Euro-Global Journal of Linguistics and Language Education
ISSN 3030-1394 /online/

Vol. 3 No. 2 (2026) Vasara

Linguistic Kinship and Lexical Divergence: German-English Shared Vocabulary, Borrowing Patterns, and the Mechanisms of Cross-Linguistic Transfer

[1] **Gunel Memmedova**
https://doi.org/10.69760/egjlle.2602015

Abstract. *English and German, as co-descendants of the Proto-Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family, share a substantial stratum of common vocabulary rooted in their shared genealogical heritage. This article investigates the multi-layered lexical relationship between the two languages through three interconnected analytical dimensions: the identification and classification of cognate vocabulary deriving from their common Proto-Germanic ancestor; the systematic analysis of German loanwords in English and English loanwords in German as distinct borrowing streams; and the examination of the sociohistorical, cultural, and ideological mechanisms that have governed the trajectory of cross-linguistic lexical transfer across different historical periods. Drawing on historical linguistics, contact linguistics, and corpus-based lexicography, the study demonstrates that the German-English lexical relationship is neither symmetrical nor static but is structured by asymmetrical flows of cultural prestige, domain-specific borrowing, and degrees of phonological and orthographic assimilation. The analysis identifies academic, scientific, philosophical, and psychological discourse as particularly dense borrowing domains in English, while contemporary English loanwords into German are concentrated in digital technology, popular culture, and commerce. The article further examines the theoretical implications of German-English lexical contact for models of language change, the role of culturonyms in cross-cultural meaning transfer, and the pedagogical consequences of shared vocabulary for language learners navigating the two systems simultaneously.*

Keywords: *German-English lexical relations, Proto-Germanic cognates, loanwords, language contact, borrowing, historical linguistics, Anglicisms, Germanisms, culturonyms*

1. Introduction

English and German occupy a uniquely privileged position in the history of the Germanic languages: as the two most widely spoken members of the West Germanic branch of Proto-Indo-European, they share a genealogical heritage of extraordinary depth and a history of sustained lexical contact whose effects are visible at every level of both vocabularies. Their common ancestry can be traced to the Proto-Germanic spoken in Scandinavia and northern Europe during

[1] Memmedova, G. Lecturer, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan. Email: memmedova.gunel2230@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1800-2353

the first millennium BCE, and this shared origin manifests in an extensive stratum of cognate vocabulary that constitutes the irreducible core of both languages' lexicons (Ringe, 2006). Yet the two languages have diverged dramatically over fifteen centuries of separate development — shaped by the Norman Conquest that introduced French and Latin into English at the expense of its Germanic heritage, by the Renaissance that enriched both vocabularies with classical borrowings, and by the age of global industrialization and colonialism that established different geopolitical trajectories for each language (Baugh & Cable, 2013).

The result of these parallel and intersecting histories is a lexical relationship of remarkable complexity: one characterized simultaneously by deep genealogical kinship and by substantial structural, phonological, and semantic divergence. English and German share core vocabulary items — words for body parts, basic actions, kinship relations, natural phenomena — that descend from identical Proto-Germanic roots yet have diverged in pronunciation, morphological form, and sometimes meaning in ways that render them cognate but not identical. Alongside this inherited shared stratum, both languages have engaged in substantial mutual borrowing across different historical periods, driven by the prestige of German academic and scientific culture in the nineteenth century, the global dominance of English in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and the ongoing contact between the two languages through international scholarship, popular culture, and digital communication (Filipovic & Hawkins, 2013).

