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Preface

It has long been my personal interest to examine the phenomenon of language contact and change in one of the most controversial periods in the development of the English language, i.e., before and after the Norman Conquest. As we all know, English has become one of the most widely spoken languages in this present world. Thanks to this internationally "accepted" language, many of us benefit when communicating with those who speak different $L_1$'s. Without it, I certainly would not have been able to communicate with an extremely large number of people from all over the world. Nonetheless, among the native speakers of English, the sense of "purity" and "correctness" in the use of English seems to have increased, which is true even among "native English teachers" (though how ambiguous the definition of this profession may be) both inside and outside their homelands. And this tendency has been transferred to the "non-native" ones as well. The point is that any language bearing a title of "international" is exposed to external causes of change. This is a natural process. Even when one attempts to protect it from changing and thinks that he/she successfully does so, the truth is, one is simply not realizing that the language changes by that very act of prevention. Once we come to realize that there is no "correctness" or "purity" attached to any language, the clearer picture of language change will emerge.
This sense of supremacy over other languages can be detected most everywhere and apparent in some titles of books written on the history of the language. If this continues to grow, it will give birth to a strong sense of nationalism. Therefore, this paper is dedicated to problematizing some of the binary relationships of pure/impure and correct/incorrect and proposes more integrated approaches to language contact and change concerning the period in question.

Of course, I have not been able to complete this thesis without the help of the following people, to whom I am most grateful.

First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Thomas Bonfiglio for having shared so much time with in discussing the content of the paper. Especially, a special seminar course at the University of Richmond entitled “Meaning and Modernity,” for which he served as a coordinator along with Dr. Julie Hayes, has played a major role in laying the foundation of this paper.

Secondly, I am most grateful to the English Department and the Graduate School of the University of Richmond, for having allowed me to study here for nearly two years. Without their support, my interest in this subject would not be appearing in this form.

Various other people have aided me during the course of research, whose help I wish to acknowledge. Dr. James Duckworth, Dr. Marcia Whitehead, and Dr. David Evans at the University of Richmond, and Prof.
Kuniko Koga at Koran Junior College, Fukuoka, Japan, are to be thanked for their support, suggestion and advice at various stages. I especially would like to thank Dr. Whitehead, whose letter of recommendation enabled me to conduct a research in the British Library in the summer of 1989. I am also indebted to the staff of the Boatwright Library at the University of Richmond, who helped me collect the necessary materials and to the staff of the British Library for their invaluable advice and support while reading there.
Contents

Preface ................................................................. iii

Chapter 1: Articulating Problems Regarding the Language Contact and Change in the History of the English Language from Late OE to ME

1. 0 General introduction ----------------------------- 1

1. 1 Two conflicting views on the linguistic situations before and after the Norman Conquest. ----------------------------- 5

Chapter 2: On the Possible Post-Creole Continuum in England: The eve of the Norman Conquest

2. 0 Introduction ----------------------------------------- 18

2. 1 What are a pidgin and a creole? ----------------------- 19

2. 2 Is ME a mixed language?: normality and abnormality of the language change ------------------------------------------ 25

Chapter 3: On Language Contact and Change in Medieval England:
The Day after the Norman Conquest

3. 0 Introduction ----------------------------------------- 53

3. 1 Again, Bailey and Maroldt vs. Thomason and Kaufman ----- 54

3. 2 Lexical borrowing from French ------------------------ 58

3. 3 Borrowing and interference -------------------------- 61

3. 4 French “loanphrases” in English ---------------------- 63

3. 5 Issues on bilingualism: interference, code switching
Chapter 1

Articulating Problems Regarding the Language Contact and Change in the History of the English Language from Late OE to ME

0. General introduction

This is a study on the process of language change as a result of language contact.. Specifically, this paper deals with the change caused by the two major waves of linguistic influence exerted on the Anglo-Saxon language by the Norse and Norman-French languages. Certain group of scholars argue that those language contact situations are responsible for having eventually led the English language to its present form. And of the two, the Norman-French influence has been by far the more often discussed issue, on which we will focus our discussion in this chapter.

One most familiar outcome of the contact between the Anglo-Saxon and Norman French cited by both teachers and students of English etymology is the still-retained “beef-cow” contrast in the language, i.e., the sets of borrowed vs. indigenous words. They tend to argue that it indicates the servant-master relations, in this case, between the two peoples. With regard to this issue, a Hawaiian writer, Joseph P. Balaz, of three ethnic origins - Czechoslovakian, Irish and Hawaiian - humorously points out this matter in Hawaiian Pidgin English:
Like different kind words, da world was full of different kind birds: yellow birds, blue birds, red birds, love birds - and den came da pigeon. Da history of da word pigeon is li'dis - Wen da French-speaking Normans wen conquer England in da year ten-six-six, dey Wen bring along wit dem da word pigeon, for da type of bird it was. Da resident Anglo-Saxon used da word dove, or D-U-F-E, as dey used to spell 'um, to mean da same bird. It just so happened dat terms in Norman-French Wen blend wit Old English sentence structure, to form what we know as Middle English. In da process, da French word became da one dat referred to da pigeon as food. Today in England, if you look for dem, you can find recipes for pigeon pie.

Food for taught, eh - Even back den, da word pigeon Wen blend with pigeon for get some moa pigeon. So now days get pigeon by da zoo - get pigeon on da beach - get pigeon in town - get pigeon in coups - and not madda wat anybody try do, dey cannot get rid of pigeon - I guess wit such wide blue sky, everything deserves to fly. (read at a Colloquium on Pidgin and Creole Languages at the University of Hawaii at Manoa in Honolulu on August 1, 1986, quoted from Romaine 1988:111-2)

Unlike the beef-cow set, the distinctive contrast between the animal prepared as food for the nobility and the animate entity taken care of by the servants became very weak. The reason might be that pigeons became scarcely eaten by the British as time went on. And it now rarely possesses a semantic property as food. Nonetheless, by illustrating the origin of the word "pigeon," Balaz creates an interesting account and successfully claims the status and function of "pidgin" languages in the society at the same time. For our concern at this stage, this creative story provides an excellent explanation of the linguistic heritage of English, i.e., the "blend of the two languages," to which we will return in
Chapter 3.

As Balaz implies in the above passage, OE seems to have undergone a significant change under the influence of the language of the newcomers. Having seen a popular view of the event, some of the scholarly accounts of the outcome of the language contact situation need to be provided.

Though written more than four decades ago, Mossé’s brief discussion on this matter still seems to be one of the best available arguments. He discusses as follows:

La Conquête normande s’est bornée à créer des conditions propices à une évolution plus rapide de l’anglais que ce n’aurait été autrement le cas; la structure proprement dite de la langue n’a pas été altérée, elle reste celle d’une langue germanique. Par contre, sur le vocabulaire cette influence a été immense et sur la syntaxe elle n’est pas négligeable. Quant à la prosodie, elle a été transformée de fond en comble. (1947:85-6)

His remark evokes one to inquire further into this age-old subject matter. And one may find that there is still much to be studied on this subject, for even as to the sociological situations in England and the relationship between the indigenous people and the new comers before and after the Norman Conquest, there is little knowledge about them. As late as in 1983, Leith (p. 23) states, “Very little is known about the relations between the English and the new comers.” It is needless to mention that when it comes to the linguistic change that was taking place in Britain,
much has not yet been elucidated.

If Mossé's account of the ME linguistic state after the major impact by a new flow of people and their language from the Continent were correct, one would certainly wonder what sort of a language English did become.¹ The above-quoted passage simply maintains that although the Anglo-Saxon language went through a rather significant change on the surface, it stayed at the deeper level as it had been prior to the Norse and Norman-French influences. What does this statement then suggest? The most reasonable interpretation of his description may be that the language's substratum remained Germanic,² while there were significant changes brought about upon the superficial elements of it. With regard to this problem, the nature of language change will be investigated later in the paper in the light of the pidginization and creolization theories that has already been partially provided by Balaz's story.

In this chapter, by reviewing the earlier studies by several historian and philologists with differing opinions, the difficulty of this subject will be investigated and stressed again. Its difficulty may not be so surprising, considering that even what happened in the recent past is

¹ It should be, however, reminded that the loss of the Germanic inflectional endings was well in progress even before the "Anglo-Saxons" left their homeland on the Continent.

² The term substratum is used in a different sense from that of the substratum theory, which implies the commonly shared linguistic base by pidginized and creolized languages.
often viewed from two completely conflicting standpoints, and it is rendered with considerably different interpretations. It often depends on each individual researcher's interest in the subject matter or traditions in a given academic school to which he/she belongs. One can go as far as to say that the result of his/her research and discussion is more or less predetermined even before collecting data and in the process of interpreting them. One may prefer to argue that it might have been so in the studies conducted in the earlier days, but it is still the case in recent studies. However, one is not capable of pursuing his/her discussion without being directed by numerous biases. Thus, this paper attempts first to clarify the different underlying biases and reasoning processes of the previous studies, then to articulate the very nature of this problematic issue in examining the available data, and finally to ask new questions about the whole issue on language contact and change in the period from late OE to ME.

1. Two conflicting views on the linguistic situations before and after the Norman Conquest.

Again, Mossé's discussion is most appropriate to begin this discussion. He (1947, Ch.2. 3) points out the most crucial problem regarding the
Norman- and Central-French\(^3\) influence on English syntax, saying that despite the fact that almost all scholars admit the "debt" English owes to French as far as its "peripheral" language elements are concerned, a number of those who maintain so argue, at the same time, strongly against the possible French influence on its syntactical elements.

Mossé maintains that this area - the syntactic influence - is not sufficiently studied, and moreover that the studies done so far are more or less biased. It may help to understand the reason why Mossé makes such a claim by viewing current trends in linguistics. For instance, studies on syntactical rules or grammars are considered those of "linguistic proper," while an area like sociolinguistics is still regarded as a subdisciplinary area in modern linguistics. It is well-depicted in the theory of generative grammarians (e.g., Chomsky 1986) that their notion of the core or most critical property of language consists of some universal principles and rules of grammar and is innate to all humans.

Two of the major scholars, who are matched with Mossé's description just previously mentioned, are Baugh and Cable. They (1978:167), while depicting the influx of several thousand words both from Norman French

\(^3\) As the dialect of Il-de-France, the old name of the province surrounding Paris, gained prestigious status as the "Standard French" dialect during the 12th and 13th centuries (Rickard 1974), the Central French came to be the variety in the place of Norman- and Anglo-French. It is well-depicted in the trend of French loanwords into English as well: more words began to come into it in the Central-French form.
and Central French into the English vocabulary and admitting the extraordinarily important role of them in the language, insist upon the indirectness of the effect on the English grammar, saying:

...by making English the language mainly of uneducated people, the Norman Conquest made it easier for grammatical changes to go forward unchecked. Beyond this it is not to be considered a factor in such changes.

They (p. 183) furthermore maintain:

It must not be thought that the extensive modification of the English language caused by the Norman Conquest had made of it something else than English. The language had undergone much simplification of its inflections, but its grammar was still English.

They claim that their argument is supported by one of the most eminent factors in language, i.e., that the basic vocabulary remained the same: "the Englishman ate, drank, and slept" (ibid.). And they provide a list of native words still in use to the present day. Despite their rather strong tone in insisting on this point, it needs to be noted that many of those words belong to a group of basic vocabulary that are considered to be relatively invulnerable both to external and internal language changing forces. ¹

¹ There are number of exceptions, as in the case of the partial borrowing of the Chinese numbers by the Japanese in the earlier contact of the two languages.
does not deny, by any means, the fact that Pr. E still retains some strong 
Germanic traits, which Mossé also mentions in his discussion (e.g., some 
word formations). But on the other hand, one cannot help noticing that 
Baugh and Cable along with some other scholars seem to, whether 
subconsciously or consciously, attempt to acknowledge the continuity of 
the great language which carries an enormous body of literary works in its 
history. Of course, there is no denying that Baugh and Cable’s work should 
be considered as one of the finest, in that they successfully explain the 
development of the English language in its transformation. 

Some other scholars are far much stronger in their argument, saying 
that the extent to which Norman French affected English was far less than 
one would normally think. Kellner (1892:303), one of the eminent figures 
in the historical study of English syntax at the turn of the century, 
remarks on this subject as follows:

The development of English syntax is, like that of English sounds, 
inflexions, and words, in the main due to internal causes: it is 
spontaneous...all these changes (phonological shifts and the eventual 
leveling of inflectional word-endings) would, in all probability, have 
taken place, even if English had been left to itself, and had not been 
subject to the influence of Latin and French. (explanation in the 
parentheses mine)

Kellner argues that English could possibly have developed into the 
present state of almost an analytic language without any external
influence. However, as in the case of Baugh and Cable, Kellner (p. 304) does not hesitate to note the possible French influence on the language, after the above-quoted discussion:

Besides this principal organic development there is another of less importance, but which has given to English syntax some of its most characteristic peculiarities - I mean the external influence of foreign languages, chiefly of Latin and French. (emphasis mine)

Thus, Kellner denies the French "intrusion" into the fundamental English components but allows some room for further study. He lists two chief reasons for it (ibid.): the insufficiency of the amount of studies of the OE texts, which may still be true even almost a century after Kellner's book, and perhaps will be so a long time from now as well, and a normally long-term introduction process of the spoken language into the written. In explicating the latter, Kellner writes:

...what we find in literary language is generally only the result of a long development which has been going on for some time in the spoken language. (ibid.)

As he also mentions, the scarcity of the number of extant manuscripts is another major obstacle.

A question should be naturally asked as to why he has to make a remark on the external influence in a way in which he may have to contradict his
first argument. If he only wishes to attribute syntactic change to internal causes as has been discussed above, he most certainly does not have to present the seemingly counter-argument, especially in the form of the underlined expression mentioned above. It is true, without any doubt, that to find the origin of a certain English syntactic construction is not an easy task, especially with the problems observed so far. Thus, he rather wishes to attribute the core changes in the language to the internal causes. Nonetheless, his argument seems not only to imply but moreover to indicate clearly his suppressed partial agreement with what he criticizes as the “over-rated influence of French on Syntax Proper” (p. 308). That is, it might have been over-rated, but it at least has its fair share in the process of the development of English.

Kellner’s definition of the term “syntax proper” includes the sound system, inflections, and word-formation of a language, and he believes that this consists the central portion of language (p. 307). He notes the drastic change from the free word order in OE to the rigid one in ME. And the ME rigid word order is also combined with “a great number of new phrases and idioms” (p. 308).

Now one of the most essential issues needs to be clarified: “Is it not a reasonable argument that the analytic characteristic of the English language is the result of its sound change and loss of inflections?” If it is so, how can one be certain that the change occurred of itself? The
following chapters will partially clarify these questions, and now let us
turn to the other end of the extreme, i.e., pro-Romance theories.

We always encounter one’s either extraordinary prejudice against, or
partiality for a certain language or a variety of a language. It is also the
case that certain people are even afraid to open their mouths when they
are talking to those who speak what is generally considered to be the
“better” and “superior” language or language variety. One’s language
identity indeed plays a vital role in linguistic ideology. The above case is
true, for instance, for many of those who speak any distinctive
geographical variety of Japanese.

“Standard Japanese” is considered to be based on some geographical
and social varieties of the Japanese language spoken in Tokyo. The
Japanese who speak drastically different from the Standard “norm” -
extreme Northern or Southern varieties - are both overtly or covertly
encouraged to master the “Standard variety,” especially if they wish to
pursue a white-collar profession.5 It is also the case in Norwich, a small
isolated speech community in Britain (Trudgill 1974), and many other
speech communities in the world.

In the same sense, many of English speakers feel, still to this day,
intimidation and an inferiority complex towards French to varying

5 This is the reason why so many of the Japanese are capable of
speaking at least two varieties of the language.
degrees. These feelings often appear on the surface in different forms. The more or less suppressed inferiority complex is what has been observed in the argument that claims the long continuity or even purity of English. Thus, the opposite perspective can be seen in the pro-Romance theories.

For some scholars of the history of English (e.g., Bailey and Maroldt 1976), it is an assumed fact that the Pr.E is a result of mixture of other languages. A quick glance at the language immediately reveals the substantial quantity of words from the Romance languages: mainly Latin and French. Given the fact that the Roman ruled over Celtic Britain, and that Latin was rendered an exceptionally prestigious status among the peoples of Europe, the Latin influence is readily explicable.6 And as to the French influence, one can simply assume that it is the result of the Norman Conquest and the following British submission to the Norman-French. Trevelyan, one of the eminent historians in the early 1900's, holds such a view regarding its effect on English. He (1926:131) maintains, "one outcome of the Norman Conquest was the making of the English language." And the use of his language in accounting for the process of "making" English is exceedingly interesting. The point of departure of his discussion is that the Anglo-Saxon language was broad

---

6 Since the Latin influence is not dealt with in this paper, this matter will not be discussed any further.
and uncultivated, while the French was otherwise in every respect. This, in Ferguson's terms, means that French served as the H language, and Anglo-Saxon as the L. But unlike the study of Ferguson, a sociolinguist, who is "supposed" to be claiming that no language is better than others, Trevelyan's discussion is full of colorful adjectives describing the two languages:

If the grammar (English grammar) is clumsy and ungraceful, it can be altered much more easily when there are no grammarians to protest. And so it fell out in England. During the three centuries when our native language was a peasants' dialect, it lost its clumsy inflections and elaborate genders, and acquired the grace, suppleness and adaptability which are among its chief merits. At the same time it was enriched by many French words and ideas. The English vocabulary is mainly French in words relating to war, politics, justice, religion, hunting, cooking and art. Thus improved, our native tongue re-entered polite and learned society as the English of Chaucer's Tales and Wycliffe's Bible, to be still further enriched into the English of Shakespeare and of Milton. (p. 132, emphasis and explanation in the parentheses mine.)

