Mannheim papers in multilingualism, acquisition and change **Student Edition 2020**
https://doi.org/10.25521/mapmac.2020.117 **Vol. 1, pp. 113–208**

The Argument Structure of Verbal Anglicisms in German Compared With That of Their English Equivalents

Lisa Seidel

Mannheim University

lseidel@mail.uni-mannheim.de

Abstract

This paper investigates the argument structure of verbal anglicisms in German compared with that of their English equivalents. It aims at answering the question whether anglicisms in German show the same tendencies as their English counterparts with regard to transitivity, argument realisation and choice of semantic roles or whether deviations between these two sets of verbs which can be explained by cross-linguistic differences between English, the source language, and German, the recipient language, occur. Furthermore, the present study seeks to identify potential differences in the verbs' degree of integration into the recipient language depending on their frequency of usage. Taking the findings of Holler and Scherer's (2010) pilot study, which deals with the argument structure of non-native verbs from English, French and Italian in German as a basis, it is hypothesised that the anglicisms in the present study, especially those used frequently in everyday speech, will predominantly follow German native tendencies and thus exhibit deviations from their English equivalents where the systems of the source and the recipient languages differ. The core of this project is a corpus study of 30 anglicisms in German based on *COSMAS II (*"Cosmas2/Web-App", Institut für Deutsche Sprache*,* 1991-2016), a full-text data base and web application for linguistic research within the corpora of the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache* (*IDS*) (primarily *Das Deutsche Referenzkorpus* (*DeReKo*, "Kl/Projekte/Korpora", Institut für Deutsche Sprache, 2018), and a comparison of these anglicisms with a sample

of their verbal equivalents in English on the basis of information listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*) (OED Online, Proffitt, 2015). The anglicisms to be examined in German are taken from the *Anglizismenindex,* a list of words compiled by *Verein Deutsche Sprache (VDS), Sprachkreis Deutsch* and *Verein Muttersprache* (Verein Deutsche Sprache, "Denglisch-und-Anglizismen/Anglizismenindex/Ueber den Index", 2018).

Keywords: anglicisms; argument structure; transitivity; language contact; corpus study

Contents

1 Introduction

Up until now, the investigation of non-native words in German has primarily focussed on phonological, morphological and orthographic aspects whereas syntactic and semantic properties have barely been taken into account. Moreover, previous research in this domain has almost exclusively addressed the integration of non-native nouns since they constitute more than 80 per cent of all foreign words in German (Holler & Scherer, 2010). However, the German lexicon encompasses a considerable number of non-native verbs as well: the latest edition of *Duden. Das große Fremdwörterbuch* (Dudenredaktion, 2015) alone contains approximately 60,000 verbs. Despite their large number, non-native verbal elements and their grammatical properties have been largely neglected in research so far. Given that the verb and its properties such as its argument structure play a central role in determining the grammatical structure and the meaning of the whole sentence (van Gelderen, 2018), it is worthwhile to investigate such phenomena in the context of language contact.

Therefore, this paper deals with the argument structure of verbal anglicisms in German and compares it with that of their English equivalents. The paper aims at answering the question whether these two groups of verbs follow the same tendencies with respect to their argument structure or, alternatively, whether deviations which are accounted for by cross-linguistic differences between the source and the recipient languages arise. According to Holler and Scherer (2010), who conducted a thematically similar study and whose results serve as a basic orientation for the present paper, the former option would imply that there are no integration effects whatsoever. Option two, on the other hand, would suggest that the anglicisms have adopted German native tendencies, hence implying that they are integrated into the recipient language regarding their argument structure. In order to be able to evaluate this question, general language-specific tendencies with respect to argument structure and other related typological differences will be used as a point of reference (see section 3.3). Moreover, it will be investigated whether anglicisms differ in their degree of integration into German – and thus in their deviation from the respective English equivalents – depending on their frequency of usage in the recipient language. To this end, two separate subsamples of anglicisms will be

examined, one containing items that are attested in a German dictionary, *Duden online* (Dudenredaktion, n.d.), and are hence presumed to occur frequently in everyday speech, and one consisting of verbs that are used rather infrequently and consequently not yet attested in the *Duden*.

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 presents an introduction to the theoretical concept of argument structure as such. In section 2.1, the distinction between arguments and adjuncts as well as that of obligatory and optional arguments, both of which are central to the analysis of argument structure, will be pointed out. Sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.3 provide descriptions of the distinct levels and components of argument structure as commonly referred to in the literature.

Section 3 is concerned with the two languages involved in the contact scenario under investigation, English and German. After defining the term *anglicism* and going into the use of such items in German (section 3.1), a brief overview of previous research in the domain of non-native verbal argument structure in German will be given, outlining Holler and Scherer's (2010) findings concerning this matter (section 3.2). Subsequently, a description of the cross-linguistic differences between English and German with respect to argument structure will be provided (section 3.3) in order to be able to identify in which of the two languages the structures found in the following analysis have their origin. Based on that, one can make a statement about whether the anglicisms under investigation rather behave like verbs in the source language or like German native verbs. On the basis of these sections, the precise research hypothesis will be formulated.

Section 4 presents the analysis of argument structure patterns, including both the results of the corpus study of anglicisms and the investigation of their English equivalents based on the OED, and thus builds the main part of this paper. To be precise, in section 4.1, the relevant methodological tools and resources as well as the sample of verbs investigated will be described. After establishing how the verbs and their arguments will be classified in the subsequent analysis (4.2.1), section 4.2 presents the findings, starting with transitivity (section 4.2.2), followed by an analysis of the syntactic and semantic levels of argument structure (4.2.3 - 4.2.4) and that of argument linking (4.2.5).

Finally, the findings will be discussed and the research question as well as the hypothesis will be revisited and evaluated in the light of the results (section 5). The paper will conclude by summarising the present project, putting its findings into a broader context and presenting implications for future research in section 6.

2 Argument Structure Theory

The fact that verbs occur with a particular number and types of other elements is expressed by the concept of *argument structure*, in which the predicate plays a central part. In order to explain this concept, one can employ a metaphor, comparing a sentence to a dramatic play: predicates act like the script of that play, defining a certain number of roles that have to occur for an adequate performance to take place and assigning these to particular actors. These roles are the predicate's *arguments*, elements that are required to complete the sentence so that it

makes little sense to speak about the action without mentioning them (Haegemann, 1994). By contrast, the parts in the script that are not central to the play, merely giving "additional, less essential information, such as providing the background of the situation (e.g. time and location), specifying the manner in which an action was carried out" (Comrie, 1993, p. 906), are *adjuncts* (Haegemann, 1994). Note that although other predicates such as nouns and adjectives can take arguments as well, "[t]he clearest example of an item that has an argument structure is a verb" (Comrie, 1993, p. 906). Hence, only verbal argument structure will be investigated in this paper.

Levin (2018) defines the term argument structure in the following way: it "refers to the lexical representation of argument-taking lexical items – typically verbs, but also nouns (especially nominalizations), adjectives, and even prepositions – that specifies sufficient information about these items' arguments to allow their syntactic realization to be determined." ("Argument Structure", 2018, paragraph 1). She goes ahead by mentioning that an item's argument structure both includes information on *the number of arguments* it requires, and it determines their *syntactic realisation* as well as their *semantic relation* to the verb (Levin, 2018). Hence, argument structure is an inherently relational concept, which expresses "the relation between each argument and its predicate" (Comrie, 1993, p. 905). The three central components of argument structure will be explained in more detail in sections 2.2.1 - 2.2.3.

The notion of argument structure as such originates in generative grammar. Being first adopted around 1980 by researchers of the Government and Binding Theory, it is "a descendant of the subcategorization frame of 1960s transformational grammar" (Levin, "Argument Structure", 2018, paragraph 1), which acknowledges a lexical item's idiosyncratic property to require the presence of a specific number and types of syntactic arguments with which it co-occurs. Adjuncts, by contrast, are not part of its subcategorisation (Heagemann, 1994; Comrie, 1993).

As a matter of fact, "the relationship between verbs and their arguments is a widely debated topic" (Levin & Rappaport, 2005, preface, paragraph 1) in linguistic theory for which there is no single conception (Levin, 2018; Trips & Stein, 2019). As Levin (2018) notes, the "understanding of the notion as a theoretical construct varies with a researcher's theoretical predispositions, especially with respect to how semantics and syntax interface with each other, resulting in controversies over the nature of argument structure in the literature" ("Argument Structure", 2018, paragraph 1). According to van Gelderen (2018), linguists can be grouped into two broad camps concerning this manner: those who see the *lexical item* as central in providing information concerning theta-roles and "argue that the arguments are connected with the verb in the conceptual structure" (van Gelderen, 2018, p. 5) such as Gruber (1965), Grimshaw (1990), Jackendoff (1972; 1983; 2002), Tenny (1994) and Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), and those who consider the *syntax* central in determining an item's argument structure such as Borer (2005) and Lohndahl (2014) among others (van Gelderen, 2018). Note that this paper builds on the former approach, assuming that the verb itself rather than the structure around it is the central element in determining the argument structure of the clause. For a detailed discussion of these and other related theoretical approaches, see van Gelderen (2018) and Ramchand (2014).

2.1 Arguments, Obligatoriness and Adjuncts

Having introduced the term argument structure as well as the major theoretical approaches to this concept, this section serves to define the terms *argument* and *adjunct* more precisely and it deals with the distinction between obligatory and optional arguments since these aspects and criteria are central to an analysis of argument structure.

As pointed out above, sentences may comprise more elements than the verb and its arguments. "[T]hey can contain constituents that provide all sorts of additional information about the event/state" (Ackema, 2015 p. 259): where, when and why it occurred, "the manner in which it took place, what the emotional state of the participants was, and so forth" (Ackema, 2015, p. 260). This information is expressed by adjuncts. As opposed to arguments, adjuncts can occur relatively freely and are not determined in their form by the governing verb (Herbst et al., 2004, p. xxxiv).

What is more, arguments and adjuncts are often said to differ in the phrasal categories they are typically expressed by. Whereas the prototypical argument is a noun phrase (NP), an adjunct is usually expressed by a prepositional phrase (PP) or an adverb phrase (AdvP). However, this is not always the case. In fact, both arguments and adjuncts can be realised by embedded clauses rather than NPs or PPs and, furthermore, arguments can be realised by the categories described as prototypical for adjuncts and vice versa. Thus, there can be PP arguments as in (1*), where* ***Under the bed*** *functions as the subject*, as well as NP adjuncts such as ***the other day*** in (2) (Ackema, 2015).

(1) ***Under the bed*** *is a good hiding place.*

(2) *Harry met Sally* ***the other day****.*

(Ackema, 2015, p. 266)

Some verbs also require a specific preposition which introduces their arguments as illustrated in the PPs in boldface in (3) and (4). Both of these are arguments rather than adjuncts, where the respective preposition is determined by idiosyncratic properties of the individual verb. Such objects are called *prepositional objects* or *oblique objects.*

(3) *David counts* ***on Carol****.*

(4) *Our firm strongly believes* ***in good customer service****.*

(Ackema, 2015, p. 266)

Moreover, the question whether a particular constituent is optional or obligatory is often used to distinguish arguments from adjuncts. Consider the sentences

(5) a. *The doctor examined* ***the patients*** **yesterday**.

b. *The doctor examined* ***the patients****.*

c. * *The doctor examined* **yesterday**.

(Based on Ackema, 2015, p. 264),

where ***the patients*** functions as direct object and ***yesterday*** as an adjunct ((5) a.). Whereas leaving out the direct object argument ***the patients*** would result in an ungrammatical sentence such as (5) c., the adjunct ***yesterday*** can, in fact, be left out without any problems as sentence (5) b. clearly proves. Hence, arguments are often said to be *obligatory*, i.e. they cannot be left out without rendering the sentence ungrammatical whereas adjuncts are deemed *optional additions* to a sentence.

Apart from the above, a fairly extensive number of criteria and tests for the distinction of arguments and adjuncts have been proposed in the literature. For brevity, the aspects mentioned suffice at this point. For a more detailed discussion, see Ackema (2015).

Considering everything that has been said so far, one could conclude that arguments are always obligatory, which is not the case. For instance, the direct object argument of many transitive verbs can be left unexpressed quite easily, resulting in an intransitive construction. To illustrate the truth of this, take the verb *eat*. Based on its meaning, *eat* clearly involves some entity that is eaten, albeit this entity need not be expressed overtly. It can also be implied, i.e. not be realised in the syntax. Thus, the verb can alternate between transitive and intransitive use as sentences (6) and (7) serve to illustrate.

(6) *David was eating* ***Brussels sprouts****.*

(7) *David was eating.*

(Ackema, 2015, p. 264)

Such entities are *optional arguments* – they "do not have to be present for the sentence in which the governing verb occurs to be grammatical" (Herbst et al., 2004, p. xxxi) as opposed to *obligatory arguments*, which "cannot be deleted without either making the sentence ungrammatical or changing the meaning of the headword." (Herbst et al., 2004, p. xxxi). Notwithstanding, the distinction between optional and obligatory elements is "by no means as straightforward as it may seem" as Herbst (2004) stresses (p. xxxii). They rather have to be seen as lying along a continuum, either expressing a stronger or somewhat looser relationship with the governing word.

With all that said, it needs to be emphasised that the findings of the subsequent study have to be treated with caution since both the distinction between arguments and adjuncts and that of obligatory and optional arguments are by no means clear-cut, often depending on the context as well as the individual speaker's decision.

2.2 Components and Levels of Argument Structure

As stated previously, argument structure is a multi-layered concept, which includes the number of arguments a verb requires, their semantic relation to the event denoted by the verb, their syntactic realisation and the way these levels are linked. In the following sections, the precise nature of these levels as well as the way they are interrelated shall be delineated, starting with the concept of transitivity and the syntactic level of argument structure.

2.2.1 Transitivity and the Syntactic Level of Argument Structure

According to Ackema (2015), "[t]he syntactic constituents that appear in the subject, direct object, and indirect object positions are the *syntactic arguments* [emphasis added] of the verb" (Ackema, 2015, p. 248). As already indicated, they can be realised by noun phrases, prepositional phrases, adjective or adverb phrases, finite clauses (e.g. *that-clauses* or *wh-clauses*) as well as non-finite clauses such as *ing-clauses* or *to-infinitive clauses* (Greenbaum, Quirk, Leech & Svartvik, 1985).

The number of syntactic arguments a verb takes is determined by its *valency* (Ackema, 2015), which "can be defined as the number of arguments a verb has" (van Gelderen, 2018, p. 11). Traditionally, verbs are presumed to require zero to three arguments. For instance, *rain* and *snow* only take a dummy subject, *it*, which merely acts as a slot-filler in the syntax but does not refer to an entity, a person or an object, in the world (Haegemann, 1994, p. 62). *Swim* and *arrive* require one argument, *eat* and *see* two, and *give* and *tell* take three (van Gelderen, 2018).

The concept of valency overlaps with that of *transitivity*, which essentially refers to a verb's object-taking properties (Bussmann, Trauth & Kazzazi, 1996). To be precise, when a verb requires a direct object, it is *transitive* (OED, "*How to Use the OED*/Glossary of Grammatical Terms", Proffitt, 2015) as opposed to verbs that do not take a direct object, which are usually considered to be *intransitive*. In a broader sense, however, verbs which select syntactic arguments other than direct objects such as dative or genitive arguments are often treated as transitive as well. According to this definition, only verbs that take no object at all are considered to be intransitive (Bussmann et al., 1996).

As for the group of transitive verbs, a further subdivision into *monotransitive*, *ditransitive* and *complex transitive verbs* can be made. The former only take a direct object, either expressed by a noun phrase as exemplified in (8) or by a finite or non-finite clause.

(8) *Tom caught **the ball**.*

(Greenbaum et al., 1985, p. 1176)

Ditransitive verbs, on the other hand, require two objects, either expressed by two NPs or an NP and a PP (Haegemann, 1994). Consider sentence (9), where *Robert* functions as the subject, ***Mary*** as the indirect object and *a book* as the direct object. The indirect object may also be paraphrased into a prepositional object equivalent to the former, resulting in a sentence like (10) with a PP headed by ***to***.

(9) *Robert gave **Mary** a book.*

(10) *Robert gave a book **to Mary**.*

(adapted from Ackema, 2015, p. 248)

The third category, *complex transitive verbs,* either take a subject complement as in (11) or an object complement as sentence (12) serves to illustrate. Note that such entities are not considered objects of the verb but complements of the subject or object (OED, "*How to Use the OED*/Glossary of Grammatical Terms", Proffitt, 2015).

(11) *Robert is becoming* ***quite mature****.*

(12) *Most students have found her* ***reasonably helpful****.*

(adapted from Greenbaum et al., 1985, p. 723)

Some verbs also have multiple options concerning the number of objects they occur with. This for instance applies to *eat*, which can be used intransitively as demonstrated in (6) (see section 2.1), not taking an object in this example, or transitively in a sentence like (7). In this case, the verb takes a direct object which is considered grammatically optional as it can be left out as well without changing the meaning of the verb or rendering the sentence ungrammatical (Greenbaum et al., 1985).

Furthermore, it is essential to point out that some constructions such as voice alternations involve a reduction in valency and, consequently, in transitivity as well. As van Gelderen points out: "we can … reduce the valency, as in *passives* and *middles*." (2018, p. 14, own emphasis), where the agent argument is lost. Note that based on this, passives and middles will be treated as separate categories in the subsequent analysis, and the individual uses of the respective verb will be regarded as *derived intransitive* variants of an otherwise transitive verb. A further description of the argument structure alternations involved in passives and middles will be given in section 2.2.3.

Apart from those aspects, Hopper and Thompson (1980) introduce a number of other factors related to transitivity such as mood, aspect, affirmation or negation as well as certain properties of the participants involved in the event denoted by the verb (e.g. volitionality, agency and affectedness**),** resulting in a more graduated concept of transitivity (van Gelderen, 2018; Hopper & Thompson, 1980). Considering the scope of this paper, however, an analysis in the context of their framework will not be possible. For a detailed discussion, see Hopper and Thompson (1980).

2.2.2 The Semantic Level of Argument Structure

In addition to the level of syntactic realisation as well as information on transitivity, the concept of argument structure entails a semantic level, which is closely related to the former. In fact, "[t]he number of syntactic arguments a verb . . . can take is determined by the number of semantic arguments that the predicate expressed by the verb takes" (Ackema, 2015, p. 248).

Semantic arguments are participants in the event denoted by the predicate. They can be classified in terms of their semantic content, indicating the way in which they participate in this particular event, which is expressed by their *semantic roles* (Ackema, 2015), also referred to as *thematic roles* or *theta-roles* in the literature (Saeed, 2009). Following Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005), the term *semantic role* will be used henceforth.

As a matter of fact, a plethora of classifications concerning the exact number and types of these roles about which there is no consensus have been proposed in the literature. As Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005) point out, "[o]ne of the most widely adopted forms of lexical semantic representation is what we term a semantic role list" (p. 35), with Gruber and Jackendoff's *Thematic Relations* (Gruber 1965; Jackendoff 1972; 1976) and Fillmore's (1968) *Case Grammar* being the best-known examples. In such lists, "grammatically relevant facets of a

verb's meaning are represented by a list of labels identifying the role that each of the verb's arguments plays in the event it denotes" (Levin & Rappaport, 1993, p. 35). The present study focusses on a set of common roles as listed and defined by Elly van Gelderen (2018), which are the following:

(A) *AGENT:* animate entity that deliberately brings about the event

CAUSER: entity responsible for (initiating) an event

EXPERIENCER: animate entity that experiences the event

THEME: person or object undergoing the action or prompting a sensory or emotional state

GOAL: animate entity that the event is done to or for

RESULT: resulting state

(B) *PATH:* path of the event

MANNER: manner of the event

INSTRUMENT: instrument through which the event occurs.

The roles listed under (A) represent the core set commonly found in the literature whereas those under (B) fulfil rather optional, adverbial functions (van Gelderen, 2018). Some of the terms need to be specified further as will be done in the following. Moreover, a number of additional roles will be introduced in order to extend the set presented by van Gelderen and cover the full range of semantic relations found in the data.

Starting with roles referring to "the participant which performs, effects, instigates or controls the situation denoted by the predicate" (Foley & Van Valin, 1984, p. 29), sometimes subsumed under the cover term *ACTOR* (Foley & Van Valin, 1984; Van Valin 1990), *AGENT* is generally understood as being animate and acting with volition as the above list indicates. *CAUSER*, by contrast, often also termed *NATURAL FORCE* (Levin, 1993), is typically considered an inanimate entity which initiates an action instead of deliberately bringing it about (Saeed, 2009). It is usually seen as being self-energetic whereas *INSTRUMENT*, which is sometimes distinguished from *CAUSER/FORCE*, is not, rather being controlled by an AGENT (Alexiadou & Schäfer, 2006). Although "it is sometimes difficult to draw the line between noun phrases that qualify as agents, natural forces, and instruments . . ." (Levin, 1993, p. 80) as Levin notes, an attempt has been made to keep these roles apart in the present analysis in order to do justice to fine-grained semantic differences.

Another somewhat different ACTOR role is *EXPERIENCER*, which is typically assigned by so-called *psych verbs,* i.e. verbs referring to certain mental or psychological states or processes, to entities experiencing or being aware of such a state caused by a particular *STIMULUS* (Levin, 1993).

Concerning the terms *PATIENT* and *THEME*, the entities *undergoing* some action, there is considerable variation in the literature (Saeed, 2009). Radford (1988) for instance treats them

as different names for one and the same role while other authors such as Jackendoff (1987) make a distinction in meaning, considering PATIENT as an entity undergoing some change in state in the action described whereas THEME undergoes an action but does not change and is often "moved either literally or figuratively or its location is described by the verb" (Saeed, 2009, p. 155). Considering the fact that this problem of definition cannot be resolved in the present paper, PATIENT and THEME will not be differentiated. Instead, both of them will be subsumed under one cover term, THEME, as van Gelderen (2018) suggests.