This article investigates the German-English lexical relationship through three interconnected analytical dimensions. The first concerns the nature and extent of shared vocabulary deriving from common Proto-Germanic ancestry — the cognate stratum that represents both languages' shared linguistic inheritance. The second concerns the historical and contemporary patterns of lexical borrowing in both directions — German loanwords (Germanisms) in English and English loanwords (Anglicisms) in German — with attention to the domains, mechanisms, and degrees of integration that characterize each borrowing stream. The third concerns the theoretical and pedagogical implications of this lexical relationship: what it reveals about the mechanisms of language change and contact, and what it means for learners navigating the two languages simultaneously. By drawing on historical linguistics, contact linguistics, corpus-based lexicography, and culturonym theory, the study aims to provide the most comprehensive account to date of the German-English lexical relationship in its full historical and structural dimensions.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Historical Linguistics and the Comparative Method

The theoretical foundation of this study rests on the comparative method in historical linguistics, which reconstructs ancestral linguistic states by identifying systematic sound correspondences between related languages and applying Grimm's Law and its subsequent refinements to trace the phonological pathways through which Proto-Germanic words evolved into their modern English and German descendants (Ringe, 2006). Grimm's Law — the systematic consonant shift that

distinguishes Germanic languages from other Indo-European branches — provides the primary framework for identifying true cognates and distinguishing them from chance resemblances or later borrowings. The subsequent High German Consonant Shift, which affected Old High German but not Old English, is the principal mechanism responsible for the systematic phonological divergences between cognate pairs in the two languages, such as English water versus German Wasser, English make versus German machen, and English open versus German offen (Waterman, 1991).

The distinction between inherited vocabulary and borrowed vocabulary is conceptually fundamental but practically complex, particularly in a language like English whose history involves stratification through multiple layers of contact — Old Norse, Norman French, Medieval Latin, Renaissance Latin and Greek, and the more recent borrowing from German and other modern languages (Baugh & Cable, 2013). The theoretical tools of contact linguistics, particularly Thomason and Kaufman's (1988) influential typology of language contact phenomena, provide the framework for analyzing the borrowing processes that have introduced German words into English and English words into German, including the distinctions between cultural borrowing (the importation of vocabulary alongside the cultural practices or concepts it denotes) and structural borrowing (the importation of grammatical patterns), and between loanwords, calques, and semantic loans.

2.2 Culturonyms and Cross-Linguistic Meaning Transfer

A particularly productive theoretical lens for analyzing a subset of German-English borrowings is provided by culturonym theory — the study of lexical units that encode culturally specific concepts, practices, or value systems that resist direct translation into languages without the relevant cultural framework (Wierzbicka, 1997). Several of the most widely discussed German loanwords in English — Schadenfreude, Weltanschauung, Zeitgeist, Angst, Gemütlichkeit — function precisely as culturonyms: they have been borrowed not because English lacked a word for the relevant concept but because the German term encoded the concept with a cultural specificity and semantic density that no available English expression could replicate (Sadikhova, 2025). The mechanism of culturonym borrowing — the adoption of a foreign term precisely because its untranslatability preserves culturally specific meaning — is theoretically distinct from ordinary lexical borrowing and demands separate analytical treatment. As Sadikhova (2025) argues in her analysis of culturonyms in contemporary discourse, such terms function not merely as labels but as compact carriers of cultural identity and worldview, and their migration across language boundaries inevitably involves negotiation between the cultural frameworks of source and target language.

2.3 Language Contact and Borrowing Asymmetries

Contact linguistics has established that lexical borrowing between languages is never symmetrical but reflects asymmetries of cultural prestige, institutional power, and communicative need at

specific historical moments (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Filipovic & Hawkins, 2013). The directionality and intensity of borrowing between German and English have reversed dramatically between the nineteenth century — when German held unparalleled prestige as the language of science, philosophy, and classical scholarship — and the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, when English as a global lingua franca has established itself as the default source of new vocabulary across virtually all professional and popular domains (Alisoy, 2025; Crystal, 2003). Understanding these asymmetries requires attention not only to the linguistic mechanisms of borrowing but to the sociohistorical conditions — political, institutional, and ideological — that create the conditions of prestige differential in which borrowing occurs (Babayev, 2025).

