

The Contact History of English

Marcelle Cole, Utrecht University and Stephen Laker, Kyushu University

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.929>

Published online: 15 September 2022

Summary

Contact between Early English and British Celtic, Latin, Norse, and French came about through a myriad of historical, political, and sociocultural developments: invasion, foreign governance, and the spread of Christianity, but also via peaceful coexistence, intermarriage, cultural exchange, and trade. The so-called Anglo-Saxon settlement of Britain brought speakers of an emerging insular West Germanic variety, which became known as *Englisc*, into contact with British Celtic and, to some extent, Latin speakers. The Northumbrian historian Bede painted a vivid picture of 8th-century multilingual Britain as an island comprising “five nations, the English, Britons, Scots, Picts and Latins, each in its own peculiar dialect, cultivating the sublime study of divine truth.” The Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons led to renewed contact with Latin, the lingua franca of Christendom. The Church became an important conduit for Latin-derived lexis related to learning and ecclesiastical ritual and organization, although it was the cultural appeal of Latin in the early modern period that explains the massive lexical contribution of Latin to English. Later periods of foreign rule and migration following Viking settlement, mainly in the 9th and 10th centuries, and the Norman Conquest of 1066 brought English into contact with Norse and Old French, respectively. Lexical borrowing from these languages involved loans reflecting foreign rule but also basic everyday words. Extensive bilingualism and second-language learning most likely promoted the rapid loss of inflection that English underwent during the medieval period. Opinions usually vary, however, on whether contact brought about direct structural transfer or merely reinforced internal developments already in progress. Contact left its mark most noticeably on the lexicon of English; the influx of Latin and French loan vocabulary extensively reshaped the lexicon and, with it, the derivational morphology of English and explains the heavy Romance element in present-day English.

Keywords: contact linguistics, historical linguistics, Old English, Middle English, British Celtic, Latin, Norse, French

Subjects: History of Linguistics

1. Historical Context

In his *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Bede said that the English peoples stem originally from the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes who arrived in Britain in the 5th century. Very soon after, they gained control over much of eastern England, especially in the south. There, from a variety of Germanic dialects, the English language emerged and took root, most likely through a steady flow of peoples from across the North Sea over the span of a few centuries. Archaeological remains show the impact of this conquest in the form of changed burial practices, jewelry, and runic finds (Cunliffe, 2013, pp. 413–422; Versloot, 2021). When the Anglo-Saxons arrived in Britain, they met with people who spoke a variety of British Celtic, and many may have spoken Latin as a result of almost four centuries of Roman rule. With the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity, beginning at the end of the 7th century, came further Latin influence, and it

continued to have an impact on religious, administrative, and educational matters throughout the 2nd millennium. Scandinavian settlement, especially in the 9th and 10th centuries, resulted in Norse influence, chiefly on vocabulary. Finally, Norman rule led to French having a profound influence on the vocabulary of English from the late 11th century onward. In the modern era, English has spread around the globe and new varieties have emerged through contact with more distant tongues, but the main formative influences that gave English its first identity remain British Celtic, Latin, Norse, and French. They are dealt with here in turn.

2. British Celtic

It is generally thought that British Celtic (henceforth British) did not have a substantial impact on the English language. However, it did pass on the names (including pre-Celtic ones) of many of Britain's rivers (Avon, Thames, Severn, Clyde, Nith, etc.), counties and districts (Cumbria, Devon, Kent, Lanark[shire], Peeble[shire], etc.), and major settlements (London, Leeds, York, Edin[burgh], Perth, etc.). When such place names are plotted on a map (Key to English Place-Names [KEPN], n.d., s.v.v. *British, Primitive Cornish, Primitive Welsh, Old Cornish, Old Welsh* <https://halogen.le.ac.uk/results/results.php?county%5B%5D=all&lang%5B%5D=CB&lang%5B%5D=CBE&lang%5B%5D=CBD&lang%5B%5D=CBB&lang%5B%5D=CBA&hword_list%5B%5D=all&placename=&placename_match_type=exact&data_set=kepnpn>), they appear with much greater frequency in the west and north of England as well as in southern Scotland (for Scottish place names, see James, 2020–). This distribution matches the historical and archaeological evidence for an intense anglicization in eastern England with a more gradual extension north and west (Padel, 2013, pp. 8–12). This difference is important because especially the East Midlands dialects of English gave rise to most modern-day standard written and spoken varieties of English, while varieties to the west remained for many centuries, or still remain, in contact with modern dialects of British (i.e., Welsh and the extinct—though to some extent revived—Cornish language in the southwest of England, and the extinct Cumbric language in the northwest of England and southern Scotland).

Excluding toponyms, not many words from British were borrowed into English. Even Maori, Hawaiian, and Japanese contributed more vocabulary (Durkin, 2014, pp. 26–27, 76–95). According to most handbooks, the number of British loans in Old English (c. 700–1100) amounts to fewer than 10, of which only *binn* 'bin' is still used with any frequency, and the number found in Middle English and Modern English dialects is probably less than 100.¹ Because it is clear that there has been continued contact between Celtic-speaking peoples throughout history, reasons have been sought to explain why so few words were borrowed. Part of the reason is undoubtedly that substrate languages (i.e., languages of lower status) do not tend to have a strong influence on the vocabulary of superstrate languages (i.e., languages of higher status). Another consideration is that the Germanic tribes first established themselves in eastern Britain, but little is known about the British varieties that were spoken in these parts. It is certain, however, that British dialects in heavily romanized lowland areas of eastern England were much more heavily influenced by Latin than other varieties. As such, many early loans are just as likely to be from Latin than British (see section 3 on this point).²

The area where lexical influence from lost substrate languages is somewhat more likely is in what is termed the secondary lexicon, that is, words that are not frequently used and that are often limited to regional varieties, such as words for small plants and animals (*gull*, *mype* 'turnip', *puffin*), old agricultural or fishing words (*coble*, *coracle*, two types of boat), domestic vocabulary (*baby*, *bragget* 'mead and ale', *kibe* 'a chilblain', *metheglin* 'spiced mead'), words for specialized tools or objects (*cayther* 'cradle, type of scaffolding', *crowd* 'a bowed lyre'), and local toponymic items (*coomb* 'deep valley', *crag* 'rugged rock', *pen* 'hill', *tor* 'rocky peak').³ Although the number is limited, a detailed survey of Celtic loans in English has not been carried out since Förster (1921). Breeze (2002) has made efforts in this direction, but a thorough evaluation of his research is wanting (note that Insley, 2019, p. 255, disagreed with several of Breeze's etymologies of Old English words). A potential treasure trove could be medieval English texts written either within or close to former British-speaking areas. Meecham-Jones (2017) identified several possible Welsh loans in such texts and thinks a coordinated survey of Middle English literature in western contact zones could yield promising results.

While a fuller examination of dialect vocabulary and medieval texts from known bilingual areas may help identify further British loans in English, the general consensus among experts specializing in language contact is that in situations of language shift, structural rather than lexical influence is expected. This implies that phonological and morphosyntactic influence are the two main areas of interest. Again, comparatively little British influence has been identified in Old English, while various suggestions have been made for Middle English as well as Modern English dialects. The general explanation for this is that only with the dissolution of Anglo-Saxon power structures—starting with the Vikings, but then more thoroughly under the Normans—did a new brittonicized English of the underclass begin to emerge in the written record, or as Tolkien (1963, p. 28) stated:

The records of Old English are mainly learned or aristocratic; we have no transcripts of village-talk. For any glimpse on what was going on beneath the cultivated surface we must wait until the Old English period of letters is over.

Tristram (2004), Laker (2008b), McWhorter (2008), Trudgill (2010), and others echoed these sentiments.

In terms of phonology, British and Old English had quite a lot in common as far as their phoneme inventories and syllable structure were concerned (Laker, 2010). Hence many suggestions of British influence on English phonology seem weak. The most frequently cited candidate is the retention of the dental fricatives [θ] and [ð] (e.g., in words such as *think*, *path*, *there*, and *other*). With the exception of Icelandic, other Germanic dialects have lost these sounds. Some scholars have argued that their longevity in English could be due to their existence in British and the fact that they are more commonly used in British (also still in Modern Welsh). Studies have also shown that Welsh-speaking, as well as bilingual Welsh-English children, acquire dental fricatives at an earlier age on average than English monolingual children (Munro et al., 2005); hence, even a short period of bilingualism could have supported the retention of dental fricatives in English. However, it also needs to be borne in mind that later contact languages, in particular

Norse, had dental fricatives in greater abundance than Old English too, so Norse contact could have promoted their use in English in a similar fashion (Laker, 2017). Either way, it is difficult to argue that a lack of change is due to contact rather than it simply being an archaism (Isaac, 2003).

Some possible instances of phonological change resulting from contact with British are found in English dialects. One such example involves the merger of initial [kw] and [hw] (e.g., in words such as *quick* and *what*) in some dialects of northern England and southern Lowland Scots (Laker, 2002, 2009). According to most scholars, both [kw] and [hw] first merged in [xw], as can be established on the basis of Middle English spellings and alliterations. Later, [xw] became [hw] and [w] (note that the older variant [hw] was lost in all but the most northerly dialects, especially Northumberland, and Scots by the 20th century). A broad selection of words attesting the change were recorded in dialect glossaries and surveys of the 19th and 20th centuries (*whick* ‘quick’, *whake* ‘quake’, *why* ‘quey, heifer’, etc.), and the change became fixed in place names too (e.g., Whernside and Wharnccliffe Side in Yorkshire, both containing *quern* ‘millstone’). The merger is noteworthy because it is not found in other Germanic languages or dialects. It did, however, occur in Welsh, namely when English loans with initial [kw] and [hw] were borrowed into the language, spelt <chw-> = [xw] (e.g., Welsh *chwarter* ‘quarter’ < Middle English *quarter* < Old French *quartier*; Welsh *chwâl* ‘whale’ < Middle English *whal*). Precisely the same change could have occurred among speakers of northern British when acquiring medieval English, not least because it is extremely difficult for language learners to discriminate two sounds in a foreign language if both are similar to one sound in their native language (Pallier et al., 1997 p. 129). Lass and Laing (2016), however, preferred to view the English dialectal change as language internal and did not think contact with British played any role in it.