As for the group of *GOAL* arguments, *RECIPIENT* is sometimes distinguished as a sub-type of the former, denoting changes of possession as will be done in the present analysis as well. The same holds true for *BENEFICIARY*, which refers to the participant to whose advantage the event denoted by the verb is performed (Saeed, 2009). Also note that GOAL can either be used metaphorically as described by van Gelderen (2018) or in a literal, locative sense (Saeed, 2009). Concerning locative roles, in addition to GOAL and *PATH* as listed by van Gelderen (2018), the roles *SOURCE*, denoting the entity from which something moves – again either literally or metaphorically – and *LOCATION*, the place in which an event took place, are sometimes distinguished (Saeed, 2009).

Other roles not mentioned so far are *COUNTER-AGENT***,** a force or resistance that an action is carried out against (Levin & Rappaport, 2005) and *ATTRIBUTE*, which serves to identify or characterise certain properties of the participants in the event such as AGENT or THEME (Greenbaum et al., 1985).

Based on the above, it should be clear that describing and identifying semantic roles is not without problems. As Saeed (2009) points out, lists of roles vary from author to author and there is disagreement as to what, if any, distinctions are to be made between AGENT and related roles and even more so between PATIENT and THEME. This is accounted for by the fact that there are various conflicting approaches to defining the nature of semantic roles as such. To give an example, the *feature decomposition approach* adopted by several authors is based on the assumption that roles are defined by a set of jointly necessary and sufficient conditions (Levin & Rappaport-Hovav, 2005). This stands in marked contrast to the notion of *generalised semantic roles,* including Dowty's *proto-role* proposal (1991) and Van Valin's (1990) *macroroles,* who reject the idea of jointly necessary and sufficient conditions and instead "make use of semantic roles that encompass a wider range of arguments than traditional semantic roles, yet are not simply more coarsely defined roles, but rather are defined in terms of relatively specific semantic criteria" (Levin & Rappaport Hovav, 2005, p. 51). Considering the scope of this paper, a detailed comparison of the various conflicting approaches cannot be given at this point. Instead, the list of roles suggested by van Gelderen (2018), including her descriptions of the individual roles, as well as those added and further specified above shall suffice as a basis to identify semantic roles in the present analysis.

2.2.3 Argument Linking

Now that the distinct levels of argument structure have been explained, the question how these levels are interlinked, i.e. what principles there are for mapping particular semantic roles onto

specific syntactic functions, will be addressed.

Following the projectionist approach of the 1980s, verbs are seen as being listed in the lexicon including their theta-roles. Furthermore, there has to be a matching number of syntactic arguments to these roles. This idea is expressed in the *Theta Criterion* as proposed by Noam Chomsky (1981): "Each argument bears one and only one theta-role, and each theta-role is assigned to one and only one argument" (Chomsky, 1981, p. 36).

Going one step further, "[a] refinement of the realization or mapping of arguments onto the syntactic structure comes in terms of Thematic Hierarchies" (van Gelderen, 2018, p. 15), which are based on the idea that certain semantic roles typically appear in particular syntactic positions. According to such hierarchies, AGENT usually functions as the grammatical subject of a sentence, THEME corresponds to the grammatical object and INSTRUMENT often occurs as a prepositional phrase (van Gelderen, 2018; Saeed, 2009).

As Ramchand (2014) states,

> Thematic hierarchies were attractive to linguists because they were general structures which could be appealed to in the statement of a number of different syntactic generalizations. However, that appeal is dependent on there being a single such hierarchy, as opposed to different rank orderings depending on the phenomenon being investigated. Unfortunately, the consensus now seems to be that this simply is not the case (Ramchand, 2014, p. 269).

For instance, Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005) alone list 16 distinct thematic hierarchies. In the end, they come to the conclusion that "it is impossible to formulate a thematic hierarchy which will capture all generalizations involving the realization of arguments in terms of their semantic roles" (Ramchand, 2014 p. 183).

Besides, such generalisations are not applicable to all types of sentences. As already implied, voice alternations, for example, result in deviations from the typical argument mappings (Saeed, 2009). Given that in a passive sentence, a shift in perspective takes place, describing the event from the PATIENT's rather than the AGENT's point of view, the nominal occurring in the object position of an active sentence is generally fronted to subject position. Thus,

> the Theme (or whichever argument is the direct object argument in the active) becomes the subject, and the Agent (or whichever argument is the subject argument in the active) need not be expressed syntactically anymore (although it can optionally appear in a *by*-phrase) (Ackema, 2015, p. 255).

Another related voice alternation is the middle alternation. In English, "[a] so-called middle resembles a passive in that the Theme argument corresponds to the subject. In contrast to a passive, however, the Agent argument cannot be expressed optionally through a *by*-phrase in a middle." (Ackema, 2015 p. 255). On top of that, passives and middles differ in meaning: whereas passives typically express an event, middles identify a property or quality of their subject and are therefore usually accompanied by a modifying adverb (Stolberg, 2015). An example of a middle construction is provided in (13), with ***This book*** being the THEME argument realised as the subject, as opposed to the corresponding active variant in (14), where

Barry is the AGENT occurring in subject position and ***this book*** the THEME functioning as direct object (Ackema, 2015):

(13) *This book reads well.*

(14) *Barry reads this book.*

(Ackema, 2015, p. 256).

Hence, it can be said that there clearly are certain regularities concerning the mapping of particular semantic roles onto specific syntactic functions, which, however, do not always hold and thus have to be treated with caution.

3 The Languages in Contact — English and German — and Previous Research

After the theoretical construct this paper deals with has been outlined, a closer look will be taken at the languages in contact in the analysis at hand, English and German, in this section. First of all, a short introduction to anglicisms in German including a definition of the term as such will be given, followed by previous research about the argument structure of non-native verbs in German. Subsequently, cross-linguistic differences between English and German in the domain of argument structure will be outlined. These sections serve as a basis for the hypothesis of the present paper.

3.1 Anglicisms in German

According to a common definition by Pfitzner (1978), an *anglicism* is a linguistic sign whose external form consists of English morphemes or a combination of English and German morphemes. Its semantic content is always based on the adoption of a word or concept existing in English, the *source language*. As a matter of fact, a plethora of other definitions have been proposed in the literature just as several ways to classify those items (Zschieschang, 2011). These are based on the following criteria among others: an item's degree of integration into the *recipient language* (i.e. German in the present analysis) regarding morphology, phonology and orthography, its frequency and context of usage (Yang, 1990), the fact whether a given word combines native and non-native elements or consists of foreign elements exclusively as well as the question whether a word contains English morphemes at all or whether native morphemes have merely undergone a shift in meaning due to the influence of an English word (Carstensen, 1967).

Besides, some researchers distinguish between words coming from British English, referring to them as *Briticisms*, and those of American origin, so-called *Americanisms* (Burmasova, 2010). Note that in the present analysis, the only distinction made is based on frequency of usage (see section 4), and the only precondition for an anglicism to be included in the investigation is the existence of a corresponding verbal equivalent in English in order to be able to establish a

comparison between the source and the recipient languages. For more detailed classifications of the term *anglicism*, see Yang (1990), Fink (1970) and Carstensen (1967).

Now that the term *anglicism* has been defined, the question of how such elements — and what kinds of elements exactly — entered the German language in the first place needs to be addressed. For reasons of space, a very condensed overview concerning this matter needs to suffice at this point.

Although language contact between English and German dates back to the 17th century, English did not gain its current status as the dominant foreign language in Germany until the second half of the 20th century, when the US emerged as a global power (Eisenberg, 2018). Ever since then, a vast number of anglicisms have entered the German language (Zschieschang, 2011). According to Carstensen and Busse's *Anglizismen-Wörterbuch* (1993), over 100,000 anglicisms have been imported into German between 1945 and the early 1990s alone, and since the turn of the millennium, the numbers have increased steadily (Hilgendorf, 2007). Today, "for a growing number of Germans contact with the English language is a frequent, if not daily, occurrence" (Hilgendorf, 2005, p. 135) in the domains of politics, science, business and economy, law, the media (the Internet, television and music), advertising as well as education. As various studies of anglicisms in the German media, for instance, have found, about one in a hundred words is an anglicism, which makes about 1.07 per cent of all words in the German media (Engels, 1976; Onysko, 2007).

As for the distinct parts of speech, previous research has proved that the four main lexical categories of nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs constitute the clear majority of all anglicisms in German. Among these, nouns represent the largest group by far, followed by verbs and adjectives, which have been shown to compete in terms of frequency, and adverbs (Burmasova, 2010). This distribution of frequency is assumed to be due to semantic, structural as well as extra-linguistic factors: while nouns represent precise concepts and are "morphologically neutral", i.e. they fit into the German system without major changes in form (Riehl, 2004), "verbs and adjectives bear a higher syntactic and semantic load" (Onysko, 2007, p. 45). For a further discussion, see Burmasova (2010).

3.2 Previous Research About the Argument Structure of Non-Native Verbs in German

Generally speaking, the investigation of anglicisms in German has been an established area of research for over 50 years. Rather than focusing on the diachronic development of anglicisms, the majority of studies, in fact, deal with synchronic data (Burmasova, 2010). In the context of these investigations, nominal elements as well as their phonological, morphological and orthographic properties have predominantly been examined (Burmasova, 2010) whereas verbs have been largely neglected so far (Holler & Scherer, 2010). Consequently, the argument structure of verbal anglicisms in German – and of non-native verbs in general – has barely been investigated systematically despite the fact that the analysis of syntactic and semantic properties of a particular item sheds light on the degree to which it is integrated into the recipient language (Holler, 2015). Holler and Scherer (2010) were among the first to carry out a system-

atic investigation of non-native verbal argument structure in German. Their corpus study is based on Primus' (1999) and Berman and Pittner's (2013) generalisations concerning argument structure patterns of German native verbs, which will be outlined briefly in the following.

Based on Mater (1971), Primus (1999) have proposed the following hierarchy for German verbs: statistically, intransitive verbs almost exclusively take an NP subject carrying nominative case (NP [nom]), most transitive verbs require an NP [nom] and an NP in the accusative (NP [acc]), whereas the pattern NP [nom] and NP [dat] (dative) is much less frequent. Ditransitive verbs take the pattern NP [nom] + NP [acc] + NP [dat] in the majority of cases, followed by the combination of a nominative, an accusative and a prepositional object. The number of genitive objects is rather negligible on the whole.

By analogy, Berman and Pittner (2013) among others have proposed a hierarchy of semantic roles which looks as follows: AGENT > PATIENT > RECIPIENT. Based on such generalisations, systematic principles for argument linking, connecting those two hierarchies, have been proposed in the literature with AGENT being linked to the subject, PATIENT to the accusative and RECIPIENT to the dative (Berman & Pittner, 2013).

Taking these generalisations as a basis, Holler and Scherer (2010) have analysed the argument structure of non-native verbs from English, French and Italian in German, investigating whether these items differ in their argument structure from German native verbs and if so, in what way. Their basic finding is that non-native elements predominantly follow the preferences of German native verbs. In fact, all syntactic patterns and semantic roles found in their sample of non-native verbs also occur in German native verbs, and the argument linking of non-native verbs as well follows the same principles as German native verbs do. Based on this, they conclude that the borrowed items can be regarded as integrated into German with respect to their argument structure, using frequent native argument structure patterns in the majority of cases.

Nevertheless, they also detected a number of deviations from the native tendencies suggested by Primus (1999) and Berman and Pittner (2013). Whereas verbs taking one or two arguments follow the German preferences very closely, differences could be found in verbs taking three arguments. First and foremost, Holler and Scherer (2010) found that non-native verbs taking a dative-NP are underrepresented in comparison with Primus' hierarchy, predominantly taking a prepositional object instead, which was also confirmed by Wolff's (2009) small-scale study of verbal anglicisms in German. Besides, on the level of semantics, the roles RECIPIENT and BENEFACTIVE were shown to occur rather infrequently in their sample of non-native verbs whereas a higher number of locative and temporal roles, linked to prepositional phrases in most cases, were found. Consequently, Holler (2015) refines the above statement, claiming that the non-native verbs are partially rather than fully integrated into German concerning their argument structure.

Note that integration itself is a complex concept which can be considered from several perspectives (see Paul, 1916 and Eisenberg 2001 for a detailed discussion). Holler (2015) assumes Eisenberg's symmetrical integration model, which includes both the integration of foreign elements into the system of the recipient language and the adaptation of native elements to requirements imposed by foreign structures (Eisenberg 2001). This leads to the formation of

grammatical sub-systems which feature elements from the source as well as the recipient languages, hence suggesting a partial rather than a full integration of non-native elements into the recipient language. This approach is followed in the present paper as well.

On the basis of Holler and Scherer's (2010) findings, it is hypothesised that the anglicisms in the present study will predominantly follow German native tendencies as well and thus exhibit deviations from their English equivalents where the systems of the source and the recipient languages differ. A precise description of those differences will be provided in the subsequent section. However, given that Holler and Scherer's results only suggest a partial integration into German, it is predicted that a number of structures characteristic of English that are not in line with the preferences of German native verbs will occur in the sample of anglicisms as well, particularly among the category of verbs taking three arguments. Additionally, differences in the verbs' degree of integration into German depending on their frequency of usage are expected as stated previously.

The present study will proceed in a similar way as Holler and Scherer's (2010) investigation only narrowing down the scope, investigating English-based verbs exclusively, by contrast. What is more, a shift in perspective will be undertaken. Instead of comparing the anglicisms with the general tendencies proposed for German native verbs, they will be compared with their verbal equivalents in the source language. Hence, more attention will be dedicated to the comparison of the two languages and how the systems interact in the given contact situation. Therefore, a different theoretical basis was chosen as well. Rather than focusing on the above hierarchies for German proposed by Primus (1999) and Berman and Pittner (2013), cross-linguistic differences between English and German concerning argument structure will be used as a point of reference, which shall be outlined in the following section.

3.3 Cross-Linguistic Differences Between English and German With Respect to Argument Structure

As Eisenberg (2018) notes, German can import elements from English rather easily given that the two languages are historically and typologically very similar. Still, English and German do display certain differences when it comes to verbal argument structure on all linguistic levels explained.

Starting with transitivity, as van Gelderen (2011) demonstrates in her article about valency changes in the history of English based on Nichols, Peterson and Barnes' (2004), Abraham's (1997), Haspelmath's (1993) and Comrie's (2006) findings concerning cross-linguistic differences in valency, present-day English is shown to have a higher number of what she calls *labile verbs* — "verbs [that] alternate in valency without any change in form" (van Gelderen, 2011, p. 108) than German. Examples of such labile verbs in English are *hide*, *break* or *drop*, which can either be used transitively or intransitively. Consider the following sentences:

(15) ***The vase*** *broke.*

(16) ***He*** *broke* ***the vase****.*

(taken and adapted from van Gelderen, 2011, p. 110).

(15), where the verb is used intransitively, shows an *anticausative* construction with just a THEME subject, ***The vase***, whereas the verb is used transitively in (16) in a causative construction with a CAUSER subject, ***He,*** and a THEME object, ***the vase***. This is referred to as *anticausative-causative* or *causative-inchoative* alternation.

In addition to verbs such as *break*, which involve change of state or location with the THEME argument central, the option to be used transitively apart from the intransitive variant applies to another class of verbs which denote controlled, volitional, acts i.e. with AGENT central, as well. A representative of the latter group of verbs is *bathe*, which is intransitive in a sentence like (17) but may as well be used transitively as in (18), adding a THEME object, ***her body***, in addition to the AGENT subject, ***She*** (van Gelderen, 2011). As Levin (1993) points out, in such cases, "the subject of the transitive use of the verb bears the same semantic relation to the verb as the subject of the intransitive use does." (p. 33).

(17) ***She*** *bathes in hot water.*

(18) ***She*** *bathes* ***her body*** *in hot water.*

(taken and adapted from van Gelderen, 2011, p. 120)

Note that German also possesses verbs that regularly participate in such alternations without any changes in form (van Gelderen, 2018). For instance, the German translation equivalent of *bathe*, "baden", may as well be used either transitively or intransitively. However, in line with the majority of its Germanic neighbours, the number of labile verbs in German is considerably lower than in English by comparison as Abraham (1997), Haspelmath (1993) and Comrie (2006) have shown, hence making a quantitative rather than an absolute claim in this regard (see van Gelderen, 2018 for more information).

Although it will not be possible to investigate other criteria connected to valency as mentioned in van Gelderen (2011) such as morphological aspects or to go into further detail about specific valency alternations in this paper, the above tendencies concerning variation in transitivity will be taken as point of reference for the present analysis. Thus, it is expected that the sample of English verbs will comprise a higher number of labile verbs than the anglicisms in German. Based on the hypothesis that the anglicisms will follow the tendencies of German native verbs, they are expected to exhibit less variation between transitive and intransitive use, by comparison, and thus show deviations from their English equivalents in this regard. Furthermore, in assuming that items used rather infrequently in everyday speech are not as integrated into the recipient language as those used frequently, it is expected that the sample of infrequent anglicisms will still contain more labile verbs than that consisting of frequent anglicisms, not following the German tendencies as closely as the latter.

Continuing with the level of syntax, the two languages under consideration show slightly differing options or preferences when it comes to the way verbal arguments are realised as well. This for instance applies to the category of ditransitive verbs. As noted before, English ditransitive verbs regularly appear in two syntactic constructions: a double object construction containing two NPs and a prepositional frame consisting of an NP and a PP instead of the first object in the double object construction. Depending on the semantic relation the verb expresses in a particular context, this alternation is either referred to as *dative alternation*, where

the "NP that is the object of the preposition *to* in the prepositional frame turns up as the first object in the double object construction" (Levin, 1993, p. 45) or *benefactive alternation* respectively. The latter involves "the benefactive preposition *for* rather than the goal preposition *to* in the prepositional variant" (Levin, 1993, p. 49). Even though German ditransitive verbs may as well use the prepositional frame as Primus (1999) based on Mater (1971) has shown, the canonical realisation of the RECIPIENT or BENEFICIARY argument in German, by contrast, is a dative-NP.[1]

So, given that the anglicisms are expected to predominantly follow German native tendencies, but that based on Holler and Scherer's (2010) findings, they are presumed to be partially rather than fully integrated into the recipient language – the category of verbs taking three arguments in particular – both the canonical German double object construction with the frame NP [dat] + NP [acc] and the prepositional object construction preferred by English verbs are expected to occur in the anglicisms.

Another, yet more subtle difference between English and German when it comes to the syntactic realisation of verbal arguments can be found in the categories of middles, anticausatives and reflexives. As for the former, consider the following sentences:

(19) a. *Das Auto fuhr* ***sich*** [refl.] *gut.*
b. *The car drove well.*

(Wunderlich, 2006, p. 11)

In German, this operation is usually marked by an overt reflexive such as ***sich*** in (19) a., with the reflexive pronoun in direct object position (Wunderlich, 2006). In English, on the other hand, there is no reflexive marker to express such relations as can be seen in (19) b.; the distinction of a middle construction from the corresponding active variant such as *They drove the car* merely consists in the omission of the AGENT argument as explained in section 2.2.3 (Saeed, 2009; Hawkins, 1986; Wunderlich, 2006).

Similarly, the *anticausative* variant of the abovementioned causative-inchoative alternation marked by a reflexive pronoun in German as in (20) a. is whereas English, again, does not make use of a reflexive marker to express this event as shown in b.

(20) a. *Die Tür öffnet* ***sich****.*
b. *The door opens.*

(Stolberg, 2015, p. 132)

In fact, middle voice and anticausatives are semantically very similar to *reflexive situations*, "where two arguments of an action or relationship described by a single predicate have identical reference." (Bussmann et al., 1996, p. 993). Yet, one needs to make a distinction between different types of reflexives, the first group being *argument reflexives,* where the reflexive pronoun functions as the direct object of a transitive verb which is merely used reflexively in

[1] This points to another related aspect in which German and English differ significantly: grammatical case (Hawkins, 1986). Note that the concept of case, however, will not be examined in detail in this paper and will thus not be explained further at this point.

this particular context and can be replaced by non-reflexive DPs, i.e. transitive constructions (Steinbach, 2002; Stolberg, 2015). This type of reflexive construction exists both in German and in English as the following examples demonstrate:

(21) *Er wäscht **sich**. / He washes **himself**.* (argument reflexive)

(22) *Er wäscht **den Pullover**. / He washes **the sweater**.* (transitive).

(adapted from Steinbach 2002, p. 140)

On top of that, German has quite a number of verbs that can only be used reflexively, often referred to as *non-argument reflexives* such as "sich schämen" (to be ashamed) or "sich fürchten" (to be afraid) whereas English "possess[es] only a handful of lexicalized reflexive verbs (absent oneself from, pride oneself on, etc.)" (Siemund, 2014, p. 49). What is more, German can also use reflexive pronouns to describe *reciprocal relations*, which denote a two-way reflexive, i.e. a bilateral relationship between two or more participants as in *Sie lieben **sich***., where English exclusively employs the reciprocal pronouns *each other* and *one another* (Greenbaum et al., 1985; Bussmann et al., 1996).

Based on the facts just mentioned, it is assumed that the anglicisms in German – especially the frequent ones – will comprise a higher number and possibly a broader range of overt reflexive constructions than their English equivalents, using the options available in the recipient language as the above hypothesis predicts.

In addition to everything that has been said so far, the two languages under investigation show considerable differences on the semantic level of argument structure or, to be more precise, in the way the semantic roles are mapped onto specific syntactic functions. As Hawkins (1986) based on Plank (1984) points out, the basic grammatical relations *subject* and *direct object* are semantically more diverse in English than in German. In other words, German verbs link these grammatical relations with relatively specific semantic roles while English is more liberal in this regard as will be explained in the following.