Earlier in his account of Norman-French Britain, he (p. 131) presents the clear-cut social strata in the use of the three languages: Latin - clergy, French - gentry, English-peasants. And this view is still supported by the recent scholarship as well. For instance, Halliday explains the relatively low rate of French loanwords into English during the period immediately following the Conquest, writing:
English, therefore, was reduced to little more than the speech of illiterate surfs, and as the early Normans made little attempt to learn the language, comparatively few French words found their way into ordinary speech during the first century after the Conquest. (1975:67)

Since the Anglo-Saxon language with "clumsy and ungraceful grammar" ceased to be used by the learned, he concludes that it was able to undergo the drastic sophistication and improvement, which somewhat parallels Baugh and Cable discussion examined earlier.

The above-quoted passage of Trevelyan's not only reveals, with its use of adjectives, his pronounced preference of French to English, but also implicates the preeminence of English after the "Romance baptism." That is, the continuity of the language is implied in it when he writes, "when our native language was a peasant's dialect," and as its result, "our native tongue re-entered polite and learned society" (emphasis mine). The expression "our native language" or "tongue" does not seem only to denote nothing more than the English language. It may be possible to argue that the proud heritage of the language is expressed in a suppressed way, i.e., stating the potentiality and capability of becoming a global language after the improvement process. As a matter of fact, Trevelyan (p. 132) further argues as follows:

...there is no more romantic episode in the history of man than this underground growth and unconscious self-preparation of the despised island patios, destined ere long to 'burst forth into sudden blase,' to be spoken in every quarter of the globe, and to produce a
literature with which only that of ancient Hellas is comparable.

It might be argued that there is not so much significant difference in the studies examined above, as to the historical evidence presented in them. But rather, it is the underlying biases that determine whether a given thesis is "superficially" pro-Germanic or pro-Romance. It is underwritten by the fact that even Halliday (1975), who also claims the low status of English after the Conquest, maintains the continuity of the great language and entitles the word *The Excellency of the English Language*. And the same type of logic is also found in Chambers (1932).

The superficial difference seems to occur when one begins to view language as a set of independent layers from the most substratum to the most superstratum that do not interact or even affect each other when it comes to the issue of language contact and change. This is problematic because it is as if one claims in sociological terms that a major change in lower social classes of people do not affect in the lives of those who belong to higher classes. Rather, language should be treated as a collective and continuous unit of interactive elements.

It is quite interesting to note that one can find the same trends in the historical studies of the Norman Conquest, i.e., the question as to whether the establishment of a "feudal system" in England can be ascribed to the completely new system brought into by the Norman-French or to the original Anglo-Saxon social system. It was not until Stenton (1931) that
it became a widely accepted notion that feudalism after the Conquest was radically different from that in the Anglo-Saxon society. However, in the studies after the 1960's, even the terms "feudalism" and "feudal system" have become ambiguous and tended even not to used at all. But, Chibnall (1986:2) discusses as follows:

So much has been written on 'feudalism' that some historians now shy away from the word altogether. This is too drastic; one might more usefully adapt Voltaire's aphorism, 'if feudalism did not exist, we would need to invent it'.

What Chibnall means is that there was a gradual assimilation process taken place in England to for its particular feudal system, which "had not existed in exactly that form in either the kingdom of Edward the Confessor or the earlier duchy of Normandy" (ibid.).

Returning to the question of language change, even with such limited studies reviewed so far, we have come to realize the importance of some new perspectives to examine the process of language change during the few centuries before and after the Conquest. In doing so, one must always be reminded, at the same time, that a new way of examining this subject is not totally void of any bias, but will bring in some new insights of the nature of the subject matter.

The next chapter will examine the linguistic situation before the
Conquest in Britain, using two major studies that hold completely opposite standpoints towards the development of English.
Chapter 2

On the Possible Post-Creole Continuum in Great Britain

- The Eve of the Norman Conquest -

0. Introduction

In 1977, one of the most controversial papers regarding the language contact of OE and Old French was published by Bailey and Maroldt, entitled "The French Lineage of English." The paper outlines the creolization processes of OE. And, as it is obvious from its title, it attempts to attribute the drastic language change from OE to ME to the immense mixing of the Anglo-Saxon and both Norman and Central French. The appearance of their paper shocked traditionalists in the field. And some strongly argue against what seems to them to be a radical and unreasonable approach to this particular language change, two of whom are Thomason and Kaufman (1988).

As late as 1988, they presented a case against Bailey and Maroldt, claiming that English is not a mixed language. By reviewing both of their argument and that of Bailey and Maroldt, we will be able to point out each side's problematic areas in their discussion and to come up with our own conclusion, which may cast some new insights in the matter in question. To begin with, it is necessary to investigate the foundation on which the
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above two arguments are based: theories of pidginization and creolization.

1. What are a pidgin and a creole?

   The first question needs to be answered is, “what exactly does one mean when he/she refers to a given language as either pidgin or creole?” Generally, one must admit that, even to the present day, the statement incorporates negative notions. Thus, the status of any so-called pidginized or creolized language is unreasonably low, because of their negative image as simplified speech or corrupted language. For instance, one can easily find this negative attitude towards them in two of the widely-used dictionaries.

   *Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language* defines a pidgin as follows:

   > A mixed language, or jargon, originally developed for purposes of trade, incorporating the vocabulary of one or more languages with a very simplified form of the grammatical system of one of these; pidgin English, bêche-de-mer, or any similar jargon.¹ (emphasis mine)

---

And a creolized language as:

the form of language that develops when speakers of mutually unintelligible languages remain in persistent and long-lasting contact with each other, with one of the contributing languages typically dominant.

In *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, pidgin is also explained as “a simplified speech with different languages” (emphasis mine), and creole as “a language based on two or more languages that serves as the native language of its speakers.”

One notices the various adjectives employed in the above descriptions, which readily arouse negative images, in that the kinds of languages in question are “simplified” as opposed to “complex,” and “mixed” instead of “pure.” Todd (1974:1) summarizes both popular and academic attitudes towards pidgins and creoles in the following passage:

Pidgins and creoles have been given both popular and scholarly attention. Popularly, they are thought to be inferior, haphazard, broken, bastardized versions of older, longer established languages. In academic circles, especially in recent years, attempts have been made to remove the stigma so frequently attached to them by pointing out that there is no such thing as a primitive or inferior language...Yet, while scholars have increasingly come to recognize the importance of pidgin and creole languages, there has been considerable debate, and disagreement, among them as to the precise meaning to be attached to the terms.
Todd's reasoning for the mistreatment against them is that they "were associated with populations which had been enslaved or with peoples whose cultures differed radically from those of western Europe, they were regarded as inferior languages, the use of which was often seen as a reflection of mental inferiority." 2

David Crystal (1987:336) defines a pidgin as "a system of communication which has grown up among people who do not share a common language, but who want to talk to each other, from trading or other reasons," and a creole as "a pidgin language which has become the mother tongue of a community."

Todd's definitions of the two types of languages are almost identical to Crystal's. A pidgin is, "a marginal language which arises to fulfill

---

2 Todd (1974:87) argues, "Nor are such feelings entirely dead, though their expression is, today, more muted." She, then, denounces Whinnom who argues, "I feel that someone venture the suggestion that modern languages have been dangerously sentimental about creole languages, which, with only a notable exceptions, constitute in most communities a distinct handicap to the social mobility of the individual, and may also constitute a handicap to the creole-speaker's personal intellectual development. (Whinnom, K. [1971]. "Linguistic Hybridization and the 'Special Case' of Pidginization and Creolization of Languages," In Hymes, D. [ed.]. Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 91-115, emphasis mine)

We must, however, note the significance of Whinnom's achievement of recognizing Jamaican Creole as a "dialect" of English, with which a recent grand TV project, The Story of English, also deals under the title "the new Englishes" (McCrum, R., W. Cran and R. MacNeil [1986]. The Story of English. New York: Viking.).
certain restricted communication needs among people who have no common language" (p. 1), and creole a language which "arises when a pidgin becomes the mother tongue of a speech community" (p. 3). How, then, does a pidgin develop into a creole?

Following the definitions given above, Todd provides what seems to be the most important account on the development of a pidgin into a creole, i.e., two processes in its development.

Firstly, Todd (p. 3) claims that certain monolingual speakers may be forced into a situation where it is impossible for them to use their first languages to communicate, as in the slave trade case. She refers to the Caribbean Africans who acquired one common European language "on the African Coast, or on board ship or while working on plantations."

This common language, a pidgin, then becomes their children's first language eventually. This is the most familiar scenario of a pidgin becoming a creole in the Americas. However, what is most relevant to our interest is her second scenario of creolization:

A pidgin can become so useful as a community lingua franca that it may be expanded and used even by people who share a mother tongue. Parents, for example, may use a pidgin so extensively throughout the day, in the market, at church, in offices and on public transport, that it becomes normal for them to use it also in the home. In this way children can acquire it as one of their first languages. (p. 3)
As Todd argues, it is essential to realize that the children can learn to communicate in a type of lingua franca while sharing another common language. This very diversity in each individual’s language capability is, of course, called bilingualism or bidialectalism, which later will be a focus of our discussion in language contact and change. But for now we should continue elucidating the creolization process in detail.

Todd’s four-phased process from pidgin to creole is still considered to be one of the most basic models, which gives us a general picture of the development from a pidgin to a creole: 1. “marginal contact,” 2. “period of naturalization,” 3. “influence from the dominant language,” 4. “the post-creole continuum.” She argues that at first pidgin is very restricted both in terms of its “use and users” (p. 50), and is “capable, with the help of gestures, of communicating needs, numbers, trading arrangements, etc.” (p. 51). The second phase involves the constant use of it by the local people. And the pidgin “expands from the user’s mother tongue.”³ Then, in the third phase, expanded (in its use and users) pidgin or creole is exposed to and borrows lexical items from what Todd calls the “dominant” or the more prestigious language.⁴ And finally, when the “evolved” language

³ At phase 2, one can only tell pidgin from creole in its function, i.e., whether it is serving as a native tongue of the speech community. However, it is often difficult to draw a line between them.

⁴ Todd (1974:51) maintains, “this phase helps to account for the indigenous lexical items and the numerous direct translations found in all pidgin and creole Englishes.”
contains a range of varieties from locally used creole to the standard and
prestigious variety, its developmental stage is called "the post-creole
continuum." It is so called that there is unbroken continuity of varieties
between the two ends of the continuum.6 This continuum comes into
existence when, for example, education is offered in the "dominant"
language and, consequently, this standard variety stays on the opposite
end of the continuum to the creole.

So far we have briefly reviewed what a pidgin and a creole are, mainly
by reviewing Todd's work in 1974. As is true in the other areas of modern
linguistics, there has been enormous refinement and elaboration done on
this subject. But for now, we will leave this general subject matter, and

6 Todd illustrates one example of this continuum in Jamaican Englishes
as in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Intermediate stages</th>
<th>Creole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It's my book</td>
<td>iz mai buk</td>
<td>a fi mi buk dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iz mi buk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a mi buk dat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is it?</td>
<td>wie ri iz?</td>
<td>a we i de?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wie i de?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we i de?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn't eat any</td>
<td>ai didn it non</td>
<td>mi na bin nyam non</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a in myam non</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mi in nyam non</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resume our previous discussion on the two controversial works mentioned earlier in the chapter.

2. Is ME a mixed language?: normality and abnormality of the language change.

Bailey and Maroldt (1977) begin their discussion with asserting that ME is a mixture of two or more languages. Considering the history of the various language contact situations in Britain, French, Latin, Old Norse, and Brittonic Keltic are, besides Anglo-Saxon, the "possible candidates for the parentage of Middle English"⁶ (p. 24). Of the four, they argue (p. 24) that French has attained a "decisive share" of the mixture, which is

---

⁶ Bailey and Maroldt's notions of the mixed nature and closeness to the other languages of ME is well-illustrated by the following diagram (p. 25):
indicated in the title of their article.\footnote{In addition, their desire to justify their claim had it entitled as such. They maintain, “The linguistic consequences of the Conquest have been subject to varying judgment, partly caused by (chauvinistic?) prejudice against the assumption of decisive foreign influences” (p. 27).}

In their opening discussion, they define the nature of creolization as “the result of mixing which is substantial enough to result in a new system, a system that is separate from its antecedent parent systems” (p. 21). Therefore, their hypothesis - the probable creole characteristics of ME - requires a reasonable outline of the process and sufficient evidence that supports it. They (p. 27) present the following outline for this case:

a. Old Norse and Anglo-Saxon creolization  
b. Major creolization before 1200  
c. Minor creolization after 1200

The first period of creolization, which, as they (p. 26) write, “prepared the ground for even more substantial foreign creolization afterwards,”\footnote{Romaine (1988:54) says Bailey and Maroldt make no claim whether ME emerged from a prior pidgin. With regard to this point, Bailey and Maroldt (1977:28) do write, “we made no claim that the Middle English creole developed out of a pidgin.”} brought about the importation of Nordic lexical elements, and the simplification of English inflections. The significance of this contact is pointed out as follows:
give, take, are, fellow, law, sky, they, their, etc.) derive from Scandinavian is just one instance that strongly supports the assumption of an Old Norse/Anglo-Saxon creolization prior to French influence. It also shows that basic vocabulary items are as borrowable as any other. (pp. 26-7)

The type of the lexical borrowing has been noted by the numerous other scholars (Baugh and Cable 1978, Wrenn 1977, Brunner 1960-2, Mossé 1947, Björkman 1900-2, Wall 1898) with differing interpretations of the findings. This is not so surprising when one comes to think of the little knowledge we have even about the socio-historical situations in England during the period (Leith 1983:23). However, we will venture to explore the subject with what little means we have.

Bailey and Maroldt state, "only a small number of words borrowed from Scandinavian show up in the manuscripts before 1050" (p. 26). It is well known in the history of English that many of the words of the Scandinavian origin did not appear in manuscripts until the end of 11th century, when the Scandinavian languages are believed to have ceased to be in daily use. According to Ekwall (1930:30), they were still being used "not very long before the Norman Conquest."\(^9\) Björkman is one of the earliest scholars who studied extensively the Scandinavian influence on

\(^9\) As a reason for this, Bailey and Maroldt (1977:26) maintain "most of the sources we have to draw upon today were written in the culturally dominant South and samples of the general type of West Saxon."

\(^10\) Baugh and Cable (1978:95) mention the survival of Norse in some parts of Scotland as late as in the 17th century.
English. He (p. 3) finds only about 50 Scandinavian words in the *Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon,*" which made their way into the written form before 1100. These words were introduced before the beginning of ME in order "chiefly to denote things closely connected with the life and institutions of the invaders" (Björkman pp. 5-6). They are *barba* (beaked ship), *cneear* (a small warship), *huscarl* (one of the king's body guard), *lip* (a fleet), *ora* (a Danish monetary unit), *orrest* (a battle), *ran* (a rapine or robbery), *scefa* (a vessel), and so on." He (p. 6) further remarks that this kind of borrowing can be compared to the "introduction of technical terms" in modern times.

As to the ones which started to appear in the ME manuscripts, Björkman characterizes them as the result of "a very intimate blending of the two languages... *hanum* (him), *haben* or *hefen* (thence), *wehefen* (whence), *hef* (they), *summ* (as), *oc* (and), etc." (ibid.).

Moreover Björkman (ibid.) maintains that the mixing of the languages may have taken place in the early period of the contact. The reason for this is that the borrowed words resulting from "the intimate contact," such as *hanum,* had already appeared in some places where the Scandinavians and English were in close contact. Is this explanation

"Published in 1897, Oxford.

"Björkman tentatively sets the beginning of the new era for English at 1200. This can obviously be challenged by many scholars.

"These words had become obsolete by the ME period. (the list of loanwords are also taken from Björkman [p. 6])
convincing? Or, is there something missing in his discussion?

One problem or general tendency, which one cannot fail to notice in most of the argument with regard to lexical borrowing, is that lexicographers authorize the first usage of a word only when it has been written down. In historical linguistics, there is indeed no other way of examining the first occurrence of a new word in a language - the spoken language\(^4\) - than to investigate the written documentation.\(^5\) Therefore, there are a few unavoidable problems involved in this kind of study. When can one say that a certain words has been commonly accepted in a speech community? How long will it take newly borrowed words to make their

\(^4\) This naturally involves difficult question as to when one can say that a certain word appeared and accepted in a speech community.


...written documents tend to be relatively homogeneous and relatively standardized. They usually represent one style of language only. Before the age of printing, when the materials used were hard to write on, like stone or clay, or expensive, like parchment, and each copy of a text had to be handwritten separately, only something that was thought to be of vital importance to the community or the future was written down.

Nonetheless, as it will be discussed later in the paper, one may encounter numerous instances of close relations between the written and spoken, especially before the printing press.
way into writing? Can some of the words be retained only in speech for some time without being written? We will return to these questions when we arrive at the discussion of the French loanwords into English, and at this point, let us briefly stop to refer to some remarks on the last two questions, which are specifically related to the lexical borrowing.