The most researched domain for Celtic influence is that of morphosyntax. Tristram (2002) and Trudgill (2011a) observed that grammatical gender and inflectional morphology in English were simplified at a faster rate and at an earlier date than in related languages and attributed this to British influence to some extent. It is certainly true that variability in grammatical gender is already seen in the late Northumbrian glosses of the 10th century (Jones, 1988, p. 26). In the same glosses, the inflectional endings of some noun stem classes begin to be used in other classes; for example, the genitive singular *-es* ending spreads from the *a*-stem nouns to most other classes, and the nominative and accusative plural *-as* ending extends from masculine *a*-stem nouns to other genders and other declensions (Campbell, 1959, p. 22; Rodríguez-Ledesma, 2016, 2018). Given that these changes first appear in Old Northumbrian areas north of the River Tees, where there was very little Norse settlement and influence, British influence may be in part responsible for them, even if later contact with Norse in more southerly areas accelerated matters (see section 4).

Another impact of Celtic influence that is often mentioned is the existence of a twofold formal and functional distinction in the present tense of the copular verb ‘be’ in Old English (Ahlqvist, 2010; Benskin, 2011, p. 178; Lutz, 2009a; Trudgill, 2011b). Old English had one stem (*eom* ‘I am’, *eart* ‘thou art’, *is* ‘it is’) that was used to describe the actual present (e.g., *he is a boy*) and another (*bēo*, *bist*, *bið* ‘I/thou/it will be’) that was used for future reference or habitual events (e.g., *boys will be boys*). In contrast, other West Germanic languages, such as Old Dutch, Old Frisian, and Old Saxon, had a single conflated paradigm, as is still the case in German *ich bin* (a blend of the

cognates of OE *bēo* and *eom*), *du bist* (related to the future/habitual present form OE *bist*), and *er ist* (related to the actual present form OE *is*).⁴ Because both British and Latin differentiate multiple stems of the verb ‘be’ to distinguish the actual present from future and/or for habitual reference, language contact with either of these languages may therefore have promoted the longer retention of this functional distinction in Old English.⁵ Nonetheless, the distinction became moribund in Early Middle English and was subsequently lost (Petré, 2013). Here, again, we have an argument for British influence (or perhaps more likely Latin) supporting a feature that probably already existed in pre–Old English (as with dental fricatives).

Several emerging constructions in Middle English have been attributed to contact with British. One candidate is the use of *do* periphrasis, as in questions (*does he drive?*), negative sentences (*he doesn’t drive*), and declarative sentences (*he does drive*).⁶ Although the verb *do* is used to varying degrees as an auxiliary in other Germanic languages and dialects, its general use in English is considered unique, yet it finds close parallels in Welsh, Breton, and especially Cornish. McWhorter (2009) has argued that the rise of the construction in Middle English—starting in the dialects of southwest England, and still used more extensively there in traditional dialects—is likely to have been transferred from Cornish into English rather than vice versa, not least because Breton also evidences a similar *do* periphrasis, and it would be a stretch to argue that the usage developed in English before entering Cornish and then crossing the Celtic Sea to Brittany.

Another possible Celtic feature in English dialects is the use of a negative particle *ne*, *na*, *nor* instead of ‘than’ in comparative constructions, for example, *better nor me* ‘better than me’ (Laker, 2008a). The feature is well attested in Early and Late Middle English, especially in West Midlands and Scots dialects, and it was still common in traditional English and Scots dialects of the 20th century. No other Germanic language or dialect seems to have developed such a negative comparative particle, but Welsh throughout its history had the construction (cf. Welsh *gwell na fi* ‘better than me’; see Nurmio & Russell, 2021, p. 215). Contact between British and English speakers may therefore have promoted this alternative comparative particle construction in English.

Other features typically not found in any, or hardly any, of the other Germanic languages and dialects, and which have been attributed to contact with British, include: possessive pronouns for inalienable possession of the type ‘I broke *my* arm’ (Vennemann, 2002), systems of verbal agreement especially characteristic of northern dialects (Benskin, 2011), *it*-clefts (Filppula, 2009), and verbal responses as replies to yes/no questions, e.g., *yes, he does* or *no, he can’t* (Vennemann, 2009).⁷ A general survey of these and other influences can be found in Filppula et al. (2008). An aim of future work will be to sketch in finer detail the chronology and geographical spread of these features. However, this is currently a difficult task because most Late Middle English sources have yet to be transcribed into a searchable geotagged corpus (as currently exists for the much smaller corpus of Early Middle English sources with LAEME <<http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html>> [Laing, 2013–]), and this is unlikely to happen any time soon.

3. Latin

Latin has exerted an influence on English throughout its history. Three chronological layers of influence are traditionally established for the early period (Pogatscher, 1888). The first involved an early continental phase of contact between Germanic-speaking peoples and Latin-speaking Romans before migration to the British Isles (c. 100 BCE to 450 CE) (Adams, 2003, pp. 275–279). Latin loans from this phase comprise mercantile terms (*ceap* ‘goods’ < *caupo*, *mynet* ‘coin’ < *moneta*), household objects and containers (*celc* ‘cup’ < *calicem*, *mise* ‘table’ < *mesa*, *bytt* ‘bottle’ < *buttis*), plants and food (*minte* ‘mint’ < *menta*, *win* ‘wine’ < *vinum*, *cese* ‘cheese’ < *caseus*), and building terms (*stræt* ‘street’ < *strata*, *tigle* ‘tile’ < *tegula*, *ynce* ‘inch’ < *unica* (see, e.g., Miller, 2012, pp. 55–89). The second hypothesized phase of borrowing occurred during the early insular period (c. 450 to 600). Borrowing during this period has been envisioned as involving transmission via British Vulgar Latin spoken by the Romano-Britons (Serjeantson, 1935), and this raises the question of whether the romanized Britons still spoke Latin. The view that Latin had died out by the time of the Anglo-Saxon settlement (Ekwall, 1960, p. xxvii) or was restricted to certain sectors of British society (Jackson, 1953, p. 105) has been challenged by Schrijver (2002, p. 87) who envisioned a scenario in which “the man on the street spoke Latin and possibly nothing but Latin,” at least in lowland Britain, where, he argued, Latin replaced British, in much the same way that the dominance of Latin had resulted in instances of language death on the continent. Parsons (2011), however, questioned whether Latin was so widely spoken, based on the relatively low number of surviving Latin place names and because British place names that are found appear to show post-Roman phonological developments (but see Schrijver, 2014, pp. 52–58 for counterarguments).

The survival of Latin in post-Roman Britain is not a prerequisite for Latin influence via Briton-Anglo-Saxon contact. If British did continue to be spoken in the romanized lowland zone of southern and eastern England, the dialect was no doubt saturated with Latin vocabulary as a result of almost 400 years of Roman dominance, making it possible that Latin loans entered Old English indirectly via British speakers shifting to English. Furthermore, the Latin lexis borrowed during the insular period shows features compatible with Vulgar Latin pronunciations in Gaul, making it impossible to isolate insular loans from continental ones (Wollmann, 1990, p. 395). According to Jackson, continued contact between the Anglo-Saxons and the Franks in Gaul provides the most likely source of Latin-derived lexis during the settlement period (Jackson, 1953, §4.2.1). The greater phonological adaptation of some ecclesiastical terms suggests that they were borrowed early (Wollmann, 1993, p. 3), but contact with the Christianized Franks is also seen as a plausible contact scenario for the transmission of early Church Latin (Green, 1998, p. 217).

The third phase of borrowing follows the Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons (c. 600–650). It comprises a period of initial Christianization and a later period following the Benedictine monastic reforms of the 10th century. Whereas borrowing during the continental and settlement phases involved transmission from Vulgar Latin via the spoken medium and showed the effects of Old English sound changes (e.g., *i*-umlaut, first fronting, and palatalization of velars), borrowing in the later Anglo-Saxon period came from Classical Latin and was mostly transmitted via the

written medium. The Church became the main channel of lexical diffusion, and the bulk of Latin-derived lexis during this period unsurprisingly comprised terms related to learning, scholarship, and ecclesiastical ritual and organization, for example, *cleric* < *clericus*, *ymen* ‘hymn’ < *hymnus*, *declinian* ‘decline’ < *declinare*, *grammatic* ‘grammar’ < *grammatica* (Vezzosi, 2012, p. 1707). Quantitatively, indirect borrowing involving lexical items fashioned from native English material through processes such as semantic borrowing (e.g., OE *synn* ‘injury, enmity, feud’ adopts the addition sense of ‘sin’) and loan translations (e.g., OE *godspellboc* based on Latin *liber evangelii*) far outweigh direct lexical borrowing (Vezzosi, 2012, p. 1708). Direct loans from Latin are generally related to church organization and ranks, while indirect borrowing involving native English material is used to convey the concepts of faith (Vezzosi, 2012, p. 1707).