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, historical-comparative, and corpus-informed methodology. The analysis of Proto-Germanic cognates draws on established comparative reconstructions in Germanic historical linguistics, particularly Ringe (2006) and Waterman (1991), supplemented by etymological data from the Oxford English Dictionary and the Duden Herkunftswörterbuch. The analysis of German loanwords in English draws on historical lexicographic sources including the Oxford English Dictionary's dating of first attestation, supplemented by frequency data from the Corpus of Historical American English (COHA) and the British National Corpus (BNC) to identify patterns of chronological distribution and domain concentration. The analysis of Anglicisms in German draws on the Anglizismenwörterbuch (Carstensen & Busse, 1993–1996) and subsequent corpus-based studies of English influence on contemporary German. The study proceeds in four analytical stages: (1) identification and classification of the Proto-Germanic cognate stratum; (2) historical and synchronic analysis of German loanwords in English by domain and period; (3) analysis of English loanwords in German with attention to contemporary digital and popular culture vocabulary; and (4) synthesis of the theoretical and pedagogical implications.

4. Proto-Germanic Cognates: The Shared Ancestral Stratum

4.1 The Scope and Nature of Cognate Vocabulary

The most fundamental dimension of the German-English lexical relationship is the extensive stratum of vocabulary that both languages inherited from their common Proto-Germanic ancestor. This inherited vocabulary constitutes the irreducible core of both languages' basic lexicons: it encompasses vocabulary for the human body (English hand / German Hand, English foot / German Fuß, English heart / German Herz), for kinship relations (English father / German Vater, English mother / German Mutter, English brother / German Bruder), for basic natural phenomena (English water / German Wasser, English fire / German Feuer, English wind / German Wind), for fundamental actions (English come / German kommen, English go / German gehen, English give / German geben), and for basic qualities (English long / German lang, English old / German alt, English good / German gut) (Ringe, 2006; Waterman, 1991).

The phonological correspondences between English and German cognates are not random but follow the systematic patterns established by Grimm's Law and the subsequent High German Consonant Shift. Grimm's Law established the characteristic consonant inventory of all Germanic languages relative to other Indo-European branches; the High German Consonant Shift further transformed the stop consonants of Proto-Germanic in the dialects that would become German, while Old English remained unaffected. The result is a set of predictable correspondences: English /p/ corresponds to German /pf/ or /ff/ (English open / German offen, English ship / German Schiff), English /t/ corresponds to German /ss/ or /z/ (English water / German Wasser, English eat / German essen), and English /k/ corresponds to German /ch/ or /ck/ (English make / German machen, English break / German brechen). These regular correspondences allow linguists to identify true cognates systematically and to distinguish inherited shared vocabulary from later borrowings (Waterman, 1991).

4.2 Semantic Divergence Among Cognates: False Friends and Semantic Drift

While the phonological correspondences between English and German cognates are systematic, their semantic trajectories have frequently diverged in ways that complicate cross-linguistic comprehension. The phenomenon of false friends — cognate pairs whose phonological similarity masks semantic divergence — is particularly well-documented in English-German comparisons and constitutes a significant source of interference for language learners in both directions (James, 1980). Classic examples include English gift (a present) versus German Gift (poison); English brave (courageous) versus German brav (well-behaved); English become (to come to be) versus German bekommen (to receive); and English sensible (rational, reasonable) versus German sensibel (sensitive, emotionally responsive). These semantic divergences arise through independent processes of semantic narrowing, broadening, amelioration, and pejoration that have operated differently in the two languages' separate historical contexts (Stern, 1931).

Semantic drift among cognates is not merely a lexicographic curiosity but a theoretical window into the mechanisms of language change. The same inherited lexical item, exposed to different social, cultural, and discursive pressures in its respective language environment, undergoes different semantic trajectories — revealing that meaning is not an intrinsic property of linguistic forms but a product of their use within specific cultural and communicative contexts (Traugott & Dasher, 2002). The systematic comparison of English-German cognate pairs and their semantic histories therefore contributes not only to contrastive lexicology but to the broader theoretical understanding of semantic change.