In relation to the second question, Bailey and Maroldt (1977:33) note that they are not certain as to how long it takes, either. But interestingly, they argue that "it can occur quickly" (original emphasis). We speculate from their argument that they may be implying that it is generally believed to enter into the written language after quite some time.

On the third question, Brunner (Ch. 1. 6) remarks that there are Scandinavian loanwords still in use in some parts of England, which have not appeared in the written form. And more specifically, Wrenn (pp. 7-8) reports that in Yorkshire, the Scandinavian word riding (a third part) survives, and that in Cumberland, "sheep are still counted in partly Norse forms of the numerals." We need now to turn to the other important issue on the Scandinavian influence raised by Bailey and Maroldt, i.e., English inflectional leveling affected by language contact:

The Nordic creolization of Anglo-Saxon caused inflections to be phonetically reduced; their final loss can be attributed to the general creole tendency to simplify morphology. (p. 45)
While arguing the above, they do not neglect the on-going inflectional leveling occurring in OE. That is, the loss of inflectional endings had been well in progress before the ancestors of what is generally called the Anglo-Saxons left the Continent for Britain. In the unattested Proto-Germanic language, nouns consist of stem forms made up of the base/root forms and formatives,\(^{16}\) either a vowel or /r/, and suffixes.\(^{17}\) Some parts of these morphological features had already been lost when the early writings in OE appeared, and as has been mentioned before, it may have been lost well before the Great Emigration. With all these facts in mind, Bailey and Maroldt write:

That the most significant changes of late Anglo-Saxon, the loss of inflections, began in the North was not simply a direct effect of Old North on Anglo-Saxon, for English went far beyond Scandinavian in its reduction of inflections.\(^{18}\) The general effects of creolization seem to be the probable explanation, which is confirmed by the fact that in many places the Scandinavian population exceeded fifty percent, although Anglo-Saxon was probably culturally dominant. (p. 26)

\(^{16}\) e.g., stan (stone) < *stain-a-z*, which used to have a formative, /a/, therefore, it is thus called. cf. Ono, S. and T. Nakao (1980:195). *Eigoshi 1.* Tokyo: Taishukan.

\(^{17}\) (base/root) + (formative) + (suffix)

\(^{18}\) If dominant Anglo-Saxon served as superstrate language and Scandinavian as substrate, it resulted in producing modified Anglo-Saxon. It should, however, be noted that in most developing pidgins, syntactical features are taken from the substrate language, and lexicons are from the other. Therefore, Bailey and Maroldt have to make this statement.
The unclear distinction between the direct effect and the general effects of creolization is possibly made to denote the different degrees of the language change in this contact case. In addition, it may be speculated that on the basis of their claim lies a general idea that is similar to what one finds in Baugh and Cable's: "Doubtless the situation was similar to that observable in numerous parts of the world today where people speaking different languages are found living side by side in the same region" (p. 95). And because of those two reasons and another sociolinguistic status of English, i.e., being the more dominant language over Scandinavian, Bailey and Maroldt must have come to the conclusion quoted above.

Against this remark, Thomason and Kaufman (1988) present their counter-argument, saying that OE had never been exerted such extent of influence by the Scandinavian languages that it underwent a substantial change. Their disagreement is equipped with detailed information on the subject matter as opposed to Bailey and Maroldt's study which lacks enough empirical support for their argument. This may be because they simply assume that ME is a product of creolization and much of their text is taken up by the discussion on the French influence.

Thomason and Kaufman (p. 310) claim:

...the detailed examination...should make it clear that in the contact between Norse and English no case can be made for anything other
than rather heavy linguistic borrowing by English from Norse.

Some of their findings will be summarized in the following discussion. And by comparing and contrasting the two studies, the linguistic situation in Britain will be examined in detail.

Thomason and Kaufman (p. 274) admit the "heavy borrowing," which, in their opinion, is not as heavy influence as interference is, in Weinreich (1953) terms, saying:

As of 1200 Northern English was thoroughly riddled with Norse traits both in lexicon and grammar. Its grammar was to a great extent, simpler than that of the other ME dialects.

Then, they provide several major cases of grammatical simplification due to the Norsification of English. Since they agree with Bailey and Maroldt on the issue of the heavy lexical borrowing,¹⁹ claiming that it penetrated rather deep into English, they spend most of their pages on structural examination.

The northern part of England is where one sees most of the Danish and Norwegian settlements (cf. Map 2. 1). It, then, naturally is regarded as the

¹⁹ Moreover, Thomason and Kaufman (p. 304) argue:

...we avoided treating lexical influence as such, because such influence can in no way demonstrate serious influence of one language on another's structure. (emphasis mine)
area where one expects to find many features of the Norsification of OE, and it certainly is. Thomason and Kaufman examine the grammatical differences in the simplification of the southern and northern ME as of ca. 1300. They maintain that the results depict that Northern English had been very much simplified and Norsified by the end of the 13th century. For instance, many of the grammatical traits that the southern dialects kept were lost in the northern ones by ca. 1300: /ö/ and /ü/, weak nouns, infinitive suffix, and so on (pp. 278-9). And there are regional differences in the degrees of simplification and Norsification. As to this issue, Table 2.1 provides some general points in the differences:
Table 2. 1

Simplification and Norsification in ME dialects (ca. 1250-1300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Southmarch</th>
<th>Wessex and Kent</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
<th>Deira</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gender/case agreement</td>
<td>no (1)</td>
<td>traces (lost MWx by 1300)</td>
<td>no (1)</td>
<td>no(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse grammar</td>
<td>slight (1)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>moderate (2)</td>
<td>heavy (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norse vocabulary</td>
<td>slight (1)</td>
<td>slight (1)</td>
<td>heavy (3)</td>
<td>massive (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final schwa</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>drops (1) (between 1250-1300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The figures in parentheses are added up in this horizontal column, indicating that the simplification and Norsification are more in progress with higher scores. (based on Thomason and Kaufman p. 281)

Table 2. 1 clearly indicates that simplification of the word-endings and Norsification were well-advanced in the north of the Danelaw's southern limits. This is true of Deira. However, according to Thomason and Kaufman, this does not sufficiently explain the linguistic changes.

\[20\] The original table in Thomason and Kaufman includes a few other traits that are closely related to French influence.
They examine (1) "a grammatical profile of North Middle English,"\(^2\) (2) "all of the linguistic peculiarities of North Middle English, including lexicon, as compared with other forms of Middle English," and (3) "the origin, whether in Old English or Old Norse, of all the above linguistic elements"\(^2\) (p. 283), and note that the results were of a nature rather unexpected, i.e., "the English component of North Middle English owes more to the Midlands than it does to Northumbrian Old English" (ibid.). Therefore, they come to the conclusion that the origin of the Norsified traits in Northern Middle English were introduced into the other areas of Britain from the Midlands.\(^3\) They (pp. 286-7) then draw up a scenario of Norsification as follows:

a. 920-950: A great deal of Norse grammatical traits went into the "East Mercian (unattested) dialect of Old English" as Norse ceased to be in actual use.

b. 950-980: The above Norsified English "became the model for linguistic developments in neighboring Fourboroughs."

---

\(^2\) i.e., ME of Deira.

\(^3\) In addition, they (p. 283) remark:

It should be noted that virtually every inflectional affix and function word of North Middle English has been identified and its origin determined.

See an extensive list (pp. 293-5) of above study, which is still partial.

\(^3\) Precisely speaking, it is the Northeastern part of the Midlands, i.e., Lincolnshire.
c. 980-: Norsified English spread to Norfolk, where Danish had no longer been spoken.

d. 1005-1035: Norsified English spread to Deira from Lindsey. "Norse was spoken though barely in both areas."

e. 1035-65: It spread to other northern areas, excluding Cumbria where it reached after 1100, from Deira.

Despite their extensive and detailed investigation of extracting the Norse traits from ME, what Thomason and Kaufman have presented for proving their above quoted hypothesized scenario is rather unconvincing in the light of our present knowledge on the process of language change, pidginization, creolization and decreolization, to which much of the rest of the chapter will be devoted.

Thomason and Kaufman's scenario is almost solely based on two pieces of evidence: (1). that they have traced Midlands grammatical elements "at its very heart" (p. 284) of northern ME;\(^24\) (2) that they have found no Northumbrian grammatical elements involved in Norsified ME. Although they also refer to an inscription written on a sundial in Yorkshire (i.e., Deira) as another piece of evidence for the date of spreading Norsified English into Deira from the Midlands,\(^25\) we do not wish to discuss it any

\(^{24}\) "Among the at least 75 percent of English-origin grammatical traits 33 Midland English features entered the English of Deira" (p. 300).

\(^{25}\) The inscription is dated 1060, and the language is in Midland English. Thomason and Kaufman maintain that the writer tried to write in Standard West Saxon.
further, for it will most likely lead us away from the matter in question. Thus, let us resume our examination of Thomason and Kaufman's scenario of the Norsification process.

The bound and free morphemes in Thomason and Kaufman's list of 33 Midland forms, which replaced Northumbrian OE, include *u:suer*, *u:sr-* ~ *u:s* > *wur(es) (our[s]), bufa > a-bu(v)en* (above), *bi-fora > be-forn* (before), *je: > vis ~ yus* (yes), etc. The list obviously indicates the basic items in the vocabulary as well as some bound morphemes. In addition, to the list, they claim that there are only a few undoubtedly Northumbrian-origin traits found in North ME, one of which is the person marking on verbs in North ME. All of the above data seem to reveal a great amount of influence on Northumbrian English. But when one further investigates the procedures of their study, one comes to different conclusion.

In their argument, Thomason and Kaufman point out that it took quite some time for the Norse vocabulary to make its way into the written language. Baugh and Cable (p. 104), too, remark on the matter, saying that the first considerable number of Norse words are found in *Ormulum*, which is believed to have been written in the East Midland area - Fourboroughs, a neighboring are to Lindsey (Thomason and Kaufman p. 284) - at the beginning of the 13th century, and that it should be attributed to

---

26 -es (2s and 3s present indicative and imperative plural), -e, -es (1s present indicative), -es, -e (present indicative plural), -e (infinitive).

27 This remark on this matter was formerly made by Wall, A. (1898:55).
the scarcity of texts from the earlier date, surviving from the areas subject to the Danelaw. Thomason and Kaufman (p. 284), on the other hand, claim that *Havelok*, which was written ca. 1250 and copied ca. 1300 in Leicester or Northampton, contains the largest number of Norse-origin grammatical traits: 45. And *Ormulum* holds 43 of them. What, then, of the writings found in Deira?

With regard to the written language where Northumbrian OE had been formally used, Thomason and Kaufman note, “this (Northumbrian OE) was not a traditional or standardized written variety of English since there was no known literary tradition to which a speaker of Northumbrian Old English could refer” (p. 286).

It is certainly true that any great literature written this area is not
known today. However, as the two manuscripts of Caedmon's Hymn - one from Northumbrian, which was written in the first half of the 8th


Northumbrian manuscript:

Nu scylun hergan
metuðæs maecti
uerc uuldurfadur
eci dryctin,
He aerist scop
heben til hrode,
tha middungeard
eci dryctin,
firum foldu,

hefaenricaes uard,
end his modgidanc
sue he uundra gihuaes,
or astelidæ.
aelda barnum
haleg scepen;
moncynnæs uard
æfter tiadæ
frea allmectig.

West Saxon manuscript:

Nu sculon herigean
meotodes meahte
weorc wuldorfaeder,
ece drihten,
He ærest sceop
heofon to hrofe,
þa middangeard
ece drihten,
firum foldan,

heofonrices weard,
and his modgeþanc,
swa he wundra gehwæs,
or onstealde.
eordan barnum
helig scyppend;
moncynnnes weard,
æfter teode
frea ælmihtig.

This practice persisted well into the late ME period. One of the reasons for translating was that texts were often read "aloud to local audiences" (McIntosh, A. et al. [1986:29]. A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English, vol. 1, Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.).
century, and the other from West Saxon - demonstrate that the translation from one dialect to the other was being done in OE England, we realize that the literate Northumbrians were aware of the particular grammatical features and perhaps their own written tradition. Their major vocabulary and its Northumbrian OE inflectional endings are still to be found in *Lindisfarne Gospels* written as late as ca. 960. But in any case, let us suppose Thomason and Kaufman's claim that the lack of "literary tradition" in Northumbrian were correct. And if the Northumbrians had had nowhere to refer to other than to outside sources, they would only have had to make reference to the neighboring areas where the "tradition" existed. Thus, between then and about 1035, Norsified English, which had a base of Midland English, poured into Northumbrian English, for Thomason and Kaufman (p. 284) claim as follows:

The latest date for the introduction of Norsified Midland English to Deira is about 1035, since Norsified Northern English had to spread to Northumberland, a region never settled by Norsemen in significant numbers, and do so before the Normans harried Yorkshire in 1069-70, that is while Yorkshire was rich and prestigious in comparison to Northumberland and Lothian. Norsified Midland English could not have spread to Deira after the time that Lindsey English had acquired the enclitic *hes* (her/them) from Flemish sometime around 1100, since Norsified Middle English never had this pronoun.

According to these two findings, Northumbrian OE was affected by Norsified ME through Lindsey within thirty years, and that influence was
so great that they go as far as to say that "Northern Middle English is essentially Midland English with Northumbrian person markers" (p. 304). They also, quite abruptly, provide some historical evidence, in addition to the inscription in 1060 on the sundial mentioned earlier. They quote from Sawyer (1971:174-5), reporting that there existed the two large sheep-raising "Norse-origin or even Norse-speaking entrepreneurs" (p. 289) in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire separated by the Humber River in the 11th century. By mentioning it, they are implying a possible close tie between the two speech communities across the river from each other. We do not here discuss the historical issues in great detail due to the limitations of space, but as far as their argument on language is concerned, it hardly reflects the actual picture of any real language contact situation.

To begin with, their hypothesis that Norsified Midland English was an important source of ME is basically supported simply by the fact that the strong Midland influence is detected in the Northern dialect and in the Central Midland dialect, which later began to possess a large share in London Standard English. There is, of course, no denying this claim, for it is surely the case, for instance, from phonological variations in ME.\(^{29}\) Nevertheless, as has already been considered earlier in the chapter, despite the fact that the written language solely makes it possible for

historical linguists to investigate and reconstruct a dialect or language at some given period, one should be aware that there is a crucial problem attached to the study, i.e., a tendency for writers to use the standardized language (cf. Ch. 2, Note 15). The writings examined in the study dated from the middle of the 13th to the early 14th century. During that time, the written variation of London was losing many of its indigenous South East features and acquiring East Midland English traits. By the end of the 14th century, it turned into a written variation whose basis was of East Midland English. And in the 15th Century, North East Midland English came into play. (O'Donnell and Todd p. 47, Baugh and Cable pp. 191-6, Nakao 1972:127-9)

The above process of the foregrounding of the later standardization exactly coincides with the period of the earliest Northumbrian manuscripts, which Thomason and Kaufman have studied and regarded as examples of the Norsification of Northumbrian English. Besides, their whole notion of language change is too rigid to explicate and reveal the dynamic nature of the change in any actual society. There seem to be two crucial problems in their study.

Firstly, Thomason and Kaufman not only take for granted the general tendency of standardization in the written language, but also the great diversity in the spoken language. This diversity of speech in a multilingual community in a language contact situation may be best
illustrated in terms of the continuous processes of pidginization, creolization and decreolization. In the light of those processes, Leith (p. 24) states the linguistic situations in Northumbria which was heavily populated by Scandinavians as follows:

Perhaps the linguistic relations between the two languages can be best described as a continuum, ranging from a relatively unmixed Scandinavian at one end of the scale to a relatively uninfluenced English speech at the other. In between, the languages co-existed, and then merged, with English forms and structures competing at first with the Scandinavian ones, then gradually spreading northwards.

In table 2. 1, we have already seen that Norse elements were present in large quantity even in the Northumbrian manuscripts, which can be regarded as those which represent an extreme variety of the English writing tradition on the continuum. If we accept this notion, what we naturally find on the other far end is “relatively unmixed Scandinavian,” which was not as well-documented as OE. As a matter of fact, this formation of a post-creole continuum is a quite common phenomenon in the process of decreolization. See a sample of a continuum of speech varieties taken from Catholic speakers in northern Ireland, whose mother tongue was originally Gaelic:

\[
\text{Yiz is buyin' bread that biz kyoich} \\
\text{Yiz is buyin' bread thaa diz be kyoich}
\]
Yiz is buyin' bread that biz raw in the middle
Yiz is buyin' bread that diz be raw in the middle
Yiz is buyin' bread that biz raw in the middle
Yiz is buyin' bread that does be raw in the middle
Youse are buyin' bread that does be raw in the middle
You're buyin' bread that's usually uncooked in the middle
(taken from O'Donnell and Todd p. 53)

In the examples above, the top variety depicts the most basilectal features while the one at the bottom reveals the most acrolectal ones. Obviously, in this continuum English serves as superstrate language. How, then, does this continuum begin to form in a speech community? Rockford (1983:300) explains this process with a model that represents one type of decreolization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Lower Mesolect</th>
<th>Mid-Mesolect</th>
<th>Upper-Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This model is especially designed to accommodate the transformation from a bilingual speech community to a post-creole continuum. Although an actual speech community involves more dynamic aspects as well as
complicated speech patterns in the process of decreolization, this model clearly demonstrates a dynamic aspect in the society that existed in Britain.