Early-21st-century research has attempted to go beyond the traditional focus on descriptive catalogs of lexical loans and first attestations to establish the nature of early medieval Anglo-Latin bilingualism and the conduits of transmission (Timofeeva, 2010a, 2017). The clergy constituted the main Anglo-Latin bilingual group, but even among the clergy, Latin competence fluctuated over the early medieval period (Timofeeva, 2010a, pp. 6–9). The high standard of Latin proficiency witnessed c. 600–800 was followed by a period of decline that King Alfred’s educational program and the monastic reforms of the 10th century helped remedy. In the reformed monasteries that emerged from the Benedictine Reform, Latin was used as a spoken medium in mass, preaching, and instruction, possibly even conversationally among the clergy, but literary competence probably prevailed over oral competence (Timofeeva, 2010a, p. 2). The ecclesiastical community at large, which Timofeeva (2017, p. 217) reconstructed as involving a complex hierarchy consisting of high and low clergy, regular and secular clergy, married and reformed clergy, monks and nuns, and educated clergy but also parish priests with only elementary Latin proficiency, provided an effective vehicle for the social diffusion of educated Latin loans from the clerical community into the spoken language of the wider monolingual population. Latin loans spread outside elite clerical circles first to prominent secular leaders “as part of the evangelical mission but also in an attempt to secure their patronage and protection” (p. 235) and to lower social classes via parish churches and preaching.

The main impact of Latin on the lexicon and derivational morphology of English was felt during the early modern period. Latin superseded French as the main source of loan vocabulary from c. 1500 onward, reaching a peak in the period 1650–1699, when Latin-derived lexis accounted for almost 30% of all new words in the language (Durkin, 2014, pp. 310–311, based on the revised sections of the *Oxford English Dictionary*’s, online 3rd ed. 2000–, OED <<http://www.oed.com/>>). The social stratification of English that had begun in the Middle Ages with the assimilation of prestige French borrowings progressed further still with the influx of Latin (and Greek) borrowings in the early modern period. Latin loans were regarded as learned (Hughes, 2000, p. 144). By the second half of the 17th century, Latin had also become a major source of scientific vocabulary (see, e.g., Miller, 2012; Vezzosi, 2012). Latin nominal and adjectival suffixes (e.g., *-acy*, *-ment*, *-(i)ty*, *-ary*, *-eous*, *-able*) were also extracted and became part of English word formation but mainly entered English via French (Miller, 2006, 2012, pp. 219–221). English also adopted numerous Latin prefixes (e.g., *post-*, *bi-*, *quasi-*, *inter-*) (Kastovsky, 2006, p. 261ff.).

Based on the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (SOED), Scheler (1977, p. 72) estimated that Latin borrowings accounted for about 28.3% of the total vocabulary of Modern English (versus French at 28.4%). Determining whether particular words are of Latin or French origin, however, is fraught with difficulties. Durkin (2014, pp. 236–237) noted that “In many cases, we cannot say with complete confidence that a word is from French rather than Latin, or vice versa, and in most of these cases composite origin from both languages seems the likeliest scenario”; for example, *procession* was first borrowed in Old English from postclassical Latin, but the form *procession*, attested in the mid-12th century, derives from Anglo-French (p. 246). The methodology employed in the third edition of the OED <http://www.oed.com/> reflects a shift in thinking away from the traditional bias of identifying the ultimate Latin origin of many words—an approach employed in the dictionary’s first edition—toward recognizing the likelihood of transmission via French. Earlier works like the SOED that relied on the first edition of OED overestimated Latin influence at the expense of French influence (e.g., Lutz, 2002, p. 142; Scheler, 1977, p. 72; see Durkin, 2014, pp. 30–31 for discussion). The third edition classifies many of the words that were traditionally considered Latin loans as borrowed either partly or entirely from French. It also distinguishes loanwords that are unambiguously either French or Latin from borrowings that could derive from a French and/or Latin source. A great deal of the scientific vocabulary classified as from Latin (or Greek) sources in the first edition of OED is classified in the third edition as formed within English from elements ultimately of Latin or Greek origin (Durkin, 2014, p. 31). Over time, French assimilated more extensively into the everyday word stock of English than Latin. Only 58 items of the 1,000 most common words in the *British National Corpus* derive solely from Latin compared with 220 items that derive uniquely from French (based on Durkin, 2014, p. 37) (see section 5).

The positive prestige associated with the grammatical system of Latin has informed attempts to model English grammar on Latin structure ever since early medieval times but with little lasting impact on the core syntax of English. There is convincing evidence that medieval scribes changed the native patterns of Old English to parallel Latin structure, but these syntactic calques were mainly restricted to translations of Latin originals and had no lasting impact on the development of English. Syntactic calques appear in a consciously Latinized artificial literary variety that was “restricted to the specific language variety spoken and/or written by the Anglo-Saxon clergy” (Timofeeva, 2010b, p. 505). For instance, the first non-finite constructions in English originate as calques of Latin structure (Fischer & van der Wurff, 2006, pp. 193–194; Timofeeva, 2010b). These include the absolute participial construction (*Laughing out loud, she turned to face him*), the accusative-and-infinitive construction (*I heard her sing*), and the nominative-and-infinitive construction (*He is said to resemble his uncle*). Such usage is restricted to translated texts, however, and non-finite Latin calques in Old English are not the source of absolute adverbials and infinitival constructions in Modern English (Timofeeva, 2010b). Similarly, the Old English dative absolute construction, for example, OE *gedonum nosternum* Lat. *peractis nocturnis* ‘When the night services are completed’, which was modeled on the Latin ablative absolute structure (Fischer & van der Wurff, 2006; Timofeeva, 2008), tends to appear in text types that circulated in monasteries, where a scholarly interest in the relationship between the English and the Latin texts existed, but not in writing intended for lay audiences (Timofeeva, 2008, p. 228).

Latin translation effects have sometimes been misinterpreted as native Old English linguistic structure. Cichosz (2021) discussed the case of Old English conjunct clauses, i.e., main declarative clauses introduced by the coordinating conjunctions *and* ‘and’ and *ac* ‘but’, which are generally regarded as verb final. Cichosz shows that verb-final order in Old English conjuncts is not common and only appears regularly in the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*: a text she shows to have been heavily influenced by the frequent use of verb-final order in its Latin source. Misinterpreting Latin calques as genuine Old English usage has important repercussions for our understanding of Old English grammar. However, the inverse tendency of too readily interpreting direct correspondences between Latin and Old English structure as translation effects is equally problematic and also highlights the need for a careful consideration of the linguistic interplay between Old English translations and their Latin sources. For example, Timofeeva (2010a, p. 26) cited scribes failing to insert personal pronouns in contexts where Latin allows pro-drop, as in OE *cweðon* for Lat. *dicant* rather than *hi cweðon* ‘they spoke’. At first glance, similar usage in Aldred’s Old Northumbrian gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels also looks like the Latinized by-product of the atomistic glossing process, but Walkden (2016) showed that this is unlikely. Whereas Latin null subjects occur in all contexts, null subjects in the gloss occur frequently in the third person, but not in the first and second person, and therefore in all likelihood represent “a genuine syntactic possibility in the grammar of North Northumbrian Old English” (p. 250). Similarly, Nagucka (2003) demonstrated that Latin was not an influential factor on the structure of the Old English prepositional phrase, even in glossarial translations where direct structural influence might be expected. Word-for-word parallels of the type *under ðysse eorðan* for Lat. *subter terras* and *on hire fiðerum* for Lat. *in pennis eius* look like calques, but they involve the use of native prepositional phrases that occur widely in Old English. Despite the availability of Old English prepositionless oblique cases, prepositional phrases render Latin oblique cases even in glosses, indicating that prepositional phrases were a natural native idiom.

4. Norse

Following occasional raids on monasteries and coastal districts around the British Isles starting in the late 8th century, Scandinavians began to settle in England from the mid-9th century and soon brought much of it under their control. However, having defeated East Anglia and much of northern England, they met strong resistance from the West Saxons in southwestern and south-central England and made a truce whereby areas north of a line stretching approximately from the River Thames to the River Mersey came under Scandinavian control. This area became known as the Danelaw. Political wrangling went on in the 10th century, with control switching back and forth. By 1016, Cnut brought all of England under Danish control, and this lasted until his death in 1035. The use of the Norse language in England is thought to have come to an end in about the 12th century. The geographical scope of Scandinavian settlement corresponds to a large extent with the distribution of Danish and Norwegian place name elements in England (see, e.g., KEPN, n.d., s.v. by <https://halogen.le.ac.uk/results/results.php?county%5B%5D=all&lang%5B%5D=all&hword_list%5B%5D=by&placename=&placename_match_type=exact&data_set=kepn> ‘farmstead, village’).

The majority of the settlers were Danes except in areas of the northwest of England and the north of Yorkshire, where Norwegians were more substantial. Dialectally, the two varieties of Norse must have been very similar, and Old English dialects were not too far removed either. This circumstance leads to one of the many difficulties in examining the influence of Norse on English. Because Norse and Old English were closely related Germanic languages, they had a similar grammatical structure, word stock, and phonology. Townend (2002) argued that a good degree of mutual intelligibility must therefore have been possible, and Keller (2020), who calculated the phonological distance between Old English and Old Icelandic using a sample of basic vocabulary, agreed with Townend.⁸

Lutz (2013, 2017) argued that borrowing from Norse was akin to borrowing from French (see section 5). Norse clearly had a dominant status for periods of time (especially during Cnut's reign) and had a wide-ranging influence on English vocabulary; it provided both administrative and legal lexis as well as basic items for which there were already native equivalents. Durkin (in press) uncovered about 1,000 words of Norse origin in the *OED* <<https://www.oed.com/>>, of which about a half are nouns (e.g., *booth*, *law*, *skin*), a quarter are verbs (e.g., *die*, *take*, *want*), and an eighth are adjectives (e.g., *ill*, *odd*, *weak*), with the rest consisting of various adverbs, prepositions, particles (e.g., *though*, *same*, *nay*). However, some words classified as Norse loans in the *OED* <<https://www.oed.com/>> and other handbooks are often suspect because cognates are known to exist in other West Germanic dialects (especially in Frisian, whose historical lexicon must be reconstructed to a large extent on the basis of modern dialects).⁹ As such, several words categorized as Norse loans may well be native English words, but their usage could have been promoted by contact with Norse (*crawl*, *ing*, *knife*, *till*, *skirt*, etc.; see especially Versloot, in press, for the concept of lexical support).