5. German Loanwords in English: Germanisms

5.1 Historical Overview and Periodization

The history of German loanword borrowing into English can be periodized into four principal phases, each reflecting the particular configuration of cultural, political, and intellectual prestige

at the relevant moment. The earliest phase, spanning the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is characterized by borrowings associated with mining and metallurgy — domains in which German technological expertise was unrivalled in Europe. Words such as cobalt (from Kobold, a mischievous spirit believed by miners to contaminate ore), nickel (from Nickel, an abbreviation of Kupfernickel, 'copper demon'), zinc (from Zink), and quartz (from Quarz) entered English through the specialized vocabulary of German-speaking miners and metallurgists (Baugh & Cable, 2013). The second phase, in the eighteenth century, brought borrowings connected to military affairs — reflecting Prussia's emergence as a major European military power — including words such as plunder (from plündern), saber (from Säbel), and shako (from Tschako).

The most substantial and intellectually consequential phase of German borrowing into English occurred in the nineteenth century, driven by the unparalleled prestige of German-language science, philosophy, and scholarship. During this period, German universities were the premier sites of advanced research in chemistry, physics, medicine, philosophy, and philology, and the resulting flow of German-origin vocabulary into English academic and scientific discourse was enormous (Cannon, 1987). In chemistry alone, the English vocabulary was enriched by German-derived terms including protein (from Protein), polymer (from Polymer), paraffin (from Paraffin), and numerous others. Psychology and psychiatry imported Freudian and post-Freudian vocabulary — including ego, id, libido, angst, neurosis, and gestalt — either directly from German or through the German-mediated transmission of classical concepts. Philosophy contributed weltanschauung, zeitgeist, leitmotiv, and doppelganger. The humanities and social sciences absorbed kindergarten, seminar, and wanderlust, among many others.

The fourth phase, extending from the twentieth century to the present, has been shaped by a combination of cultural and intellectual factors. The emigration of German-speaking scholars to Britain and America following the rise of National Socialism transferred significant intellectual capital and associated vocabulary to the anglophone world, while the ongoing prestige of German philosophical, musicological, and psychoanalytic traditions has sustained the borrowing of culturally dense German terms — including schadenfreude, weltschmerz, realpolitik, and gemütlichkeit — as culturonyms encoding concepts for which English lacks adequate near-equivalents (Sadikhova, 2025).

5.2 Domain Analysis and Degrees of Integration

The analysis of German loanwords in English reveals strong domain concentration: the most densely represented fields are psychology and psychiatry, philosophy, music, mining and chemistry, military affairs, and cultural discourse. This domain pattern reflects the epistemological and cultural domains in which German intellectual culture exercised the greatest international prestige and in which the concepts developed were genuinely novel rather than duplicative of existing English vocabulary (Cannon, 1987). The degree of phonological and orthographic integration of German loanwords into English varies considerably. Fully integrated borrowings —

such as kindergarten, rucksack, and nickel — have undergone anglicized pronunciation and are treated as ordinary English words by contemporary speakers who are typically unaware of their German origin. Partially integrated borrowings — such as schadenfreude and zeitgeist — retain German spelling but are pronounced with approximated English phonology. Unintegrated borrowings — such as weltanschauung — retain German capitalization, spelling, and pronunciation and function as marked foreign terms even in professional discourse.

The following table presents a representative selection of German loanwords in English, organized by domain and approximate period of entry.

German Source	English Borrowing	Domain	Period of Entry
Kindergarten	kindergarten	Education	19th century
Rucksack	rucksack	Material culture	19th century
Zeitgeist	zeitgeist	Philosophy/culture	19th century
Angst	angst	Psychology	Early 20th century
Schadenfreude	schadenfreude	Psychology/emotion	Late 20th century
Wanderlust	wanderlust	Travel/culture	19th century
Doppelgänger	doppelganger	Literature/psychology	19th century
Gestalt	gestalt	Psychology	Early 20th century
Leitmotiv	leitmotif/leitmotiv	Music/literature	Late 19th century
Wunderkind	wunderkind	General/education	Late 19th century