Secondly, Thomason and Kaufman (p. 303) conclude their counter-thesis against Bailey and Maroldt by maintaining that the Scandinavian languages never did play a vital role in the process of the English grammatical simplification. As very definition of simplification is in question, this notion of simplification will be examined here.

The term, simplification, has denoted the leveling of inflectional systems so far in this paper. And as far as Thomason and Kaufman's argument is concerned, they also hold that the loss of synthetic features in the English language was a general tendency as they write:

Norse did not stimulate simplification in English, since the simplifications we see in in Middle English when compared to Old English probably were taking place in Old English before Norse influence became relevant. (p. 303)

One might also argue that the shift from an analytic to a synthetic language is a process of simplification. But is it all that

---

30 Rickford (1983:300) suggests that the number of mesolects may be less or more, depending on each speech community. He ([1986]. *Dimensions of a Creole Continuum*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.) later opens up a controversial concept of multi-dimensional aspect of the post-creole continuum.
straightforward?

Trudgill (1983:106) brings in a new insight into this problem. His point is made from the standpoint of the learner, and is concisely put forth by one question: “simplification for who?” He (ibid.) claims that the simplification in question is mainly for the “adult non-native learner,” but not for both the “native (adult) speaker” and, “in any serious way, for the young child.” Moreover, he (p. 105) asserts as follows:

It is...legitimate to suggest that these changes (simplification processes and so on) are...non-natural, and that it is, on the contrary, the movement from analytic to synthetic that can more convincingly be argued to be natural. (explanation in the parentheses and emphasis mine)

The “non-natural” change occurs in language in language contact situations, and the “natural” change is a result of “the inherent nature of linguistic systems themselves...without external stimulus” (p. 102). Therefore, according to this thesis, as far as we can claim the continuous simplification during the Norse settlement in Britain, what happened in this case should have been ascribed to language contact situations.

Bailey and Maroldt hold a similar notion to Trudgill’s, in that they agree that change from the synthetic stage to the analytic is neither “simplification” in its functions nor the “normal” process. They claim that they do not see any reason for native speakers of a certain language
to change the synthetic language to the analytic solely by the process of internal developments of a language. That is, as long as the functional system is transparent to the speakers, so that the functional elements are able to be kept apart, syntagmatic reduction through natural change will usually be prevented from preceding to a degree that would result in the loss of relevant distinctions. In other words, as long as they do not find themselves in awkward situations, there is no internal urge to change it anyway. It is rather some external force that makes a language analytic. Bailey and Maroldt (p. 40) regard its process of change as a result of external language contact, "creolization." It is of no surprise that they regard synthesis as "natural" process, as Trudgill sees it.

Thus, our conclusion should be led in a direction that is quite contrary to Thomason and Kaufman's. That is, it may be a plausible notion that Norse did affect or stimulate OE in its grammatical simplification.

With regard to the effect of simplification on learners, Romaine (p. 32) agrees with Trudgill to some degree, by saying, "simplification will have psycholinguistic consequences, since one can expect that greater generality of rules and fewer exceptions in grammar make a language
easier to learn." But unlike Trudgill, she does not specify the type of learners for whom language acquisition will become easier. We can, of course, speculate from her discussion that it is the adult second language learner who finds the grammar with much generality easier than anybody else.  

There is one more point to be discussed here: simplification to what degree? Even if we accept the notion of a post-creole continuum, and of the notion that the types of OE, which we find in the extant manuscripts, existed as one extreme representing the Anglo-Saxon writing tradition, we might not think that somewhere in the middle of the scale existed a "mixed" language in a popularized idea. However mixed it may have been, it could not have been so to the extent that one finds in the European and non-European language contact situations. It must be again noted one more time that the two languages were so much alike (Thomason and Kaufman pp. 302-3, Baugh and Cable pp. 94-7, Wall pp. 51-2), and that the effect of the contact was not exactly pidginization, which usually results in a drastically different language system altogether. Trudgill (p. 106)

---

31 This issue of simplification is closely related to a quite controversial "baby talk theory" Romaine (1988: Ch. 3. 1) provides a very good introductory discussion on this subject. The basis of her discussion in the above chapter can be found in the latest one of her three major papers on acquisition of grammar in children's language learning: (1985). "Grammar and Style in Children's Narratives," Linguistics, 22:137-40.

32 This is a relative notion. Grammatical generality may pose different interpreting problems to learners.
argues that pidginization brings about "admixture" and "simplification," due to "restriction in function" followed by "linguistic reduction," and contact followed by the "imperfect learning." He, then, notes (ibid.) that another type of language change, which is of the same nature in principle as pidginization and creolization, but of moderate degree of shift from its original language, exists as well, and refers to it as "creoloid." His brief definition and explanation are given as follows:

Creoloids...are languages which show relatively large numbers of changes of the non-natural type, as a result of linguistic contact, and which may be relatively easier for adults to learn.33

Romaine (p. 160) remarks that a "creoloid," for instance, denotes a type of languages that are found in multilingual communities like a variety of Singapore English. She (ibid.) discusses that in Singapore, "English acts as a superstrate language and a continuum of varieties develops between the superstrate and more basilectal varieties that reflect influence from the speaker's mother-tongue(s)."34 However different one names the language mixture composed of OE and ON, it is

---

33 Another character of a creoloid must be noted. That is, it has not developed from a prior pidgin.

34 Romaine (1988:160) and Trudgill (1983:106) note that Platt ([1975]. "The Singapore English Speech Continuum and its Basilect 'S inglish' as a 'Creoloid'," Anthropological Linguistic, 17:363-74.) was the first scholar to use this terminology.
sufficiently convincing that OE did go through a number of changes including large-scale lexical borrowing and reduction in the inflectional systems, now that the nature of language change and the possible outcome of it have been examined. It has also been discussed that the observable traits of the contact and influence in the written documents need special consideration and treatment, i.e., they possibly belong to the most conservative and standardized end of a continuum, on which also exist varieties of the mixed language. In the next chapter, we will turn our discussion to the period following the Norman Conquest, beginning with further review of the two works by Bailey and Maroldt and Thomason and Kaufman.
Chapter 3

On Language Contact and Change in Medieval England

- The Day after the Norman Conquest -

0. Introduction

This chapter begins with a paragraph written from a historical perspective on the situations after the Norman-Conquest:

The changes wrought by the Conquest were too subtle to be detected in the below-ground evidence - ceramics, metal and glass objects were not really affected by the Conquest, either in fabric or design, even Norman coins' continued in the Saxon style. Thus, to the question, "Would the archaeologist recognize the Norman Conquest in the absence of documentary evidence?", the strict answer must be "No". However, taken in a broader landscape context, the proliferation of castles and churches, the acceleration of urbanization, changes in place-names and extensions of trading practices seen in the archaeological record of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries would indicate that there had in reality been profound economic, social and political changes, many of which would not have occurred, at least in the form they took if there had been no Conquest. (Rowley 1984:21)

1 As far as pennies during this period in northern Europe are concerned, we see a great number of similarities among those minted in Britain, Normandy and Scandinavia.

2 The influence of the Anglo-Saxon style can also be found in many other areas. For instance, The Préaux Gospels’ border decoration, which was written and illuminated in Normandy at the end of the 11th century, depicts the illuminator’s strong inclination towards the Anglo-Saxon style.
In the first half of the above statement, one finds the inclination towards the "Germanist's" historical perspectives, while in the last half, Rowley expresses some modification of his earlier statement, indicating partial acceptance of the "Romanist's" notions as well, which have been briefly reviewed in Introduction and Chapter 1. In linguistic terms, Chapter 2 has examined the two extreme theses by the two pairs of scholars: Bailey and Maroldt's and Thomason and Kaufman's dispute on the Norsification of OE. Bailey and Maroldt (p. 27) argue that it may be due to some "chauvinistic" reasons that many scholars are opposed to the notion of a "decisive foreign influence on English." On the other hand, Thomason and Kaufman have taken a position that may even be called "Germanist purism," maintaining that English had not been through any change that was "other than normal" (p. 264).

This chapter continues examination of the above scholars and their dispute over the relationship between OE, and Norman and Central French, with particular focus on lexical borrowing and syntactic features. By doing so, some plausible explanation will be attained as to what most likely took place during the period of the possible French influence.

1. Again, Bailey and Maroldt vs. Thomason and Kaufman

Thomason and Kaufman's argument against Bailey and Maroldt cannot be better highlighted than in the following words:
As to whether creolization occurred somewhere/sometime in England in the contact between English and French, such an issue, it seems to us, could hardly be raised by scholars familiar with the social and linguistic history of England, unless by creolization they understand something greatly different from what we do, something which robs the notion of creolization of much meaning. (p. 307)

Naturally one comes to ask, “What are the bases for Bailey and Maroldt’s claim that the contact between English and French resulted in creolization, which is rebuked so harshly?” Actually, they take a unique step to explain the mixed character of ME.

Bailey and Maroldt (p. 27) propose that two stages of creolization took place between the two languages. They write:

French creolization seems to have proceeded in two steps - major creolization, before 1200, and a minor one (mainly with Central French) that involved massive borrowing during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The second creolization was from French. (emphasis original)

It is obviously the first creolization that has shed completely new light on the age-old subject centered around this dark period in the history of the English language in terms of its very limited amount of extant literature, and at the same time has evoked some great controversies among scholars of interest in the linguistic situation of those days.
Bailey and Maroldt (p. 38) remark that "a major creolization before 1200" was actually "a heavy admixture of Anglo-Saxon elements into Old French." When it comes to supporting the possibility of this creolization, they seem to have some problems. They refer to several instances of this linguistic change, which are normally considered to be developed not so much by the French contact with the English, but by the non-native speaker's use of French in Britain. They (Note 26), however, argue that since French served as an acrolect in Britain, and that naturally the forms we find today in the written documents are accordingly written in what is regarded as "normal" Anglo-Norman, those remaining writings do not provide evidence for their hypothesis. To the interest of our discussion, this argument of "a new system" (p. 33), i.e., French creolization from English immediately following the Conquest, is not the only or major factor, for after all it is likely that the change was brought forth through the interaction of the two languages. Of course, creolized French, or what is generally called Anglicized French, existed in England. For instance, Rothwell (1968) maintains that the earliest French textbooks written in England indicate that they were written for those who had prior knowledge of French to some extent. And the insular French was always being exposed to "Anglicisms" from about 1250.³ Obviously the time when

³ Some form of language influence may have been exerted soon after the major contact. Thus, the spoken language might have been affected to a considerable degree by 1250.
French started to be affected by the indigenous language is another problematic issue, but the point is clear. In any instance, Bailey and Maroldt have apparently missed the most critical issue by saying:

Children playing with one another could have, as in situations observable today, grown up with a mixed language, though adult mixture must have played no inconsiderable role. (p. 29)

The order of the creolization process is reversed in the discussion above. It is adult learners who are more responsible for imperfect learning and language-mixing, which has been discussed earlier in Chapter 2. And then, the pidginized language of those adults will be passed on to the children, thus becoming a creole. But for now, let us return to Bailey and Maroldt’s discussion on the second creolization: English creolization from French.

Like many other predecessors who conducted the same type of research, Bailey and Maroldt begin with lexical borrowing. As they (p. 31) claim, it is the most obvious place where tremendous amount of French elements are found in ME, Mod.E, and Pr. E. Basing their figures on Finkenstaedt and Wolff’s study (1973:119, 121-8), Bailey and Maroldt (p. 31) remark that of the whole entries of the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, 28.3% are of the French origin, while 27% are of the Germanic. They further argue that the massive Latin related elements, which consist
28.24% of the total entries, are largely responsible for the previous borrowing from French. In other words, this preceding lexical borrowing "prepared the way for other Romance influences" (p. 31-2). Although Thomason and Kaufman (p. 315) admit the large number of lexical borrowing from French and other languages, they refuse to regard it as the result of face-to-fact language contact. In the following section, the past studies on the issue of lexical borrowing will be reviewed.

2. Lexical borrowing from French

Although there had been studies conducted earlier of the similar nature (Serjeantson 1935, Sykes 1899, Skeat 1892, and 1891), Jespersen (1938) was the first scholar to come up with statistical data on the subject. He examined the varying number of loanwords in each 50 year period from the late OE period to the Mod.E. His method was to investigate the first appearance of 1,000 loanwords in English writings, using the Oxford English Dictionary for the chronology of each word. From A-I, he studied the first 100 loanwords under each letter, and in J and L, the first 50. In addition, he excluded derivative words that had certainly or probably arisen in English. Baugh (1935) argues that it is important to note that Jespersen's research excluded words with less than five quotations, which can possibly exclude less frequently used words from the list. However, this practice led him to eliminate such important words as bon-
bon, carton, millionaire, and premiere.

When Jespersen conducted his research, about half of the volumes of _OED_ were still not available. Koszal (1937) consulted the latter half of _OED_, using the same research tactics as that of Jespersen.

Baugh also calculated the loanwords from Norman and Central French which appeared on pages ending with the digits -00, -20, -40, -50, -60, -80 in _OED_. Baugh (1935:92) argues that by comparing Jespersen's study with his, he finds "a much slower rate of increase" for the period of 1150-1250, and "the preeminence of the half century 1350-1400." However, as far as the general trends in taking in loanwords are concerned, we should not be too concerned about these differences, which we will discuss below.

Mossé (1943) followed Jespersen's research method, studied the French loanwords in English found under the letter A in _OED_, and, at the same time, reviewed the three major works by Jespersen, Koszal and Baugh. His work generally supports their findings. (cf. Table 3. 1 and Figure 3. 1 given at the end of the chapter)

According to Table 3. 1 and Figure 3. 1, it is clearly indicated that the trends in the importation of loanwords are similar. An indication of a rise in numbers is already shown starting with the period between 1151-1200. Even Baugh's study indicates that the number is more than double. The rate of increase from this period to 1201-1250, however, is greater still,
not to mention the periods 1251-1300, 1301-1350, and 1351-1400, when
the rates become even higher.

It should be noted that the studies by these scholars cover only a small
portion of the total number of French words borrowed into the English
language throughout the period and even after the ME period. As in the
case of Scandinavian loanwords, it may be also true in this case that there
are more loanwords used in daily conversation than those actually written
down in the extant manuscripts. Thus, one should not be misled by the
small number of loanwords in the early era of Norman-French Britain. As
a matter of fact, despite the extremely small number of words found in
Table 3. 1 before 1250, Baugh and Cable (1978:168) assert that roughly
900 loanwords were in use in Britain. With regard to the small number of
extant literature, Baugh (1935:92) points out another problem related to
this kind of research. That is, up to 1400, at least, the number of words
found in each period seems to reflect the amount of surviving literary
works dating from the period. And as to the rough estimate of the total
number of French loanwords in ME, Baugh’s study reveals astonishing
figures.

Baugh’s study of OED found a total of 1,031 words by the research
strategy mentioned earlier. Baugh’s calculations reveal that of the 1,031
words, 611 first appear between 1150-1500. Since the portion of OED
studied comprises 6% of the whole dictionary, it is probable that slightly
more than 10,000 words were introduced from Norman and Central French.

3. Borrowing and interference

Without any doubt, this massive infusion of loanwords into English seems to suggest more than a mere influence exerted by the French language; Bailey and Maroldt regard it as prime evidence of the heavy language admixture of English and French. But on the contrary, Thomason and Kaufman hold a strong disagreement that the seemingly overwhelming number of loanwords is not immediately related to the heavy language contact situations. They (p. 21) claim that “borrowing” and “substratum interference”⁴ through language contact need to be clearly differentiated:

Borrowing: the incorporation of foreign elements into the speaker’s native language. (p. 21)

Substratum interference: a subtype of interference that results from imperfect group learning during a process of language shift. (p. 38)

Their reasoning largely rests in the language contact theory by Weinreich (1953),⁵ which allows them to draw a clear distinction between

⁴ Thomason and Kaufman (p. 38) argue that this term limits the notion of interference too much.

⁵ They (p. 13) claim, “Today, Weinreich’s 1953 book Languages in Contact still stands as the best known and most authoritative study of the subject...” But they (ibid.) also point out the shortcoming of Weinreich’s study, saying, “but even that impressive work provides no means of predicting what types of contact-induced change will occur when.”
borrowing and interference. That is, Weinreich does not recognize borrowing as a result of full-scale societal bilingualism. Thus, Thomason and Kaufman claim that lexical borrowing, which, they maintain, can occur with the lowest possible intensity of language contact, saying, "...lexical borrowing frequently takes place without widespread bilingualism..." (p. 37). Therefore, it is possible that "in borrowing proper many words will be borrowed before any structural interference at all occurs..." (p. 21, emphasis mine). And they further argue:

unlike borrowing, interference through imperfect learning does not begin with vocabulary: it begins instead with sounds and syntax, and sometimes includes morphology as well before words from the shifting group's original language appear in the target language. (p. 39)

They (p. 313) point out that this massive borrowing, which is "due to the peculiarity of English speakers of that time" is comparable to the Japanese adoption of "thousands of Chinese borrowings in our Middle Ages." They also claim that the time of possible close contact (1065-1265)\(^6\) does not coincide with the period of the "great borrowing" from French, which, according to them, occurred between 1450-1550.\(^7\) It is

\(^6\) Thomason and Kaufman (p. 330) claim that this is the period when French was a living language in England.