A question mark also surrounds the English third-person plural pronouns *they*, *their*, *them*. Although *OED* <<https://www.oed.com/>> stated that the Old English plural pronouns *hīe*, *hira*, *him* were replaced by the Norse pronouns *þeir*, *þeira*, *þeim*, progenitor forms for *they*, *their*, *them* already appeared in late Northumbrian Old English dialects to the north of the Danelaw area, that is, County Durham. According to Cole (2018), they could just as well derive from the Old English plural demonstrative pronoun in pronominal use. Because a similar functionality (i.e., of the demonstrative pronouns in pronominal use) had already established itself in Norse, the coalescence in forms would simply have led to their propagation.

In terms of date of borrowing, only about a hundred Norse loanwords listed in the *OED* <<https://www.oed.com/>> appear in Old English sources while the other 900 appear in Middle English or regional dialects of the modern era.¹⁰ The comparatively low number of Norse words in Old English seems mainly due to the fact that most Anglo-Saxon sources come from areas outside the Danelaw. Consequently, most Norse loanwords appear in Middle English texts, especially those from the late 14th to early 15th centuries. A detailed analysis of Norse loanwords found in Middle English literary sources using an exacting classification system has now been completed as part of the Gersum Project (Dance et al., 2019).

Unsurprisingly, the traditional dialects of northern England attest more loans than any other variety of English (with the exception of the dialects of Orkney and Shetland). Most of these loans were collated around the turn of the 20th century in the *English Dialect Dictionary* (EDD <<http://eddonline-proj.uibk.ac.at/edd/termsOfUse.jsp>> [Markus, 2018]), but the spread of these words can best be seen by examining the responses from the *Survey of English Dialects* (SED) (Orton et al., 1962–1971), which was conducted in the 1950s and 1960s. One of the results of this survey was the identification of a focal area where Scandinavian loanwords are especially abundant. Kolb (1965) defined this area and referred to it as the *Gürtelzone* ‘belt zone’. He demonstrated that there was a long-standing demarcation of the northern limits of the Danelaw closely coinciding with the flow of the River Tees, the historical border between Yorkshire and County Durham. In contrast, the southern limit of the focal zone had clearly shifted northward over time. For example, when the SED was carried out, many Scandinavian loanwords were no longer found in southern parts of Yorkshire or Lincolnshire, but they surely existed in earlier times. For instance, the Norse loanword *wath* ‘ford’ was recorded in the north of Yorkshire, Westmoreland, and parts of Cumberland in the SED, yet further in the south of Yorkshire, Lancashire, Lincolnshire, and Nottinghamshire it exists only in a fossilized state as a place- or field-name element (see Survey of English Place-Names [SEPN] <<https://epns.nottingham.ac.uk/search/>>).

In terms of phonological influence on English, it has been suggested that speakers of Norse affected the development of Old English palatalized velar plosives.¹¹ In particular, it is evident that place names outside of the Danelaw area have the assibilated consonant /tʃ/ while those within it have /k/ (phonetically, this /k/ had a palatal variant [c] or [cʲ] before a front vowel), for example, Chiswick (a district of London) versus Keswick (Cumberland), where both place names contain ‘cheese’ as a first element.¹² According to Gevenich (1918), assibilation ([c] → [tʃ]) had occurred in all Old English dialects by the time of the Scandinavian settlements but was subsequently converted back [tʃ] → [c] by Norse speakers because they did not have such an affricate. However, van Langenhove (1930) argued that such an exchange is far less likely than Norse influence merely hindering the further development of the palatalized velar into an assibilated one in the 9th and 10th centuries (i.e., [c] → no change). This proposal allows for a mere adjustment rather than a radical switch of sounds.¹³ As a consequence, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether northern variants, for example, *kirk* ‘church’, *kist* ‘chest’, *kirn* ‘churn’, are Norse loans or native Old English words influenced by Norse speakers.¹⁴ In some cases, however, there can be greater confidence that the word is native to English and that the assibilation was merely blocked, as in *keslop* ‘rennet’, *kincoough* ‘whooping cough’, *keens*, *kins* ‘chaps (of the skin)’, because Norse cognates for these words are lacking (Laker, 2021).¹⁵

Warner (2017) and many other scholars have argued that the faster loss of grammatical gender and simplification of inflectional morphology in northern English dialects is due to Scandinavian influence. For instance, Miller (2012, pp. 132–134) pointed to the generalized use of the –s plural and –s genitive in northern dialects. Nonetheless, the fact that the extended use of the –s plural and –s genitive and the breakdown of grammatical gender is found in late Northumbrian texts beyond the Scandinavian focal zone (i.e., above the Tees) indicates that these processes were probably initiated independently of Scandinavian influence. More likely, Norse merely

accelerated these processes. The result was an increase in the functionality of a limited number of morphological endings rather than the plethora of different endings, with identical and overlapping functionality, inherited from Old English and Norse.

One work that has argued that Norse syntactic structure underlies much of Middle English and Modern English syntax is Emonds and Faarlund (2014). In fact, the authors made the bold claim that Modern English is effectively derived from Norse. However, reviews have been highly critical of the book's unbalanced approach to dealing with counterevidence, and the way the authors took West Saxon as a proxy for all Old English dialects (Barnes, 2016; Bech & Walkden, 2016; Stenbrenden, 2016). To illustrate some of the difficulties, consideration can be given to one feature that has been viewed as a strong candidate for Norse influence by many scholars (Emonds & Faarlund, 2014, pp. 108–110; Kroch et al., 2000; Miller, 2012, pp. 144–145), but which no longer seems very convincing (see Walkden, in press).

Kroch et al. (2000) drew attention to the fact that the West Saxon dialect of Old English has a different word order compared to other Germanic languages. Briefly, in most Germanic languages, in a simple declarative sentence the order of constituents is subject + verb (*I have . . .*), but if any constituent that is not the subject appears first in the sentence, the verb and subject switch positions (e.g., *never have I . . .*). The result is that the verb is always the second constituent of a main clause. This verb second (V2) rule can be seen in the last example, as the inversion still occurs with negative constituents in Modern English (*nor have I . . .* or *neither have I . . .*), but under normal circumstances there is usually no inversion in English (e.g., *today/because of the weather/unfortunately + I have . . .* versus German *heute/wegen des Wetters/leider + habe ich . . .*). V2 inversion was already rare in West Saxon Old English, except under certain specified conditions, so the dialect had departed significantly from other Germanic languages, such as Old Dutch, Old Frisian, Old Saxon, Old High German, and Old Norse (including modern varieties thereof, which retain the V2 rule). However, Kroch et al. (2000) noticed that many instances of V2 inversion still occur in northern Middle English texts, as in the northern prose version of the Rule of St Bennet. For example, subject + verb occurs in *sain benet spekis in þis sentence* 'Saint Bennet speaks in this sentence', but when the prepositional phrase (i.e., *in þis sentence*) precedes, inversion occurs: *in þis sentence spekis sain benet* (Kock, 1902, pp. 8–9). The northern Middle English findings led Kroch et al. (2000) to claim that V2 must have been lost in all pre-Old English dialects, before being reinstated in northern Late Old English or Early Middle English dialects due to Scandinavian influence. V2 is then done away with again in later Middle English.

However, the earliest Northumbrian Old English sources in which this feature can be analyzed—the 10th-century glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and, as Walkden (in press) shows, the Durham Ritual—often had V2. Furthermore, since these glosses were written north of the Tees, that is, outside the Danelaw proper, it would be unlikely for Norse settlers to have radically altered the basic constituents in these varieties, especially at so early a date. Thus, Walkden reaches the conclusion that the northern dialect of Old English simply retained the Germanic V2 syntax longer than West Saxon. (The longevity of inherited Germanic structures in Northumbrian Old English could be due to longer and prolonged settlement and contact along the North Sea Coast, in contrast to inland varieties such as West Saxon). Norse could well have added a little extra life to the V2 rule, but to argue that Norse completely reinstated the V2-rule is going too far.

To sum up, claims of Norse syntactic evidence have been overstated in the literature. Arguments of syntactical influence would be expected to align better with the other evidence from place names, loanwords, and dialect phonology which demonstrates that Norse influence is more closely aligned to the Danelaw area and, especially, modern dialects in the focal zone, north of the Humber and south of Tees. Unfortunately, little attention has been paid to the dialect syntax of traditional northern English dialects in the focal zone.

5. French

The Norman conquest of England in 1066 marked a shift in the political and administrative control of the country that was to have far reaching consequences for the development of English, particularly in the lexical domain. Following the ousting of the English-speaking Anglo-Saxon establishment, native French speakers rapidly filled the secular and religious echelons of power, and Anglo-French became established in the official and public spheres. Our understanding of what type of French was spoken in medieval England and by whom, and what the scale and nature of its influence was, has been more empirically informed, thanks to the availability of new resources such as the *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England* (Given-Wilson et al., 2005), the *Anglo-Norman Online Hub textbase* (Rothwell & Trotter, 2007), the *Anglo-Norman Correspondence Corpus* (Ingham, 2008), the *Historical Thesaurus of English* (Kay et al., 2020), and the *Bilingual Thesaurus of Everyday Life in Medieval England* (Sylvester & Ingham, 2019).