6. English Loanwords in German: Anglicisms

6.1 The Anglicism Wave and Its Sociolinguistic Context

The flow of borrowing between German and English reversed decisively in the second half of the twentieth century, as the global dominance of American English — in science, technology, popular culture, and international commerce — established English as the de facto source language for new vocabulary in virtually all modern domains. The penetration of English loanwords into

German, collectively designated Anglicismen (Anglicisms), has been one of the most extensively documented phenomena in contemporary German linguistics (Carstensen & Busse, 1993–1996; Busse & Görlach, 2002). The pace of Anglicism adoption accelerated dramatically from the 1990s onward, driven by the digitization of communication, the globalization of youth culture, and the increasing use of English as the working language of multinational corporations headquartered in or trading with German-speaking countries (Alisoy, 2025).

The domain distribution of contemporary Anglicisms in German is strikingly concentrated in digital technology and computing (downloaden, updaten, chatten, googeln, spammen), popular culture and entertainment (der Film, der Star, das Selfie, der Thriller, das Streaming), business and commerce (das Meeting, das Feedback, der Manager, das Branding, das Networking), and sport and leisure (der Trainer, das Jogging, das Surfing, der Penalty). This concentration reflects precisely those domains in which American English culture exercises the greatest global influence and in which new concepts, practices, and technologies originate predominantly in anglophone contexts before diffusing globally (Busse & Görlach, 2002). The linguistic adaptation of English borrowings into German follows predictable patterns: nouns receive obligatory grammatical gender assignment (das Internet, der Computer, die App), verbs are adapted to German morphological patterns (googeln, downloaden), and many borrowed nouns can be compounded with native German elements following German compounding conventions (the Computermaus, die Smartphone-Hülle).

6.2 The Purism Debate and Language Policy

The substantial influx of English vocabulary into German has generated sustained public and institutional debate about linguistic purism and the integrity of the German language. The Verein Deutsche Sprache (Society for the German Language), founded in 1997, has campaigned actively against what it terms the Anglicization of German, proposing native German substitutes for English borrowings — Handy for mobile phone (which is itself a pseudo-Anglicism, as English speakers do not use the word 'handy' to mean mobile phone), Rechner for Computer, and Netz for Internet — with varying degrees of popular acceptance (Durrell, 2004). The language policy debate reflects broader tensions between linguistic nationalism and the pragmatic accommodation to global communicative norms that characterizes most contemporary language communities. As contact linguistics research has consistently demonstrated, these purist interventions have limited effect on the actual trajectory of language change, which is driven by communicative need, prestige, and the social dynamics of language use rather than by institutional prescription (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988).

7. Pedagogical Implications

The German-English lexical relationship has substantial implications for language pedagogy, particularly in contexts where learners are acquiring one of these languages with prior knowledge of the other. The extensive shared cognate stratum constitutes a powerful positive transfer resource:

learners of German with English L1 can exploit systematic sound correspondences — applying Grimm's Law in reverse, as it were — to identify probable German cognates for known English words, substantially accelerating vocabulary acquisition in both directions (James, 1980). Pedagogical approaches that make these correspondences explicit — teaching learners to recognize that English words with initial /p/, /t/, or /k/ often have German cognates with /pf/, /ss/tz, or /ch/ respectively — can dramatically reduce the cognitive load associated with Germanic vocabulary acquisition.

At the same time, the false friends documented in the cognate stratum constitute a persistent source of negative transfer that systematic pedagogical attention can mitigate. Explicit instruction in the most common false cognate pairs, grounded in the historical mechanisms of semantic divergence, equips learners to navigate the interference zone between the two languages more confidently (Filipovic & Hawkins, 2013). For advanced learners, attention to the culturonym layer of German-English borrowing — the semantically dense German terms that have been adopted into English precisely because they encode concepts without adequate native-language equivalents — provides valuable insight into both the cross-linguistic mechanisms of meaning transfer and the cultural knowledge systems that each language encodes (Sadikhova, 2025; Wierzbicka, 1997). As Babayev (2025) argues in his analysis of cross-cultural terminology, understanding the cultural embeddedness of such terms is essential for genuinely competent use, as opposed to superficial familiarity with their denotative content.