As for the category of objects, German makes a semantic distinction between accusative-NPs and dative-NPs. The former usually express the entity affected or produced (PATIENTs) while the latter tend to refer to the direction of an activity towards a particular goal or the participant to whose advantage the event occurs i.e. roles such as GOAL, RECIPIENT or BENEFICIARY. As a result of case syncretism, English, by contrast, regularly collapses these semantic roles "into a common grammatical entity, direct object. . . ." (Hawkins, 1986, p. 55). Consequently, English direct objects can be regarded as semantically more diverse than German accusative-NPs and dative-NPs.

What applies to the category of objects also holds true for subjects. This for instance becomes evident in German *impersonal constructions*, where the EXPERIENCER role is mapped onto an accusative NP functioning as subject, instead being realised as an accusative-NP as exemplified in (23) a. or a dative-NP in other cases. English, on the contrary, regularly maps EXPERIENCERs onto surface subjects as (23) b. serves to illustrate (Hawkins, 1986).

(23) a. ***Mich** friert.*

b. ***I** am freezing.*

(Hawkins, 1986, p. 56)

Note that this is not to say that EXPERIENCERs can never be assigned subject status in German as sentence (24), an alternative to (23) a. with a nominative EXPERIENCER subject, ***Ich***, clearly proves. However, there are predicates in German which do not permit the mapping of EXPERIENCERs onto surface subjects at all and others for which non-subject mappings exist and are regularly used while the EXPERIENCER arguments of the corresponding predicates are always mapped onto surface subjects in English, thus making the group of English EXPERIENCER subjects larger than in German (Hawkins, 1986).

(24) ***Ich*** *friere.*

(Hawkins, 1986, p. 56)

Apart from that, as Rohdenburg (1974) has shown, there are quite a number of instances in which other non-agentive roles such as INSTRUMENT and locative roles cannot be mapped onto subjects in German at all while this is possible in English. Consider sentences (25) a. and (26) a., where English permits an instrumental or locative subject, which would be ungrammatical or at least highly unidiomatic in German, by contrast, as illustrated in (25) b. and (26) b. respectively. Consequently, German usually maps INSTRUMENTs and locative roles onto prepositional phrases (see (25) c. and (26) c.).

(25) a. ***This advertisement*** *will sell us a lot.*
b. * ***Diese Anzeige*** *wird uns viel verkaufen.*
c. ***Mit dieser Anzeige*** *verkaufen wir viel.*

(Hawkins, 1986, p. 61)

(26) a. ***This hotel*** *forbids dogs.*
b. * ***Dieses Hotel*** *verbietet Hunde.*
c. ***In diesem Hotel*** *sind Hunde verboten.*

(Hawkins, 1986, p. 58)

These are only some examples which serve to reflect a general tendency of English being more liberal when it comes to the mapping of semantic roles onto the syntactic functions of subject and direct object than German, a fact which is widely recognised in the literature (e.g. Hawkins, 1985; Levin & Rappaport Hovav, 2005) and is hence expected to be reflected in the analysis as well.

Summing up, based on the cross-linguistic differences between English and German with regard to verbal argument structure described, the anglicisms in the present study are presumed to differ from their English equivalents in the following ways: firstly, the sample of anglicisms in German is expected to show less variation in transitivity than their English counterparts, i.e. to contain fewer labile verbs; secondly, on the level of syntax, the anglicisms are assumed to exhibit deviations in the syntactic realisation of reflexive and ditransitive constructions from their English equivalents; thirdly, concerning the level of semantics as well as the argument linking, the sample of anglicisms is expected to contain a smaller range of semantic

roles within the grammatical relations of subject and object than the English verbs. However, based on Holler and Scherer's (2010) findings, the anglicisms are presumed to still exhibit a number of structures characteristic of English, thus being partially rather than fully integrated into German. Besides, all the differences described so far are expected to be more significant between the sample of frequent anglicisms and their English equivalents than between the infrequent ones and their respective equivalents as stated before. That is because the former are assumed to be more integrated into the recipient language, hence following German native tendencies more closely and therefore deviating from the system of the recipient language more strongly than the latter.

4 Corpus Study of Anglicisms in German and Investigation of Their English Equivalents Based on the OED

Having laid the theoretical foundation for the present analysis in the first part of this paper, the following sections deal with the core of this project, the corpus study of anglicisms and the comparison with their English equivalents. First and foremost, the general procedure of the study, the relevant methodological resources and the sample of verbs under investigation will be outlined (sections 4.1–4.1.2). Subsequently, the findings of the corpus study of anglicisms as well as those of the study of their English equivalents will be presented (sections 4.2.1–4.2.3).

4.1 Methodology

As mentioned previously, the first part of the present analysis, which is concerned with a sample of anglicisms in German, represents a corpus study based on COSMAS II. Composed at and made accessible by the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache,* COSMAS II is a full-text data base and web application for linguistically motivated research within the corpora of the IDS ("Cosmas2/Web-App", Institut für Deutsche Sprache, 1991-2016). It comprises a total of 541 corpora, primarily provided by *Das Deutsche Referenzkorpus* ("Kl/Projekte/Korpora", Institut für Deutsche Sprache, 2018). These corpora are organised into 18 *archives according to differences in composition, format as well as other properties.* Focusing on written data exclusively, this study is based on *Archiv W der geschriebenen Sprache*, the largest and most diverse of all archives provided by the IDS containing a total of 9 billion word forms within a broad range of text types from the 18th century up until today ("Cosmas2/Uebersicht", Institut für Deutsche Sprache, 2018).

As for the sample of English equivalents, the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) was chosen as a data base. Although being a primarily historical dictionary of the English language, the OED also includes present-day information and references, containing a total of 600,000 words as well as 3.5 million quotations "from classic literature and specialist periodicals to film scripts and cookery books . . . from across the English-speaking world" (OED, "About", Proffitt, 2015, paragraph 2). For the purpose of this study, the individual quotations listed under the OED entries of the verbs in the sample were analysed.

Hence, the subsequent study consists of two separate analyses, whose results will be presented, compared and discussed in the following. Before, however, the set-up of the study shall be outlined in more detail.

4.1.1 Samples of Verbs

The set of verbal anglicisms is based on the *Anglizismenindex*, a list of words and phrases arranged in alphabetical order provided by *Verein Deutsche Sprache*, *Sprachkreis Deutsch* and *Verein Muttersprache*.[2] Since the editors of this index make a distinction between items which occur frequently in everyday language and those whose occurrence is rather infrequent, the set of verbs to be investigated in the present analysis was divided into two categories accordingly. Given that they do not, however, specify the criterion of frequency any further, the items were cross-checked in *Duden online* (Dudenredaktion, n.d.) for their occurrence before being assigned to either of the categories as a first step.[3] Hence, the verbs' occurrence in the *Duden* was used as the relevant criterion in assigning the respective items to the subsample of frequent or infrequent verbs.

Moreover, the anglicisms' definitions were established in this step, which served as a basic orientation for the subsequent analysis. The frequent verbs' definitions are based on information given in the *Duden*. In cases of meaning discrepancies in the individual context, they were slightly adjusted with the help of the *Anglizismenindex* (Verein Deutsche Sprache, "Denglisch-und-Anglizismen/Anglizismenindex/AG-Anglizismen-index", 2018). The latter also served as a basis for defining verbs not attested in the *Duden*. Find a list of all definitions in appendix A.4.

Subsequently, the anglicisms were checked for their English equivalents in the OED. This was done by cutting off the German infinitive endings *-en, -n* or *-ieren*[4] (Hoberg, 2016; Greenbaum et al., 1985). For instance, for German *daten, date* was selected as the corresponding English equivalent. In anglicisms such as *shaken,* where the corresponding English verb, *shake*, ends in *-e*, only the final letter, *-n*, was cut off. Sometimes, additional adjustments needed to be made. To give an example, the order of the letters *e* and *l* in *batteln* was changed in order to obtain the correct English infinitive, *battle*. Anglicisms which do not have verbal equivalents in English, i.e. items borrowed into German as nominals and derived within the recipient language such as the English noun *dumpster*, and are thus not attested in the OED were excluded at this point.

[2]Note that the *Anglizimsenindex* was merely chosen as a starting point for the following analysis since it represents the most comprehensive list of Anglicisms in German the author is aware of. It must be emphasised, however, that the author does not share *Verein Deutsche Sprache*'s purist views (Görlach, 2003; Verein Deutsche Sprache, "Leitlinien") and that etymological as well as lexicographic information included in the *Index* was double-checked with a standard German and English dictionary respectively given the institution's status as a "Laienlinguistischer Verein" (Kilian, Nier & Schiewe, 2016).

[3]Note that verbs were cross-checked with the respective entries in the latest printed edition of *Duden Deutsches Universalwörterbuch* (Dudenredaktion, 2016), which proved that the online version contains more detailed information on individual properties of the verbs such as etymology and usage.

[4]Note that the suffix *-ieren* typically signals Latin or French origin (Wolff, 2009). However, the *Duden* clearly lists the verbs *encodieren* and *implementieren* as being borrowed from English, which is why they were included in the investigation (Dudenredaktion, n.d.).

Finally, the two subsamples of anglicisms to be investigated for their argument structure in COSMAS II were compiled in such a way that the proportion of frequent and infrequent items in the entire sample of verbs investigated reflects the share of these two sub-groups of the total number of verbs listed in the *Anglizismenindex* correctly. The frequent verbs amount to 44.53% of the whole list in the *Anglizismenindex* (375 verbs in total) whereas the infrequent verbs make up a share of 55.47%, and the sample size of the verbs under examination is 30. Hence, 13 frequent verbs and 17 infrequent verbs were selected.

The verbs were selected manually since the words listed in the *Anglizismenindex* are not tagged according to parts of speech. To be precise, the first verb listed under each initial letter listed in alphabetical order was selected, starting with the letter *A*. This resulted in the following list of verbs for the subsample of frequent verbs (*sample* $1_{A,}$ i.e. sample 1 anglicisms): *adden, babysitten, campen, dealen, encodieren, faken, gamen, hypen, implenentieren, jetten, kicken, labeln* and *mailen.* As for the subsample of infrequent verbs, the procedure needed to be adjusted slightly due to the fact that only a small number of infrequent anglicisms are attested in COSMAS II. Therefore, the alphabetical list of words was searched systematically several times, skipping to the first verb of the subsequent initial letter whenever a verb did not feature 25 hits in the corpus at least, and continuing with the second word listed under the respective initial letter once the whole list was run through completely, repeating this procedure until the sample size of 17 was reached. This resulted in the following set of verbs (*sample* $2_{A,}$ i.e. i.e. sample 2 anglicisms): *batteln, boosten, callen, cashen, chanten, connecten, daten, dumpen, gambeln, leaken, pasten, printen, punchen, releasen, reviewen shaken and shooten.*

4.1.2 General Procedure

After compiling the samples of verbs, the anglicisms were searched in COSMAS II, and the most recent hits (sorted by date of publication) for each verb found in the corpus, 25 in total, were extracted. Given that the majority of non-native words which have not been part of everyday speech for long are not lemmatised as has been found out in a test query and confirmed by the IDS, the individual word forms needed to be specified manually in the query. For this purpose, the operator #REG (used for *regular expressions* ("Cosmas2/WebApp/Hilfe/Suchanfrage", Institut für Deutsche Sprache, 2018)) was applied in order to generate a list of word forms minimally containing the verbs' stem, up to two characters preceding it and up to four following it to cover the full range of potential inflectional forms. This resulted in the query #REG(^[e-g]{0,2}dump[e-t]{0,4}$) for the verb *dump*, to give an example.

After extracting 25 sentences for each anglicism, the verbs' argument structure was analysed in these sentences, and the dominant structures of the individual verbs in terms of transitivity, syntax and semantics were recorded in order to be able to establish a direct comparison between those items and their English equivalents (see appendix A.7). Moreover, all the structures occurring with anglicisms were listed, and their frequencies of occurrence relative to the whole sample were established to make a general, quantitative claim concerning the verbs' basic tendencies and preferences in German.

The same basic procedure was applied to the anglicisms' English equivalents, which were

checked for their argument structure in the Oxford English Dictionary, though slight adjustments in terms of methodology needed to be made due to the resources available. To be specific, only the entries most similar in meaning to the corresponding anglicisms were analysed in order to be able to establish a point of reference since an analysis of all quotations listed in the OED would have exceeded the scope of the present study. Given that the number of quotations listed under each entry in the OED varies strongly and is, in fact, rather small in the majority of cases, all frequencies referring to the whole samples or subsamples of verbs investigated will be given in relative frequencies in the following sections so that a valid comparison can be made.

4.2 Findings and Interpretation

The following sections present the results of the corpus study of anglicisms compared with those of the investigation of their equivalents in the source language. The chapter is structured as follows: after a short note on classification in section 4.2.1, the findings concerning transitivity including the verbs' basic syntactic constructions, i.e. intransitive, monotransitive, reflexive, etc., will be presented (4.2.2). Section 4.2.3 will shed light on the concrete syntactic realisation of the verbs' argument structure, followed by an analysis of the semantic roles they select (4.2.4). Finally, the way these roles are mapped onto the specific syntactic functions will be presented (4.2.5), thus covering all the components of argument structure explained in the theoretical part of this paper.

4.2.1 Classification

Following Herbst's (2004) assumption that for both theoretical and lexicographical purposes, arguments "are best described in terms of formal categories such as phrases and clauses. . . ." (Herbst et al., 2004, p. xxv), they are specified in terms of phrase and clause types. A definition of the individual labels is provided in the list of abbreviations. Note that prepositional objects are labelled as [prep + NP]. Dummy subjects such as expletive *it* or *there* (or, correspondingly, *es* in German) as in ***Es** wurde . . . geshakt.* (NON14/OKT.03254 Niederösterreichische Nachrichten, 02.10.2014) are subsumed under one common label, *NP-0*.

Furthermore, as the above definition of transitivity implies, there are considerable discrepancies in the literature as to whether verbs which take a direct object should exclusively be regarded as transitive or whether verbs taking other types of objects such as an indirect object or prepositional objects should be counted among the category of transitive verbs as well. In line with the OED's approach, the former option will be followed in the subsequent analysis. Still, other types of objects will be analysed too as these are clearly part of verbal argument structure as well.

Also note that although the OED subsumes both monotransitive and ditransitive verbs under one common category, that of transitive verbs (OED, "*How to Use the OED*/Glossary of Grammatical Terms", Proffitt, 2015), a distinction between these two subcategories will be made. This will be done in order to be able to make precise judgments about the verbs' argument realisation, particularly because differences in ditransitive verbs are expected to occur

Table 1: Basic Syntactic Constructions of Anglicisms Compared With Their English Equivalents (Absolute Frequencies)

Syntactic construction	Monotransitive	Intransitive	Labile	Reciprocal	Total
Sample 1_A	4	4	5	0	13
Sample 1_E	5	1	7	0	13
Sample 2_A	4	1	10	2	17
Sample 2_E	5	0	11	1	17
Samples 1_A & 2_A	9	5	14	2	30
Samples 1_E & 2_E	10	1	18	1	30

between the sample of anglicisms and their English equivalents.

4.2.2 Transitivity and Basic Syntactic Constructions

Starting with transitivity and the basic syntactic constructions found, it can be said that the majority of anglicisms, 40% to be precise, are used intransitively, followed by monotransitive constructions, which account for approximately one third (35%) of the entire number of sentences (750 in total) and ditransitive constructions, making up less than 2%. The remaining structures are reciprocals, found in around 5% of the sentences, and argument reflexives (0.5%). Among the category of passives, which amount to around one fifth of the total number of sentences (19%), the majority of verbs show intransitive use (derived from transitive structures in the active), constituting approximately 14% of the total number of sentences analysed. Impersonal constructions make up approximately 5%. See appendix (Tables A.1.1–A.1.2) for a detailed overview of the overall numbers.

As a matter of fact, the corresponding sample of English verbs shows somewhat different tendencies. To be precise, rather than preferring intransitive use, the latter are realised in monotransitive constructions in the majority of cases (45%), yet closely followed by intransitive constructions (32%). Ditransitives, reflexives and reciprocals only make up a small share of the total number of sentences (441), 2% to less than 1% each. Passive sentences containing one argument constitute about one fifth of the entire sample of English verbs (18%), impersonal passive constructions were not found at all.

In the next step, a closer look is taken at the individual verbs in the samples of anglicisms and their English equivalents with respect to transitivity and the alternations they participate in. Table 1 sums up the results, only presenting the absolute frequencies for simplicity. The relative frequencies can be found in the appendix (Table A.1.3). Note that for this calculation, derived intransitive passive uses were treated as the corresponding active variants of the respective verbs. That is, they were counted among the group of transitive constructions given that a passive can only be derived from a transitive structure in the active and that passivisation is not included in the transitivity alternations discussed in van Gelderen (2011) (see section 3.3).

Broadly speaking, most of the anglicisms investigated are shown to be labile (14 in total), while around one third (9 out of 30) are exclusively, or almost exclusively, found in transitive structures. 5 verbs are purely intransitive, and 2 verbs are predominantly reciprocal. As a matter of fact, in terms of quantity, the sample of English verbs exhibits similar tendencies, with 18 labile verbs, 10 exclusively transitive ones, 1 purely intransitive verb and 1 showing reciprocal constructions as a preferred realisation.

Considering the two subsamples of verbs separately, it can be seen that 5 of the 13 frequent anglicisms are labile (*babysitten, faken, gamen, kicken* and *mailen*), i.e. alternating between transitive and intransitive use. All of these participate in the unexpressed object alternation (Levin, 1993), where the direct or accusative object is optional, resulting in alternating pairs of transitive and intransitive use with the subject bearing the same semantic relation to the verb in both cases as explained in section 3.3. To give an example, *babysitten* is used transitively with an AGENT subject, ***Er***, and a THEME direct object, ***den Hund***, in (27) and intransitively with just an AGENT subject, ***ich***, in (28). Note that *mailen* also occurs in ditransitive constructions in addition to participating in the unexpressed object alternation as will be illustrated in the next section.

(27) ***Er*** *babysittete* ***den Hund*** *am Wochenende*

(NEW05/SEP.00079 NEWS, 01.09.2005, p. 140)[5]

(28) *Und in dem Rahmen werde* ***ich*** *auch babysitten.*

(L14/FEB.02499 Berliner Morgenpost, 17.02.2014, p. 20)

Apart from that, 4 verbs in subsample 1A are exclusively realised in transitive constructions: *adden, encodieren, implementieren* and *labeln.* Note that the latter is found in complex transitive constructions involving an object complement in the majority of cases. The remaining 4 verbs, *campen, dealen, gamen* and *jetten,* are purely intransitive.

The corresponding subsample of English verbs (sample 1_E) shows slightly different numbers although the basic tendencies are, in fact, quite similar to those just described. To be precise, 7 of the 13 English verbs in sample 1_E, *babysit, deal, fake, game, jet, kick* and *mail* are labile, hence constituting the majority of this subsample. 5 verbs are exclusively transitive (*add, encode, hype, implement* and *label*) and only one verb, *camp*, is shown to be purely intransitive. All of the labile verbs except for *jet* participate in the same transitivity alternation as the anglicisms described above, with AGENT occupying subject position in both the transitive and intransitive variants and the object being optional and hence left out in a number of instances. Note that *mail* can be used ditransitively as well just as its German counterpart. *Jet*, on the contrary, shows the causative-inchoative alternation mentioned in van Gelderen (2011). In other words, THEME occupies subject position in the anticausative variant as exemplified in (29) while the corresponding causative version entails an AGENT subject followed by THEME as direct object as sentence (30) serves to demonstrate. Its German counterpart, *jetten*, by contrast, exclusively shows the anticausative construction.

[5]In the following, the primary sources of the individual corpus hits will be given. Note that all these were accessed and exported via COSMAS II (Institut für Deutsche Sprache, 1991-2016).

(29) *... before **he** jetted off to Tokyo or the Bahamas ...*
(The *Radio Times*21 Oct. 1971, 71/3, *as cited in "jet" (ID 101169), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015)*

(30) ***Clarksons** jet **you** to top resorts like Alpbach ...*
(*Daily Telegraph* 28 Sept. 1968, 9/6 *(advt.), as cited in "jet" (ID 101169), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015*)

Taking a closer look at the individual verbs and their specific equivalents, it can be seen that there is, in fact, more variation than the overall numbers suggest at first sight. While two-thirds of the anglicisms in sample 1_A (9 in total) behave the same way as their English equivalents in terms of transitivity (*adden, babysitten, campen, encodieren, faken, implementieren, kicken, labeln* and *mailen*), around one third of the verbs under consideration, *dealen, gamen, jetten* and *hypen,* show deviations from the corresponding English verbs. The first three are intransitive in German and labile in English whereas the latter, in turn, is shown to be labile in German but exclusively transitive in English.

Sample 2 exhibits even more variation between English and German although, again, the overall numbers are fairly similar. Among the infrequent anglicisms of subsample 2A, 10 verbs (*callen, daten, shaken, boosten, cashen, dumpen, reviewen, shooten, chanten* and *punchen*) are labile. 4 verbs, *leaken, pasten, releasen* and *printen*, almost exclusively arise in monotransitive constructions, 1 verb, *gambeln,* is purely intransitive, and 2 verbs, *batteln* and *connecten,* predominantly occur in reciprocal constructions. The corresponding subsample of English verbs, sample 2_E, shows fairly similar numbers, containing a clear majority of 11 labile verbs (*battle, call, date, gamble, leak, paste, dump, print, review, shoot* and *chant*) and 5 exclusively transitive verbs (*release, shake, boost, cash* and *punch*). In addition, the verb *connect* predominantly turns up in reciprocal constructions but is also found in the *intransitive simple reciprocal alternation* described in Levin (1993), which "involves verbs found in two frames in a near-paraphrase relationship: 'NP l V ($_{pp}$ [P NP2]' and '[$_{NP}$ NP l and NP2] V "' (Levin, 1993, p. 63), both in German and in English.