The use of the term ‘Anglo-French’ to denote the unique insular variety of French spoken in medieval England, as opposed to the older term ‘Anglo-Norman’, recognizes that the heritage variety developed from mixed linguistic input and was never restricted to Norman French. The conquerors were politically Norman but linguistically mixed (Miller, 2012, pp. 149–150; Rothwell, 1996, p. 200, 1998a, p. 149f.). They hailed from Normandy, but also from Brittany and Picardy, and spoke a range of langues d’oil varieties as well as Breton. Doublets in English of the type *catch/chase* and *warranty/guardian* were traditionally taken to reflect the early borrowing of Norman variants followed by the later borrowing of Central French variants. The textual evidence, however, indicates that a mix of word forms already appear in 11th-century (Anglo-)Norman texts and Early Middle English texts from c. 1200, making the separation of French influence on English into an early period of Norman French influence followed by a later period of Central French influence artificial (Miller, 2012, pp. 152–160; Rothwell, 1996, 1998a, 151f, pp. 154–157).

Aristocratic French political and cultural dominance is reflected in the lexical impact that French had on the elite domains of government, law, religion, warfare, art and architecture, as well as the spheres of cuisine and dining, literacy and education, clothes and textiles (see, e.g., Miller, 2012, pp. 164–167). The prestige of French loan lexis increased the socially stratified “layering” of English. Loan and native lexis became associated with different registers: *obtain/get*, *sufficient/enough*, *aid/help*, and so forth.

However, the widespread tendency to paint a strict dichotomy between the nature of Norse and Anglo-French lexical influence on English is criticized by Lutz (2013). Contact between speakers of Norse and Old English is often assumed to be adstratal; the borrowing of everyday Norse loans

is interpreted as the result of speakers mixing on equal terms, while the superstrate influence of French explains its impact on the prestige domains and registers. This traditional view neglects the lexical evidence for Norse superstrate influence, for example, *lagu* 'law', *unlagu* 'injustice', *þræl* 'serf', or the semantic loan *earl* (Lutz, 2013, pp. 566–568), and the fact that the Danes brought, not only the Danelaw region, but ultimately the country as a whole, under Danish control (see section 4). Contact with French also resulted in a massive influx of basic words. Lutz argued that lexical borrowing from both Norse and French reflects foreign rule and words of a basic nature, and that superstratal influence from both languages explains both types of borrowing. It is precisely because of the unequal sociopolitical terms on which the contact takes place that “superstratal loans of this basic type carry more prestige in the recipient language than their inherited equivalents” (Lutz, 2013, p. 571).

In an influential study that forged understanding of English–French contact for decades, but which has since come under scrutiny (see, e.g., the collection of articles in Ingham & Timofeeva, 2018), Thomason & Kaufman (1988) explained French influence on English in terms of language shift. French vocabulary flooded into English in the first half of the 13th century as the French-speaking aristocratic classes shifted to English and French died out. The claim that French had died out by the mid-13th century is at odds, however, with textual evidence indicating that after 1250 French started to be used in an even greater range of text types than ever before (Ingham, 2010, 2012). The superstrate status of French and the cultural prestige of French-derived lexis cannot be denied, but the tendency to conceptualize French–English contact as involving aristocratic bilingualism and high status borrowing alone has had the effect of oversimplifying our understanding of the sociolinguistic relationship between speakers of English and French. Research conducted in the early 21st century highlights the maintenance of French in the 13th and 14th centuries and argues that stable bilingualism provided the framework for lexical borrowing. From this perspective, 1250–1400 is best understood as a period of sustained bilingualism in which French was used as a medium of communication in various non-aristocratic bilingual speech communities. French had few, if any, native speakers but enjoyed the status of a prestige language (Ingham, 2010, p. 1). Ingham and Marcus (2016, p. 148) described “a flourishing bilingual culture in the professional circles of later medieval England” in which municipal administrators, medieval medical practitioners, manorial estate managers, and merchants were conversant in French (Ingham, 2010, 2012; Ingham & Marcus, 2016; see Wright, 2000, 2005, 2013 for discussion of multilingual texts).

French was employed in a wider range of social contexts than previously acknowledged, and, by extension, the semantic range of French loans was far broader than the elitist content domains traditionally associated with French influence. Research based on the *Bilingual Thesaurus of Everyday Life in Medieval England* (Sylvester & Ingham, 2019) shows that French lexis was not restricted to elite pursuits but also filtered into the language of everyday occupational groups. An average of 27% of the lexis used in the occupational domains of trade, building, farming, food preparation, manufacture, and water travel involve French-derived lexis (Ingham et al., 2019). French influence is also stronger than Scandinavian influence, even in domains traditionally associated with Scandinavian languages, like farming and seafaring. The impact of French on the lexical domain of technical building vocabulary is strongest at the superordinate and basic levels

of the lexicon (Sylvester, 2018). At this level we find almost equal numbers of native and borrowed terms, while at the subordinate (hyponymic) level native terms dominate. In other words, there was more borrowing of vocabulary at the lowest level of the social stratum than among skilled workers. Ingham's (2018) study of French borrowings in the northern Middle English version of the homiletic text, the *Cursor Mundi*, composed c. 1300, demonstrates that only about 30% of the terms fall into the traditional social structure content domains. The other 70% are not domain specific and have broad applicability; they comprise abstract nouns like *fair*, *age*, *peace*, *joy*, adjectives such as *certain*, *bold*, *diverse*, *clear* and verbal lexicon "especially in terms of lexicalizing concepts of interactive behaviour" like *confirm*, *tempt*, *comfort*, *blame* (Ingham, 2018, p. 216; see also Ingham, 2016). The findings for Middle English are in line with Modern English where loanwords, or words formed from loanwords or loan elements, make up 53% (n = 529) of the 1,000 most common words in the *British National Corpus*, and 81% (n=429/529) of these borrowings derive from French (n=220) or French and/or Latin (n=209) (based on Durkin, 2014, p. 37).

The existence of non-aristocratic bilingual speech communities also indicates that the diffusion process should not be viewed only in terms of French influence trickling down from the highest social strata. The most plausible agents of change were bilingual speakers who interacted with the monolingual native population on a sufficient scale to bring about lexical borrowing. The locus of contact influence in the ordinary language of monolingual English speakers is not found in the written language but in the spoken medium (Ingham, 2018, p. 210; cf. Rothwell, 1998b, p. 156). The use of French and the resulting penetration of French-origin lexis in various professional domains created a context whereby French loans spread from specialist speech communities to the general population (Ingham et al., 2019). Ingham (2018, p. 210) also posited that parish priests and friars, who were competent in French by virtue of being educated, would have influenced the language of the wider speech community as they went about their everyday activities of pastoral care and preaching in the spoken medium.

Lutz (2013) explored the complexity of the relationship between superstratal influence and high prestige, noting that they need not necessarily go hand in hand. She questioned the well-known 'master/servant talk hypothesis', that is, the idea that masters used words of French stock while servants used English words, and that consequently, aristocratic speakers were the main agents in introducing loans into English (Lutz, 2013, pp. 575–577). In reality, the adoption of such loans by both master and servant probably had more to do with necessity than prestige; servants would have needed to know the terms for ordinary objects in the language of their masters (e.g., *chair* versus *stool*, *beef* versus *cow*), leading to many apparently "unnecessary" loans becoming part of the basic vocabulary of English over time. The use of French among the lower-educated probably also explains why the right-bound accent patterns of Anglo-French (e.g., *pheasant*, *raisin*) were adapted to the left-bound native patterns of English (e.g., *phasant*, *raisin*) (cf. Middle High German and Modern German accentuation *Rosíne*, *Fasán*; see Lutz, 2009b for detailed discussion).

As discussed in section 3, determining the actual quantitative impact of French on the word stock of English is complicated by the language's close relationship with Latin. Data from the third edition of the OED <<https://www.oed.com/>> indicate that French borrowing reached a peak in the period 1300–1349, at which point French loans constituted approximately 40% of all new words

entering the English language for that period: over 45% if French and/or Latin borrowings are included. Latin-derived borrowings became increasingly common in the period 1350–1399, but Latin superseded French as the main source of loan lexis only after 1500 (Durkin, 2014, Figure 14.2). Note that French borrowings do not show any specific geographical distribution, unlike British and Norse (see sections 2 and 4), and the same can be said for the limited number of French place names (see Trotter, 2014). *KEPN* lists only 81 place names scattered across different parts of England that contain, wholly or partially, a French element (see *KEPN: French* <<https://halogen.le.ac.uk/query/kepn>>).

French influence on English was not restricted to the lexical domain. The derivational morphology of French-derived lexis provided English with a range of suffixes that could be added to romance and native stems to create new words, for example, *information*, *doable*, *cutee*, *amazement*, *oddity* (see Ciszek, 2008; Dalton-Puffer, 1996; Gardner, 2014; Lloyd, 2011; Palmer, 2009). The French derived suffixes show variable degrees of productivity; for instance, *-(a)tion* appears only on Latinate bases, whereas *-able* has been readily added to romance and English stems since the Middle English period (Miller, 2012, p. 183; Rothwell, 2001, p. 558). Rather run-of-the-mill English-French hybrids of the type *murderment*, *pathment* indicate that French derivational morphology was also a feature of everyday register (Langenfelt, 1933, p. 876, cited by Miller, 2012, p. 183). Anglo-French loans ending in suffixes retained right-bound accent patterns but shifted the original stress of the loans further left (e.g., *ványity*, *fratérnity*, *curiósity* with ´-ity < OF -itée). The modified patterns were applied to Latin loans with the same suffixes in Early Modern English. Latin loans of this period involving suffixes with no corresponding Anglo-French cognate loan (e.g., *humanístic*, *characterístic* with -ístic < L. -ísticus) and Modern French loans with new suffixes (e.g., *grotésque*, *picturésque* with -ésque) retained their original accent patterns (Lutz, 2009b, 2013, p. 583).