\(^7\) Thomason and Kaufman do not cite the source of this information, but from Table 3. 1, it is clear that the peak of the lexical borrowing was between 1350-1400.
quite clear from the above-quoted discussion why Thomason and Kaufman do not consider the lexical borrowing from French as a major factor in language contact and change. Their argument is akin the Kellner's, which we examined in Chapter 1, and offers nothing new in this subject. And naturally, there are scholars with an extremely different perspective regarding the assessment of loanwords from French, e.g., Sykes' (1899) paper entitled "French Elements in Middle English: Chapters illustrative of the origin and growth of Romance influence on the phrasal power of standard Englishes in its formative period." As its title is almost self-explanatory, the paper deals with the French contribution to the development of the analytic features of English.

4. French "loanphrases" in English

In the introduction of the above paper, Sykes (pp. 7-8) discusses as follows:

The object of the present study is to show how, to what extent, and at what time the English language schooled itself to new phrasal expressions, which were often without equivalents in AS., but which sometimes displaced equivalent AS. expressions; to show how far those phrasal changes proceeded under the influence of OFr. - a natural outcome of the relation of English, its formative period, to French, in social life, in education, and in legal, ecclesiastical, military, and literary affairs; to show the chronological movement of those phrasal changes so as to establish a comparison with the movement of change in the vocabulary; to draw from any ascertained
results some conclusions respecting the character and chronology of the formation of Standard English.

In order to support his argument, he examines, for instance, verbal and prepositional phrases (phrases using at only). Regarding the French influence on those elements, he asserts as follows:

a. verbal phrases: “The change of a language from a synthetic to an analytic base, necessitating the growth of phrasal forms for inflexions and conjugations, favours analogically the phrasal expression of verbal notions...” (p. 9).

b. prepositional phrases: “In the formative period of English, OFr. à, possessed of a vast phrasal power, met in AS. at an ineffective instrument of translation, for the phrasal power of at was far less extensive, far less subtle” (p. 40).

Sykes concludes that due to the importation of numerous phrasal expressions into English, the “Anglo-Saxon” language underwent a significant change from a synthetic language to a more analytic one, claiming:

That a great factor in the changes which distinguish MidE. from AS., and which persist as characteristics of Standard English in Chaucer - changes that affect the phraseology, idiom, syntax, style - is found to be the influence of OFr. (p. 63)

And just as one expects, he condemns Kellner’s argument as one such
vaguely defined (cited here again):

The influence of French on Syntax Proper has been overrated. English syntax, in the main, is still Germanic, just as English sounds, inflections, and word-formation are. (emphasis original)

It can be speculated from the discussion in Chapter 1 that Sykes attempts to establish a theory that is not much different from Trevelyon's historical point of view of the language.

Against Sykes argument, Bødtker (1905) strongly refutes, writing:

Sykes has decidedly gone too far. A Middle English expression cannot be claimed to be French, simply because it is antedated by its French parallel, and Anglo-Saxon expressions were surely able to survive unsupported by similar constructions in Old French. (p. 3)

He asserts that if ever any foreign influence had been exerted on OE, it must have been that of Scandinavian origin, not that of French. For instance, Sykes remarks that the two OE verbs, beran and niman gained much "phrasal power" through the French verb-phrases with porter and prendre,⁸ respectively, against which Bødtker disagrees. He instead claims that ON verbs, bera, nema and taka could have played a more

---

⁸ According to Sykes, verbal phrases using prendre started to build more extended power in the first half of the thirteenth century. A large number of expressions are found in the first half of the fourteenth century, and even a larger one in the second half of the same century.
important role in the formation of Pr.E phrases, if foreign influence had to be considered at all in the formation of verb phrases using bear and take in Pr.E.

We must also refer to another scholar who insists on the growth of phrasal power in English, i.e., Prins (1952).⁹

Prins examines pre-1200 English texts such as The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Lives of Saints, and he also studies the current papers and periodicals of our time such as The Times and The Observer. And he finds a total of 572 loanphrases¹⁰ from French. He argues that of the 572, 441 are genuine loanphrases from French, 90 doubtful, and 41 partial ones. By doubtful French loanphrases, he means the phrases whose first entries in English antedate French entries, and partial loanphrases are those which may be due to native development, or to French and/or Latin influence. Table 3. 2 and Figure 3.2 summarize his findings.¹¹ (cf. Table 3. 2 and Figure 3. 2 given at the end of the chapter.)

⁹ Although the book was published in 1952, he claims that his interest and some study in the subject started well back in his undergraduate days. His doctoral dissertation (1933) includes some of the findings from that time.

¹⁰ The term "loanphrases" may not exactly describe this type of linguistic influence on a language as Sykes and Prins would like to see it, since it must involve a process of direct structural borrowing.

He discusses the way in which phrases like *after all*, and *according to* came into existence from the parallel French phrases, *après tout*, and *acordant à*, respectively, in the English language as follows:

But though we here (in the middle of the 14th century) witness the decline of Anglo-Norman and the rise of English, it is English wholly transformed as a result of a bilingual situation which had existed for more than two centuries...when those who had hitherto spoken French gradually began to adopt English as a means of expression, they carried their French vocabulary and speech-habits into English....(p. 27)

We wonder to what extent this claim may be valid. If it is entirely correct, the numerous phrasal expressions naturally represent a significant degree of language interference by Thomason and Kaufman's definition, i.e., imperfect learning that includes direct translation and assimilation at all formal linguistic levels: phonetic, phonological, morphological, and syntactic. But as Thomason and Kaufman's discussion on the process of lexical borrowing indicates, the loanphrases may possibly be the product under the similar circumstances as those in Japan during the Middle Ages mentioned earlier. That is, the borrowings might have occurred without actual face-to-face contact situations on a large scale. In the case of Japanese borrowing from Chinese, Thomason and Kaufman (p. 66) claim that this occurred through the prestigious Chinese literary language, not as a result of "the existence of a group of bilinguals
within the borrowing-language speaker population”\textsuperscript{12} (ibid.). They (ibid.) also maintain the amount of influence that a literary language can exert is very limited: lexical borrowing, structural interference or only syntactic - not phonological. They further remark that they find no cases of morphological borrowing involved in this category of language influence. But as far as present-day Japanese is concerned, quoting from their student’s study (Takano 1985), they (p. 38) accept the existence of English interference:

...younger Japanese speakers, all of whom have studied English throughout their schooling, have to some extent phonemicized former allophonic variants such as [ɔ] and [ʃ] under the influence of English.

And now in Japanese, it contains substantial number of loanwords from English, which often constitute peculiar phrases combined with original Japanese lexicons. the following is one of the many instances.

In the first half of the 1980’s, such phrases as za baagen\textsuperscript{13} (“the” bargain sale) or za manzai (“the” comic dialogue) were very popular in


\textsuperscript{13} The Japanese language is transcribed in the same manner as it is done in E. H. Jorden’s series of Japanese textbooks throughout in the text of this paper, unless noted otherwise.
advertisements all over Japan. Those phrases bear a structural pattern, that is, the plus a nominal expression in Japanese, which was at first almost exclusively in kanji, the Chinese characters, and then expanded to other expressions as well. The English word the was transcribed in katakana, the native syllabary, in the phonetically closest sounds. Of the several semantic features that the English the bears, the Japanese equivalent, za, adopted at least two features, i.e., uniqueness and emphasis. So, the phrase, za baagen, means that “it is the true bargain sale to which you should come.” This phrase pattern, popular though it was, has now become more or less obsolete in Japanese.

One may argue that the above example depicts the fact that foreign language education may have a strong effect in a society like Japan where it is given regardless of social classes. But the matter is not as simple as it looks at a first glance. There seem to be two important issues related to it: the situations in which this type of borrowing occurs, and the effect of the borrowing.

As to the first one, it is without any doubt that the example given above can be definitely attributed to English education in Japan. Thus, the reason why many of the Japanese people are familiar with the English loanword za (the) seems readily explained. However, there are more

---

Katakana is one of the two sets of Japanese syllabaries and is now used mainly for foreign loanwords and onomatopoeic expressions.
factors involved in it. First of all, English and some other Western languages are regarded as prestigious languages in a unique way.\textsuperscript{15} And in addition, Haarmann (1985:193) points out the Japanese society experiences "impersonal bilingualism" through various mass-media commercials that produce peculiar commercial texts in two codes, e.g., Japanese and English. He (ibid.) claims that this impersonal language contact situation surely exerts influence on the Japanese language, despite the fact that for many Japanese, direct language contact is very rare.

As to the second issue, since the lexical borrowing is often accompanied with actual sounds through radio and TV, the impact on the indigenous language can be great. And the effect is on a much larger scale due to the background knowledge of English through education.

The discussion on Japan so far makes us speculate if it is possible to

\textsuperscript{15} Citing from an unavailable study (unavailable at least for the author at the time of writing this paper) by Haarmann, H. and M. Waseda (1985). \textit{The Use of Foreign Elements in Japanese TV Commercials: A report}. Tokyo. They report the several images that the Japanese have towards English, French and Japanese. They discover that English bears positive images: brightness, smoothness, and trendiness. French is thought to be more beautiful, soft and sophisticated than English, though it also possesses a more foreign image. And Japanese has positive images as far as familiarity and liking are concerned, but it presents negative impressions as old-fashioned and unattractive.

Furthermore, Haarmann (p. 171) claims that the homogeneity of the country and the unwillingness to accept personal contacts with outsiders contribute to the formation of the above stereotypes.
compare one contemporary society like Japan with another contemporary one with regard to language contact and change. Even within the same country, there are various different factors involved when one compares an urban community with a rural one. The kind of language contact and influence is uniquely different from each other. And this is also the case in comparing different medieval societies because of the different environments, social biases and so on. Thus, one cannot simply compare the lexical borrowing in medieval Japan with that in England. That is, although Chinese culture and literature were more highly esteemed than the native ones, the Japanese did not experience any submission to Chinese aristocrats in Middle Ages. Therefore, the situations in England must be dealt as a different issue. And in addition, the knowledge of the spoken H language must have been more wide-spread in England. As to this point, Baugh and Cable (p. 124) describe the knowledge of French among the middle class as follows:

...in the period preceding the loss of Normandy in 1204 there were some who spoke only English. There was likewise a considerable number who were genuinely bilingual as well as many who had some understanding of both languages while speaking only one. That the latter class - those who were completely or to some extent bilingual - should have been fairly numerous need cause no surprise. Among people accustomed to learn more through the ear than through the eye, learning a second language presents no great problem.
As is the case of Baugh and Cable, while there are some scholars who refute the directness of the existence of French in England, they all acknowledge the continuing immigration from the Continent and the ever-presentation of French influence on the English traditions before the loss of Normandy.\footnote{16 cf. Clark (1976). "People and Languages in Post-Conquest Canterbury," Journal of Medieval History, 2:1-33.} It makes one wonder why Thomason and Kaufman are so convinced as to deny the significance of groups of bilinguals in England at that time. As to this issue of bilingual community, Torres (1986) examines Ancrene Wisse and concludes that the West Midlands region in the 13th century was a bilingual code-switching community. This claim is supported by the fact that "a functional analysis of lexical choice" (p. 45), and "a formal-functional syntactic analysis of discourse grammar" (ibid.) show the process of "hybridization" of the Anglo-Norman French and West Midlands English. And its process was largely made possible by the fact that "this speech community use their speech varieties with positive sociolinguistic attitudes toward both" (p. 51). And the reason why it is necessary for Torres to make this comment seems to be apparent. That is, he attempts to avoid the controversial issue of the preference and prestigious status of either one of the two languages. As it may, let us investigate the nature of a code-switching society by reviewing the earlier studies on our contemporary speech communities,
and then return to the issue of lexical borrowing.

5. Issues on bilingualism: Interference, code switching and mixing, and interlanguage.

Weinreich conducted a thorough research on language contact, and published one of the most influential book not only in what is still regarded as a marginal field, sociolinguistics, but also in general linguistics. What his study accomplished at that time is still of much importance and validity, e.g., his treatment of differentiating language borrowing from language interference. And most importantly, he articulates well the natures of language contact situations at the societal and individual levels.

Since the time of Weinreich's book, there have been, without any doubt, both tremendous development and improvement on the subject of "language contact" both on a societal scale and at the individual level. Among many topics relevant to the subject, language mixing or intrasentential switching by an individual bilingual has been studied rather extensively in the last two decades. This section especially attempts to clarify the controversial relationship between languages that bi- or multi-linguals have acquired. More specifically, it examines the bilingual intrasentential switching of languages in a given sentence. As Nishimura (1986:126) discusses, early studies (e.g., Weinreich 1953:73)
argued the improbability of mixing languages within a single sentence, but recent findings have presented counterevidence that mixing at this level does occur frequently in a certain mode of bilingual speech.

By studying the principles and constraints governing this linguistic behavior, this section will unveil some part of bilingual language processing, and the interlingual relationship.

To begin our discussion on bilingual language processing, we must first examine early literature on bilingual interference by Weinreich who has, without any doubt, exerted a tremendous influence on this area of study, as has been mentioned above.

Weinreich (1953) claims that there are three basic types of bilingual interference observed in their linguistic activities.¹⁷

The first one is phonological interference, i.e., foreign accent. A commonly held idea is that this type of interference is generally found in L₂ spoken by the population who do not have very strong competence in that language. However, it is not necessarily true. We often encounter highly competent L₂ users who still retain a relatively distinctive

¹⁷ Following Weinreich's study on bilingual interference, Haugen ([1956]. *Bilingualism in the Americas*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.) claims that “interference” is the overlapping of two languages, and Mackey ([1968]. “The Description of Bilingualism,” In Fishman, J. [ed.]. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. Hague: Mouton.) defines it as the use of linguistic features that belong to L₁, while speaking or writing in L₂.
accent.\textsuperscript{18}

The second type is found at the semantic level. For instance, a Japanese bilingual, whose $L_1$ and $L_2$ are Japanese and English, respectively, and whose competent in English is at level 3 on ETS Oral Proficiency Rating Scales,\textsuperscript{19} may still produce a sentence like "She had her neck cut off." The speaker's intentional meaning is "She had her head cut off." Apparently, he/she must have assumed that the direct translation from the Japanese expression kubi o kiru (literally "cut one's neck off") carries the same semantic information in English as well. There are numerous instances of this kind observed in bilingual speech. As noted above, this type of interference can also be regarded as direct translation.

The third type of interference occurs at the syntactic level. Weinreich cites a classic example by a German speaker whose $L_2$ is English:

\begin{enumerate}
\item This woman loves the man.
\end{enumerate}

By this utterance, the speaker meant "The man loves the woman." Weinreich claims that due to the syntactic interference of the sentence in

\textsuperscript{18} It is particularly true of those who started learning $L_2$ after they have reached a certain age, and of those who make some sociological implications by retaining their own accents.

\textsuperscript{19} According to this five-point scale, three indicates the superior level. The speaker at this level is able to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations.
German, "deise Frau Liebt dear Mann," speaker produced (1). Though it is quite simplistic observation on the way L₂ syntactically interferes with L₁, it plays an important role in forming the foundations of the present bilingual study. And the review of Weinreich's research explains Thomason and Kaufman's comparison of the language interference in Medieval England and Japan. That is, because of the imperfect acquisition of a target language, and the language's high status in the society, an indigenous language reversely begins to incorporate imperfectly-acquired elements of the H language.

It is clear now that there are more aspects involved in bilingual interference. And when it comes to bilingual code switching and mixing,2⁰ one cannot easily categorize all of them into the general and broad term "interference." In addition, "interference" carries a negative connotation as "negative transfer" does, i.e., "intrusion" of unnecessary elements of a certain language into another. However, as many contemporary scholars argue, code switching and mixing serve as a very effective communicative strategy in a certain community, e.g., an urban Hispanic community.2¹

1977 saw the appearance of one of the most essential works regarding

---

2⁰ In this paper, if necessary, the two terms are used discrimatively. Code switching refers to the switching of two languages intersententially, while code mixing is the intrasentential switching. But, the two terminologies are often used indiscriminately.

2¹ Interestingly, Torres compares Ancrene Wisse and bilingual Chicano literary discourse.
the functions of code switching and mixing, i.e., McClure’s study on them in a Hispanic community.

She reports that the community in which she conducted her research is a relatively self-contained one. She (p. 112) further reports that the use of bilingual switching and mixing are almost equivalent to the creative language use by a skillful monolingual writer or orator. It may be slightly overstated, but the essence of her claim holds validity. That is, bilingual switching can be compared to the monolingual style-shifting registers. It can also be compared to bidialectalism, the switching of geographical and social dialects, e.g., shifting from a variety of “Black English Vernacular” to a variety of “Standard American English” in an American black community depending on the topic, participants, situation of conversation”²² (Baugh 1983).

McClure conducts a sociolinguistic, functional and pragmatic research, but at the same time she attempts to utilize as many formalistic methods as possible. By doing so, the study clearly explains what Weinreich’s framework does not. For instance, McClure cites an example as follows:

(2) I want a motorcycle VERDE. ( I want a green motorcycle)

²² He provides an excellent account of black street speech. He asserts that “bidialectal style-shifting” occurs because of the shared linguistic characteristics and shared social domains of black street speakers and so-called standard English speakers.
At a first glance, there seems to be one Spanish lexical item that has been borrowed into an English sentence. However, the word order of NP in VP is not that of English. Weinreich may regard this whole sentence as an instance of grammatical interference from the Spanish construction: NP - Det N Adj. Then, we may be completely content with the explanation that it is a mere instance of interference. McClure maintains, however, that this sentence needs more detailed analysis.