8. Conclusion

This article has demonstrated that the lexical relationship between German and English constitutes one of the most richly documented and theoretically productive instances of cross-linguistic kinship and contact in the history of the European languages. The two languages share an extensive Proto-Germanic cognate stratum whose systematic phonological correspondences, despite centuries of independent development, remain identifiable through the regular application of Grimm's Law and the High German Consonant Shift. Alongside this inherited vocabulary, the two languages have engaged in sustained mutual borrowing across different historical periods — German to English primarily in the domains of nineteenth-century science, philosophy, psychology, and cultural discourse; English to German predominantly in the domains of twentieth and twenty-first century digital technology, popular culture, and global commerce.

The directionality and intensity of these borrowing flows reflects the asymmetrical distribution of cultural prestige and epistemic authority at different historical moments, confirming contact linguistics' fundamental insight that borrowing is socially and ideologically structured rather than linguistically determined. The analysis of culturonyms — German terms borrowed into English precisely because their semantic density resists translation — reveals the most theoretically interesting dimension of the German-English relationship: the way in which lexical borrowing can function as a mechanism for the cross-cultural transfer of conceptual frameworks and value

systems, not merely of labels. Future research should continue to exploit the rich documentation of German-English contact to advance theoretical understanding of language change, and should attend to the accelerating contemporary influx of English into German as a case study in real-time lexical change under conditions of global communicative dominance.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: G.M.; Methodology: G.M.; Investigation: G.M.; Writing – original draft: G.M.; Writing – review & editing: G.M.

References

Alisoy, H. (2025). From Echo Chambers to Critical Dialogue: A Comparative Case Study of Social Media-Based Pedagogy For Addressing Scientific Misinformation. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities* , *2*(4), 35-47. https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0250203002

Babayev, J. S., Sadikhova , S. N., Baghirova, M. A., Seidova , E. R., & Mammadova , A. A. (2025). Un análisis léxico-estilístico e intercultural de los vulgarismos y sus ámbitos de uso . *Universidad Y Sociedad*, *17*(6), e5525. Recuperado a partir de https://rus.ucf.edu.cu/index.php/rus/article/view/5525

Filipovic, L., & Hawkins, J. A. (2013). The ideology of globalization in English and German. Language and Intercultural Communication, 13(3), 254–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.789931

Sadigzade, Z. (2025). Dialect Diversity and Social Change: New Approaches in Sociolinguistics. *Journal of Azerbaijan Language and Education Studies*, *2*(3), 91-107. https://doi.org/10.69760/jales.2025002017

Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics. University of California Press.

Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2002). Regularity in semantic change. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486500

Baugh, A. C., & Cable, T. (2013). A history of the English language (6th ed.). Routledge.

Busse, U., & Görlach, M. (2002). German. In M. Görlach (Ed.), English in Europe (pp. 13–36). Oxford University Press.

Cannon, G. (1987). Historical change and English word-formation: Recent vocabulary. Peter Lang.

Crystal, D. (2003). English as a global language (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Durrell, M. (2004). Using German: A guide to contemporary usage (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Ringe, D. (2006). A linguistic history of English: Vol. 1. From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic. Oxford University Press.

Stern, G. (1931). Meaning and change of meaning. Indiana University Press.

Waterman, J. T. (1991). A history of the German language (rev. ed.). Waveland Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Understanding cultures through their key words. Oxford University Press.

Babayev, J. (2025). A comparative-linguistic analysis of Australian and New Zealand English. EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education, 2(5), 20–27.

Carstensen, B., & Busse, U. (1993–1996). Anglizismen-Wörterbuch: Der Einfluss des Englischen auf den deutschen Wortschatz nach 1945 (3 vols.). De Gruyter.

James, C. (1980). Contrastive analysis. Longman.

Received: 12 March 2026
Accepted: 24 April 2026
Published: 25 April 2026