The sharp rise in the use of certain syntactic structures from 1200 onward, for example, the genitive periphrastic *of* construction (Miller, 2010, Vol. 1, p. 16), dative-accusative syncretism (Ingham, 2009), pronouns of inalienable possession of the type ‘in *his* hand’ (Miller, 2012, p. 186), the use of *for* with Middle English infinitives, type *I want for to go* (Miller, 2012, p. 185), has led scholars to argue that French influence was the initial impetus for the spread of these developments. French influence, particularly via translation-induced contact, has also been posited as a contributing factor to Middle English word order developments (Haeberli, 2002, 2011; Ingham, 2009), argument structure (Trips, 2020; Trips & Stein, 2019), and *it*-clefting (Trips & Stein, 2018).

However, many of the syntactic developments attributed to French influence can be shown to predate French contact. The incipient loss of the dative-accusative distinction is already found in Northumbrian Old English (Fernández-Cuesta & Rodríguez-Ledesma, 2020), as is the use of possessive pronouns for inalienable possession (Miller, 2012, p. 186). Other developments, such as the use of objective pronouns with the copula (e.g., *That’s me*) and Middle English compound relative pronouns (e.g., *which that* and *the which*) are found in other Germanic languages and are best viewed as areal features (Miller, 2012, p. 186). British has also been suggested as a candidate source for the use of possessive pronouns for inalienable possession and *it*-cleft constructions in English (see section 2).

Contact may have reinforced or accelerated internal developments, but it did not generally introduce structure that was not already part of the native inventory. For instance, borrowed verbs retained their original French argument structure in English (Pinker, 1989, pp. 45–47). Native verbs in double-object constructions exhibit both the double-object form (*John gave the museum the painting*) and the prepositional form (*John gave the painting to the museum*), but ‘Latinized’ verbs exhibit only the prepositional form (*John donated the painting to the museum*. **John donated the museum the painting*). The argument structure of borrowed French verbs influenced the grammar of native verbs in that it led to an increased use of the argument structure common to both languages in Middle English, both in the case of double-object constructions (Trips & Stein, 2019) and reflexive argument structure (Trips, 2020), particularly in English translations of French works, but it did not introduce a completely new structure to the language.

Further Reading

Beal, J. C., & Faulkner, M. (2019). Language contact in the history of English. In A. P. Grant (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of language contact* (pp. 374–387). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Dance, R., Pons-Sanz, S. M., & Schorn, B. (Eds.). (in press). *New perspectives on the Scandinavian legacy in medieval Britain*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.

Filppula, M., & Klemola, J. (2020). External influences in the history of English. <<https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-284>>. *Oxford research encyclopedia of linguistics*.

Filppula, M., Klemola, J., & Paulasto, H. (2008). *English and Celtic in contact*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ingham, R., & Timofeeva, O. (2018). Special issue on mechanisms of French contact influence in Middle English: Diffusion and maintenance. *English Language and Linguistics*, 22(2), 197–205.

Miller, D. G. (2012). *External influences on English: From its beginnings to the Renaissance*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Schreier, D., & Hundt, M. (Eds.). (2013). *English as a contact language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Townend, M. (2002). *Language and history in Viking age England: Linguistic relations between speakers of Old Norse and Old English*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.

Trudgill, P. (2016). Contact-related processes of change in the early history of English. In M. Kytö & P. Pahta (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of English historical linguistics* (pp. 318–334). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

References

Adams, J. N. (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ahlqvist, A. (2010). Early English and Celtic. *Australian Celtic Journal*, 9, 43–73.

- Allen, C. L. (2019). *Dative external possessors in early English*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University.
- Barnes, M. P. (2016). Review of Emonds and Faarlund. *Maal og Minne*, 108(1), 173–179.
- Bech, K., & Walkden, G. (2016). English is (still) a West Germanic language. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 39(1), 65–100.
- Benskin, M. (2002). Bede's Frisians and the *Adventus Saxonum*. *NOWELE*, 41, 91–97.
- Benskin, M. (2011). Present indicative plural concord in Brittonic and early English. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 109(2), 158–185.
- Breeze, A. (2002). Seven types of Celtic loanword. In M. Filppula, J. Klemola, & H. Pitkänen (Eds.), *The Celtic roots of English* (pp. 175–181). Joensuu, Finland: Joensuu University Press.
- Bremmer, R. H., Jr. (1990). The nature of the evidence for a Frisian participation in the *Adventus Saxonum*. In A. Bammesberger & A. Wollmann, *Britain 400–600: Language and history* (pp. 353–396). Heidelberg, Germany: Winter.
- Bremmer, R. H., Jr. (2001). Continental Germanic influences. In P. Pulsiano & E. Treharne (Eds.), *A companion to Anglo-Saxon literature* (pp. 375–387). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Campbell, A. (1959). *Old English grammar*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Cichosz, A. (2021). Verb-final conjunct clauses in Old English prose: The role of Latin in translated texts. *NOWELE*, 74(2), 172–198.
- Ciszek, E. (2008). *Word derivation in early Middle English*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Coates, R. (2006). Behind the dictionary-forms of Scandinavian elements in England. *Journal of the English Place-Name Society*, 38, 43–61.
- Cole, M. (2018). A native origin for present-day English *they*, *their*, *them*. *Diachronica*, 35(2), 165–209.
- Cunliffe, B. (2013). *Britain begins*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (1996). *The French influence on Middle English morphology: A corpus-based study of derivation*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Dance, R., Pons-Sanz, S., & Schorn, B. (2019). *The Gersum project: The Scandinavian influence on English vocabulary* <<https://www.gersum.org/>>. Cambridge, UK.
- Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed words: A history of loanwords in English*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Durkin, P. (in press). Norse borrowings in the OED: A fresh examination. In R. Dance, S. M. Pons-Sanz, & B. Schorn (Eds.), *New perspectives on the Scandinavian legacy in medieval Britain*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- Ekwall, E. (1960). *The concise Oxford dictionary of English place-names* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Emonds, J. E., & Faarlund, J. T. (2014). *English: The language of the Vikings*. Olomouc, Czechia: Palacký University.
- Fernández-Cuesta, J., & Rodríguez-Ledesma, N. (2020). Reduced forms in the nominal morphology of the Lindisfarne Gospel Gloss. A case of accusative/dative syncretism? *Historica Folia Linguistica*, 54, 37–65.

- Filppula, M. (2009). The rise of it-clefting in English: Areal-typological and contact-linguistic considerations. *English Language and Linguistics*, 13(2), 267–293.
- Filppula, M., Klemola, J., & Paulasto, H. (2008). *English and Celtic in contact*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Fischer, O., & van der Wurff, W. (2006). Syntax. In R. Hogg & D. Denison (Eds.), *A history of the English language* (pp. 109–198). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Förster, M. (1921). Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen. In M. Förster & K. Wildhagen (Eds.), *Texte und Forschungen zur englischen Kulturgeschichte: Festgabe für Felix Liebermann zum 20. Juli 1921* (pp. 119–242). Halle (Saale), Germany: Niemeyer.
- Gardner, A. C. (2014). *Derivation in Middle English: Regional and text type variation*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki XCII. Helsinki, Finland: Société Néophilologique.
- Gevenich, O. (1918). *Die Palatalisierung von K > Č im Lichte der englischen Ortsnamen*. Halle (Saale), Germany: Max Niemeyer.
- Given-Wilson, C., Brand, P., Phillips, S., Ormrod, M., Martin, G., Curry, A., & Horrox, R. (2005). *The parliament rolls of medieval England, 1275–1504*. Cambridge, UK: Scholarly Editions.
- Green, D. H. (1998). *Language and history in the early Germanic world*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Haeblerli, E. (2002). Inflectional morphology and the loss of verb-second in English. In D. W. Lightfoot (Ed.), *Syntactic effects of morphological change* (pp. 88–106). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Haeblerli, E. (2011). Investigating Anglo-Norman influence on late Middle English syntax. In R. Ingham (Ed.), *The Anglo-Norman language and its contexts* (pp. 143–163). Woodbridge, UK: York Medieval Press.
- Holbrook, N., & Morton, R. (2011). Assessing the research potential of grey literature in the study of Roman England <<https://doi.org/10.5284/1000418>> [data-set]. York, UK: Archaeology Data Service [distributor].
- Hughes, G. (2000). *A history of English words*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Ingham, R. (2008). *Anglo-Norman correspondence corpus* <<http://wse1.webcorp.org.uk/anglo-norman/about.html>>. Birmingham City University.
- Ingham, R. (2009). Mixing languages on the manor. *Medium Ævum*, 78, 80–97.
- Ingham, R. (2012). *The transmission of Anglo-Norman: Language history and language acquisition*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Ingham, R. (2016). Middle English borrowing from French: Nouns and verbs of inter-personal cognition in the Early South English Legendary. In C. Collette & T. Fenster (Eds.), *French in medieval England: Networks, exchanges, collaborations, essays in honour of Jocelyn Wogan-Browne* (pp. 128–139). Woodbridge, UK: Boydell.
- Ingham, R. (2018). The diffusion of higher-status lexis in medieval England: The role of the clergy. *English Language and Linguistics*, 22, 207–224.
- Ingham, R. (Ed.). (2010). *The Anglo-Norman language and its contexts*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell.