Again, most of the labile verbs in this subsample of anglicisms as well as their English equivalents participate in the unexpressed object alternation, with the exception of German *boosten* and English *print* and *battle. Battle* occurs in reciprocal constructions in addition to its intransitive use, while *boosten* and *print* arise in the causative-inchoative alternation. To illustrate this, consider sentences (31) and (32). The former shows an anticausative construction with RESULT occupying subject position while the latter displays the corresponding causative variant, taking an AGENT subject and a RESULT object. Note that *print* is exclusively found in the progressive with this construction.

(31) *... **the first editions** were still printing.*
(Martin Russell, *Double Hit*, 1973, xviii. 132, as cited in "print" (ID 15148), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015)

(32) *What I didn't appreciate when **I** printed **all the files** ...*
(Peter Lovesey, *House Sitter*, 2004, ix. 126, as cited in "print" (ID 15148), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015)

Just as in the first subsample of verbs, however, quite a number of individual deviations between the anglicisms and their English equivalents can be found as well. Whereas *leaken, pasten* and *printen* are almost exclusively transitive, and *gambeln* only occurs in intransitive constructions in German, the corresponding English verbs are all labile. In turn, the verbs *shaken, boosten, cashen* and *punchen* are labile in German while their English equivalents exclusively occur in transitive structures. Besides, while the verb *batteln* is predominantly reciprocal in German, English *battle* is labile, alternating between intransitive, transitive as well as reciprocal use in the source language.

Summing up, the number of transitive verbs in the whole sample of anglicisms differs only marginally from the corresponding share in the sample of English verbs whereas no more than half of the anglicisms investigated are labile compared with two-thirds of the English verbs analysed. In turn, the sample of anglicisms contains a higher number of purely intransitive verbs and one more reciprocal verb. Moreover, taking a closer look at the individual verbs, considerable deviations in usage as to whether they are labile, purely transitive, intransitive or reciprocal can be found between the anglicisms and their English equivalents, which are even more substantial in sample 2 than in sample 1.

4.2.3 Syntactic Realisation

Having analysed the verbs' transitivity and the basic syntactic constructions encountered as well as the alternations they participate in, this section goes into detail about their concrete syntactic realisation, i.e. in terms of syntactic functions[6] and phrase types. Table 2 gives an overview of the most frequent structures.

Broadly speaking, it can be seen that the sample of anglicisms follows the same basic tendencies concerning their arguments' syntactic realisation as their English equivalents within the categories of intransitive, monotransitive and argument reflexive constructions in the active as well as in derived intransitive passive constructions. To be precise, both in the sample of anglicisms and their English equivalents, intransitive verbs take an [NP] subject; in addition, monotransitive verbs require an [NP] functioning as accusative or indirect object in the majority of cases; in argument reflexive verbs, the reflexive pronoun usually functions as accusative or direct object both in English and in German, and derived intransitive passive constructions only take an [NP] subject in most cases. Systematic differences between the two groups of verbs become apparent within the categories of ditransitive and reciprocal verbs as will be pointed out in more detail in the following.

To start with, in the sample of anglicisms, the majority of ditransitives (14 in total) are expressed in a double object construction with the frame NP [dat] + NP [acc] (8 times). This is illustrated in (33), with a dative object, ***mir***, in addition to the accusative-NP, *ein Foto ihrer*

[6]Note that in German, the concept of syntactic functions overlaps with that of morphological case marking. That is, as noted in section 3.3, German makes an overt morphological distinction between dative and accusative objects, which, as a rule, coincides with the distinction of direct and indirect objects in English (Hawkins, 1986). Although case will not be investigated in detail, for comparability, this morphological distinction will be made in the subsequent analysis given that the studies and generalisations used as a basic point of reference for the present paper are from German and hence refer to morphological case marking as well.

Table 2: Most frequent syntactic argument structures found (according to phrase types and syntactic functions)

Construction	Anglicisms	English Equivalents
Active		
Intransitive	[NP] subject	[NP] subject
Monotransitive	[NP] subject + [NP] acc. obj.	[NP] subject + [NP] DO
Ditransitive	[NP] subject + [NP] dat. obj. + [NP] acc. obj.	[NP] subject + [NP] DO + [prep_NP] prep. obj.
Reflexive	[NP] subject + [NP-refl.] acc. obj.	[NP] subject + [NP-refl.] DO
Reciprocal	[NP] subject + [NP-refl.] acc. obj.	[NP] subject + [NP-recipr.] DO
Passive		
Der. intransitive	[NP] subject	[NP] subject
Impersonal	NP-0	NA

Tasche. Alternatively, the accusative object may be expressed by a finite clause. As opposed to this, the prepositional frame merely turns up three times in the sample of anglicisms, twice in sample 1_A with *mailen* and once in sample 2_A with *cashen.* The prepositional phrase is in both cases headed by ***an*** (meaning *to*) as in (34).

(33) *Sie mailt* ***mir*** *ein Foto ihrer Tasche.*
(L17/DEZ.00961 Berliner Morgenpost, 10.12.2017, p. 3)

(34) *Ernst Plech … cashte als Makler 607.476 Euro* ***an das Justizministerium****.*
(T17/JAN.02592 die tageszeitung, 31.01.2017, p. 24)

Considering the two subsamples of verbs individually, it can be seen that sample 1_A contains 9 double object constructions with the frame NP [dat] + NP [acc] compared with only 2 prepositional constructions. By comparison, sample 2_A, which comprises no more than 3 ditransitive constructions in total, shows 2 instances of the double object construction, in *printen* and *reviewen*, and 1 prepositional object construction in *cashen* as demonstrated above.

The sample of English verbs, by contrast, gives a different picture, with the majority of ditransitives (7 out of 9) being expressed in the frame [NP] + [to_NP] whereas only 2 double object constructions can be found. To be precise, *mail* shows 4 instances of the prepositional frame compared with only 1 occurrence of the double object construction. *Leak*, which may also take three arguments, exclusively takes the prepositional frame whereas *cash* is both found in the double object construction and in the prepositional frame with PP headed by *for*.

As for the category of reflexive verbs, it should be mentioned that the only reflexively marked structures found in the sample of anglicisms are argument reflexives and reciprocals, constituting a total of 41 (5.47%) of the entire sample of verbs altogether. To be specific, 37 of these are reciprocals marked by a reflexive pronoun as exemplified in sentence (35). All

of these occur in the sample of infrequent verbs, with *batteln*, *connecten*, *daten* and *dumpen*, except for the verb *adden*. The remaining 4 reflexive structures found are argument reflexives, twice occurring with *hypen* (sample 1_A) and *shaken* (sample 2_A) respectively. This can be seen in (36) with the reflexive pronoun ***sich***.

(35) *Hier „batteln" **sich** die HipHop-KünstlerInnen …*

(T16/SEP.00100 die tageszeitung, 01.09.2016, p. 27)

(36) *Dazu shaken **sich** die dirndldekolletierten Madln gemeinsam mit Mutti und Oma vor der Bühne weg.*

(FLT16/DEZ.00020 Falter, 07.12.2016, p. 35).

As opposed to this, anticausative or middle constructions marked by a reflexive pronoun were not found at all. Nevertheless, the verbs *boosten, releasen, leaken* and *connecten* were found in structures resembling English anticausatives or middles, with the object of the corresponding transitive construction occupying subject position in the intransitive variant unaccompanied by a reflexive pronoun in object position. Taking a closer look at the sentences showing these structures, however, it becomes clear that except for the verb *boosten*, which could be counted among the causative-inchoative verbs with the THEME argument undergoing a change of state as in (37), neither the category of anticausatives nor that of middles seem fully applicable to the structures found in use with the remaining verbs.

(37) ***Der stärkste der drei Vierzylinder-Diesel** boostet auf Tastendruck kurzzeitig von 190 auf 200 PS …*

(FOC14/MAR.00584 FOCUS, 31.03.2014, pp. 96–97)

That is because "[t]he middle alternation is described as being restricted to verbs with affected objects" (Levin, 1993, p. 26) and in fact, none of the objects in *releasen, leaken* or *connecten* could be regarded as such. What is more, the middle alternation usually includes an adverbial element, which none of the sentences containing these verbs entail either. The causative-inchoative alternation does not seem applicable to these verbs either since group of causative-inchoative verbs "can roughly be characterized as verbs of change of state or change of position" (Levin, 1993, p. 30), which neither holds for *releasen* nor for *leaken* or *connecten*.

After all, "there has been some debate in the literature about whether there really is a middle alternation that is distinct from the causative/inchoative alternation or whether there is only a single alternation" as Levin (1993, p. 26) notes, hence making a definite distinction between these alternations fairly difficult in the first place. Despite all that, the similarities to English middles and anticausatives these verbs show in terms of the syntactic realisation as well as semantic roles of their arguments cannot be denied.

Considering the category of reflexive verbs in the sample of English equivalents, by comparison, only 6 of the 441 sentences are shown to contain reflexively marked constructions (1.36%), 4 of which are argument reflexives. As a matter of fact, these do not occur in any of the English equivalents of the German verbs just described except for *fake*, *jet* and *boost*.

Besides, 2 instances of reciprocals marked by a reflexive pronoun in combination with a prepositional phrase were found with the verb *connect* as exemplified in (38), thereby resembling the realisation of the corresponding anglicism as demonstrated in (39).

(38) *They saw their sovereign … connecting* ***himself*** *by the strongest ties* ***with the most faithless and merciless persecutor****.*
(T. B. Macaulay in *Critical and Historical Essays*, 1854, as cited in "connect" (ID 39326), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015)

(39) *… kann man* ***sich mit Freunden und Fitbit-Gruppen weltweit*** *connecten …*
(Z13/APR.00037 Die Zeit (Online-Ausgabe), 04.04.2013)

Apart from these general findings, the verbs show a number of individual deviations in their syntactic realisation between the source and the recipient languages, most of which concern prepositional phrases. The most striking findings will be described here.

To begin with, in its primary sense of *to sell drugs*, German *dealen* takes a prepositional phrase hosted by *mit* in the majority of cases. Prepositional constructions are found with English *deal* as well, though with a different preposition, *in,* in this particular sense. Interestingly, the literal translation of the German prepositional object [mit_NP] (i.e. [with_NP]) also exists in English, yet signalling an entirely different meaning in this case, namely *to concern oneself with sth.* (OED Online, "deal" (ID 47704), Proffitt, 2015). Besides, whereas German *dealen* cannot be used transitively at all, its English equivalent does occur in transitive constructions with THEME as direct object.

Furthermore, English *hype* predominantly occurs with a prepositional object hosted by *into* whereas German *hypen* is not found in combination with a prepositional phrase at all. This is accounted for by differences in meaning (see section 4.2.4 for a detailed account). The same holds true for English *add*, which also takes an additional [to_NP] expressing a GOAL argument as opposed to its German counterpart, which does not take a prepositional phrase, again caused by slight differences in meaning. While the English verb can be defined as *to join (something) to something else* (OED Online, "add" (ID 2155), Proffitt, 2015) in a literal sense, comparable to its German translation equivalent "hinzufügen" (Duden online, "hinzufuegen", Dudenredaktion, n.d.), which also takes a GOAL argument expressed as a PP headed by *zu* (meaning *to*), the anglicism *adden* exclusively occurs in the context of social media, hence expressing a more metaphorical sense and not taking a PP.

Similarly, in addition to the transitive and one-argument intransitive variants, English *date* occurs with a PP a number of times whereas *daten* in German does not. The English verb participates in the *with preposition drop alternation* described in Levin (1993). That is, it alternates between an intransitive form that involves a PP headed by the preposition ***with*** as in (40) and a transitive paraphrase of the former characterised by a lack of the preposition (41), hence receiving reciprocal interpretation, which is found in German as well, yet being expressed differently in the syntax, by an overt reflexive item.

(40) *I see you are not dating* ***with Ruth*** *any more.*
(Railroad Telegrapher, Jan. 1922, 34/1, as cited in "date" (ID 39326), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015)

(41) *Are we dating?*

(D. Ollivier Entre Nous 89, 2003, as cited in "date" (ID 39326), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015)

4.2.4 Semantic Roles

In the following, a closer look will be taken at the level of semantics, starting with a general, quantitative overview of the patterns of semantic roles found while going into detail about individual differences in the second part of this section, thereby shedding light on idiosyncratic properties of the individual verbs.

Generally speaking, both the anglicisms investigated and their English equivalents show a clear preference of the AGENT role, which makes up around 44% of the total number of roles occurring in both the sample of anglicisms and that of English verbs, closely followed by THEME, accounting for 34% of all the roles the anglicisms take and almost 37% in the sample of English verbs. See appendix Tables A.3.1–A.3.2 for the remaining roles.

Considering the patterns of semantic roles, it can be seen that 90% of the anglicisms taking one argument in the active require an AGENT, followed by THEME in 5% of the cases and RECIPIENT, INSTRUMENT and STIMULUS making up the remaining 5%. This clear dominance of the AGENT role is found in the sample of English verbs as well, where it even accounts for 95%, whereas the remaining one-argument roles occurring with the anglicisms cannot be found. In fact, the only role that can occupy subject position without an additional argument other than AGENT in the sample of English verbs is RESULT (5%).

As for the verbs taking two arguments, the anglicisms show AGENT + THEME in 63% of the cases, followed by EXPERIENCER + STIMULUS (6%) and AGENT + COUNTER-AGENT (5%). The English verbs examined display an even more pronounced preference of the combination AGENT + THEME, arising in 78% of all active sentences containing two arguments, while AGENT + GOAL and AGENT + RESULT are the second and third most frequent structures (6% and 3%).

Even stronger deviations can be found in verbs taking three arguments. While AGENT + RECIPIENT + THEME (29%), AGENT + THEME + LOCATION/GOAL (each accounting for 18%) are by far the most frequent combinations found in the sample of anglicisms, in the sample of English verbs, the first two arguments are always AGENT + THEME with an additional GOAL/PATH/INSTRUMENT, ranging from 14% to 35%, in the most frequent combinations.

Within the category of passives, the two samples show the same preferences in verbs taking one argument, with THEME being the most frequent role occurring in more than 70% of the cases, followed by RESULT (7%). The anglicisms and their English equivalents also display similar tendencies in the verbs taking two arguments, where the combinations THEME + INSTRUMENT, THEME + RESULT and THEME + LOCATION are among the most frequent ones with only slightly deviating numbers. Appendix Tables A.3.3–A.3.4 give a detailed overview of the individual patterns.

In the next step, the individual verbs and the semantic roles they take shall be considered. As a matter of fact, the majority of anglicisms in both subsamples, *adden, babysitten, campen,*

dealen, encodieren, faken, gamen, jetten, labeln and *mailen* in sample 1_A, and *batteln, boosten, chanten, connecten, daten, dumpen, gambeln, leaken, pasten, printen, punchen, releasen, reviewen* as well as *shaken* in sample 2_A, do not show significant deviations from their English equivalents in meaning and hence in the semantic roles they select. The remaining verbs, by contrast, exhibit striking discrepancies as will be outlined in the following paragraph. Appendix A.4 presents an overview of the verbs' definitions.

For instance, the anglicism *implementieren* shows two options concerning the combination of semantic roles it selects. It may either take AGENT + THEME or AGENT + RESULT depending on whether it serves to express an event in which an existing entity is inserted into a system or programme or, alternatively, that the entity under consideration is carried into effect or established by the action denoted by the verb in the first place. In English, on the contrary, only the latter sense and combination of semantic roles can be found. A similar phenomenon occurs with the verb *cashen*, which is also split into two patterns in German depending on the meaning it serves to express in a given context. In the sense of *to generate or receive* money, *cashen* takes a RECIPIENT subject and a THEME as accusative object whereas in the sense of to *transfer or pay* money, it selects an AGENT subject, THEME as accusative object and RECIPIENT as prepositional or dative object in addition. Again, in English, only the latter option can be found (OED Online, "cash" (ID 28429), Proffitt, 2015), which clearly suggests that some verbs develop additional meanings and, along with that, alternative argument structure patterns in the recipient language.

Another remarkable shift in meaning resulting in an alternation of semantic roles which, in fact, cannot be found in any common lists of verb alternations (Levin, 1993) – at least none which is applicable to the event at hand – occurs in the verb *shooten*. In the majority of cases, *shooten* takes an AGENT as subject and a THEME as accusative object with the definition *to take a picture of somebody*. Still, a number of instances (5 in total) where the verb is used intransitively can be observed as well, as exemplified by sentence (42). Considering the sense of *shooten* in this sentence, *to do a photoshoot/ to* ***be*** *photographed*, it becomes clear that the verb does not fall into the category of verbs participating in the causative-inchoative alternation. It rather makes sense to consider the subject, ***ich***, as AGENT since the definition already entails a change in perspective, thereby preventing the shift in roles occurring in passive, anticausative or middle constructions, where the subject assumes the role of the object in the corresponding transitive variant.

(42) *… **ich** hab' auf dem Hollywood Boulevard in Unterwäsche geshootet.*
(RHZ17/MAI.20093 Rhein-Zeitung, 20.05.2017, p. 36)

Finally, the verb *hypen* in German exhibits striking deviations in semantic roles from its English equivalent, *to hype*, as well. These are again accounted for by fundamental deviations in meaning. Whereas the English verb can be defined as *to cheat or deceive* according to the OED (OED Online, "hype" (ID 90267), Proffitt, 2015), thus taking an AGENT subject, a THEME object and an optional prepositional GOAL argument in addition, its German counterpart is treated as a *psych verb* in the sense of *to idolise or praise sb. excessively,* consequently taking an EXPERIENCER subject and a STIMULUS object instead.

Apart from that, verbs which show deviations in meaning between English and German but not in the semantic roles they select could be found. An example of such verbs is *kicken*, which is used in the sense of *to play football* in German in the majority of cases compared with *to strike out with the foot* in English (OED Online, "kick" (ID 103264), Proffitt, 2015). Still, both *kicken* and *kick* link the semantic role AGENT to the subject. The same holds true for *callen,* which almost exclusively occurs in senses relating to the game of poker in German but shows the same combination of semantic roles as its English equivalent in its primary sense, *to utter loudly* (OED Online, "call" (ID 26411), Proffitt, 2015).

4.2.5 Argument Linking

Finally, the question how the individual semantic roles are mapped onto the specific syntactic functions shall be addressed. For brevity, this section focusses on the basic syntactic functions of subject, direct and indirect objects – or accusative and dative objects in the case of German – as well as prepositional objects in the active as shown in table 3. For the remaining ones, see appendix A.6.

To start with, the syntactic function of subject was shown to be considerably more diverse in German than in English. In other words, the German subjects analysed exhibit a higher number of distinct roles which can be mapped onto it in addition to AGENT, 5 in total (THEME, INSTRUMENT, EXPERIENCER, RECIPIENT and STIMULUS), compared with 3 in the sample of English verbs (INSTRUMENT, RESULT and THEME). To give an example, the verb *encodieren* primarily maps INSTRUMENT onto the subject in German as demonstrated in (43), where ***Unsere Plattform*** functions as the subject, whereas its English equivalent exclusively permits AGENT subjects such as ***The lecturer*** in (44).

(43) ***Unsere Plattform*** *encodiert und spielt das digitale Signal aus …*
(VDI06/SEP.00698 VDI Nachrichten, 29.09.2006, p. 12)

(44) ***The lecturer*** *… encodes [his] information in appropriate speech signals.*
(B. C. Brookes in Quirk & Smith *Teaching of English,* 1959 v. 155, as cited in "encode" (ID 39326), OED Online, Proffitt, 2015)

This tendency is also reflected in the relative frequencies: AGENT is mapped onto subject in 80% of the German sentences compared with 95% of the English sentences.

Considering the two subsamples of anglicisms independently, it can be seen that the share of the canonical subject role, AGENT, is lower in the sample of frequent verbs than in that of infrequent verbs. To be precise, AGENT accounts for (79%) in sample 1_A while EXPERIENCER and THEME each amount to 8% and 9%. In sample 2_A, AGENT is mapped onto 88% of all subjects, and INSTRUMENT and RECIPIENT are the second most frequent roles, each making up a percentage of 4% and 5%. Moreover, one more non-AGENT role is mapped onto subject in sample 1_A than in $2_{A,}$ hence making the former more diverse than the latter.

As a matter of fact, the results within the category of accusative or direct objects give a different picture. While only 4 roles, THEME, STIMULUS, RESULT and COUNTER-AGENT can be mapped onto accusative objects in German, English direct objects are found realising

two more roles, RECIPIENT and GOAL, in addition. The latter were only found as dative or prepositional objects in use with the anglicisms investigated. Nevertheless, the share of the canonical object role, THEME, is lower in the sample of anglicisms (84%) than in the sample of English verbs, where it amounts to 93%. That is, although the anglicisms take a smaller range of distinct roles as accusative object than their English equivalents, the individual non-THEME roles found occur more frequently relative to the total number of accusative objects, each making up 4% to 7%, than the corresponding roles in English direct objects, ranging from 0.5% to 5%. Hence, it can be said that the function of direct object in English is more diverse in realising a higher number of distinct semantic roles than the German accusative objects found but not in terms of the frequencies the individual non-THEME roles constitute relative to the total number of objects analysed. As for the individual subsamples of anglicisms, an equal number of distinct roles can be found (3 each) and relative frequency of the canonical object role, THEME, does not differ considerably between the two subsamples, thus making none of them more diverse than the other.

With respect to prepositional objects, the samples of anglicisms and English verbs exhibit the exact same semantic roles: THEME, COUNTER-AGENT, GOAL, RECIPIENT and BENEFICIARY. Concerning these roles' frequencies, significant deviations between the distinct samples and subsamples of anglicisms and English verbs can be seen, with the individual roles ranging from less than 1% to over 60%. These frequencies do, however, not seem to form a particular pattern. They rather appear to be the result of idiosyncratic properties of the verbs and hence of the composition of the individual samples under investigation.

