensiv" on pharmaceutical product packaging. Functional-stylistic asymmetry is given here, firstly, in the difference of meanings (<care>  $\neq$  <Effekt, Wirkung>: care does not mean any medical effect or healing), and secondly, in different stylistic features of diastratic variants: using the Anglo-Americanism "intensive care" manufacturers promote marketability of goods, without guarantees of possible healing, while the German-speaking combination "ausgeprägter Effekt" indicates the pharmacological properties of a drug and helps to find proper medications of a particular group. Discursive asymmetry manifests itself in various referential destinations of phrases: English diastratic version is aimed at the buyer and the German version is aimed at the patient with a specific disease. Thus, the American speech strategy will be focused on the sales and the German on help provision.

However, the asymmetry of contacting glosses is often a result of the attitude among the autochthonous language speakers towards the donor language and the people who speak this language. In other words, the difference, forming the asymmetry, is artificially created by native recipient language speakers for the purpose of differentiating or distancing themselves from the donor language, cf. units «*Klapprechner*» (instead of «*Laptop*»), «*Fernsprech*» (instead of «*Handy*») were created by the opponents of Americanization.

### 3.2 Level of Citation

The second most important feature of the exoglossic language development can be considered a *high citation level of the prestigious donor language in the recipient language*. It should be noted that the degree of donor language citation is equivalent, firstly, to the degree of the recipient language permissiveness in a particular exoglossic language situation, secondly, to the degree of loyalty to the donor language and, thirdly, to the prestigiousness of the donor language among the recipient language speakers. The most explicit symptoms of increased donor language citation level in the German literary speech include the following:

- Invariable preference of the imported variant over the autochthonous variant, for example:

"*Jeder vierte Bundespolizist leidet an Burnout*" (German: *every fourth police officer suffers from burnout*) instead of "*jeder vierte Bundespolizist ist ausgebrannt*".

(Spiegel. *Jeder vierte Bundespolizist leidet an Burnout.*)

- So-called "greediness for foreign" by J. Schottel ("*Fremdgierigkeit*"), expresses interest in all that comes from a foreign (exoglossic) language, for example:

"*Solange man sich innerhalb der unsäglichen "Visitenkarten-im-Netz" -Metapher oder der "Ihr-Firmenprospekt-für-drei-Mark-fünfzig-weltweit-abrufbar"-Metapher bewegt, wird man kaum bemerken, was man mit wohldröhnendem Broschürenjargon anrichtet – business als usual, sozusagen*".

(KommDesign.de. Wir ohne Sie: Warum PR-Phrasen schlecht sind.)

- Abuse of the borrowed material up to the point when new units or new meanings appear, which are at least incomprehensible for the native donor language speakers (pseudo borrowings), cf. "Rollout" (Anglo-German.: *visit, public appearance*) and "toppen" in the expanded meaning <outpace>:

"Mercedes-Rollout: Mattsilbern in Valencia"

(Spiegel. Formel 1: Mercedes verpflichtet Heidfeld als Testfahrer);

"Schumacher toppt Rosenberg"

(Spiegel. Schumacher toppt Rosenberg).

### 3.3 Interference

A firm sign of exoglossia is an *interfering effect of the imported language material*, capable, as noted above, to consolidate into a correlative standard, i.e. into a stable system of deviations from the recipient language codified norms. Interference occurs primarily in the language areas with the highest number of borrowings, and mainly affects the phenomena, exhibiting certain similarities (semantic, phonetic, structural, etc.) in both contacting languages. For example, use of international terms instead of autochthonous or converged variants of the latter, cf.: "Killerwal" instead of "Mörderwal", "Lifestyle" instead of "Lebensstil".

### 3.4 Hybridization

*Hybridization*, also known as language mixing, is a combination of the recipient language material with the donor language citation. The observed tendency towards univertation in the German literary language, which means formation of multicomponent composites of words groups (eg, *Blow-out-Preventer*, *webdesignen*), accelerates the mixed composites formation: cf. «*Livesendung*», «*Reiseboom*», «*Powerfrau*», «*Werbespot*». The specifics of such hybrids is their transformativeness, cf.: *Livesendung* ↔ *live senden*, *Powerfrau* ↔ *eine Frau mit Power*. In this regard, it should be emphasized that the need for nominalization of certain speech patterns is dictated by the immanent linguistic content compression mechanism, as well as by the desire to condense the semantic richness per time unit. To achieve this, for example, English has conversion and gerunds and the German language forms composites.

Despite the fact that the hybridization is a stable feature of exoglossia (assuming that it is mixed with the material of only one language donor), it is impossible to completely eliminate hybridization from the German literary languages. A contact between two languages is always characterized by a non-equivalent mixing due to the above described multi-level asymmetry. Thus, hybridization is inseparable from the language nature as one of the word formation mechanisms. In the German language there are many examples of firmly ingrained hybrid formations with the elements of foreign origin: *Adelstitel* (Adel-s + *Titel* → Lat. *titulus*), *Bürohaus* (*Büro* → French. *bureau* + Haus), *meterhoch* (*Meter* → Greek. *métron* + hoch), *ausbaldowern* (aus + *baldowern* → Heb. *ba'al* + *dāvār*) and many others.