- Ingham, R., & Marcus, I. (2016). Vernacular bilingualism in professional spaces, 1200 to 1400. In A. Classen (Ed.), *Multilingualism in the Middle Ages and early modern age: Communication and miscommunication in the premodern world* (pp. 145–164). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Ingham, R., Sylvester, L., & Marcus, I. (2019). Penetration of French-origin lexis in Middle English occupational domains. In M. Cennamo & C. Fabrizio (Eds.), *Historical linguistics 2015: Selected papers from the 22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Naples, July 2015* (pp. 460–478). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Ingham, R., & Timofeeva, O. (2018). Special issue on mechanisms of French contact influence in Middle English: Diffusion and maintenance. *English Language and Linguistics*, 22(2), 197–205.
- Insley, J. (2019). Britons and Anglo-Saxons. In W. Haubrichs & C. Jochum-Godglück (Eds.), *Kulturelle Integration und Personennamen im Mittelalter* (pp. 254–276). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Isaac, G. (2003). Diagnosing the symptoms of contact: Some Celtic-English case histories. In H. L. C. Tristram (Ed.), *The Celtic Englishes III* (pp. 46–64). Heidelberg, Germany: Winter.
- Ito, M. (2008). Celtic words in the *English Dialect Dictionary* edited by J. Wright. *Bulletin of the School of Humanities, Toyohashi University of Technology*, 30, 156–182.
- Jackson, K. (1953). *Language and history in early Britain: A chronological survey of the Brittonic languages first to twelfth century A.D.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Repr. Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 1994).
- James, A. (2020–). *The Brittonic language in the Old North* <<http://spns.org.uk/resources/bliton>> (Vol. 3).
- Jones, C. (1988). *Grammatical gender in English, 950 to 1250*. London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Kastovsky, D. (2006). Vocabulary. In R. M. Hogg & D. Denison (Eds.), *A history of the English language* (pp. 199–270). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kay, C., Alexander, M., Dallachy, F., Roberts, J., Samuels, M., & Wotherspoon, I. (Eds.). (2020). *The historical thesaurus of English* <<http://ht.ac.uk/>>. Version 5. Glasgow, UK: University of Glasgow.
- Keller, J. (2020). The Leipzig-Jakarta list as a means to test Old English / Old Norse mutual intelligibility. *NOWELE*, 73(2), 252–275.
- Key to English Place-Names. (n.d.). *Key to English place-names* <<http://kepn.nottingham.ac.uk/#>>. English Place-Name Society. University of Nottingham. Also available, with different interface, at the University of Leicester <<https://halogen.le.ac.uk/query/kepn>>.
- Klemola, J. (2018). The historical geographical distribution of periphrastic DO in southern dialects. In L. Wright (Ed.), *Southern English varieties then and now* (pp. 262–292). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Kock, E. A. (Ed.). (1902). *Three Middle-English versions of the Rule of St. Benet and two contemporary rituals for the ordination of nuns*. London, UK: Early English Text Society.
- Kolb, E. (1965). Skandinavisches in den nordenglischen Dialekten. *Anglia*, 83, 127–153.
- König, E., & Gast, V. (2009). *Understanding English-German contrasts* (2nd ed.). Berlin, Germany: Erich Schmidt.

- Kroch, A., Taylor, A., & Ringe, R. (2000). The Middle English verb-second constraint: A case study in language contact and language change. In S. C. Herring, P. van Reenen, & L. Schøsler (Eds.), *Textual parameters in older languages* (pp. 353–391). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Laing, M. (2013–). *A linguistic atlas of Early Middle English, 1150–1325 (LAEME)* <<http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html>> (Version 3.2) (with R. Lass [introduction] and webscripts by K. Williamson, V. Karaiskos, & S. Branchaw). Edinburgh, UK: University of Edinburgh.
- Laker, S. (2002). An explanation for the changes kw-, hw- > χw- in the English dialects. In M. Filppula, J. Klemola, & H. Pitkänen (Eds.), *The Celtic roots of English* (pp. 183–198). Joensuu, Finland: Joensuu University Press.
- Laker, S. (2007). Palatalization of velars: A major link of Old English and Old Frisian. In R. H. Bremmer Jr, S. Laker, & O. Vries (Eds.), *Advances in Old Frisian philology*. Special issue of *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 64 (pp. 165–184). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Rodopi.
- Laker, S. (2008a). The English negative comparative particle. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 106, 1–28.
- Laker, S. (2008b). Changing views about Anglo-Saxons and Britons. In H. Aertsen & B. Veldhoen (Eds.), *Six papers from the 28th Symposium on Medieval Studies held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam on 15 December 2006* (pp. 1–38). Leiden, The Netherlands: Leiden University Department of English.
- Laker, S. (2009). On the geography and date of the merger /kw/, /hw/ > /χw/. In E. Penttilä & H. Paulasto (Eds.), *Language contacts meet English dialects: Studies in honour of Markku Filppula* (pp. 179–198). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Laker, S. (2010). *British Celtic influence on English phonology* [Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University].
- Laker, S. (2017). Early changes of dental fricatives: English and Frisian compared. In S. Laker & M. de Vaan (Eds.), *Frisian through the ages: Festschrift für Rolf H. Bremmer Jr*. Special issue of *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 77(1–2) (pp. 243–267). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Laker, S. (2021). Palatalization and assibilation of /k/ in English and Scottish place-names. *NOWELE*, 74(1), 80–115.
- Langenfelt, G. (1933). *Select studies in colloquial English of the late Middle Ages*. Lund, Sweden: Håken Ohlsson.
- Lass, R., & Laing, M. (2016). Q is for WHAT, WHEN, WHERE? The ‘q’ spelling for OE hw-. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 37, 61–110.
- Lloyd, C. (2011). *Semantic and word formation: The semantic development of five French suffixes in Middle English*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Lutz, A. (2002). When did English begin? In T. Fanego, B. Méndez-Naya, & E. Seoane (Eds.), *Sounds, words, texts and change: Selected papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, 7–11 September 2000* (pp. 145–171). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Lutz, A. (2009a). Celtic influence on Old English and West Germanic. *English Language and Linguistics*, 13(2), 227–249.
- Lutz, A. (2009b). Word accent position and language contact in English and German. *Anglia*, 127(2), 283–306.

- Lutz, A. (2013). Language contact and prestige. *Anglia*, 131(4), 562–590.
- Lutz, A. (2017). Norse loans in Middle English and their influence on Late Medieval London English. *Anglia*, 135(2), 317–357.
- Markus, M. (Ed.). (2018). *English dialect dictionary online* <<http://eddonline-proj.uibk.ac.at>> (Version 3.0). Electronic edition of J. Wright, *English dialect dictionary* (EDD; 1898–1905). Innsbruck, Austria: University of Innsbruck.
- McWhorter, J. H. (2008). *Our magnificent bastard tongue: The untold history of English*. New York, NY: Gotham.
- McWhorter, J. H. (2009). What else happened to English? A brief for the Celtic hypothesis. *English Language and Linguistics*, 13(2), 163–191.
- Meecham-Jones, S. (2017). Code-switching and contact influence in Middle English manuscripts from the Welsh Penumbra—Should we re-interpret the evidence from *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*? In P. Pahta, J. Skaffari, & L. Wright (Eds.), *Multilingual practices in language history: English and beyond* (pp. 97–119). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Miller, D. G. (2006). *Latin suffixal derivatives in English and their Indo-European ancestry*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, D. G. (2010). *Language change and linguistic theory* (Vols. 1–2). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, D. G. (2012). *External influences on English: From its beginnings to the Renaissance*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Munro, S., Ball, M. J., Müller, N., Duckworth, M., & Lyddy, F. (2005). Phonological acquisition in Welsh–English bilingual children. *Journal of Multilingual Communication Disorders*, 3(1), 24–49.
- Nagucka, R. (2003). Latin prepositional phrases and their Old English equivalents. In D. Kastovsky & A. Mettinger (Eds.), *Language contact in the history of English* (pp. 251–266). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Nurmio, S., & Russell, P. (2021). Brittonic. In G. Keydana, W. Hock, & P. Widmer (Eds.), *Comparison and gradation in Indo-European* (pp. 201–224). De Gruyter.
- Orton, H., Barry, M. V., Halliday, W. J., Tilling, P. M., & Wakelin, M. F. (Eds.). (1962–1971). *Survey of English dialects (B): The basic material* (Vol 4. each in 3 parts). E. J. Arnold. (Repr. London, UK: Routledge, 1998).
- Padel, O. J. (2013). Brittonic place-names in England. In J. Carroll & D. N. Parsons (Eds.), *Perceptions of place: Twenty-first-century interpretations of English place-name studies* (pp. 1–41). Nottingham, UK: English Place-Name Society.
- Pallier, C., Christophe, A., & Mehler, J. (1997). Language-specific listening. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 1(4), 129–132.
- Palmer, C. (2009). *Borrowings, derivational morphology, and perceived productivity in English, 1300–1600* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan].
- Parsons, D. N. (2011). Sabrina in the thorns: Place-names as evidence for British and Latin in Roman Britain. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 109, 113–137.
- Petré, P. (2013). On the distribution and merger of *is* and *bið* in Old and Middle English. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 111, 301–325.