Considering the syntactic functions of dative or indirect objects respectively, the numbers at first sight suggest that there is no difference between the sample of anglicisms and their English equivalents whatsoever given that they are again found to express the same semantic roles, RECIPIENT and BENEFICIARY. Taking a closer look at all objects analysed and the individual roles mapped onto them though, it can be seen that RECIPIENT, which is exclusively assigned to dative or prepositional objects in German, can in fact also be mapped onto direct objects in English. A similar situation can be observed with GOAL, which is only found in prepositional objects in German but in direct objects in English as well.

5 Discussion

Having presented the results of the corpus study of anglicisms in German and their comparison with the results of their English equivalents, the research question and hypothesis of the present paper will be readdressed in the light of the findings in this section. Moreover, some additional findings already touched on in the analysis which go beyond the initial expectations but seem worthwhile to go into will be discussed.

As outlined in section 3.3, the first part of the research hypothesis was that anglicisms predominantly follow German native tendencies, thereby displaying deviations from their English equivalents. However, based on Holler and Scherer's (2010) findings, it was expected that the anglicisms are not fully integrated into German with respect to their argument structure, still showing a number of structures that are characteristic of English but rather uncommon in

Table 3: Argument Linking of Anglicisms and English Verbs (Relative Frequencies)

Sample		**Anglicisms**			**English Verbs**		
Subsample		1_A	2_A	1_A & 2_A	1_E	2_E	1_E & 2_E
Syntactic realisation	Semantic role						
[NP] subject		**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
	AGENT	78.60%	87.71%	83.86%	95.93%	94.51%	95.00%
	THEME	9.34%	3.14%	5.77%	3.26%	0.00%	1.11%
	INSTRUMENT	3.50%	4.86%	4.28%	0.81%	3.38%	2.50%
	EXPERIENCER	7.78%	0.00%	3.29%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	RECIPIENT	0.00%	4.29%	2.47%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	STIMULUS	0.78%	0.00%	0.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	RESULT	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.11%	1.39%
[NP]/[CL]/		**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
[class-CL]/	THEME	80.17%	86.70%	84.21%	90.67%	94.33%	93.06%
[NP-refl./	STIMULUS	17.24%	0.00%	6.58%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
recipr.] /	RESULT	2.59%	6.38%	4.93%	8.00%	2.84%	4.63%
[with_NP]-	COUNTER-AGENT	0.00%	6.91%	4.28%	0.00%	2.13%	1.39%
recipr.							
acc. obj./	RECIPIENT	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.33%	0.00%	0.46%
DO	GOAL	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.71%	0.46%
[NP]		**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
dat. obj./	RECIPIENT	100%	0.00%	85.71%	100%	0.00%	50.00%
IO	BENEFICIARY	0.00%	100%	14.29%	0.00%	100%	50.00%
[prep_NP]		**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
prep. obj.	THEME	80.00%	41.38%	54.55%	6.67%	62.22%	48.33%
	COUNTER-AGENT	6.67%	27.58%	20.45%	0.00%	8.89%	6.67%
	GOAL	0.00%	24.14%	15.91%	60%	26.67%	35.00%
	RECIPIENT	13.33%	3.45%	6.82%	26.67%	0.00%	6.67%
	BENEFICIARY	0.00%	3.45%	2.27%	6.67%	2.22%	3.33%

German, especially among the group of ditransitive verbs. Secondly, it was hypothesised that frequent verbs exhibit a higher degree of integration into the recipient language than those only used occasionally.

Generally speaking, it can be said that the first part of the hypothesis was largely confirmed although some of the initial predictions concerning the verbs' behaviour at the individual levels of argument structure were proved to be incorrect. As opposed to this, the second part of the hypothesis was largely disproved. The interpretations leading to these conclusions will be explained in detail in the following.

Starting with transitivity, it was demonstrated that the sample of anglicisms on the whole shows fairly similar tendencies as that of their English equivalents. In fact, the majority of verbs in both samples were shown to be labile, alternating between transitive and intransitive use on a regular basis. Nevertheless, deviations in frequency concerning the number of labile verbs confirming the above hypothesis could be detected. It was indeed evidenced that the sample of anglicisms, in line with what has been predicted on the basis of van Gelderen's (2011) meta-analysis of cross-linguistic differences in transitivity, contains fewer labile verbs than the sample of their English equivalents. This confirms the research hypothesis that anglicisms in German exhibit deviations from English verbs – even if these are relatively small – having adapted to native tendencies of the recipient language in reducing the number of alternations between transitive and intransitive use.

Furthermore, just as expected, the subsample of infrequent anglicisms taken as a whole contains a substantially higher percentage of labile verbs than the subsample of frequent anglicisms investigated. In terms of overall frequencies, this supports the second part of the initial hypothesis that verbs used frequently in everyday speech follow the native tendencies of the recipient language more closely than those only used occasionally.

Besides these general tendencies regarding transitivity, the individual pairs of verbs showed considerable deviations in usage between the source and the recipient languages, again suggesting that the anglicisms have adopted German native tendencies rather than having taken along their argument structure from the source language. However, contrary to what has been predicted and what the abovementioned overall tendencies suggest, differences between individual pairs of verbs are, in fact, more substantial between the sample of infrequent anglicisms and their English equivalents than between the sample of frequent anglicisms and their English counterparts. As has been shown, almost half of the verbs exhibit differences between source and recipient language as to whether they are labile, purely transitive, intransitive or reciprocal. Only one third of the verbs in sample 1_A deviate from their English equivalents, by contrast. This clearly contradicts the hypothesis that verbs used frequently are more integrated into the system of the recipient language and thus exhibit stronger deviations from the corresponding items in the source language than those only used occasionally.

What is more, most of the sentences in the sample of English verbs taken as a whole were shown to contain monotransitive constructions while the majority of anglicisms turn up in intransitive constructions. This implies that some shift in preference regarding the number of arguments the verbs take must have taken place, leading to a reduction in valency in the recipient language. As far as this finding is concerned, two competing explanations seem pos-

sible. Either, one could argue that this shift can be accounted for by the speakers' lack of knowledge of the corresponding verbs' argument structure in the source language, possibly resulting in a reduction of the number of arguments a particular verb occurs with in order to facilitate the mapping process. Alternatively, one could argue that this shift preference regarding transitivity is accounted for by typological differences between English and German. As van Gelderen (2011) points out in her analysis of cross-linguistic differences concerning valency, languages are presumed to differ in what she calls *basic valency orientation*, which "shows itself in being morphologically less complex than the non-basic one" (van Gelderen, 2011, p. 106). As Plank and Lahiri (2009) claim[7], the basic valency of German(ic) is intransitive, i.e. the majority of verbs show intransitive constructions as their basic, unmarked realisation, and the corresponding transitive variants can be regarded as being derived from the former rather than the other way around. For English, on the other hand, which originally started out the same way as its Germanic neighbours, it is not possible to determine a basic valency orientation anymore. That is because English has developed a growing number of transitive structures over the centuries caused by an increase in labile verbs (van Gelderen, 2011). Provided that the anglicisms in German follow the native tendencies of the recipient language, this would explain their preference for intransitive structures compared with a higher number of monotransitive structures in their English equivalents. Note that these interpretations are only possible explanations for the shift in valency in the source language. In order to verify or falsify either of these, further research needs to be carried out.

Considering the level of syntactic realisation, the anglicisms under investigation were shown to follow German native tendencies in most respects while still retaining some structures that are characteristic of English, hence confirming the research hypothesis that the verbs are only partially integrated into the recipient language.

To be precise, the anglicisms investigated show the double object construction, i.e. dative-NP + accusative-NP as a preferred realisation rather than the prepositional frame [NP] + [to_NP], thereby differing from their English equivalents. This suggests that the anglicisms predominantly follow German native tendencies and are thus largely integrated into the native system regarding the syntactic realisation of their arguments. However, the prepositional object construction was found in the anglicisms in a few instances as well, thereby confirming the initial hypothesis that the verbs are only partially integrated into German with respect to their argument structure, hence still occurring in structures characteristic of the source language.

Instead of interpreting these structures as remnants of the grammatical system of the source language, however, one could argue that the occurrence of the prepositional frame has nothing to do with the influence of English whatsoever given that German ditransitive verbs, in fact, also arise in the prepositional frame as Primus (1999) has proved. Yet another possible explanation for the occurrence of the prepositional frame lies in a tendency generally observed in

[7]Note that the question of basic valency is a highly controversial topic. Other authors such as Haspelmath (1993), Abraham (1997), Nichols et al. (2004) and Comrie (2006) hold a different view concerning the basic valency of German(ic). Clearly, however, a discussion of this would expand the scope of this paper, which is why the above shall suffice at this point.

language contact situations attested by Korhonen (2006), according to which morphologically marked case constructions such as the dative are often substituted by prepositional constructions. In line with the initial hypothesis as well as Holler's (2015) conclusion concerning the occurrence of the prepositional frame in her investigation, however, it appears most plausible to attribute the prepositional construction to the influence of the source language. Clearly, however, further research is needed in order to confirm such a claim.

Regardless of how one interprets the above, the second part of the research hypothesis, predicting a difference in the degree of integration between frequent and infrequent verbs, was disproved entirely with respect to the realisation of ditransitive constructions given that a preference for the German double object construction containing a dative-NP followed by an accusative-NP was attested in both subsamples of anglicisms.

As for the category of reflexive verbs, considerable discrepancies from what has been expected were shown as well. Even though the anglicisms indeed exhibit a substantially higher number of reflexive and reciprocal uses than their English equivalents in total, they do not display a broader range of distinct reflexively marked constructions. In fact, both the anglicisms and the English verbs were found in argument reflexive and reciprocal constructions marked by a reflexive pronoun whereas, contrary to what has been predicted, anticausative or middle constructions are not marked reflexively in the sample of anglicisms at all. Instead, structures resembling English middles or anticausatives were found. However, given that these constructions do not occur in the corresponding English equivalents, a contact-induced explanation seems highly unlikely. Considering the scope of this study, it is not possible to provide a valid explanation for this rather unexpected finding at this point. In order to further investigate this result and find potential explanations, a larger data set would have to be examined, accompanied by an in-depth analysis of the individual constructions in both the source and the recipient languages.

On the level of semantics, it has been shown that the majority of anglicisms analysed in both the samples of frequent and infrequent verbs do not display significant deviations in meaning and hence, in the semantic roles they select, between English and German.

Furthermore, the anglicisms were shown to exhibit the same basic preference for the AGENT role and the combination AGENT + THEME in verbs taking more than one argument as their English equivalents. The deviations found in the additional roles are rather insignificant but should still be addressed at this point since they differ from Holler and Scherer's (2010) findings. Although similar to what they found out, differences in the semantic roles of verbs taking three arguments were found in the present analysis as well, these occurred in different syntactic categories than in Holler and Scherer's investigation. Contrary to their results (see section 3.2), both the anglicisms and their English equivalents were shown to prefer a locative PP as a third argument. However, the three-argument anglicisms show the combination AGENT + RECIPIENT + THEME as a preferred combination in the present analysis whereas in the sample of English verbs, the first two arguments are always AGENT + THEME, which clearly contradicts Holler and Scherer's findings that RECIPIENT is underrepresented in German.

Going one step further and taking a look at the way the semantic and syntactic levels are interlinked, two remarkable though entirely contrary findings were made. As opposed to what

has been predicted, the anglicisms investigated display a broader range of semantic roles in subject position as well as a higher percentage of non-AGENT roles such as EXPERIENCER, RECIPIENT and INSTRUMENT relative to the whole number of subjects found than their English equivalents. As a matter of fact, this stands in stark contrast to the initial hypothesis that English verbs license a broader range of semantic subjects than German verbs as proposed by Hawkins (1986) and Rohdenburg (1974).

The findings concerning objects, in turn, present a different picture. Even though the individual non-THEME roles found in use with the anglicisms occur more frequently relative to the total number of accusative objects than the corresponding roles in English direct objects, it was indeed shown that the anglicisms examined permit a lower range of distinct semantic roles as accusative object than their English equivalents allow as direct object. Moreover, a clear division of semantic roles into the distinct groups of syntactic functions was observed in the sample of anglicisms, with accusative objects expressing THEME in the majority of cases while RECIPIENT and BENEFICIARY are exclusively mapped onto dative and prepositional objects. As a result of case syncretism, the English verbs, on the contrary, were shown to collapse these roles into a common syntactic function, direct object just as expected. Thus, in line with what has been hypothesised based on the regularities concerning argument linking postulated by Hawkins (1986), English direct objects were evidenced to be more diverse than the anglicisms' accusative objects in permitting roles which can only be mapped onto dative or prepositional objects in German and featuring a higher percentage of non-THEME direct objects than the anglicisms.

With that said, the initial predictions concerning the category of argument linking can be regarded as largely confirmed in the case of objects but not in the case of subjects. The findings concerning subjects clearly contradict the general language-specific tendencies introduced in section 3.3. One possible explanation for this rather unexpected finding is that the results are due to idiosyncratic properties of the individual verbs and thus the composition of the samples of verbs under investigation rather than being caused by language-specific differences. In other words, the result might be interpreted as an effect of cross-categorial differences with respect to semantic classes. To give an example, the anglicism *hypen* was considered to be a psych verb, exclusively licensing EXPERIENCER subjects, whereas its English equivalent, *to hype,* does not fall into this category, therefore taking the canonical subject role, AGENT. What is more, as a comparison of the distinct subsamples of anglicisms has shown, frequency of usage in German does not seem to have a systematic effect on the mapping of semantic roles onto the specific syntactic functions since the findings concerning subjects and objects are somewhat divergent, hence contradicting the second part of the research hypothesis with regard to argument linking.

In addition to everything that has been said so far, quite a number of individual differences both on the levels of syntax and semantics could be found between the anglicisms and their English equivalents. On the syntactic level, these primarily concern prepositional phrasesand the majority of differences regarding these were attested in the subsample of frequent verbs, thus confirming the second part of the research hypothesis that verbs used frequently in German show more deviations from their English equivalents than those only used occasionally.

This does not hold true for the semantic level, by contrast, where the number of deviations is evenly distributed across the two subsamples of anglicisms.

Another finding which should be emphasised is the fact that the sample of anglicisms entails a considerable number of impersonal passive constructions whereas, in fact, not a single such construction was found with their English equivalents. Although the theoretical framework introduced does not refer to this phenomenon, one could argue that using impersonal constructions again is a specific strategy employed by speakers of German who are not aware of the exact usage of the corresponding items in the source language, hence unintentionally reducing the number of arguments of the respective verbs and thereby facilitating the process of argument linking. Clearly, though, further research will be necessary in order to verify this claim.

6 Conclusion and Outlook

This paper investigated the argument structure of verbal anglicisms in German compared with that of their English equivalents. It aimed at answering the question whether they behave the same way as their respective equivalents in the source language in terms of argument structure patterns, or whether considerable deviations between these two groups of verbs can be found which are due to cross-linguistic differences between the source and the recipient languages. The latter would imply that the anglicisms have adopted German native tendencies. Furthermore, the present study investigated whether there are differences in integration into the recipient language between anglicisms which occur frequently in everyday speech and those not used as frequently.

After outlining the individual components and levels of argument structure in section 2, a short introduction to anglicisms in German was given (section 3.1), followed by previous research regarding the argument structure of non-native verbs in German as well as cross-linguistic differences between English and German concerning this matter (sections 3.2 - 3.3), based on which the hypothesis of this paper was generated.

The hypothesis was that anglicisms predominantly follow German native tendencies and thus show deviations from their English equivalents where the two systems differ. All these differences were expected to be more significant between the sample of anglicisms used frequently in German and their English equivalents than between those used rather infrequently in everyday speech and their respective equivalents given that the former were presumed to be more integrated into the recipient language and hence to follow native tendencies more closely than the latter. However, based on Holler and Scherer's (2010) findings, it was predicted that the anglicisms are partially rather than fully integrated into German with respect to their argument structure, thus still retaining a number of structures from English.

In the following step, the methodological tools and resources the present study in based on were presented, including a description of the general procedure and the samples of verbs under investigation (section 4 - 4.1.2). Subsequently, the findings of the corpus-study of anglicisms as well as the results of the investigation of their equivalents in the source language based on the OED were presented (4.2).

As discussed in section 5, the majority of findings suggest that the anglicisms indeed follow German native tendencies in most respects such as transitivity, the preferred syntactic realisation of ditransitive verbs and the semantic diversity of objects, thereby deviating from their English equivalents, while still occurring in a number of structures found in English that are not in line with the general tendencies of German. This especially concerns the syntactic realisation of reflexive verbs and the prepositional frame in ditransitives – provided that one interprets the latter as a remnant of the source language. Hence, the overall hypothesis was largely confirmed. Nevertheless, some of the initial predictions concerning the verbs' behaviour on the individual levels of argument structure were proved to be incorrect, particularly with regard to the semantic diversity of subjects. The second part of the research hypothesis, predicting that verbs used frequently in German show more deviations from their English equivalents, thus being more integrated into the system of the recipient language than those only used occasionally, was largely disproved. Except for some individual deviations on the level of syntax, no systematic differences between frequent and infrequent verbs were found.

These somewhat divergent results suggest that further research needs to be carried out in order to attain more representative results. At this point, it should not go unmentioned that the present study was subject to certain methodological limitations, especially with regard to comparability between the two data sets under investigation. That is, given that the occurrence of anglicisms in German is a comparatively recent linguistic phenomenon, the query results from COSMAS II which served as a data base for the sample of anglicisms investigated do not date back further than 30 years whereas the respective OED quotations used for the analysis of English verbs cover a wide range of time spans. Furthermore, the number of hits examined in COSMAS II deviates from the total number of English sentences investigated given that the OED provides a varying number of quotations for each entry, ranging from one to more than 20. Therefore, the results must be treated with caution, and it cannot be denied that a corpus study of the anglicisms' English equivalents with comparable data in terms of size and actuality would attain more representative results.

Despite their limitations, the findings of the present study can be used as a starting point for future research in the domain of argument structure in the language contact scenario of English and German. This especially applies to the level of syntactic realisation, where some unresolved questions among the categories of anticausative or middle-like constructions and ditransitive structures as well as impersonal passives occurred. It goes without saying that comparing the anglicisms with their respective native equivalents in German would shed further light on the question of integration and adaptation to the recipient language. Bearing this in mind, it seems fruitful to revisit the topic in a large-scale investigation in order to shed further light on the still insufficiently researched behaviour of non-native verbal elements and their grammatical properties in German.

Bibliography

Abraham, W. (1997). Kausativierung und Dekausativierung: Zu Fragen der verbparadigmatischen Markierung in der Germania. In T. Birkmann, H. Klingenberg, D. Nübling & E. Ronneberger-Sibold (Eds.), *Vergleichende germanische Philologie und Skandinavistik: Festschrift für Otmar Werner* (pp. 13–28). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ackema, P. (2015). Arguments and Adjuncts. In T. Kiss, & A. Alexiadou (Eds.), *Syntax – Theory and Analysis: An International Handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 246–273). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110377408.246

Alexiadou, A. & Schäfer, F. (2006). Instrument Subjects Are Agents or Causers. In D. Baumer, D. Montero & M. Scanlon (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (pp. 40–48). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Berman, J. & Pittner, K. (2013). *Deutsche Syntax. Ein Arbeitsbuch* (5 ed.). Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag.

Borer, H. (2005). *Structuring Sense: In Name Only.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burmasova, S. (2010). Empirische Untersuchung der Anglizismen im Deutschen am Material der Zeitung Die WELT (Jahrgänge 1994 und 2004). Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, Bamberg.

Bussmann, H., Trauth, G., Kazzazi, K. (1996). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics.* London: Routledge.

Carstensen, B. (1967). *Amerikanismen in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Entlehnungsvorgänge und ihre stilistischen Aspekte.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Carstensen, B. & Busse, U. (1993). *Anglizismen-Wörterbuch: Der Einfluß des Englischen auf den deutschen Wortschatz nach 1945* (Vol.1). Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110888133

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Comrie, B. (1993). Argument Structure. In J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, T. Vennemann (Eds.), *Syntax: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung/An International Handbook of Contemporary Research* (Vol. 1, pp. 905–914). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Comrie, B. (2006). Transitivity Pairs, Markedness, and Diachronic Stability. *Linguistics, 44*(2), 303–318. https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2006.011

Dowty, D.R. (1991). Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language*, *67*(3), 547–619. https://doi.org/10.2307/415037

Dudenredaktion. (2015). *Duden. Das große Fremdwörterbuch.* (11 ed.). Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Dudenredaktion. (2016). *Duden. Deutsches Universalwörterbuch.* (8 ed.). Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Dudenredaktion. (n.d.). Duden online. Retrieved 18.10.2018, from https://www.duden.de

Eisenberg, P. (2001). Die grammatische Integration von Fremdwörtern. Was fängt das Deutsche mit seinen Latinismen und Anglizismen an? In G. Stickel (Ed.), *Neues und Fremdes im deutschen Wortschatz. Aktueller lexikalischer Wandel* (pp. 183–209). Berlin: Jahrbuch 2000 des IDS.

Eisenberg, P. (2018). *Das Fremdwort im Deutschen* (3 ed.). Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110474619

Engels, B. (1976). *Gebrauchsanstieg der lexikalischen und semantischen Amerikanismen in zwei Jahrgängen der WELT (1954 und 1964): eine vergleichende computerlinguistische Studie zur quantitativen Entwicklung amerikanischen Einflusses auf die deutsche Zeitungssprache.* Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.

Fillmore, C. J. (1968). The Case for Case. In E. Bach, & R. T. Harms (Eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory* (pp. 1–88). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fink, H. (1970). *Amerikanismen im Wortschatz der deutschen Tagespresse dargestellt am Beispiel dreier überregionaler Zeitungen (Süddeutsche Zeitung, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Die Welt).* München: Hueber.

Foley, R. & Van Valin, W. (1984). *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gelderen, E. van (2011). Valency Changes in the History of English. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, *1*(1), 106–143. https://doi.org/10.1075/jhl.1.1.05van

Gelderen, E. van (2018). *The Diachrony of Verb Meaning. Aspect and Argument Structure.* New York: Routledge.