According to McClure (p. 98), if VERDE had been produced with the Spanish phonological features, it indicates that it is a switched item from Spanish rather than a borrowed word. If it is so, this NP is subject to the Spanish syntactic constraint. Moreover, provided that "motorcycle" had carried only the English phonological features, it then suggests that it is rather these two English lexical items that were switched into the Spanish construction. In other words, it, then, should be interpreted as an instance of code mixing within NP. Therefore, following the above guideline, in (2), the shifting took place twice: the first one (syntactic, English to Spanish) at the point of V and NP, and within NP (lexical and phonological, Spanish to English).\(^2^3\)

McClure's study concludes that there are seven sociolinguistic and pragmatic functions served by code switching and mixing. With the

\(^2^3\) The shifting must be in this order, for two of the items in the underlying Spanish structure of NP again change into English.
limitations of space, we shall only examine three of them in this paper, but her conclusion clearly indicates that these linguistic activities do not simply occur at random but in some specific fashions that are agreed upon by the members of the community.\(^{24}\)

(3) and (4) are two examples of "emphasis":

(3) P (girl, 9)\(^{25}\): Stay here Roli. Te quedas aquí!
(4) R (boy, 4): I go get it.
   P (girl, 9): hazte, hazte pa'alla! (Get over, get over there!)

McClure (p. 106) claims that in (3), the speaker, P, used a switch from English to Spanish, and uttered this imperative in Spanish with the almost identical meaning as that in English. She asserts that the switching occurred to emphasize what she wanted Roli to do. In (4), by changing the code from Spanish to English, and putting the imperative statement into Spanish, P was again emphasizing the force of imperative.

The second function is "mode-shift" (p. 109), which serves to indicate the change of the manners and styles of speech:

(5) T (researcher): Tell me a story.
   S (girl, 5): I know a story of pigs and I know a story of Wizard


\(^{25}\) Alphabetic letters are used for the sake of identifying each speaker. Numbers in the parentheses indicate their ages.
T: The Wizard of Oz? OK. Tell me whichever one you like.
S: OK. (takes a deep breath) Asi no va. Esperate. (Not that way. Wait.) Oh, Sonny and Cher, OK?
T: OK.
S: Sonny and Cher, it was raining and then Sonny and Cher broke his window.

(6) J (boy, 8): (final sentence of story told in Spanish)
.. respiran les llantas del tren, y... (...the train’s tire breathe, and...) that’s all I could think.

(5) and (6) apparently depict the change of one’s manner of speech. That is, by those switches, the speakers tried to indicate the distinction whether they were currently in the story-telling mode or out of it. The third function, “topic shift,” is somewhat similar to this function. In the following two sets of conversations, speakers obviously code switched so that they could change the topic of conversation from one to another:

(7) H (girl, 13): Me duela la muela (My molar hurts)
R (girl, 9): Remember when we eat dinners over there at my house, we drink soda.

(8) R (boy, 4): Y donde mis rabbits? (And where my rabbits?)
L (girl, 6): Ahi estan. Les setan dando comida. (There they are.

26 If this item has English phonological features, this may be categorized as an instance of code mixing. However, as Poplack (1988:223) discusses in the case of the Ottawa-Hull area findings, in many cases the distinction between switched items and borrowed ones is not clear.
They are giving them food.)

D (girl, 6): Yo les voy dar comida al pajaro y... (I will give food to the bird and...)

R: (will) you (be) playing (checkers)?

D: Yeah, she's gonna wash her hands.

McClure's empirical findings have demonstrated that in a certain bilingual community, code switching and mixing are the necessary tools for their social interaction. However, her functional approach has not yet answered our question: "What is the interlingual relationship between those languages?" At this point, we need to shift our focus to more formal approaches.

Poplack (1988, 1981, 1980), in a series of studies on the bilingual speech patterns of Puerto Ricans in a downtown section, New York, provides a set of syntactic constraints on code switching and mixing. Again, this is another attempt to refute the argument for random switching.

The subjects in her studies like those of McClure's live in a linguistically stable and self-contained bilingual community. Thus, we naturally expect that the speakers use two languages, though to various extents according to each individual. And at the same time, they share the
similar social domains. This suggests the linguistic activities in the community be in a relatively uniform fashion, and that those who do not currently share the existing norm be encouraged to follow it either explicitly or implicitly by other members. In this Puerto Rican community, switching is also believed to be used as a communicative tool as in the case of McClure. Poplack (1980:581) actually reports:

> While fluent bilinguals tended to switch at various syntactic boundaries within the sentence, non-fluent bilinguals favored switching between sentences, allowing them to participate in the mode-switching mode, without fear of violating a grammatical rule of either of the languages involved.

She (p. 615) further argues against the traditional overgeneralized notion that switching is negative “interference” from other languages, saying that in this particular speech community it is not the case. That is, more highly competent users in both languages tend to make more switches

---


28 Heller (1988:7) refers to this type of switching in this Puerto Rican community as “intergroup talk.” She also reports that switching may become the norm for the same purpose between francophones and anglophones in Quebec. (emphasis mine)
intrasonically. This type of switching, as noted in the introduction, is even claimed as improbable by Weinreich (p. 73).

As a result of the series of studies, Poplack claims that there are two grammatical constraints on switching:29 "the free morpheme constraint," and "the equivalent constraint." The first constraint allows the speaker to switch "after any constituent in discourse provided that constituent is not a bound morpheme" (1980:585-6). For instance, she discusses that the following construction may be impossible:

(9) Eat-iendo (eating)

As for the second constraint, Poplack (ibid.) describes, "Code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L₁ and L₂ elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language." And she (p. 586) provides an example to illustrate possible switching points in a code-mixed sentence by this constraint:

A. English  I  told him  that  so that  he  would bring it  fast
B. Spanish  (Yo)  le dije  eso  pa' que  (él)  la trajera  ligero
C. Switching  I  told him  that  pa' que  (él)  la trajera  ligero

---

29 Poplack (1980:585) argues that this constraint may not be an attribute of linguistic universals.
If the simple and general constraint can also be applied to (2), the utterance collected by McClure with the assumptions given above (cited here again as (2)’), it will become grammatically unacceptable:

(2)’ I want a motorcycle verde.

However, Poplack (p. 558) remarks that this type of construction “occurs very rarely” in her data, which can also be interpreted as it does occur. Given the formal analysis of the sentence, which we have previously discussed, we know that (2)’ is not a grammatically inappropriate sentence. Nishimura’s (1986) study of a Japanese-American community supports this notion as well. The following example appears as one of the collected data:

(10) KAERI NI WA border DE we got stopped.
    (return) (on) (as for) (on)
    (We got stopped on the border on the way home)

The two items in the first phrase in Japanese form P(article) P(hrase):
N → KAERI; P → NI. Because of its postpositional characteristic, the PP construction in Japanese is:

---

30 All of the Japanese lexical items in the following sentences are capitalized.
PP → NP (P)

In this case PP is followed by the topic marker, WA. And PP and the topic marker constitute a Topic P(phrase).\(^{31}\) Therefore, its word order is completely opposite from that of English.

As for (10), the first PP poses us no problem at all; it is an entirely Japanese construction with the Japanese lexical items. It is the second phrase that contradicts Poplack's second constraint, i.e., the equivalence constraint. That is, it needs an additional switch within PP. Nishimura (p. 129) reports another similar construction:

\[
(11) \quad \text{SOREKARA,} \quad \text{his wife NI} \quad \text{YATTARA}
\]
\[
\quad \text{(in addition)} \quad \text{(to)} \quad \text{(give [conditional])}
\]
\[
\quad \text{(In addition, if [we] give [it] to his wife.)}\(^{32}\)
\]

She argues that the two questionable phrases in (10) and (11) are first governed by the Japanese sentence structure rule, because of the

---

\(^{31}\) This is a controversial categorization. Some prominent scholars like Jorden ([1987]. Japanese: The spoken language. New Haven: Yale University Press.) claims that this is a double particle construction. Thus, "KAERI NI WA" constitutes a single PP. The concept of having a topicalization marker in a language is extremely difficult for anyone whose language lacks it.

\(^{32}\) It is a normal process to delete the nominative, accusative, and dative NPs and their case marking particles when the speaker assumes that the hearer(s) have already understood them.
postpositional word order in the phrases. Then, another set of switches occurs at the individual word level. The tree configuration for the two sentences clearly illustrates the point:

(10)

```
S(j)
  /  \\    \\/
Topic(j)        S(j)
  \   /     \   /
PP(j)    WA     PP(j)
  \     \     \   /
N(j)  P(j) N(j)  P(j)
    KAERI    NI    DE
```

we got stopped

(11)'

```
S(j)
  /    \\/
ADV(j)    S(j)
      \   /     \   /
PP(j)    V(j)  P(j)
      \     \   /
NP(j)  NP(e) N(j)
          X     N(e)
      border
```

SOREKARA  his wife  YATTARA

Poplack's second constraint, however, further commands, "a switch is inhibited from occurring within a constituent generated by a rule from one

33 "j" and "e" in the parentheses represent Japanese and English, respectively, and "X" stands for a point where switching occurs.
language which is not shared by the other” (p. 586). According to this (Poplack’s) regulation, the phrases in (10)’ and (11)’ violate the equivalence constraint, for it inhibits English lexical items (e.g., his wife) in the Japanese construction, which does not share the same syntactic structure rule as in English. Nonetheless, Nishimura’s study lists several other similar switched phrases. What it suggests is that this type of switching is not inhibited in this community or perhaps in general between English and Japanese.\(^*\)\(^{34}\) In addition, once the concept of the stratification in item arrangement, which is depicted in the tree configurations above, is taken into account, we come to understand that switches observe each language’s syntactic rules at each nod. Thus, we may speculate that in (2)’, the following switches have similarly occurred:

\(^{34}\) Annamalai ([1989]. “The Language Factor in Code Mixing,” International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 75:47-54) reports that numerous Tamil-Kannada switched phrases even violate Poplack’s “free morpheme constraint,” and requests “the need to take the language factor into account when characterizing the nature of code mixing.
The above configuration may justify our discussion so far, and that the point we have been attempting to make is now clear. That is, the code-mixed sentences occur not randomly, but they are governed by the syntactic structure rules of the languages whose elements are involved in the mixing. The notion is vital counterevidence against the thesis that there is some form of a new grammar acquired to produce mixed sentences. Lederberg and Morales (1985) take sides of our argument as well. They call this new grammar “a third grammar,” and claim, “the constraints of code switching are based on the integration of the grammars of the two code-switched languages rather than on the creation of a third grammar.”

The above discussion by Lederberg and Morales may be misleading.

---

35 “s” in the parentheses represents Spanish.
36 The controversial interlanguage may be included in this grammar.
because "the integration of the grammars" suggests a somewhat different picture from the one we have been attempting to draw so far in this paper. It is rather an interaction of the two autonomous grammars. And this concept parallels the modular systems proposed by Chomsky (1986) regarding the components of the "Universal Grammar." In such set of systems, each system works autonomously but must interact with the other systems, while neither intervening the others nor being intervened by them. This process is necessary to generate a grammatically appropriate sentence. Moreover, Woolford's analysis of the code-mixed sentences (1983:520) also supports this notions (see Appendix 3. 1).

While it is true that Weinreich's study is still considered a great achievement, the area of study on bilingual code switching and mixing has revealed a new insight into the interlingual relationship of a bilingual individual.

So far, it has been discussed that switching and mixing do not occur accidentally in some particular bilingual communities, but they occur in some specific ways that may differ from one speech community to another. It has also been investigated that multi-grammar systems in a bilingual mind seem to exist autonomously, and that every switch is subject to the syntactic structure rules of each language. It is also important to note that each speech community develops its particular principles.
Returning to the issue of lexical borrowing, as switching has become a norm in a given society, it is natural that switches occur among smaller segments. And as this linguistic activity persists for a longer period, many lexical items in the one language begin to lose their original identity and become loanwords in the other.

Still, an important question has not been answered: "Did such bilingual communities where code switching served as "in-group talk" exist in medieval England? It is almost impossible to give an exact answer to the question. But as Baugh and Cable report on the matter of knowledge of French among the people, and as Tanaka (1987:157-8) claims the existence of a French section in a town like Southampton and of active commercial exchanges across the Channel, it does not seem so unusual to posit groups of people\textsuperscript{37} who used French, English, and possibly Latin.\textsuperscript{38} In any case, it is these groups of people who affected the literary language.

Given the information mentioned above, another important question needs to be answered here: "Could the large number of lexical items have come from the process mentioned above?" The answer is "possibly yes." However, there is another crucial factor involved regarding this issue.


\textsuperscript{38} With regard to the status of the three languages, some scholars argue that of the three, Norman-French had "the worst place." see Keeton, G. W. (1966). The Norman Conquest and the Common Law. London: Bernes & Noble.
It must be noted that the sharp increase of loanwords beginning in the last half of the twelfth century agrees with the rise of status of the French language in France as Rickard (1974:46) writes:

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw the wide-spread acceptance of the vernacular as a literary medium, side by side with Latin. From the beginning of the thirteenth century, we also find the vernacular being used to some extent in local documents in Picardy. Indeed, from the year 1254 onwards, French is used as well as Latin ever in documents emanating from the royal chancellerly in Paris.

The above passage provides one reason for the preeminence of French lexicons in ME. That is, because of the increasing prestige of French, they began to use its words and other elements in ME documents. This may have also partially contributed to the increase in the number of French-like expressions in the literary language. Using words borrowed and phrases directly translated into ME could have come into fashion even in the monolingual population. Of course, by this argument, we are, by no means, negating the probability of a code-switching effect on the lexical borrowing for an extended period. On top of the above factors, we should also note that it may be possible that a greater number of those words recorded later in the written language must have already been in the spoken much earlier. Now, there is one last issue we need to discuss regarding language contact and change in ME: syntactic change.
6. A brief study of syntactic change in ME: On the development of the English word order.

Bailey and Maroldt (p. 45) maintain that the two language contacts that have been examined in the paper made room for OE to further pursue its analytical features by means of stimulating the "declensional simplifications." And studies like Torres' suggest that there is another factor to be considered: structural and lexical borrowing as a result of long-continued switching and mixing. As we know, English was becoming the language of many official purposes and was replacing French. Thus, as the competence of French declined even in the literary population, a number of structures were retained in English. In this section, though many studies have been done in the syntactical development from late OE to ME, we will re-examine some of the issues related to the subject using several examples. By doing so, we attempt to find some connections with the discussion so far in this paper.

The most common Pr.E word order in a sentence such as "John hit the boy" is well-illustrated by Chomsky's phrase structure rules, which are presented here in a rather simplistic way as follows (Chomsky 1986:57):

(a) S → NP VP
(b) VP → V NP
(c) NP → DET N
(d) NP → N

See the second note in Appendix 3.1.
(e) V \(\rightarrow\) hit
(f) N \(\rightarrow\) boy
(g) N \(\rightarrow\) John
(h) DET \(\rightarrow\) the

In Pr.E, unlike highly synthetic languages, the agent and the receiver of a certain action in a given sentence are determined by the word order, or the presence of minor class of lexicons (as in the passive voice sentence of the above example), or the semantic properties\(^{40}\) of a verb. The first two of them are considered to be two of the typical characteristics of the analytic language. For instance, O'Donnell and Todd (1980:43) attempt to illustrate the development of the second feature by contrasting two examples as follows:

(12) Oft hem anhaga
Metudes milstse,
geond lagulade,
hreran mid hondum
wadan wraeclastas:
are gebideth,
theah the he modcearig
longe sceolde
hrimcealde sae,
wyrd bith ful araed

(13) Often the solitary man prays to him for favour,
For God's mercy, although he sad at heart
Through waterways, must for a long time
Stir with his hands (i.e., row over) the rime-cold sea,
Traversing the paths of exile: fate is quite inexorable.

They argue that while (12), the OE text, has two prepositions, (13), the equivalent Mod.E version, has eight of them. Although this is such an

\(^{40}\) Specifically, the assignment of cases by verbs.
extremely simple comparison, the point they attempt to make is quite true in many cases. And the expanded number of uses for each preposition in Pr.E has evoked scholars, some of whom we mentioned in the previous section, to examine the possibility of extended "phrasal power" among prepositions. 41

As to the matter of word order, the recent work of Chomsky (1986) reveals that Pr.E belongs to the [+configurational] group of languages, while languages like Italian are classified as [-configurational]. That is, languages, which are marked by configurationality, have the general tendency of dependence on the word order. And those that are not marked possess more freedom of it.42 Thus, the assignment of the agent and that of the receiver in Pr.E are mainly determined by word order and minor class of lexicons. The following description of the word order of OE, however, presents us with somewhat different picture.

Plenti taim waka man tɔk fɔi as i fɔ helep
Fɔ gud ting fɔ gɔd, iven wen i di taia fɔ i bele
(i get fɔ go) fɔ ples we wata de, an fɔ lɔŋ, lɔŋ taim i get fɔ
Muf wit i han di si we i kol pas mak,
(i get fɔ) waka i wan fɔ dis graun: laif de daso.