Within the framework of language politicization, the German literary language hybridization can be initiated by permissive activities of the language policy subjects or a society that possess a function of language norm formation, cf. the hybrids in a modern German advertising: "*Organizer-Fach*", "*Farbdisplay*", "*United-Sondermodell*", "*Food-Lüge*", "*Outdoor-Uhr*", "*ICT-Kapazität*", "*Ich-bin-nicht-der-Typ-der-sich-gerne -bindet-Flat*". As a rule, an alien element citation through retention of an original form of borrowed units occurs in order to eliminate the ambiguity in the translation, to create a local flavor, and certainly to make an effective advertising. German language autochthonous means play the role of functional undifferentiated words; and Anglo-Americanisms interfering in the vertical language function as success, prosperity and well-being markers, i.e. a kind of "ornamentation". The created difference (due to contact asymmetry) is obvious: for example, it means not just wristwatch (*Uhr*), but the watch you can wear outdoors; as a result, we get a determinative composite "*Outdoor-Uhr*". Authoritativeness of such sources as television only assists in promoting such word formation and making its products a language norm.

## 4. Conclusion

It must be emphasized that the described aspects also indicate that the German literary language hybridization, being a "fusion" stage of the exoglossic and autochthonous language material, is also a tool for polyglossia development in its system. Polyglossia itself, however, can be diagnosed exclusively in the endoglossic development phase, because under exoglossic conditions there is an illusion that all previous borrowings, including proper names, have the correct pronunciation rules adopted from the prestigious donor language with a varying assimilation degree.

Thus, an essential condition of language development can be considered a compromise of expanded (autochthonous) and (exoglossic) norms integrated in the recipient language structure. Polyglossia appears to be a sign of the developed language, i.e. multifunctional, operating by many standards, cf. German diglossic variants, referring to word-formation standards of different periods: «Reformator» (codified, Lat.: *reformator* = reorganizer) and "Reformer" (insufficiently codified, Eng.: *reformer* = a politician advocating for modernization, reformation of a particular social area). Transition of the exoglossic norm in diglossia is a consequence of a language increment integration in the recipient language system, which asymmetry of elements does not only condition the expanded functions of the latter, but democratization of literary norms, representing "a quite general process, taking very different cultural and language areas" [11].

Polyglossia, as a consequence of genetic stratification of the literary languages lexis, is an essential condition for their optimal functioning. Thus, the plural form "Risiken" of lexeme "Risiko", typical for economic discourse, is the extension of content-related possibilities of the German literary language system, and the feminine gender of "Deadline" unit (by analogy with "die Linie") – the expansion of its formal possibilities.

It becomes obvious that an antinomy of the literary languages development (according to Ferdinand de Saussure, antinomy here means the unity of opposites) stands for saving the homogeneity as a differential sign of a literary language [12] with development in the opposite direction to its resources homogeneity. D. Nübling names the tendency to allomorphy ("Allomorphie") to be the reason for the German literary language system's non-homogeneity [13], which can be referred to general tendencies of exoglossic nature. Allomorphy is a distortion of 1:1 ratio, i.e. when several forms are subject to one function and vice versa. An example of the exoglossic tendency to allomorphy in the German literary language system within the period under study is a different reading of letter "c" in the American English borrowings (1 form: 2 functions): [k] (*Comedy, Elastic*); [s] (*City, Reception*).

## References

- Schrodt, R. (2000). Words From Afar. [Online] Available: [www.unet.univie.ac.at/~a9902976/index.html](http://www.unet.univie.ac.at/~a9902976/index.html) (April 17, 2009).
- Riesel, E. (1959). German Stylistics. Moscow: Foreign Languages, 468.
- Viereck, W. (1988). *German in Language Contact: British English and American English vs. German*. In: Language History. Eds., Besch, W., Reichmann, O., Sonderegger, S., Vol. 1., Berlin, NY: de Gruyter, 938-948.
- Meremkulova, T.I. (2010). *The Borrowing of Gallicisms into German in early Absolutism*. In the Proceedings of 2010 International Conference "World Culture and Language". Tomsk Polytechnic University Press, 120-123.
- Lengauer, H. (2000). *Continuity and Discontinuity*. In: The Difficult 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Eds., Barkhoff, J., Carr, G., Paulin, R. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 65-76.
- Issayev, M.I. (1996). Normalization Processes in Languages of Different Sociolinguistic Types. In Language Norm: Typology of Normalization Processes. Moscow: Linguistic Institute of the Russian Academy of Science, 314-325.
- Munske, H.H. (1988). *Is German a Mixed Language? About the Position of Borrowings in the System of German*. In: German Language Stock. Lexical Studies. Eds., H.H., Munske. Berlin, NY: Walter de Gruyter, 46-74.
- Polenz, P. (2009). The History of German. Berlin, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Eckert, G. (1986). Type of the Language and History: Investigations of Typological Change of French. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Niehr, Th. (2002). Linguistic Notes about the Popular Criticism of English Borrowings. [Online] Available: [www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/germ1/mitarbeiter/niehr/anglizismen.html](http://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/germ1/mitarbeiter/niehr/anglizismen.html) (October 20, 2010).
- Parkhomovsky, V.Ya., Semenyuk N.N. (1996). *Language Norm: Typology of Normalization Processes: Introduction*. In: Language Norm: Typology of Normalization Processes. Moscow: Linguistic Institute of the Russian Academy of Science, 11-20.
- Gukhman, M.M., Semenyuk N.N. (1983). The History of Literary German: IX–XV Centuries. Moscow: Nauka.
- Nübling, D., Dammel, A., Duke, J., Szczepaniak, R. (2010). Historic Linguistics of German. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.