Görlach, M. (2002). *English in Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenbaum, R., Quirk, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument Structure.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gruber, J. (1965). *Studies in Lexical Relations.* Ph.D dissertation, MIT.

Haegemann, L. (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory* (2 ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Haspelmath, M. (1993). More on the Typology of the Inchoative/Causative Verb Alternations. In B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (Eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity* (pp. 87–120). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.23.05has

Hawkins, J. A. (1986). *A Comparative Typology of English and German.* London: Croom Helm.

Herbst, T., Heath, D., Götz, D., Klotz, M., & Roe, I. F. (2004). *A Valency Dictionary of English. A Corpus-Based Analysis of the Complementation Patterns of English Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110892581

Hilgendorf, S. (2005). "Brain Gain statt [instead of] Brain Drain": the role of English in German education. *World Englishes*, *24*(1), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0883-2919.2005.00387.x

Hilgendorf, S. (2007). English in Germany: contact, spread and attitudes. *World Englishes, 26*(2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2007.00498.x

Hoberg, U. (2016). *Duden Deutsche Grammatik* (5 ed.). Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Holler, A. (2015). Grammatik und Integration. Wie fremd ist die Argumentstruktur nichtnativer Verben? In S. Engelberg, M. Meliss, K. Proost & E. Winkler. (Eds.), *Argumentstruktur zwischen Valenz und Konstruktion* (pp. 397–416). Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Holler, A. & Scherer, C. (2010). Zur Argumentstruktur entlehnter Verben. In Scherer, C. & Holler, A. (Eds.), *Strategien der Integration und Isolation nicht-nativer Einheiten und Struk-*

turen (pp. 183–198). Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110234329.183

Hopper, P. & Thompson, S. (1980). Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language 56*(2), 251–299. https://doi.org/10.2307/413757

Institut für Deutsche Sprache (1991-2016). COSMAS I/II (*Corpus Search, Management and Analysis System*). Retrieved 20.12.2018, from http://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2/web-app/

Institut für Deutsche Sprache (2018). COSMAS II (*Corpus Search, Management and Analysis System*/Projekt. Retrieved 20.12.2018, from http://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2/projekt/

Institut für Deutsche Sprache (2018). COSMAS II/Uebersicht. Retrieved 07.01.2019, from https://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2/uebersicht.html

Institut für Deutsche Sprache (2018). COSMAS II/Web-App/Hilfe/Suchanfrage. Retrieved 07.01.2019, from http://www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas2/web-app/hilfe/suchanfrage/eingabe-zeile/syntax/reg.html

Institut für Deutsche Sprache (2018). Das Deutsche Referenzkorpus DeReKo. Retrieved 07.01.2019, from http://www.ids-mannheim.de/kl/projekte/korpora/

Jackendoff, R. (1972). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and Cognition.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jackendoff, R. (1987). The Status of Thematic Relations in Linguistic Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *18*(3), 369–411.

Jackendoff, R. (2002). *Foundations of Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kilian, J., Niehr, T. & Schiewe, J. (2016). *Sprachkritik: Ansätze und Methoden der Kritischen Sprachbetrachtung* (2 ed.). Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110409666

Korhonen, J. (2006). Valenzwandel am Beispiel des Deutschen. In V. Agel, L. M. Eichinger & H. W. Eroms (Eds.), *Dependenz und Valenz: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung* (Vol. 2, pp. 1462–1474). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Levin, B. (2018). Argument Structure. Retrieved 08.11.2018, from https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199772810-0099

Levin, B. & Rappaport Hovav, M. (1995). *Unaccusativity.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Levin, B. & Rappaport Hovav, M. (2005). *Argument Realization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610479

Lohndahl, T. (2014). *Phrase Structure and Argument Structure.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mater, E. (1971). *Deutsche Verben. 6: Rektionsarten.* Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut.

Nichols, J., Peterson, D. & Barnes, J. (2004). Transitivizing and Detransitivising Languages. *Linguistic Typology*, *8*(2), 149–211. https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.2004.005

Onysko, A. (2007). *Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching.* Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110912173

OED (2015). *Oxford English Dictionary.* Online Version. Ed. Proffitt. Oxford University Press. Retrieved 10.01.2019, from http://www.oed.com

OED (2015). *Oxford English Dictionary.* Online Version/About. Ed. Proffitt. Oxford University Press. Retrieved 08.01.2019, https://public.oed.com/about/

OED (2015). *Oxford English Dictionary.* Online Version/*How to use the OED/Glossary of Grammatical Terms.* Ed. Proffitt. Oxford University Press. Retrieved 10.01.2019, from https://public.oed.com/how-to-use-the-oed/glossary-grammatical-terms/

Paul, H. (1916). *Deutsche Grammatik.* Halle: Niemeyer.

Pfitzner, J. (1978). *Der Anglizismus im Deutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Bestimmung seiner stilistischen Funktion in der heutigen Presse.* Stuttgart: Metzler.

Plank, F. (1984). Verbs and Objects in Semantic Agreement: Minor Differences between Languages that Might Suggest a Major One. *Journal of Semantics*, *3*(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/3.4.305

Plank, F. & Lahiri, A. (2009). *Microscopic and Macroscopic typology: Basic Valence Orientation.* Delivered at the Eighth Biennial Conference of the Association for Linguistic Typology, Berkeley: University of California.

Primus, B. (1999): Rektionsprinzipien. In H. Wegener (Ed.), *Deutsch. kontrastiv. Typologisch-vergleichende Untersuchungen zur deutschen Grammatik* (pp. 135–170). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511840425

Ramchand, G. (2013). Argument structure and argument structure alternations. In M. Den Dikken (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax* (pp. 265–321). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804571.013

Riehl, C. M. (2004). *Sprachkontaktforschung: eine Einführung.* Tübingen: Narr.

Rohdenburg, G. (1974). *Sekundäre Subjektivierungen im Englischen und Deutschen: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zur Verb- und Adjektivsyntax. PAKS-Arbeitsbericht Nr: 8.* Bielefeld: Cornelsen-Velhagen and Klasing.

Saeed, J. (2009). *Semantics* (3 ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Siemund, P. (2014). The emergence of English reflexive verbs: An analysis based on the Oxford English Dictionary. *English Language and Linguistics*, *18*(1), 49–73. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674313000270

Steinbach, M. (2002). *Middle Voice: A Comparative Study in the Syntax-semantics Interface of German.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.50

Stolberg, D. (2015). *Changes between the lines: diachronic contact phenomena in written Pennsylvania German.* Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110339505

Tenny, C. (1994). *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Trips, C. & Stein, A. (2019). Contact-induced changes in the argument structure of Middle English verbs on the model of Old French. *Journal of Language Contact, 12*(1), 232–267. https://doi.org/10.1163/19552629-01201008

Van Valin, R. D. (1990). Semantic Parameters of Split Intransitivity. *Language*, *66*(2), 221–60. https://doi.org/10.2307/414886

Verein Deutsche Sprache (2018). Denglisch-und-Anglizismen/Anglizismenindex/AG-Anglizismenindex. Retrieved 18.10.2018, from https://vds-ev.de/denglisch-und-anglizismen/anglizismenindex/ag-anglizismenindex/

Verein Deutsche Sprache (2018). Denglisch-und-Anglizismen/Anglizismenindex/Ueber den Index. Retrieved 15.02.2019, from https://vds-ev.de/denglisch-und-anglizismen/anglizismenindex/ueber-den-index/

Verein Deutsche Sprache (2018). Leitfaden. Retrieved 15.02.2020, from https://vds-ev.de/leitlinien/

Wolff, P. (2009). *Zur Argumentstruktur entlehnter Verben. Überlegungen zur Argumentselektion bei Anglizismen.* Magisterarbeit, Universität Mainz.

Wunderlich, D. (2006). Towards a structural typology of verb classes. In D. Wunderlich (Ed.), *Advances in the Theory of the Lexicon* (pp. 57–166). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197815.57

Yang, W. (1990). *Anglizismen im Deutschen: am Beispiel des Nachrichtenmagazins Der Spiegel.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Zschieschang, T. (2011). *Anglizismen in neuesten deutschen Zeitschriften: Vorfindlichkeiten und Vergleich.* Stuttgart: ibidem.

Appendix

A.1 Transitivity and Basic Syntactic Constructions

Table A.1.1: Basic Syntactic Construction Anglicisms

Sample	**Sample 1_A**		**Sample 2_A**		**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**	
Syntactic construction	Absol. freq. frequent verbs	Rel. freq. frequent verbs	Absol. freq. infrequent verbs	Rel. freq. infrequent verbs	Absol. freq. total	Rel. freq. total
Active						
Intransitive	141	43.39%	150	35.29%	291	38.8%
Monotransitive	98[8]	30.15%	162	38.12%	260	34.67%
Ditransitive	11	3.38%	3	0.71%	14	1.87%
Reciprocal	5	1.54%	33	7.77%	38	5.07%
Reflexive	2	0.62%	2	0.47%	4	0.53%
Total	**257**	**79.08%**	**350**	**82.24%**	**607**	**80.93%**
Passive						
Derived intransitive	54[9]	16.62%	50	11.76%	104	13.87%
Impersonal	14	4.30%	25	5.88%	39	5.20%
Total	**68**	**20.92%**	**75**	**17.64%**	**143**	**19.07%**
Active & passive (total)						
Total	**325**	**100%**	**425**	**100%**	**750**	**100%**

[8] among these: 8 complex
[9] among these: 11complex

Table A.1.2: Basic Syntactic Construction English Verbs

Sample	**Sample 1_E**		**Sample 2_E**		**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	
Syntactic construction	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.
Active						
Intransitive	48	32.43%	94	32.08%	142	32.19%
Monotransitive	68[10]	45.94%	131	44.71%	199	45.12%
Ditransitive	5	3.38%	4	1.37%	9	2.04%
Reciprocal	0	0.00%	6	2.05%	6	1.36%
Reflexive	2	1.35%	2	0.68%	4	0.91%
Total	**123**	**83.11%**	**237**	**80.89%**	**360**	**81.63%**
Passive						
Derived intransitive	25[11]	16.89%	56[12]	19.11%	81	18.37%
Impersonal	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	**25**	**16.89%**	**56**	**19.11%**	**81**	**18.37%**
Active & passive (total)						
Total	**148**	**100%**	**293**	**100%**	**441**	**100%**

Table A.1.3: Basic Syntactic Constructions of Anglicisms Compared With Their English Equivalents

Syntactic construction	**Transitive**		**Intransitive**		**Labile**		**Reciprocal**		**Total**	
Frequency	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.
Sample 1_A	4[13]	30.76%	4	30.76%	5	38.46%	0	0	13	100%
Sample 1_E	5[14]	38.46%	1	7.69%	7	53.85%	0	0	13	100%
Sample 2_A	4	23.53%	1	5.88%	10	58.82%	2	11.76%	17	100%
Sample 2_E	5	29.41%	0	0	11	64.71%	1	5.88%	17	100%
Samples 1_A & 2_A	9	30.00%	5	16.67%	14	33.33%	2	6.67%	30	100%
Samples 1_E & 2_E	10	33.33%	1	3.33%	18	60%	1	3.33%	30	100%

[10] among these: 4 complex
[11] among these: 6 complex
[12] among these: 2 complex
[13] Among these: one complex transitive verb
[14] (see [7])

A.2 Syntactic Realisation

Table A.2.1: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns Anglicisms

Sample				**Sample 1_A**				**Sample 2_A**				**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
Active															
Intransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	NA	NA	102	72.34%	39.69%	31.38%	125	83.33%	35.72%	29.41%	227	78.01%	37.40%	30.27%
2	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] prep. obj.	NA	14	9.93%	5.45%	4.31%	16	10.67%	4.57%	3.76%	30	10.31%	4.94%	4.00%
3	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] ADV	NA	24	17.02%	9.34%	7.38%	9	6.00%	2.57%	2.12%	33	11.34%	5.44%	4.40%
4	[NP] subj.	[NP] dat. obj.	NA	1	0.71%	0.39%	0.31%	0	0%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0.34%	0.16%	0.13%
Total construction				**141**	**100%**	**54.87%**	**43.38%**	**150**	**100%**	**42.86%**	**35.29%**	**291**	**100%**	**47.94%**	**38.80%**
Monotransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP] acc. obj.	NA	85	86.74%	33.07%	26.15%	146	90.12%	41.71%	34.36%	231	88.85%	38.06%	30.80%
2	[NP] subj.	[NP] acc. obj.	[prep_NP] ADV	2	2.04%	0.78%	0.62%	16	9.88%	4.57%	3.76%	18	6.92%	2.96%	2.40%

Table A.2.1: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns Anglicisms

Sample				**Sample 1_A**				**Sample 2_A**				**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
3 (complex transitive)	[NP] subj.	[NP] acc. obj. + [Adj_P]/ [prep_NP] C_O	NA	8	8.16%	3.11%	2.46%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8	3.08%	1.31%	1.06%
4	[NP] subj.	[CL]/ [dass-CL] acc. obj.	NA	3	3.06%	1.17%	0.92%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3	1.15%	0.50%	0.40%
Total construction				**98**	**100%**	**38.13%**	**30.15%**	**162**	**100%**	**46.28%**	**38.12%**	**260**	**100%**	**42.83%**	**34.66%**
Ditransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP] dat. obj.	[NP] acc. obj.	6	54.55%	2.33%	1.85%	2	66.67%	0.57%	0.47%	8	57.14%	1.32%	1.06%
2	[NP] subj.	[NP] dat. obj.	[CL]/ [dass-CL] acc. obj.	4	36.36%	1.56%	1.23%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4	28.57%	0.66%	0.54%
3	[NP] subj.	[NP] dat. obj.	[to_NP] prep. obj.	1	9.09%	0.39%	0.31%	1	33.33%	0.29%	0.24%	2	14.29%	0.33%	0.27%

Table A.2.1: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns Anglicisms

Sample				**Sample 1_A**				**Sample 2_A**				**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
Total construction				**11**	**100%**	**4.28%**	**3.39%**	**3**	**100%**	**0.86%**	**0.71%**	**14**	**100%**	**2.31%**	**1.87%**
Reciprocal															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP]-refl. acc. obj.	NA	4	80.01%	1.55%	1.23%	21	63.64%	6.00%	4.94%	25	65.79%	4.12%	3.34%
2	[NP] subj.	[NP]-refl. acc. obj.	[mit_NP] prep. obj.	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12	36.36%	3.43%	2.82%	12	31.58%	1.98%	1.60%
3	[NP] subj.	[NP]-recipr. acc. obj.	NA	1	20.00%	0.39%	0.31%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	2.63%	0.16%	0.13%
Total construction				**5**	**100%**	**1.94%**	**1.54%**	**33**	**100%**	**9.43%**	**7.76%**	**38**	**100%**	**6.26%**	**5.07%**
Reflexive															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP]-refl. acc. obj.	[von/ in_NP] ADV	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	50.00%	0.33%	0.27%
2	[NP] subj.	[NP]-refl. acc. obj.	NA	2	100.00%	0.78%	0.62%	0	0.00%	0.57%	0.47%	2	50.00%	0.33%	0.26%
Total construction				**2**	**100%**	**0.78%**	**0.62%**	**2**	**100%**	**0.57%**	**0.47%**	**4**	**100%**	**0.66%**	**0.53%**

Table A.2.1: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns Anglicisms

Sample				**Sample 1_A**				**Sample 2_A**				**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
Total active				**257**	**100%**	—	—	**350**	**100%**	—	—	**607**	**100%**	—	—
Passive															
Impersonal															
1	NP-0 subj.	NA	NA	14	100.00%	20.59%	4.31%	25	100.00%	33.33%	5.88%	39	100.00%	27.27%	5.20%
Total construction				**14**	**100.00%**	**20.59%**	**4.31%**	**25**	**100.00%**	**33.33%**	**5.88%**	**39**	**100.00%**	**27.27%**	**5.20%**
Derived intransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	NA	NA	23	42.59%	33.82%	7.08%	36	72.00%	48.00%	8.47%	59	56.73%	41.26%	7.87%
2	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] prep.obj.	NA	1	1.85%	1.47%	0.31%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0.96%	0.70%	1.33%
3	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] ADV	NA	17	31.48%	25.00%	5.23%	14	28.00%	18.70%	3.29%	31	29.81%	21.68%	4.13%
4	[NP] subj. +[prep_NP] C_S	NA	NA	9	16.67%	13.24%	2.76%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	9	6.43%	6.29%	1.2%
5	[NP] subj. +[Adj_P] C_S	NA	NA	2	3.70%	2.94%	0.62%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	1.92%	1.40%	0.27%

Table A.2.1: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns Anglicisms

Sample				**Sample 1_A**				**Sample 2_A**				**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
6	[NP] subj.	[NP] dat. obj.	NA	2	3.70%	2.94%	0.62%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	1.92%	1.40%	0.27%
Total construction				**54**	**100%**	**79.41%**	**16.62%**	**50**	**100%**	**66.67%**	**11.76%**	**104**	**100%**	**72.73%**	**15.07%**
Total passive				**68**	**—**	**100%**	**—**	**75**	**—**	**100%**	**—**	**143**	**—**	**100%**	**—**
Total active & passive				**325**	**—**	**—**	**100%**	**425**	**—**	**—**	**100%**	**750**	**—**	**—**	**100%**

Table A.2.2: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns English Verbs

Sample				**Sample 1_E**				**Sample 2_E**				**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
Active															
Intransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	NA	NA	39	81.25%	31.71%	26.35%	52	55.32%	21.94%	17.75%	91	64.08%	25.78%	25.28%
2	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] prep.obj.	NA	2	4.17%	1.62%	1.35%	38	40.43%	16.03%	12.96%	40	28.17%	11.11%	9.07%
3	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] ADV	NA	6	12.50%	4.88%	4.05%	4	4.26%	1.69%	1.37%	10	7.04%	2.77%	2.27%
4	[NP] subj.	[NP] IO	NA	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
5	[NP] subj.	[Adv_P] ADV	NA	1	2.08%	0.81%	0.68%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0.70%	0.28%	0.23%
Total construction				**48**	**100%**	**38.21%**	**30.75%**	**94**	**100%**	**39.66%**	**32.08%**	**142**	**100%**	**39.44%**	**36.85%**
Monotransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP] DO	NA	44	64.71%	35.77%	35.48%	107	81.68%	42.19%	34.13%	151	75.88%	41.94%	34.24%
2	[NP] subj.	[NP] DO	[prep_NP] ADV	7	10.29%	5.69%	4.73%	14	10.69%	7.17%	5.80%	21	10.55%	5.83%	4.76%
3	[NP] subj.	[NP] DO	[Adv_P] ADV	3	4.41%	2.44%	2.03%	6	4.26%	5.06%	4.10%	9	4.52%	2.50%	2.04%
4	[NP] subj.	[NP] DO	[prep_NP] prep. obj.	9	13.24%	6.08%	7.30%	2	1.53%	0.00%	0.00%	11	5.52%	3.06%	2.49%

Table A.2.2: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns English Verbs

Sample				**Sample 1_E**				**Sample 2_E**				**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
5 (complex transitive)	[NP] subj.	[NP] DO + [as_NP]/ [Adj_P] C_O	NA	4	5.88%	3.25%	3.13%	2	1.53%	0.84%	0.68%	6	3.02%	1.67%	1.36%
6	[NP] subj.	[NP] DO	[prep_V-ing] ADV	1	1.47%	0.81%	0.68%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	0.50%	0.46%	0.23%
Total construction				**68**	**100%**	**48%**	**46.05%**	**131**	**100%**	**55.26%**	**44.71%**	**199**	**100%**	**54.54%**	**57.13%**
Ditransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP] IO	[NP] DO	1	20%	0.81%	0.66%	1	25%	0.42%	0.34%	2	22.22%	0.56%	0.45%
2	[NP] subj.	[CL] DO	[to_NP] prep. obj.	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	25%	0.42%	0.34%	1	11.11%	0.28%	0.23%
3	[NP] subj.	[NP] DO	[to/for_NP] prep. obj.	4	80%	3.25%	0.27%	2	50%	0.84%	0.68%	6	66.67%	1.67%	1.36%
Total construction				**5**	**100%**	**4.06%**	**0.93%**	**4**	**100%**	**1.68%**	**1.36%**	**9**	**100%**	**2.51%**	**2.04%**
Reciprocal															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP]-recipr. DO	NA	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3	50%	1.27%	1.02%	3	50%	0.83%	0.68%
2	[NP] subj.	[NP]-refl. DO	[with_NP] prep. obj.	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2	33.33%	0.84%	0.68%	2	33.33%	0.56%	0.45%

Table A.2.2: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns English Verbs

Sample				**Sample 1_E**				**Sample 2_E**				**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
3	[NP] subj.	[with_NP] -recipr. DO	NA	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1	16.67%	0.42%	0.34%	1	16.67%	0.28%	0.23%
Total construction				**0**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**2.04%**	**6**	**100%**	**1.67%**	**1.36%**
Reflexive															
1	[NP] subj.	[NP]-refl. DO	NA	1	50%	0.81%	0.68%	1	50%	0.42%	0.34%	1	50%	0.28%	0.23%
1	[NP] subj.	[NP]-refl. DO	[Adv_P]	1	50%	0.81%	0.68%	1	50%	0.42%	0.34%	1	50%	0.28%	0.23%
Total construction				**2**	**100%**	**1.62%**	**1.46%**	**2**	**100%**	**0.84%**	**0.68%**	**4**	**100%**	**0.56%**	**0.46%**
Total active				**123**	**83.10%**	—	—	**237**	**80.89%**	—	—	**360**	**81.63%**	—	—
Passive															
Impersonal															
1	NP-0 subj.	NA	NA	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total construction				**0**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**
Derived intransitive															
1	[NP] subj.	NA	NA	10	40.00%	40.00%	6.76%	32	57.14%	57.14%	10.92%	42	51.85%	51.85%	9.52%
2	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] prep. obj.	NA	3	12.00%	12.00%	2.03%	1	1.79%	1.79%	0.34%	4	4.98%	4.98%	0.91%