O'Donnell and Todd (p. 48) maintain that the above passage in Cameroon Pidgin English contains 9 prepositions, and that it suggests, "that the processes by which modern English develop from OE do not differ fundamentally from those by which Cameroon Pidgin developed from English."

42 This discussion on configurationality is very much oversimplified due to the limitations of space.
Although in OE like in Pr.E, the SVO order is the most common one, there are several other orders found quite often. As for the use of the SVO order, if Obj₂ is not a pronoun, but a noun in the main clause of a sentence, this SVO construction is most common:

\[
\text{Subj} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{Obj₂} \\
(14) \quad \text{He} \quad \text{geseah} \quad \text{bone man} \text{n.} \quad (\text{He saw the man.})^{43}
\]

When ḷa (then) or ne (not) is placed at the beginning of the clause, the following construction can be found:

\[
\text{V} \quad \text{Subj} \quad \text{Obj₂} \\
(15) \quad \text{ḥa} \quad \text{sende} \quad \text{se cyning} \quad \text{bone disc} \text{.} \quad (\text{Then the king sent the dish.})^{44}
\]

Without Obj₂, however, Subj precedes V as in the following construction:

\[
\text{Subj} \quad \text{V} \\
(16) \quad \text{ḥa} \quad \text{Drihten Hælend Crist} \quad \text{cwæd} \quad \text{to Andrea his apostle.} \\
\quad \text{(Then Lord Savior Christ said to Andrew his apostle.)}^{45}
\]

As it is in Pr.E, the SVO order is very common in the main clause in

---


^{44} ibid.

^{45} Taken from *The Legend of St. Andrew* (Markman and Steinberg 1983:385).
which Obj₂ is a pronoun, or in the embedded clause in which Obj₂ is not a pronoun:

(17) Se haliga Andreas him andswarode. (The holy Andrew answered.)

(18) Pa he bone cyning sohte, he beotode. (When he visited the king, he boasted.)

As we have seen in the above examples, the word order in OE is very much different from that in Pr.E. with regard to this issue, Swieczkowski (1962:9) maintains that even in ME, the word order is not as fixed as it is in Pr.E. He (p. 9) writes, “Middle English texts present nothing like the rigorous word order of present day English.” For instance, his findings on the order of Subj and the predicate (Pred) support this notion. (See Table 3. 3 given at the end of the chapter.).

In Table 3. 3, Pred specifically refers to V. Therefore, what “Final Pred in the main and subordinate clauses” signifies is the occurrence of V at the end of the clause. This quantitative study makes it clear that there were other frequently-used word orders than the SVO, and that despite some regional variations, the SVO order, which was by any means not

---

46 ibid.
47 Taken from O'Grady and Dobrovolsky (p. 203).
uncommon even in *Beowulf*, gradually became the predominant one. Let us examine another statistical study on the increase of the SVO order from late OE to ME in Fries' findings. (See Table 3. 4 given at the end of the chapter.)

It is obvious now that the word order has become more rigid as we move towards Mod.E. Naturally, the next question is why English lost its diversity of word order, and how it happened. The traditional notion is that the "morphological loss through phonological reduction" stimulates the change in English word order (Bean 1983:139). In other words, we can simply paraphrase it by saying that the loss of inflectional endings forced the English speaker to depend more upon the work order, for the case of a word is no longer obvious just from its ending except in some instances.

As indicated in Table 3. 3 and 3. 4, the rate of shift towards SVO is the highest in the period between early and late ME. This seems to indicate some correlation with the period of enormous lexical borrowings, although the peak of change for syntactic change comes later.

Once again it must be noted that there are two main groups of scholars studying the history of English. The first group claims that the past language contacts, especially with the Scandinavian languages and Norman French, affected English, and made the language lose its inflectional endings and become more dependent on the word order. On the other hand, the other group claims that the leveling of inflectional endings had
already in progress before the major two contacts, and some of them go as far as to say that the syntactic development has only followed the normal course of linguistic development, i.e., syntactic > analytic.

In order to examine the two conflicting theses, let us return to the example (14) cited here again as (14)'

(14)' He geseah þone mann.

What one must also notice from (14)' is that this shows as many analytic characteristics as Pr.E does. To make this point clear, let us now consider a paradigm of an a-stem masculine noun in OE: 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>stanes</td>
<td>stana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>stane</td>
<td>stanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>stan</td>
<td>stanas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that Subj and Obj₂ take exactly the same form both in singular and plural. It is also true of a-stem neuter nouns like scip (sg. nominative/accusative [ship]) and word (sg.

48 The examples given in this paper is in the West Saxon forms. It is in that dialect that most of the extant writings were written.
nominative/accusative [word]). In sentence (14)', he is a masculine pronoun, and is Subj, and mann belongs to the minor declension class of nouns, serving as Obj$_2$. The two paradigms for those words (the singular forms only) are given in Table 3.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>mann</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>mannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>menn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>hine</td>
<td>mann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14)' is not so much different from the Pr.E equivalence, "He saw the man," as far as the synthetic features are concerned. That is, he indicates it is nominative, which is even the case in Pr.E. And if he were to be replaced by any of the a-stem nouns, one cannot distinguish between Subj and Obj$_2$ unless he/she examines the word order.\(^{49}\)

Actually, by the time the first writings in OE appeared, much of the original inflections had been already lost. For instance, the reason the a-stem noun is named so is due to the fact that in the unattested Proto-Germanic language, it used to carry a formative, \(-a-\), placed between the base, stain, and the grammatical suffix, \(-z\). Therefore, stain-a-z (sg. nominative) and stain-a-fe (sg. accusative).

\(^{49}\) There are still quite a few nouns whose nominative and accusative forms are different as in the o-stem nouns, e.g., giefu (sg. nominative [gift]) and giefe (sg. accusative).
nominative) is the original word in Proto-Germanic, which was reduced to *stan* in OE.\(^{50}\)

The discussion so far naturally leads one to the conclusion that the syntactic change was well in progress in OE or perhaps even before it. This is by far the strongest reason for which both the traditional and modern Germanists claim the least possible amount of foreign influence on the development of English syntax. Regarding this issue, Thomason and Kaufman maintain that the "simplification" of the English language did not follow an abnormal course of progress at all. In order to support their notion, they compare English with six other both West and North Germanic languages and their minor language groups, regarding its degree of simplification and foreignization. The languages examined are Danish & Bokmaal, Swedish, North Low German & Mecklenburgish, Standard Dutch, Saterland East Frisian, and Standard High German. Then, Thomason and Kaufman choose twenty factors related to the simplification and foreignization, which are:

a. reducing unstressed V to schwa
b. lengthening stressed V in open syllable
c. degeminating consonants
d. dropping final schwa
e. loss of interdental fricative
f. loss of /h/ before /w/
g. change of /w/ to /v/

\(^{50}\) cf. Note 17 in Chapter 2.
h. devoicing of final obstruents
i. massive word-of-mouth lexical borrowing
j. foreign derived affixes from the same language given in i.
k. loss of dative case: dative > preposition + N
l. two genitive constructions, e.g., 's and of in English
m. loss of gender on definite article
n. loss of gender on modifying adjectives
o. loss of distinct person/number markers on verbs (present)
p. loss of distinct person/number markers on verbs (past)
q. use of interrogative words in restrictive relative clauses
r. use of "more/most" in comparative and superlative forms
s. use of polite "ye"
t. exclusive (or predominant) SVO word order

Of the total twenty points, which would classify that language as a highly "simplified" and "foreignized" one in Thomason and Kaufman's terms, English scores 15. As for the other Germanic languages, Danish & Bokmaal score 15.5, Swedish - 13.5, North Low German & Mecklenburgish - 13.5, Standard Dutch - 13.5, Saterland East Frisian - 12, and Standard High German - 10. What Thomason and Kaufman (p. 321) attempt to prove in the above findings is that English is not so much simplified and foreignized, when compared to other Germanic languages that they do not consider as those which have gone through as much language contact as English did. This study presents a counterevidence against some scholars' theses that claim possible "creolization" periods in the development of English.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{51} cf. Chapter 2, pp. 23-4, especially Todd's discussion on pidginization and creolization.
We rather suspect that some of the writers whose interpretation of the history of English we are objecting to might interpret the evidence for "creolized" stages in these languages' development; however, such a use would rob the term "creolization" of its distinctive content, and certainly we do not use the term in the way these authors do. The languages in question were not colonized in the same way that English was by Norse and French.

Their argument contains a very problematic issue, i.e., its clear distinction between language contact situations within Western European languages and those between European and non-European languages. And this presupposition encourages them to a conclusion that has been quoted earlier in the paper: English did not undergo either "abnormal" or "creolization" developmental processes, and "most of the simplification in Standard English and in Southern English dialects has occurred while English speakers were overwhelmingly monolingual" (p. 321).

Thomason and Kaufman's observation above seems to be well-supported by the statistical data in Table 3. 4, i.e., rather a gradual change during 1000-1300, and quite a drastic one during 1300-1500. In c. 1500, V-Obj₂ order comprises 98.13%, where as in c. 1300, in slightly over 40% of all sentences, we find the Obj₂-V order. We must not also forget that almost the same rate of change is observed in other areas of the language, e.g., the introduction of the lexical items and loan phrases of foreign origin with slightly earlier peaks in rates of change. The lexical introduction picks up its speed at c. 1175, i.e., approximately 150 years before the
syntactic change becomes accelerated. As Thomason and Kaufman argue, it is true that great shifts to Mod.E occurred in the period beginning in late ME when "English speakers were overwhelmingly monolingual." But it seems obvious that they neglect an important issue related to the nature and the pattern of change in language. That is, "Can any change in language occur overnight?"

Chen and Wang (1975) present an interesting case, regarding the rate of sound change. Based on their study, Aitchison (1984:99) asserts that an S-curve represents the general rate of language change: the vertical axis stands for the amount of change, and the horizontal axis represents the time-scale. That is, a change and a diffusion of the change start with a extremely slow rate, then at a rapidly increasing rate at one stage, and proceeds towards the end at a slower rate. And it is also the case with the syntactic and lexical changes in English.\(^{52}\) Therefore, we can maintain that any change in the word order has to be initiated by some cause, which in this case is the inflectional leveling, and the following consequence of the fixed word order. Then, as Thomason and Kaufman claim, is this change a normal development of the language? Can this be just "simplification" of the language?

It is difficult to accept the notion, though widely accepted, that

\(^{52}\) The Great Vowel Shift is not an exception. The change did not appear abruptly or all of a sudden. At first, the certain sound change must have begun slowly and unnoticed.
speakers of any language have innate laziness in their speech, and always prefer a more "simplified" form. It is unlikely that the loss of distinction between the nominative and accusative case in English happened, because people were inclined to much sloppier speech. If it was so, why would they have had to do it? To begin with, the loss must have caused certain ambiguity for the native speaker, and it must have made the language more complex, if it had been only for the sake of creating "simplicity" in the case systems. This kind of notion of "simplification," seems to have derived from the simplistic idea that a more inflectionally complex language is more difficult to be acquired than a more analytic one. For the native speaker, whether the native tongue is synthetic or analytic does not make any difference as to the ease of acquisition. If this argument is correct, there must be a cause for the inflectional leveling.

Bean (p. 138) maintains that the loss of the distinction between nominative and accusative case is due to the Germanic accent shift, which took place before the proto-Germanic period. As the time went on, the weakened inflectional endings were reduced to the less elaborated systems, which finally resulted in the identical endings for the nominative and accusative singular and plural in a-stem, u-stem, r-stem, nd-stem, and consonant stem nouns (Bean p. 139). By the time OE began to be recorded in the early writings, the word order was very much fixed, and as we have seen in some sentences from that time, there were some rules
governing the determination on a specific word order. Fries’ study shows that in the 10th century, slightly over 50% of all clauses had the Obj₂-Subj arrangement. And as we have examined earlier, this order is most prominent in the case where Obj₂ is not a pronoun. A study by Saitz (1955)\(^5\) reveals nearly the same statistical figures from the 9th century writings: 49% SVO order - both Subj and Obj₂ are nouns, 30% SVO and 60% SOV - Subj is a pronoun and Obj₂ is a noun, and 0% SVO - both Subj and Obj₂ are pronouns. It seems almost inevitable to suspect that the SOV ordering was the underlying word order in OE, which was rapidly changing to the SVO order in the next few hundred years.\(^5\) The basis for our argument is obvious, i.e., the lack of the case distinction between the nominative and accusative nouns in the majority of the noun paradigms. For instance, the juxtaposing of Subj and Obj₂ - both of them being nouns - might have caused some ambiguity.\(^5\) Due to this possible ambiguity, the noun Obj₂ had to move across V, in order for V to mark the boundary line. However, the pronoun Obj₂ was already marked by its distinctive ending from its nominative one, and it usually was placed at its underlying position. Then, as in Fries’ study, during the 13th century, SVO was

---


\(^5\) Bean (pp. 138-9) supports this view.

\(^5\) We must note, however, there are very few languages with Obj₂ being placed before Subj. Perhaps it is due to reasons of perception.
gradually becoming more common than SVO, followed by the quick shift in the 14th and 15th centuries, which makes it rather impossible to accept the notion that English syntax was only treading its normal course of development. At this point, we should examine some specimens of the language, especially that of the transitional stage, in order to understand what was happening at that time and to find cues for the following changes to the predominant SVO order. For this purpose, several examples from Ancrene Wisse (abbreviated as AW henceforth) will be examined.

AW, "Rule for Anchoresses" is a revised version of Ancrene Riwle that is believed to have been written for three ladies of noble birth who decided to live as anchoresses, and to have been rewritten for general public in the early half of the 13th century, perhaps ca. 1230 as AW. There have been numerous arguments regarding the authorship of this work, but not much is known still to this day.

Given below is a passage from AW:

Dame ḷu ārt iweorret. ḷine van beoṉ se stronge. ḷ tu ne maht nanesweis wid ute mi sucurs edfleon hare honden. ḷ ha ne don ḷe to scheome deaṉ efter al ḷi weane. Ich chulle for ḷe luue of ḷe. neome ḷe feht up o me. ḷ arudde ḷe of ham ḷe ḷi deaṉ secheṉ. Ich wat ḷah to soṉe ḷ ich schal bituhen ham neomen deaṉes wunde. ḷ ich hit wulle heorteliche forte ofgan ḷ in heorte. Nu ḷenne biseche ich ḷe for ḷe luue ich cuṉe ḷe. ḷ tu uuie me lanhure efter ḷe ilke dede deaṉ, hwen ḷu naldest liues. (AW: Ms. Corpus Christi College, Tolkien [ed.]. [1962:199].)
The dialect used in AW is that of the southwestern Midland area, e.g., the presence of -o- as in honden indicates that this writing belongs to the western area in Midland. Although it is not shown in the above, passage, throughout AW, the written representation of OE /yl/ is indicated by -u-:
\[\text{huften} \prec \text{hyften}\] (handmaid), and \text{duke} \prec \text{dyde} (did). These are also the western features (Wakelin 1988:90).

Many of researchers (e.g., Mossé 1952, Wakelin 1988) argue that the language of AW is very conservative, because of the kind of geographical dialect in which it was written. However conservative it is, there are some new trends as shown in the above passage whose style is especially conversational. Let us first examine the pronouns used in the passage.

Generally, pronouns are believed to be fairly resistant to language change, and it is true in English. In AW, many of the OE pronouns like ic, me, bu, heo, he and hit were retained. Despite its conservative characteristics, this needs to be noted that there are several new forms as well. For instance, the wide-spread merger of the nominative and accusative nouns and personal pronouns (1st person and 2nd person) further spread their paradigms to the other ones, i.e., 3rd person singular masculine accusative, hine, was replaced by its dative form, him: (...luue hefe ouercumen him... [...]love had overcome him...]).\(^6\) We also find the same change in 3rd person singular feminine accusative, hie, which was

\(^6\)Taken from Tolkien (p. 199).
replaced by the dative form, \textit{hiera} > \textit{hire} in \textit{AW}: (schawde hire his feire neb. [showed her his fair face.]).\footnote{Taken from Tolkien (p. 198).}

As for the 1st person singular genitive, \textit{min} (\textit{AW} form \textit{mi}) depicts further weakening of the word-ending, /n/: (neome)\textit{p} feht up o me. [take that fight upon me.]).

We find in the above passage, the parallel usage of \textit{pu} and \textit{tu}. Both of them indicate 2nd person singular nominative: (Dame "\textit{pu}" art iwearret. [Madam, you are attacked.]) and (\textit{p} “\textit{tu}” ne maht nanesweis wi\d ute me sucurs edfleon hare honden. [that you might not at all, without my help, escape their hands.]). According to Mossé (1952:40, 51), the latter form, \textit{tu}, is an assimilated form of \textit{pu}. That is, since \textit{p} represents \textit{pet} and the final sound is [t], the initial sound of \textit{pu} is assimilated into the preceding sound. What this indicates is the fact that despite its relatively standardized writing practices even before the age of the printing press, there are some spoken elements that can be phonetically transcribed into the written language. And it provides some glimpses of what was taking place in this time of change.

The above passage also reveals some leveling processes for verbs. One specific example of the weakening of the inflectional ending is indicated by that of \textit{neomen}: (ich schal bituhen ham neomen de\d es wunde. [I shall between them take death’s wound.]). Its ending \textit{-en} is reduced from its
older form -an. Eventually, even in this conservative dialect, the final -n was reduced to the point that it was lost completely. Some scholars (Markman and Steinberg 1983:404) argue that this trend is also clearly shown by the fact that the final -n of the preposition, on, was even dropped in the written form in AW. This may be true to some extent, but if we closely examine the deletion of -n, we soon come to understand that this again reflects the typical pronunciation-spelling convention at that time. This is because the deletion took place in the environment in which it was followed by a bilabial nasal /m/ in the passage, and perhaps in the spoken language, underlying /n/ might have been represented by the nasalization of preceding [o]. Furthermore, the final -n of on is not deleted prevocally, nor before alveolar stops, nor finally. This is also the case with in. Nonetheless, as mentioned before, it is partially correct to claim that this deletion of -n in on and in in the spelling may parallel the loss of word-final /n/, which was occurring to verbs. In the

---

58 It is interesting to note that -eo- in neomen indicates that the older spelling was retained at this time, but that, at the same time, the leveling of the inflectional endings was taking place as in this example.

59 Ormulum from East Midland, which was written in c. 1200, shows more of this convention, e.g., the short vowel is indicated by the following double consonants. But there is no doubt that the writers at this time were following the tradition of OE manuscripts as well.

60 Not shown in the above passage and including the nasal alveolar stop /n/. This perhaps indicates the word boundary between the two separate independent morphemes.

61 Not shown in the above passage.
passage quoted from *AW*, we also find this loss of -n in *neomen*: (Ich chulle for þe luue of þe. neome þ feht up o me. [I shall for the love of you, take that fight upon me.]). In the original text, a period appears after þe, and one can argue that since these sentence elements are separated by the period, *neome* is not in the infinitive form. But as shown in the translation, these two elements should be closely connected. The equivalent part of *Ancrene Riwle* supports this view: “Ich chulle, uor þe luue of þe, nimen þis fight up on me” (Day 1952:177).

It is evident by now that even the language of *AW*, which belongs to one of the most conservative dialects of ME, shows an overt sign of change. But on the other hand, the word order in the above passage is quite conservative. For instance, after the time expression *þenne*, V-Subj-Obj₂ is found as in OE:

\[(19) \text{Nu}þenne \text{ biseche} \quad \text{ich} \quad \text{þe}... \quad \text{(Now then, I beseech you...)}\]

And when Subj is a noun and Obj₂ is a pronoun, Subj-Obj₂-V can be found:

\[(20) \& \text{ich} \quad \text{hit} \quad \text{wulle} \quad \text{heorteliche}... \quad \text{(and I wish it heartily...)}\]

Thus, while the OE word-order rules were still employed in *AW*, the
SVO order would dominate the others very soon as a result of the changes observed so far. In other words, there was sufficient power built up by that time for the sharper S-curve rate of change to emerge.

Thomason and Kaufman and many other scholars discuss the nature of directness and indirectness of the language contact effect. It is not certain that the kind of change discussed so far in the paper is completely ascribed to a "normal" process of language change. Rather, it is more feasible and inevitable to assume that the two major language contacts had affected the leveling to a great degree. The leveling occurred partially because of the language contact situations both directly and indirectly affected the existing paradigms with an enormous amount of lexical borrowing.

It is clear now that one cannot fully supportive of Bailey and Maroldt's argument on the French effect on OE word order, either, for the reasons discussed in this paper. They (p. 46) claim that OE shows "preference for (surficial) SVO word order," and French SVO order encouraged English to shift towards the same direction. This process of syntactic change encompasses another dimension.

The previous discussion on "language simplification" has argued against the notion that the natural process of language change is from synthetic to analytic, on which Thomason and Kaufman have solely based their thesis. Against this notion, some psycholinguistic aspects from
Romaine and Trudgill have been employed. But on the other hand, it is also true from the standpoint of the formal language development theory that a language does generally go through a cyclical change, i.e., from "morphology with few grammatically functional word order rules" to "word order with few morphological rules" and back to the previous stage again.⁶² Are we contradicting ourselves? Perhaps yes. But it seems inevitable, in order to see a much broader view of this particular change.

We have examined the development of the SVO order in English very briefly in this section, but there are still numerous unanswered questions regarding the shift to the predominant use of the SVO order in English.⁶³

---


⁶³ Romaine (1988:54) summarizes the past sociolinguistic studies on ME, and states that the sociolinguistic status of the language is "far from resolved."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jespersen</th>
<th>Koszal</th>
<th>J + K</th>
<th>Baugh</th>
<th>Mossé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001-1050</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>- (0)</td>
<td>2 (0.1)</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>- (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1051-1100</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>3 (0.15)</td>
<td>- (0)</td>
<td>2 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101-1150</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>3 (0.15)</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>1 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1151-1200</td>
<td>15 (1.5)</td>
<td>11 (1.1)</td>
<td>26 (1.3)</td>
<td>7 (0.7)</td>
<td>5 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-1250</td>
<td>64 (6.4)</td>
<td>39 (3.9)</td>
<td>103 (5.2)</td>
<td>35 (3.5)</td>
<td>58 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251-1300</td>
<td>127 (12.7)</td>
<td>122 (12.3)</td>
<td>249 (12.5)</td>
<td>99 (9.9)</td>
<td>105 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301-1350</td>
<td>120 (12.0)</td>
<td>118 (11.9)</td>
<td>238 (12.0)</td>
<td>108 (10.8)</td>
<td>169 (9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351-1400</td>
<td>180 (18.0)</td>
<td>164 (16.0)</td>
<td>344 (17.3)</td>
<td>198 (19.8)</td>
<td>291 (17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401-1450</td>
<td>70 (7.0)</td>
<td>69 (7.0)</td>
<td>139 (7.0)</td>
<td>74 (7.4)</td>
<td>104 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451-1500</td>
<td>76 (7.6)</td>
<td>68 (6.9)</td>
<td>144 (7.2)</td>
<td>90 (9.0)</td>
<td>166 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-1550</td>
<td>84 (8.4)</td>
<td>80 (8.1)</td>
<td>164 (8.2)</td>
<td>62 (6.2)</td>
<td>155 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551-1600</td>
<td>91 (9.1)</td>
<td>89 (9.0)</td>
<td>180 (9.1)</td>
<td>95 (9.5)</td>
<td>158 (9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1650</td>
<td>69 (6.9)</td>
<td>63 (6.4)</td>
<td>132 (6.6)</td>
<td>61 (6.1)</td>
<td>180 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-1700</td>
<td>34 (3.4)</td>
<td>48 (4.9)</td>
<td>82 (4.1)</td>
<td>37 (3.7)</td>
<td>78 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1750</td>
<td>24 (2.4)</td>
<td>32 (3.2)</td>
<td>56 (2.8)</td>
<td>33 (3.3)</td>
<td>43 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751-1800</td>
<td>16 (1.6)</td>
<td>33 (3.3)</td>
<td>49 (2.5)</td>
<td>26 (2.6)</td>
<td>52 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801-1850</td>
<td>23 (2.3)</td>
<td>35 (3.5)</td>
<td>58 (2.9)</td>
<td>46 (4.6)</td>
<td>68 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1900</td>
<td>2 (0.2)</td>
<td>14 (1.4)</td>
<td>16 (0.8)</td>
<td>25 (2.5)</td>
<td>68 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1000 988 1988 1000 1703

(based on Nakao 1972:426, figures in parentheses represent the percentage of the total loanwords in each column.)
Figure 3.1

(taken from Mossé 1943:39)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1050 - 1100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 - 1150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150 - 1200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 - 1250</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250 - 1300</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 - 1350</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 - 1400</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 - 1450</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450 - 1500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 - 1550</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550 - 1600</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1650</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650 - 1700</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 - 1750</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750 - 1800</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 - 1850</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 - 1900</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 -  2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(based on a table of French loanphrases in English, Prins 1952:32)

**Figure 3.2**

(ibid.)
Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Pred-Subj</th>
<th>Final Pred (Main Clause)</th>
<th>Final Pred (Subordinate Clause)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beowulf</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelfric</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnut</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ch. I, I</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ch. II</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Horn</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers Plowman</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermons</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alfred stands for Alfred Laws, Aelfric - Aelfric's Homilies, Cnut - Cnut Laws, P. Ch. 1, 2, 3 - Peterborough Chronicles, Sermons - Middle English Sermons

Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c.1000</th>
<th>c.1200</th>
<th>c.1300</th>
<th>c.1400</th>
<th>c.1500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obj2 - V</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>40+%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V - Obj2</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>60-%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>98.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fries 1940)
The process of producing a code-mixed sentence, "I put the forks en las mesas," by Woolford (1983:525)*

* This model is obviously based on "the equivalence constraint," showing a shared construction in the overlapping area by the English and Spanish phrase structure rules. But as we have discussed in the paper, the switching constraints are arranged in stratified ways.

** In 1986, Chomsky proposed to abandon all the phrase structure rules. Instead, word order in a specific language is determined by some parameters attached to the powerful .."X-bar theory."
Chapter 4

Summary

- As the Discussion Continues -

... and was born in the womb of the robber, i.e., Very different exteriors can hide similar origins. (Todd 1974:87)

It seems most appropriate to end this paper with a summary, not with a conclusion. Throughout the paper, both old and new questions about the development of the English language have been asked, and the problems have just begun to become clearer by mostly reviewing the past studies on the subject. As we have discussed in the introduction, the bases or presuppositions of certain scholars may often be determined by their biases, linguistic or otherwise, to the subject matter. And the extreme difficulty in this type of study seems to be suggested by the fact that only until recently have we seen a scholar like Suzanne Romaine discussing openly whether the history of the English language might have involved some type of a "creolization" process.

At any event, in the two situations of language contact, one finds some substantial changes in the indigenous language. The lack of sufficient information with regard to this issue, however, prevents further support...
of this argument. As Loyn (1977:115-6) points out, this is due to the strong literary traditions in OE and Latin in the areas where both OE and the Scandinavian languages were spoken and to the relative scarcity of runic inscriptions in the Norse languages. It must be stressed again that the nature of written language discussed in Chapter 2 is another major factor. Nevertheless, as the admixture of the two cultures and languages gradually progressed, even some of the basic OE lexical items were replaced by the Norse elements. And the classic example is the pronouns for third person plural. These Norse traits first became evident in the northern areas where the Norse lived, but they gradually diffused to the
southern parts of England, including the London dialect. Burnley (1989:111-4) claims that increasing number of immigrants from the western and northern areas can be ascribed to the diffusion. He (p. 1211) claims:

The immigration of literate men would naturally have a direct - but not necessarily lasting - influence on the written language of London texts and documents, but we must assume that the spoken language too was affected. (cf. Appendix 4. 1)

---

Mossé (1952:55) provides the following table as to the diffusion of the third person plural forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subj</td>
<td>pæi, pæy, pæi</td>
<td>pæi, pæi</td>
<td>hy, heo, ho, he, ha, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>pæim, thaim, thame</td>
<td>heom, hem</td>
<td>Acc. hi, his, his, hes, hies, es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dat. heom, hem, høm, ham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explaining the above table, Mossé (p. 58) writes:

The mixed type which is that of the Midlands and which agrees with a subject form type 2 (Scandinavian) þeiz, they and an object form of type 1 (native) hem...This type is that of the London dialect and the common language in the second half of the 14th century. As is well known, and that very early, by the example of the Ormulum (where we find þez, heme and þeinem), it was the North that progressively contaminated the Midlands and London. An object form, them, was nevertheless unknown in the language of the capital before the 15th century. (emphasis mine)
He (ibid.) further maintains that this immigration included major literate figures like Chaucer and Langland.

With regard to this question of simplification, we must re-examine the most popular and traditional notion such as expressed by Nist (1966:149), who sees "a morphological simplification, due to the speech interference of Scandinavian and French, for the sake of easier communication." If the Scandinavians and British were able to communicate with very little difficulty, there was no necessity to simplify any of the languages involved. It is rather through constant, long-term code-switching and -mixing processes that various OE paradigms were affected. And now it is most doubtful that his process can be called "simplification."

In the second language contact with Norman French, the increasing prestige of once a vernacular language for the use of verbal communication as well as for official documents may be one of the major reasons for the massive lexical borrowings. And at the same time, one cannot deny the important role of both individual and societal bilingualism

---

2 With regard to this issue, Burnley (p. 145) claims:

The intensity of settlement varied considerably over this area, and place-names that the places of origin of the settles did also, but their numbers seem to have been sufficient in some areas to have brought about a creolised language in which one might have heard a man using Norse phrases into English words and grammatical forms employed in English sentences.
and bidialectalism to differing extents, which seems to hold some share in the process of this change.

As far as social and economic factors are concerned, the interaction between and amalgamation of the two peoples, cultures, and social systems by means of close contact and intermarriage\(^3\) took place to initiate new innovations in those areas. The new directions in the society are deeply embedded and intertwined in the language change at that time.

In relation to the above discussion, what we often neglect when examining the Norman French influence on English is the origin of the Normans. As Baugh and Cable (p. 108), and Davis (1976:7-13) discuss, there is a strong argument for the extremely quick adaptability of the Norse to any indigenous culture. For those who hold this view about the Norse, the case in Normandy is a clear example. As soon as Rollo, a leader of "pagan pirates," became Duke under the French king in ca. 911, the adaptation began. And they claim that those Norse became completely French by the time of the conquest of England. But on the other extreme, there exist popular notions or myths regarding the Norse conquest of Normandy, i.e., the Norse thoroughly devastated the land in Normandy so that "it had to be repopulated with the Northmen who came either direct from Scandinavia, or alternatively from the Danish settlements in England.

\(^3\) Chibnall (p. 5)
and Ireland."⁴ Along the line of this myth lies the idea of the Norman Empire. It is difficult to accept either of the extreme notions. And further studies are needed in this area, too, for the linguistic identity of the Normans is another important factor in studying the language change after the Conquest.⁵

What has become most evident now is that we are far from any type of general conclusion. But one essential reality of historical linguistic study has been revealed. That is, one can only study linguistic diachrony within the framework of synchrony. And more importantly, the diachronic picture is shaped by the synchronic perspective, even when seemingly "purely objective" examinations of any past manuscript are undertaken. In other words, language determines one's identity with, and even ideology of its diachronic aspects. Therefore, what this paper has aimed at is not simply the examination of facts about the historical change of the English language. Rather, by doing so, it has somewhat illustrated the point made by Balaz's satirical account on the word "pigeon" into English.

Thus, language is not, as many language teachers claim, just a tool for communication. It is pregnant with linguistic biases and suppressed

⁴ Davis (p. 20) remarks that this kind of idea is still popular among "British tourists."

historical events.

What seems to be most problematic with this entire issue of the possible creolization processes in the history of English is that the notions of "interference," "simplification" and "pidginization and creolization" carry negative and disdainful connotations. Those terminologies themselves reveal the distorted pictures that one might have when dealing with a certain language bearing any of those descriptions. The fact is, however, that it is almost impossible to find any language without them.

As to the process of so-called "simplification" of English, many linguists attempt to ascribe this process to its "natural" developmental causes rather than to some external "interference" or "negative transfer," which neutralizes its negative concept to a large extent. However, as this paper has examined, what seems to be simplification of a language from one perspective is actually complicating it from another.

"Pidginization" and "creolization," the concepts of these linguistic processes, are based on the notion that they are only related to languages that deviant extremely from "Standard European Linguistic Norm." This naturally encourages one to neglect and suppress the fact that many of these languages may possibly have been mixed and changed as a result of language contact. This is partially underwritten by the findings by Doi (1984:133, see Figure 4. 1 given at the end of the chapter.), which indicate
that English shows the least amount of pan-creole features. As Romaine points out, there are certain problems in the typological exercises in these types of studies.

Relating to this issue, quite a number of applied studies on pidginization and creolization can be found in education, especially in language policy in classrooms in the kind of speech communities where a post-creole continuum from “standardized dominant variety” to “various degrees of substandard varieties” exists. The emphasis is placed almost solely on enforcing the standard in major educational instructions. The sense of the standard or H-language supremacy in language seems to be becoming ever stronger in recent years. Therefore, as the counterpoising effect, we are witnessing an ever stronger sense of linguistic nationalism in many instances. For instance, Romaine (p. 172) reports:

In his most recent work Labov⁶ has argued that in urban areas, Black English is becoming more unlike white English. This linguistic divergence reflects fundamental social and racial divisions between the two speech communities.⁷

Thus, it is time to realize that some of the past studies on language


⁷ Romaine (p. 172) argues that the cause of this divergence between the two varieties is “marginal interaction” between black and white communities due to the formation of separate black communities.
contact and change may have reinforced the kind of tendency reported by Romaine and also have stimulated people to draw a fine “segregating” line between “normal” and “abnormal” languages, or between “simplified languages due to the internal changes” or “simplified languages due to the external contaminating changes.” Therefore, the account by Balaz seems to hold an important key to solve the linguistic situations in Britain in the period in question. The examination of our contemporary linguistic biases will help understand the biases one holds and have an important key to a more integrated study on this subject.
Appendix 4.1

Maps Indicating Medieval Immigration into London from Northern Counties
(taken from Burnley p. 112-3)
Figure 4.1

Bickerton's Pan-Creole Features in Selected Languages
(taken from Romaine p. 66, originally in Doi p. 133)


Blackwell.
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