Table A.2.2: Syntactic Argument Structure Patterns English Verbs

Sample				**Sample 1_E**				**Sample 2_E**				**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**			
Rank	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total	Abs. freq.	Rel. freq.	Rel. freq. act. & pass. sep.	Rel. freq. total
3	[NP] subj.	[prep_NP] ADV	NA	6	24.00%	24.00%	4.05%	21	37.5%	37.5%	7.17%	27	33.33%	33.33%	6.12%
4 (complex intrans-itive)	[NP] subj. + [NP] C_S	NA	NA	4	16.00%	16.00%	2.70%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4	4.94%	4.94%	0.91%
5 (complex intrans-itive)	[NP] subj. + [Adj_P] C_S	NA	NA	2	8.00%	8.00%	1.35%	2	3.57%	3.57%	0.68%	4	4.94%	4.94%	0.91%
6	[NP] subj.	[NP] IO	NA	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total construction				**25**	**100%**	—	—	**56**	**100%**	—	—	**81**	**100%**	—	—
Total passive				**25**	**16.89%**	**100%**	—	**56**	**19.11%**	**100%**	—	**81**	**18.37%**	**100%**	—
Total active and passive				**148**	—	—	**100%**	**293**	—	—	**100%**	**441**	**100%**	—	**100%**

A.3 Semantic Roles

Table A.3.1: Semantic Roles Single Anglicisms

Sample	Sample 1_A		Sample 2_A		Samples 1_A & 2_A in total	
Frequency	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.
AGENT	204	40.48%	312	47.49%	516	44.44%
THEME	159	31.55%	230	35.01%	389	33.51%
INSTRUMENT	16	3.17%	21	3.20%	37	3.19%
RECIPIENT	17	3.4%	16	2.44%	33	2.84%
RESULT	12	2.38%	20	3.04%	32	2.76%
STIMULUS	25	4.96%	0	0.00%	25	2.15%
GOAL	10	1.98%	15	2.28%	25	2.15%
COUNTER-AGENT	1	0.20%	21	3.20%	22	1.89%
EXPERIENCER	21	4.17%	0	0.00%	21	1.81%
PATH	16	3.17%	3	0.46%	19	1.64%
THEME + ATTRIBUTE	19	3.77%	0	0.00%	19	1.64%
LOCATION	3	0.60%	14	2.13%	17	1.46%
SOURCE	1	0.20%	3	0.46%	4	0.34%
BENEFICIARY	—	—	2	0.30%	2	0.17%
Total	**504**	**100%**	**657**	**100%**	**1,161**	**100%**

Table A.3.2: Semantic Roles Single English Verbs

Sample	**Sample 1_E**		**Sample 2_E**		**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**
AGENT	119	44.91%	227	43.40%	346	43.91%
THEME	85	32.08%	205	39.20%	290	36.80%
RECIPIENT	6	2.26%	0	0.00%	6	0.76%
INSTRUMENT	1	0.38%	21	4.02%	22	2.79%
RESULT	12	4.53%	18	3.44%	30	3.81%
BENEFICIARY	1	0.38%	3	0.57%	4	0.51%
EXPERIENCER	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
STIMULUS	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
COUNTER-AGENT	0	0.00%	7	1.34%	7	0.89%
GOAL	23	8.68%	16	3.06%	39	4.95%
SOURCE	2	0.75%	1	0.19%	3	0.38%
PATH	6	2.26%	8	1.53%	14	1.78%
LOCATION	0	0.00%	15	2.87%	15	1.90%
THEME + ATTRIBUTE	10	3.77%	0	0.00%	10	1.27%
RESULT + ATTRIBUTE	0	0.00%	2	0.38%	2	0.25%
Total	**265**	**100%**	**523**	**100%**	**788**	**100%**

Table A.3.3: Semantic Roles Patterns Anglicisms

Sample	**Sample 1_A**		**Sample 2_A**		**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**
Semantic argument structure patterns												
Active												
One argument												
AGENT	97	96.04%	107	85.60%	204	90.27%	37.74%	30.57%	33.61%	29.84%	25.18%	27.20%
THEME	0	0.00%	11	8.80%	11	4.87%	0.00%	3.14%	1.81%	0.00%	2.59%	1.46%
RECIPIENT	0	0.00%	6	4.80%	6	2.65%	0.00%	1.71%	0.99%	0.00%	1.41%	0.80%
INSTRUMENT	2	1.98%	1	0.08%	3	1.33%	0.78%	0.29%	0.49%	0.62%	0.23%	0.40%
STIMULUS [15]	2	1.98%	0	0.00%	2	0.88%	0.78%	0.00%	0.33%	0.62%	0.00%	0.27%
Total active 1 argument	101	100%	125	100%	226	100%	39.30%	35.71%	37.23%	31.08%	29.41%	30.13%
Two arguments												
AGENT + THEME	77	53.85%	140	68.63%	217	62.54%	29.96%	40.00%	35.75%	23.69%	32.94%	28.93%
EXPERIENCER + STIMULUS	20	13.99%	0	0.00%	20	5.76%	7.78%	0.00%	3.30%	6.15%	0ö00%	2.67%
AGENT + COUNTER-AGENT	1	0.70%	16	7.85%	17	4.89%	0.39%	4.57%	2.81%	0.31%	3.76%	2.27%

[15] anti-causative

Table A.3.3: Semantic Roles Patterns Anglicisms

Sample	Sample 1_A		Sample 2_A		Samples 1_A & 2_A in total		Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)			Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)		
Frequency	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Sample 1_A	Sample 2_A	Samples 1_A & 2_A in total	Sample 1_A	Sample 2_A	Samples 1_A & 2_A in total
THEME + PATH	16	11.19%	0	0.00%	16	4.61%	6.23%	0.00%	2.64%	4.92%	0.00%	2.13%
INSTRUMENT + THEME	7	4.89%	6	2.94%	13	3.75%	2.72%	1.71%	2.14%	2.15%	1.41%	1.73%
THEME + GOAL	8	5.59%	0	0.00%	8	2.31%	3.11%	0.00%	1.32%	2.47%	0.00%	1.07%
AGENT + GOAL	0	0.00%	8	3.92%	8	2.31%	0.00%	2.29%	1.32%	0.00%	1.88%	1.07%
AGENT + THEME − ATTRIBUTE	8	5.59%	0	0.00%	8	2.31%	3.11%	0.00%	1.32%	2.47%	0.00%	1.07%
AGENT + RESULT	3	2.10%	4	1.96%	7	2.02%	1.17%	1.14%	1.15%	0.92%	0.94%	0.93%
RECIPIENT + THEME	0	0.00%	7	3.43%	7	2.02%	0.00%	2.00%	1.15%	0.00%	1.65%	0.93%
AGENT + NA + THEME	0	0.00%	7	3.43%	7	2.02%	0.00%	2.00%	1.15%	0.00%	1.65%	0.93%
AGENT + NA + COUNTER-AGENT	0	0.00%	5	2.45%	5	1.44%	0.00%	1.43%	0.82%	0.00%	1.18%	0.67%

Table A.3.3: Semantic Roles Patterns Anglicisms

Sample	**Sample 1_A**		**Sample 2_A**		**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**
INSTRUMENT + RESULT	0	0.00%	5	2.45%	5	1.44%	0.00%	1.43%	0.82%	0.00%	1.18%	0.67%
AGENT + RECIPIENT	3	2.10%	0	0.00%	3	0.86%	1.17%	0.00%	0.49%	0.92%	0.00%	0.40%
AGENT + PATH	0	0.00%	3	1.47%	3	0.86%	0.00%	0.86%	0.49%	0.00%	0.7%	0.40%
RECIPIENT + SOURCE	0	0.00%	2	0.98%	2	0.57%	0.00%	0.57%	0.33%	0.00%	0.47%	0.27%
INSTRUMENT + GOAL	0	0.00%	1	0.49%	1	0.29%	0.00%	0.29%	0.17%	0.00%	0.24%	0.13%
AGENT + INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
AGENT + BENEFICIARY	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total active 2 arguments	143	0.00%	204	100%	347	100%	55.64%	58.29%	57.17%	44.00%	48.00%	46.27%
Three arguments												
AGENT + RECIPIENT + THEME	10	76.92%	0	0	10	29.42%	3.89%	0.00%	1.65%	3.08%	0.00%	1.32%

Table A.3.3: Semantic Roles Patterns Anglicisms

Sample	Sample 1_A		Sample 2_A		Samples 1_A & 2_A in total		Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)			Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)		
Frequency	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Sample 1_A	Sample 2_A	Samples 1_A & 2_A in total	Sample 1_A	Sample 2_A	Samples 1_A & 2_A in total
AGENT + THEME + LOCATION	—	0.00%	6	28.58%	6	17.65%	0.00%	1.71%	0.99%	0.00%	1.40%	0.80%
AGENT + THEME + GOAL	2	15.39%	4	19.06%	6	17.65%	0.78%	1.14%	0.99%	0.62%	0.94%	0.80%
AGENT + THEME + INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	2	5.88%	0.00%	0.57%	0.33%	0.00%	0.47%	0.27%
AGENT + THEME + RECIPIENT	1	7.69%	1	4.76%	2	5.88%	0.39%	0.29%	0.33%	0.30%	0.24%	0.27%
AGENT + THEME + SOURCE	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	2	5.88%	0.00%	0.57%	0.33%	0.00%	0.47%	0.27%
INSTRUMENT + THEME + GOAL	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	2	5.88%	0.00%	0.57%	0.33%	0.00%	0.47%	0.27%

Table A.3.3: Semantic Roles Patterns Anglicisms

Sample	**Sample 1_A**		**Sample 2_A**		**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**
INSTRUMENT + RESULT + LOCATION	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	2	5.88%	0.00%	0.57%	0.33%	0.00%	0.47%	0.27%
AGENT + RESULT + BENEFICIARY	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	2.94%	0.00%	0.29%	0.16%	0.00%	0.24%	0.13%
AGENT + THEME + BENEFICIARY	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	2.94%	0.00%	0.29%	0.16%	0.00%	0.24%	0.13%
AGENT + THEME + PATH	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total active 3 arguments	13	100%	21	100%	34	100%	5.06%	6.00%	5.60%	4.00%	4.94%	4.53%
Total active	257	100%	350	100%	607	100%	42.34%	57.66	100%	79.07%	82.35%	80.93%

Table A.3.3: Semantic Roles Patterns Anglicisms

Sample	**Sample 1_A**		**Sample 2_A**		**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**
Passive												
Zero arguments												
0	14	100.00%	25	100.00%	39	100.00%	20.59%	33.33%	27.27%	4.30%	5.88%	5.20%
One argument												
THEME	16	48.49%	35	97.22%	51	73.91%	23.53%	46.67%	35.66%	4.92%	8.23%	6.80%
THEME – ATTRIBUTE [16]	11	33.33%	0	0.00%	11	15.94%	16.18%	0.00%	7.69%	3.38%	0,00%	1.47%
RESULT	4	12.12%	1	2.78%	5	7.25%	5.88%	1.33%	3.50%	1.23%	0.25%	0.67%
STIMULUS	2	6.06%	0	0.00%	2	2.90%	2.94%	0.00%	1.40%	0.62%	0.00%	0.26%
Total passive 1 argument	33	100%	36	100%	69	100%	48.53%	48.00%	48.25%	10.15%	8.47%	9.20%
Two arguments												
THEME + AGENT	1	4.76%	6	42.86%	7	20.00%	1.47%	8.00%	4.90%	0.31%	1.41%	0.93%
THEME + INSTRUMENT	7	33.33%	0	0.00%	7	20.00%	10.30%	0.00%	4.90%	2.15%	0.00%	0.93%
THEME + RESULT	5	23.81%	0	0.00%	5	14.29%	7.35%	0.00%	3.49%	1.54%	0.00%	0.67%

[16] subject complement

Table A.3.3: Semantic Roles Patterns Anglicisms

Sample	**Sample 1_A**		**Sample 2_A**		**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**	**Sample 1_A**	**Sample 2_A**	**Samples 1_A & 2_A in total**
RESULT + LOCATION	0	0.00%	5	35.72%	5	14.29%	0.00%	6.67%	3.49%	0.00%	1.17%	0.67%
THEME + LOCATION	4	19.05%	1	7.14%	5	14.29%	5.88%	1.33%	3.49%	1.23%	0.24%	0.67%
THEME + RECIPIENT	3	14.29%	0	0.00%	3	8.57%	4.41%	0.00%	2.10%	0.92%	0.00%	0.40%
RESULT + INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	2	14.29%	2	5.71%	0.00%	2.67%	1.40%	0.00%	0.47%	0.26%
STIMULUS + EXPERIENCER	1	4.76%	0	0.00%	1	2.85%	1.47%	0.00%	0.70%	0.31%	0.00%	0.13%
THEME + GOAL	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
THEME + BENEFICIARY	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total passive 2 arguments	21	100%	14	100%	35	100%	30.88%	18.67%	24.47%	6.46%	3.29%	4.66%
Total passive	68	100%	75	100%	143	100%	100%	100%	100%	20.29%	17.64%	19.06%
Total active and passive	**325**	**100%**	**425**	**100%**	**750**	**100%**	**43.33%**	**56.67%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	Sample 1_E		Sample 2_E		Samples 1_E & 2_E in total		Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)			Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**
Semantic argument structure patterns												
Active												
One argument												
AGENT	41	100.00%	49	90.74%	90	94.74%	33.33%	20.68%	25.00%	27.70%	16.73%	20.41%
THEME	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
RECIPIENT	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
STIMULUS	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
RESULT	0	0.00%	5	9.26%	5	5.26%	0.00%	2.11%	1.39%	0.00%	1.70%	1.13%
Total	41	100%	54	100%	95	100%	33.33%	22.79%	26.39%	27.70%	18.43%	21.54%
Two arguments												
AGENT + THEME	38	67.85%	128	81.01%	166	77.57%	30.90%	54.01%	46.11%	25.67%	43.69%	37.64%
EXPERIENCER + STIMULUS	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
AGENT + COUNTER-AGENT	0	0	6	3.80%	6	2.80%	0.00%	2.53%	1.67%	0.00%	2.05%	1.36%
INSTRUMENT + THEME	1	1.79%	5	3.16%	6	2.80%	0.81%	2.11%	1.67%	0.68%	1.71%	1.36%

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	**Sample 1_E**		**Sample 2_E**		**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**
AGENT + GOAL	1	1.79%	12	7.60%	13	6.08%	0.81%	5.06%	3.61%	0.68%	4.10%	2.95%
AGENT + THEME –ATTRIBUTE	4	7.14%	0	0.00%	4	1.87%	3.25%	0.00%	1.11%	2.70%	0.00%	0.91%
AGENT + RESULT	6	10.71%	1	0.63%	7	3.27%	4.88%	0.42%	1.94%	4.05%	0.34%	1.58%
THEME + GOAL	3	5.35%	0	0.00%	3	1.40%	2.44%	0.00%	0.83%	2.02%	0.00%	0.68%
RECIPIENT + THEME	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
AGENT + NA + THEME	0	0.00%	2	1.27%	2	0.93%	0.00%	0.84%	0.55%	0.00%	0.68%	0.45%
AGENT + NA + COUNTER-AGENT	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
INSTRUMENT + RESULT	0	0.00%	3	1.90%	3	1.40%	0.00%	1.27%	0.83%	0.00%	1.02%	0.68%
RESULT + LOCATION	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	**Sample 1_E**		**Sample 2_E**		**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**
AGENT + RECIPIENT	1	1.79%	0	0.00%	1	0.47%	0.81%	0.00%	0.28%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%
AGENT + PATH	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
THEME + PATH	1	1.79%	0	0.00%	1	0.47%	0.81%	0.00%	0.28%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%
RECIPIENT + SOURCE	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
INSTRUMENT + GOAL	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
AGENT + INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	1	0.63%	1	0.47%	0.00%	0.42%	0.28%	0.00%	0.34%	0.23%
AGENT + BENEFICIARY	1	1.79%	0	0.00%	1	0.47%	0.81%	0.00%	0.28%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%
Total	56	100%	158	100%	214	100%	45.52%	66.66%	59.44%	37.84%	53.93%	48.53%
Three arguments												
AGENT + RECIPIENT + THEME	1	3.85%	0	0.00%	1	1.96%	0.81%	0.00%	0.28%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	Sample 1_E		Sample 2_E		Samples 1_E & 2_E in total		Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)			Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)		
Frequency	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Sample 1_E	Sample 2_E	Samples 1_E & 2_E in total	Sample 1_E	Sample 2_E	Samples 1_E & 2_E in total
AGENT + THEME + LOCATION	0	0.00%	3	12.00%	3	5.88%	0.00%	1.27%	0.83%	0.00%	1.02%	0.68%
AGENT + THEME + INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	7	28.00%	7	13.73%	0.00%	2.95%	1.94%	0.00%	2.39%	1.59%
AGENT + THEME + RECIPIENT	4	15.38%	0	0.00%	4	7.84%	3.25%	0.00%	1.11%	2.70%	0.00%	0.90%
AGENT + THEME + RESULT	1	3.85%	0	0.00%	1	1.96%	0.81%	0.00%	0.28%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%
AGENT + THEME + SOURCE	2	7.69%	0	0.00%	2	3.92%	1.63%	0.00%	0.56%	1.35%	0.00%	0.45%
INSTRUMENT + THEME + GOAL	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	Sample 1_E		Sample 2_E		Samples 1_E & 2_E in total		Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)			Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)		
Frequency	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Absol. freq.	Rel. freq.	Sample 1_E	Sample 2_E	Samples 1_E & 2_E in total	Sample 1_E	Sample 2_E	Samples 1_E & 2_E in total
INSTRUMENT + RESULT + LOCATION	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
AGENT + RESULT + BENEFICIARY	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
AGENT + THEME + BENEFICIARY	0	0.00%	2	8.00%	2	3.92%	0.00%	0.84%	0.56%	0.00%	0.68%	0.45%
AGENT + THEME + PATH	4	15.38%	7	28.00%	11	21.56%	3.25%	2.95%	3.05%	2.70%	2.39%	2.49%
AGENT + THEME + GOAL	14	53.85%	4	16.00%	18	35.30%	11.38%	1.69%	5.00%	9.46%	1.37%	4.08%
AGENT + THEME + COUNTER-AGENT	0	0.00%	1	4.00%	1	1.96%	0.00%	0.42%	0.28%	0.00%	0.34%	0.23%

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	**Sample 1_E**		**Sample 2_E**		**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**
AGENT + THEME + SOURCE	0	0.00%	1	4.00%	1	1.96%	0.00%	0.42%	0.28%	0.00%	0.34%	0.23%
Total	26	100.00%	25	100.00%	51	100.00%	21.13%	10.54%	14.17%	17.57%	8.53%	11.56%
Total active	123	34.17%	237	65.83%	360	100.00%	100%	100%	100%	83.11%	80.89%	81.63%
Passive												
Zero arguments												
0	0	100%	0	100%	0	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
One argument												
THEME	3	27.27%	30	85.72%	33	71.74%	12.00%	53.57%	40.74%	2.02%	10.24%	7.48%
THEME – ATTRIBUTE[17]	6	54.55%	0	0.00%	6	13.04%	24.00%	0.00%	7.41%	4.05%	0.00%	1.36%
RESULT	1	9.09%	3	8.57%	4	8.70%	4.00%	5.36%	4.94%	0.68%	1.02%	0.91%
RESULT – ATTRIBUTE	0	0.00%	2	5.71%	2	4.35%	0.00%	3.57%	2.47%	-	0.68%	0.45%
STIMULUS	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
RECIPIENT	1	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	2.17%	4.00%	0.00%	1.23%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%

[17] subject complement

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	Sample 1_E		Sample 2_E		Samples 1_E & 2_E in total		Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)			Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**
Total	11	100.00%	35	100.00%	46	100%	44.00	62.50%	56.79%	7.43%	11.94%	10.43%
Two arguments												
THEME + PATH	1	7.14%	1	4.76%	2	5.71%	4.00%	1.79%	2.47%	0.68%	0.34%	0.45%
THEME + GOAL	10	71.43%	0	0.00%	10	28.57%	40.00%	0.00%	12.35%	6.75%	0.00%	2.27%
THEME + AGENT	0	0.00%	2	9.52%	2	5.71%	0.00%	3.57%	2.47%	0.00%	0.68%	0.45%
THEME + INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	4	19.05%	4	11.43%	0.00%	7.14%	4.94%	0.00%	1.37%	0.91%
THEME + RESULT	2	14.29%	0	0.00%	2	5.71%	8.00%	0.00%	2.47%	1.35%	0.00%	0.45%
THEME + LOCATION	0	0.00%	7	33.34%	7	20.00%	0.00%	12.50%	8.64%	0.00%	2.39%	1.59%
THEME + RECIPIENT	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
STIMULUS + EXPERIENCER	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
THEME + BENEFICIARY	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	2.86%	0.00%	1.79%	1.23%	0.00%	0.34%	0.23%

Table A.3.4: Semantic Roles Patterns English Verbs

Sample	**Sample 1_E**		**Sample 2_E**		**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**		**Share of the entire sample (active and passive separately)**			**Share of the entire sample (active and passive together)**		
Frequency	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Absol. freq.**	**Rel. freq.**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**	**Sample 1_E**	**Sample 2_E**	**Samples 1_E & 2_E in total**
RESULT + AGENT	1	7.14%	0	0.00%	1	2.86%	4.00%	0.00%	1.23%	0.68%	0.00%	0.23%
RESULT + LOCATION	0	0.00%	5	23.81%	5	14.29%	0.00%	8.92%	6.17%	0.00%	1.71%	1.13%
RESULT + INSTRUMENT	0	0.00%	1	4.76%	1	2.86%	0.00%	1.79%	1.23%	0.00%	0.34%	0.23%
Total	14	100%	21	100%	35	100%	56.00%	37.50%	43.20%	9.46%	7.17%	7.94%
Total passive	25	100%	56	100%	81	100%	100%	100%	100%	16.89%	19.11%	18.37%
Total	**148**	**100%**	**293**	**100%**	**441**	**100%**	**33.56%**	**66.44%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

A.4 Definitions of Anglicisms and Their English Translations

The definitions listed in Table A.4.1 were all taken and adapted from *Duden online* (Dudenredaktion, n.d.) and the *Anglizismenindex* (Verein Deutsche Sprache, "Denglisch-und-Anglizismen/Anglizismenindex/AG-Anglizismenindex", 2018). The corresponding English translations were created by the author.

Table A.4.1: Frequent Anglicisms (Sample 1_A) Based on the *Duden* and the *Anglizismenindex*

No.	Verb	German definition	English translation
1	adden	(1) (in sozialen Netzwerken im Internet) zu den eigenen Kontakten hinzufügen	(1) to add a contact to one's list of contacts (in social media)
2	babysitten	(1) sich als Babysitter betätigen	(1) to work as a babysitter
3	campen	(1) am Wochenende oder während der Ferien im Zelt oder Wohnwagen leben	(1) to live in a tent or caravan at the weekend or during the holidays
4	dealen	(1) mit Rauschgift handeln (2) (generell) mit etw. handeln	(1) to deal in drugs (2) to deal in sth. (generally)
5	encodieren	(1) (eine Nachricht) mithilfe eines Codes verschlüsseln[18]	(1) to encode, encrypt a message with a code
6	faken	(1) (Informationen) fälschen oder übertrieben darstellen, vortäuschen	(1) to fake information or portray in an exaggerated manner
7	gamen	(1) ein Computerspiel spielen (2) etw. spielen	(1) to play a video game (2) to play (a game)
8	hypen	(1) jemanden/etwas hochjubeln, verherrlichen, feiern (ugs.) (2) beliebt/im Trend sein, hochgejubelt, verherrlicht werden werden	(1) to praise sb./sth. excessively, idolise (2) to be in fashion, to be praised excessively, idolised
9	implementieren	(1) etw. in ein Programm/System einsetzen, einbauen (2) etw. einführen/etablieren	(1) to insert sth. into a programme/system (2) to establish sth.
10	jetten	(1) mit dem Jet an einen bestimmten Ort bringen (lassen)	(1) to take/fly sb. to a particular place in a jet
11	kicken	(1) Fußball spielen (2) (einen Ball) mit dem Fuß stoßen, schießen (3) etw. spielen	(1) to play football (2) to kick, shoot a ball with the foot (3) to play sth. (a game, etc.)
12	labeln	(1) mit einem Label versehen	(1) to mark with a label
13	mailen	(1) als E-Mail senden	(1) to send as an email

[18] Med. added occasionally for the medical context

The definitions listed in Table A.4.2 were all taken and adapted from the *Anglizismenindex* (Verein Deutsche Sprache, "Denglisch-und-Anglizismen/Anglizismenindex/AG-Anglizismenindex", 2018). The corresponding English translations were created by the author of the present paper.

Table A.4.2: Infrequent Anglicisms (Sample 2_A) Based on the *Anglizismenindex*

No.	Verb	German definition	English translation
1	batteln	(1) (mit/-einander, gegen/-einander, für etw.) kämpfen (2) gegen etw. ankämpfen	(1) to fight with/against sb. (2) to fight sth.
2	boosten	(1) beschleunigen, (sich) steigern, aufdrehen (Motor) (2) stärken, fördern (medizinischer Kontext) (3) verstärken, steigern, anheben (Stat.) (4) dopen, Aufputschmittel nehmen	(1) to accelerate, boost (engine) (2) to strengthen, boost (medical context) (3) to increase (stat.) (4) to dope, take stimulants
3	callen	(1) Einsatz zahlen, mitgehen (Poker) (2) jdn. rufen	(1) Poker: to match the bet of another player in order to remain in play (2) to utter loudly
4	cashen	(1) Geld verdienen, erhalten (2) Geld überweisen, bezahlen (3) jdn. besiegen, überwältigen (militärischer Kontext) (4) jdn. überlisten, hineinlegen, abzocken (ugs.)	(1) to receive, generate money (2) to transfer, pay money (3) to defeat, subdue sb. (military context) (4) to cheat, outsmart sb. (coll.)
5	chanten	(1) (spirituell) singen	(1) to chant, sing spiritually
6	connecten	(1) Kontakte (mit/zwischen jdm.) knüpfen, Beziehungen aufbauen, sich/jdn. vernetzen (2) Verbindung aufbauen (IT) (3) kombiniert werden (Kleidung)	(1) to network, establish connections, relations with./between sb. (2) to establish a connection (3) to be matched with (clothes)
7	daten	sich mit jdm. treffen (im romantischen Sinne), mit jdm. in einer Beziehung sein	to go out with sb. (in a romantic sense), to be in a relationship with sb.
8	dumpen	(1) Preise/Löhne drücken (2) wegwerfen (3) herunterschrauben, downgraden (4) vom Markt verdrängen (5) leeren (Dateien) (6) entfernen	(1) to cut prices/wages (2) to dispose of sth. (3) to downgrade (4) to drive out of the market (5) to empty (files) (6) to remove
9	gambeln	(1) (glücks-)spielen, zocken (ugs.) (2) etw. aufs Spiel setzen, mit etw. spielen	(1) to gamble (2) to gamble with sth., put sth. at stake

Table A.4.2: Infrequent Anglicisms (Sample 2_A) Based on the *Anglizismenindex*

No.	Verb	German definition	English translation
10	leaken	(1) vertrauliche Informationen weitergeben, durchsickern lassen	(1) to leak confidential information
11	pasten	(1) einfügen (IT)	(1) to paste (IT)
12	printen	(1) drucken (2) bedrucken (3) (Dokumente/Papiere) erfassen	(1) to print (2) to print on sth. (3) to record (documents/papers)
13	punchen	(1) (jdn.) (mit der Faust) schlagen, boxen (2) verzerrt dargestellt/ mit einer Pointe versehen werden (Nachrichten) (3) durchlöchern, ein Piercing stechen (4) die Punchline sein, herausstechen (musikalischer Kontext) (5) (auf etw.) drucken	(1) to strike out, hit sb. (with one's fist), to box/punch (2) to be distorted, to be given a punchline (news) (3) to pierce, punch (4) to be the punchline, stand out (musical context) (5) to print sth. (onto sth.)
14	releasen	(1) veröffentlichen, herausgeben	(1) to release, publish
15	reviewen	(1) kritisch beurteilen, überprüfen (zum Zwecke einer Veröffentlichung)	(1) to review, examine (for the purpose of publication)
16	shaken	(1) sich/ein Körperteil bewegen, tanzen (2) (ein Getränk) mixen, schütteln (3) schwanken (Finanzen)	(1) to move (parts of the body), dance (2) to mix, shake up (a drink) (3) to fluctuate (financial context)
17	shooten	(1) (etw./jdn.) fotografieren, Fotos (von etw./jdn.) schießen (2) fotografiert werden, ein Fotoshooting haben	(1) to take a photograph of sb./sth. (2) to be photographed, to do a photoshoot

Abbreviations

coll. colloquial

jdn. jemanden ("somebody", accusative case)

jdm. jemandem ("somebody", dative case)

sb. somebody

sth. something

IT information technology

ugs. umgangssprachlich ("colloquial")

stat. statistics

A.5 English Verbs Based on the OED

The definitions listed in Tables A.5.1 and A.5.2 were all taken from *OED Online* (Proffitt, 2015, http://www.oed.com).

Table A.5.1: English Verbs (Sample 1_E) Based on the OED

No.	Verb	OED number	OED ID	Definition
1	add	1.a.	2155	To join (something) to something else so as to increase the amount, size, importance, etc.; to put in as an additional element or ingredient.
2	babysit	1.a.	276128	To look after a child or children while the parents or guardians are out.
		1.b.		To look after a child or children while the parents or guardians are out. (With reference to an electronic device)
3	camp	1.a.	26748	To live or remain in a camp; to form or pitch one's camp; to encamp.
		2.a.		To sojourn or remain in a tent, pitch one's tent; also *famil.* to take up one's quarters, lodge.
4	deal	Draft additions August 2007 a.	47704	To sell illegal drugs.
		Draft additions August 2007 b.		To sell (illegal drugs).
5	encode	NA	61744	To translate into cipher or code; also *techn.* of computers
6	fake	1.a.	67778	To tamper with, for the purpose of deception
		1.d.		To feign or simulate
7	game	3.a.	76469	To take part in an indoor game, of a kind on which stakes or wagers may be placed
8	hype	NA	90267	To short-change, to cheat; to deceive, to con, esp. by false publicity.
9	implement	1.a.	92452	To complete, perform, carry into effect (a contract, agreement, etc.)
10	jet	1.a.	101169	To convey by jet aircraft or jet engine.
		1.b.		To travel by jet aircraft. Chiefly with indication of direction or route.
11	kick	1.a.	103264	To strike out with the foot.
		4.a.		To strike (anything) with the foot.
		5.a.		To impel, drive, or move, by or as by kicking.
12	label	3.a.	104693	To attach a label to (an object); to mark with a label.

Table A.5.1: English Verbs (Sample 1_E) Based on the OED

No.	Verb	OED number	OED ID	Definition
		4.a.		To apply a classifying word or phrase to (a person or thing); to categorize (a person or thing) using a particular word or phrase.
13	mail	*mail 2*	112487	To send an email; (also) to exchange emails, to communicate by email.
		email 1	240904	To send (a message or file) by email; to send an email to (a person, organization, etc.).
		email 2	240904	To send an email; (also) to exchange emails, to communicate by email.

Table A.5.2: English Verbs (Sample 2_E) Based on the OED

No.	Verb	OED number	OED ID	English translation
1	battle	1.a.	16262	To fight, to engage in war.
		3.		To give battle to, fight against, assail in battle. Also fig.
2	boost	1.	21509	To hoist; to lift or push from behind (one endeavoring to climb); to push up. Also *fig.* To assist over obstacles, to advance the progress of; to support, encourage; to increase (in value, reputation, etc.)
		2.		*Electr.* To increase or otherwise regulate the electromotive force in (a circuit, battery, etc.).
3	call	I.1.a.	26411	To cry out loudly, forcibly, and distinctly, so as to be heard at a distance.
		I.1.b.		To cry out loudly, forcibly, and distinctly, so as to be heard at a distance.
		I.2.a.		To utter loudly or distinctly; to shout out; to announce.
		III 20. c. (b)		*Poker context:* To match the bet of (another player) in order to remain in play, or (esp. in earlier use) in order to get other players to show their hands to determine who has the best cards.
4	cash	I.1.a.	28429	To give or obtain the cash for (a note, cheque, draft, money order, etc.); to convert into cash.

Table A.5.2: English Verbs (Sample 2_E) Based on the OED

No.	Verb	OED number	OED ID	English translation
		I.4.a.		To recite (words) musically or rhythmically, esp. as an incantation or as part of a ritual.
5	chant	1.a.	30510	To sing (a song, tune, etc.). Frequently (esp. in later use): *spec.* to sing (a song, esp. a repetitive one) in a monotone, or with a prolonged intonation.
6	connect	4.a.	39326	To unite (a person) *with* others (by ties of intimacy, common aims, or family relationship.
		5.a.		To become joined or united; to join on.
7	date	10.a.	47418	To arrange or go on a date with (a person); (now usually) to go out with (a person) regularly as a romantic partner.
		10.b.		To go out, or arrange to go out, on a date with somebody; esp. to go out with a person (regularly) as a romantic partner.
8	dump	II.2.a.	58418	To throw down in a lump or mass, as in tilting anything out of a cart; to shoot or deposit (rubbish, etc.); to fling down or drop (anything) with a bump.
		II.2.b.		To deposit oneself, drop down.
		II.2.c.		To export, or throw on the market, in large quantities and at low prices; *spec.* to offer for sale (surplus goods), esp. abroad, at less than the ordinary trade prices.
9	gamble	2.a.	76447	To play games for stakes, as cards, dice, etc., or bet on the outcome of particular events, e.g. the result of a race or other sporting contest.
		2.b.		To behave in a way which exposes something valuable to risk, danger, or unnecessary uncertainty; to speculate or take risks, esp. recklessly.
		2.c.		To stake money or risk anything of value on the outcome of an event involving a large degree of chance or uncertainty, as a game of chance, a horse race or other sporting contest, a commercial enterprise, etc.

Table A.5.2: English Verbs (Sample 2_E) Based on the OED

No.	Verb	OED number	OED ID	English translation
		4.		To bet, wager (a sum of money, or other stake). Also more generally: to expose (something valuable) to risk or danger in the hope of gaining some advantage, benefit, or success.
10	leak	4.c.	106656	To allow the disclosure of (secret or confidential information).
11	paste	2.c.	138572	*Computing.* To insert (text or graphics) into a document by copying it from elsewhere in a single operation.
12	print	II.8.a.	151481	*Computing.* To produce a paper printout of (information stored or accessed on a computer).
		II.8.b.		*Computing.* To produce a paper printout of (information stored or accessed on a computer).
13	punch	II.4.a.	154565	To pierce, cut, or perforate with or as with a punch; to make a hole or holes.
		II.4.b.		To make (a hole or perforation) with or as with a punch.
		III.7.a.		To deliver a sharp blow to or forward thrust at; *esp.* to hit with one's fist; to beat, thump.
14	release	II.4.b.	161859	To make (an official statement, information, etc.) public, usually through the media.
		III.7.a.		To make (a film, recording, etc.) available to the public.
15	review	4.a.	164851	To look over or through (a document, book, etc.) in order to correct or improve it; to revise.
		6.a.		To write a critical appraisal of (a book or, in later use, a play, film, etc.), typically for publication in a newspaper or magazine; to appraise (a writer, artist, or the like) in this way.
		6.b.		To write reviews; to follow the occupation of a reviewer.
16	shake	II.6.a.	177308	To vibrate irregularly, tremble. To move to and fro irregularly or tremulously, agitate (some part of the body).
		phrasal verb. to shake up, 2		To shake together for the purpose of combining or mixing; to shake (a liquid) so as to stir up the sediment.

Table A.5.2: English Verbs (Sample 2_E) Based on the OED

No.	Verb	OED number	OED ID	English translation
17	shoot	2.f.	178501	To take a snapshot (of) with a camera; to photograph (a scene, action, person, etc.) with a cinematographic camera.

A.6 Argument Linking

Table A.6.1: Overview of the Most Frequent Argument Structure Patterns Found

Construction	Most frequent pattern	Argument 1	Argument 2	Argument 3
Active				
Intransitive	Anglicisms	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
	English verbs	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
Monotransitive	Anglicisms	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj./DO	NA
	English verbs	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj./DO	NA
Ditransitive	Anglicisms	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	RECIPIENT ↓ [NP] dat. obj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.
	English verbs	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	RECIPIENT ↓ [NP] DO	THEME ↓ [to_NP] prep. obj.
Reflexive	Anglicisms	AGENT/ EXPERIENCER ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME/ STIMULUS ↓ [NP-refl.] acc. obj.	GOAL/ SOURCE/NA ↓ [prep_NP] adv.
	English verbs	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP-refl.] DO	PATH ↓ [Adv_P] adv.

Table A.6.1: Overview of the Most Frequent Argument Structure Patterns Found

Construction	Most frequent pattern	Argument 1	Argument 2	Argument 3
Reciprocal	Anglicisms	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP-refl.] acc. obj.	NA
	English verbs	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME/NA ↓ [NP-recipr.] DO/ [NP-refl.] DO	NA/THEME ↓ [with_NP] prep. obj.
Passive				
Derived intransitive	Anglicisms	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
	English verbs	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
Impersonal	Anglicisms	NP-0	NA	NA
	English verbs	—	—	—

A.7 Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs

Table A.7.1: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Frequent Anglicisms, Sample 1_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
1	adden	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
2	babysitten	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	AGENT ↓ [von_NP] adverbial	NA
3	campen	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA

Table A.7.1: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Frequent Anglicisms, Sample 1_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
4	dealen	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [mit_NP] prep. obj.	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA
5	encodieren	active	monotransitive	INSTRUMENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	RESULT/ INSTRUMENT ↓ [in_NP]/ [mit/mittels] adverbial	NA
6	faken	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
7	gamen	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
8	hypen	active	monotransitive	EXPERIENCER ↓ [NP] subj.	STIMULUS ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	STIMULUS ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA

Table A.7.1: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Frequent Anglicisms, Sample 1_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
9	implementieren	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
10	jetten	active	intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	PATH ↓ [prep_NP] adverbial	NA
11	kicken	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA
12	labeln	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
			complex transitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [als/auf] acc. obj. + ATTRIBUTE ↓ [NP] C_O	NA
		passive	derived complex intransitive	THEME ↓ [als/mit/zu_NP] subj. + ATTRIBUTE ↓ [NP] C_S	NA	NA

Table A.7.1: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Frequent Anglicisms, Sample 1_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
13	mailen	active	ditransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	RECIPIENT ↓ [NP] dat. obj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
			derived intransitive + [an_NP] prep. obj.	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	RECIPIENT ↓ [an_NP] prep. obj.	NA
			impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA

Table A.7.2: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Infrequent Anglicisms, Sample 2_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
1	batteln	active	reciprocal	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	COUNTER-AGENT ↓ [NP-refl.] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	
2	boosten	active	intransitive	THEME[19] ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA
3	callen	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA

[19] Anti-causative interpretation

Table A.7.2: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Infrequent Anglicisms, Sample 2_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
4	cashen	active	monotransitive	AGENT/ RECIPIENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	AGENT ↓ [von_NP] adverbial	NA
5	chanten	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA
6	connecten	active	reciprocal	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA ↓ [NP-refl.] acc. obj.	THEME ↓ [mit_NP] prep. obj.
7	daten	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
8	dumpen	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
9	gambeln	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA
10	leaken	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	AGENT ↓ [von_NP] adverbial	NA

Table A.7.2: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Infrequent Anglicisms, Sample 2_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
11	pasten	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
12	printen	active	monotransitive	INSTRUMENT ↓ [NP] subj.	RESULT ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	RESULT ↓ [NP] subj.	LOCATION ↓ [ins/auf_NP] adverbial	NA
13	punchen	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA
			derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	LOCATION ↓ [in_NP] adverbial	NA
14	releasen	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	
15	reviewen	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] acc. obj.	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	

Table A.7.2: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (Infrequent Anglicisms, Sample 2_A)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
16	shaken	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA
17	shooten	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	impersonal	NP-0	NA	NA

Table A.7.3: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 1_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
1	add	active	monotransitive + [to_NP] prep. obj.[20]	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	GOAL ↓ [to_NP] prep. obj.
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	GOAL ↓ [to_NP] prep. obj.	NA
2	babysit	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
			intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
3	camp	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA

[20]Note that according to Greenbaum et al. (1985), only verbs with animate prepositional objects can be regarded as ditransitive, and the GOAL argument in *add* is inanimate.

Table A.7.3: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 1_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
4	deal	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
			intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
5	encode	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	RESULT ↓ [in_NP] adverbial
				AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	RESULT ↓ [in/into_NP] adverbial	
6	fake	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
7	game	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
8	hype	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	GOAL ↓ [into_NP]/ [into_VP-ing] adverbial
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	GOAL ↓ [into_NP] adverbial	NA

Table A.7.3: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 1_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
9	implement	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	RESULT ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	RESULT ↓ [NP] subj.	AGENT ↓ [by_NP] adverbial	NA
10	jet	active	monotransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	GOAL ↓ [to_NP]	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	GOAL/PATH ↓ [prep_NP] adverbial	NA
11	kick	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	PATH/GOAL/ SOURCE ↓ [Adv_P]/ [prep_NP] adverbial
			intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
12	label	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived complex intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj. + ATTRIBUTE ↓ [NP] C_S	NA	NA

Table A.7.3: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 1_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
13	mail	active	ditransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	RECIPIENT ↓ [to_NP] prep. obj.
			intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA

Table A.7.4: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 2_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
1	battle	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	derived complex intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
2	boost	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
3	call	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA

Table A.7.4: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 2_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
4	cash	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
			ditransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	BENEFICIARY ↓ [for_NP] prep. obj.
				AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	BENEFICIARY ↓ [for_NP] IO	THEME ↓ [NP] DO
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	BENEFICIARY ↓ [for_NP] prep. obj.	NA
5	chant	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
6	connect	active	intransitive (for reciprocal)	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [with_NP] prep. obj.	NA
7	date	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	NA	NA	NA
8	dump	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	LOCATION ↓ [into/upon_NP] adverbial	NA

Table A.7.4: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 2_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
9	gamble	active	intransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	NA	NA	NA
10	leak	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive + [to_NP] prep. obj.	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	GOAL ↓ [to_NP] prep. obj.	NA
11	paste	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	LOCATION ↓ [into/onto_NP] adverbial
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	LOCATION ↓ [into_NP] adverbial	NA
12	print	active	monotransitive	INSTRUMENT ↓ [NP] subj.	RESULT ↓ [NP] DO	NA
			intransitive[21]	RESULT ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	RESULT ↓ [NP] subj.	LOCATION ↓ [in/on/upon_NP] adverbial	NA

[21] anti-causative

Table A.7.4: Dominant Patterns Individual Verbs (English Verbs, Sample 2_E)

No.	Verb	Voice	Characteristics	Arg. 1	Arg. 2	Arg. 3
13	punch	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	INSTRUMENT ↓ [with_NP] adverbial
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
14	release	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
15	review	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
16	shake	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA
17	shoot	active	monotransitive	AGENT ↓ [NP] subj.	THEME ↓ [NP] DO	NA
		passive	derived intransitive	THEME ↓ [NP] subj.	NA	NA