- Pinker, S. (1989). *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pogatscher, A. (1888). *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnworte im Altenglischen*. Quellen und Völker, 64. Strasburg, France: Trübner.
- Pons-Sanz, S. M. (2013). *The lexical effect of Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact on Old English*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- Ringe, D. (2021). *Historical morphology of English*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rodríguez-Ledesma, M. N. (2016). *Dauides sunu vs. filii david*: The genitive in the gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels. In J. Fernández-Cuesta & S. Pons-Sanz (Eds.), *The Old English gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, author and context* (pp. 213–238). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Rodríguez-Ledesma, M. N. (2018). Zelotes and elnvnges: The extension of genitive singular -es in the gloss to the Durham Collectar. *Anglia*, 136(4), 611–642.
- Rothwell, W. (1996). Playing “Follow My Leader” in Anglo-Norman studies. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 6, 177–210.
- Rothwell, W. (1998a). Arrivals and departures: The adoption of French terminology into Middle English. *English Studies*, 79, 144–165.
- Rothwell, W. (1998b). Anglo-Norman at the (green)grocer’s. *French Studies*, 52, 1–16.
- Rothwell, W. (2001). English and French in England after 1362. *English Studies*, 82, 539–559.
- Rothwell, W., & Trotter, D. (2007). *The Anglo-Norman online hub textbase* <<http://www.anglo-norman.net>>. Aberystwyth University.
- Scheler, M. (1977). *Der englische Wortschatz*. Berlin, Germany: Erich Schmidt.
- Schrijver, P. (2002). The rise and fall of British Latin: Evidence from English and Brittonic. In M. Filppula, J. Klemola, & H. Pitkänen (Eds.), *The Celtic roots of English* (pp. 88–110). Joensuu, Finland: University of Joensuu.
- Schrijver, P. (2014). *Language contact and the origins of Germanic languages*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Schumacher, S. (2009). Lexical and structural language-contact phenomena along the Germano-Celtic transition zone. In S. Zimmer (Ed.), *Kelten am Rhein: Akten des dreizehnten Internationalen Keltologiekongresses/Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Celtic Studies. 23. bis 27. Juli 2007 in Bonn. Zweiter Teil: Philologie. Sprachen und Literaturen. Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher*, 58(2) (pp. 247–266). Mainz am Rhein, Germany: Von Zabern.
- Serjeantson, M. S. (1935). *A history of foreign words in English*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Stenbrenden, G. F. (2016). Why English is not dead: A rejoinder to Emonds and Faarlund. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 37, 239–279.
- Stenbrenden, G. (2020). Old English <cg> and its sound correspondences in Old English and Middle English. *English Language and Linguistics*, 24(4), 687–718.

- Stiles, P. V. (2021). On the fourfold root of the verbum substantivum in English (and Germanic). In M. Tarsi (Ed.), *Studies in general and historical linguistics offered to Jón Axel Harðarson on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (pp. 237–268). Innsbruck, Austria: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Sylvester, L. (2018). Contact effects on the technical lexis of Middle English: A semantic hierarchic approach. *English Language and Linguistics*, 22, 249–264.
- Sylvester, L. M., & Ingham, R. (Eds.). (2019). *Bilingual thesaurus of everyday life in medieval England* <<https://thesaurus.ac.uk/bth/>>.
- The Oxford English Dictionary* (3rd ed. 2000–). *OED Online* <<http://www.oed.com>> (J. A. Simpson [2000–2013], & M. Proffitt [2013–], eds.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Timofeeva, O. (2008). Translating the texts where *et verborum ordo mysterium est*: Late Old English idiom vs. *ablative absolutus*. *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 18, 216–228.
- Timofeeva, O. (2010a). Anglo-Latin bilingualism before 1066: Prospects and limitations. In A. Hall, O. Timofeeva, Á. Kiricsi, & B. Fox (Eds.), *Interfaces between language and culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö* (pp. 1–36). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Timofeeva, O. (2010b). *Non-finite constructions in Old English, with special reference to syntactic borrowing from Latin*. Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki LXXX. Helsinki, Finland: Société Néophilologique.
- Timofeeva, O. (2017). Lexical loans and their diffusion in Old English: Of ‘gospels’, ‘martyrs’, and ‘teachers’. *Studia Neophilologica*, 89, 215–237.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. (1963). English and Welsh. In H. Lewis (Ed.), *Angles and Britons* (pp. 1–41). O’Donnell Lectures. Cardiff, UK: University of Wales Press.
- Townend, M. (2002). *Language and history in Viking Age England: Linguistic relations between speakers of Old Norse and Old English*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- Trips, C. (2020). Impersonal and reflexive uses of Middle English psych verbs under contact influence with Old French. *Linguistics Vanguard*, 6(s2), Article 20190016.
- Trips, C., & Stein, A. (2018). Cleft sentences in the history of French and English: A case of pragmatic borrowing? In M. García-García & M. Uth (Eds.), *Focus realization in Romance and beyond* (pp. 287–309). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Trips, C., & Stein, A. (2019). Contact-induced changes in the argument structure of Middle English verbs on the model of Old French. *Journal of Language Contact*, 12, 232–267.
- Tristram, H. L. C. (2002). Attrition of inflections in English and Welsh. In M. Filppula, J. Klemola, & H. Pitkänen (Eds.), *The Celtic roots of English* (pp. 111–149). Joensuu, Finland: Joensuu University Press.

- Tristram, H. L. C. (2004). Diglossia in Anglo-Saxon England, or what was spoken Old English like? *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 40, 87–110.
- Trotter, D. (2014). Why are there so few French place-names in England? *English Today*, 118, 39–42.
- Trudgill, P. (2010). *Investigations in sociohistorical linguistics: Stories of colonisation and contact*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2011a). *Sociolinguistic typology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2011b). A tale of two copulas: Language-contact speculations on first-millennium England. *NOWELE*, 62–63, 285–320.
- Van Bree, C. (2017). The Frisian substrate beneath the Groningen dialect. In S. Laker & M. de Vaan (Eds.), *Frisian through the ages: Festschrift für Rolf H. Bremmer Jr.* Special issue of *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 77(1–2) (pp. 65–87). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Van Langenhove, G. (1930). The assibilation of palatal stops in Old English. In N. Bøgholm, H. Brusenforff, & C. A. Bodelsen (Eds.), *A grammatical miscellany offered to Otto Jespersen on his seventieth birthday* (pp. 69–75). Copenhagen, Denmark: Levin & Munksgaard.
- Vennemann, T. (2002). On the rise of “Celtic” syntax in Middle English. In P. Lucas & A. M. Lucas (Eds.), *Middle English from tongue to text: Selected papers from the Third International Conference on Middle English: Language and Text, held at Dublin, Ireland, 1–4 July 1999* (pp. 203–234). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Vennemann, T. (2009). Celtic influence in English? Yes and no. *English Language and Linguistics*, 13(2), 309–334.
- Versloot, A. P. (2021). Traces of a North Sea Germanic idiom in the fifth–seventh centuries AD. In J. Hines & N. IJssennagger-van der Pluim (Eds.), *Frisian of the early Middle Ages* (pp. 339–373). Woodbridge, UK: Boydell.
- Versloot, A. P. (in press). The West Germanic heritage of Yorkshire English. In S. Pons-Sanz & L. Sylvester (Eds.), *Medieval English in a multilingual context: Current methodologies and approaches*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vezzosi, L. (2012). English in contact: Latin. In A. Bergs & L. J. Brinton (Eds.), *English historical linguistics: An international handbook* (pp. 1703–1719). Handbooks of linguistics and communication science vol. 34.2. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Walkden, G. (in press). Scandinavians and verb-second in Northumbrian Old English. In R. Dance, S. Pons-Sanz, & B. Schorn (Eds.), *New perspectives on Scandinavian legacy in Medieval Britain*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- Walkden, G. (2016). Null subjects in the Lindisfarne Gospels as evidence for syntactic variation in Old English. In J. Fernández Cuesta & S. M. Pons Sanz (Eds.), *The Old English gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels: Language, author and context* (pp. 237–254). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.
- Warner, A. (2017). English-Norse contact, simplification, and sociolinguistic typology. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 118(2), 317–403.
- Wollmann, A. (1990). *Untersuchungen zu den frühen lateinischen Lehnwörtern im Altenglischen: Phonologie und Datierung*. Munich, Germany: Wilhelm Fink.

Wollmann, A. (1993). Early Latin loan-words in Old English. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 22, 1–26.

Wright, L. (2000). Bills, accounts, inventories: Everyday trilingual activities in the business world of later medieval England. In D. Trotter (Ed.), *Multilingualism in later medieval Britain* (pp. 149–156). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, L. (2005). Medieval mixed-language business texts and the rise of Standard English. In J. Skaffari, M. Peikola, R. Carroll, R. Hiltunen, & B. Wårvik (Eds.), *Opening windows on texts and discourses of the past* (pp. 381–399). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Wright, L. (2013). The contact origins of Standard English. In D. Schreier & M. Hundt (Eds.), *English as a contact language* (pp. 58–74). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Notes

1. Excluded here are Cornish words found in dialects of Cornwall and surrounding counties. The switch from Cornish to English did not reach completion until the 18th century (though the language has since been revitalized to some extent). Ito (2008) identified about 100 Cornish loanwords in Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary* (EDD <http://eddonline-proj.uibk.ac.at/edd/termsOfUse.jsp>).

2. The hub of Romanization was in the lowland zone of Britain. Some 93% of Roman villa sites identified in England and Wales are found southeast of a line stretching from the River Humber to the River Exe (Holbrook & Morton, 2011). This corresponds precisely with the main areas of Anglo-Saxon settlement, based on various historical and archaeological evidence (see section 1).

3. Insights on the so-called secondary lexicon are taken from studies of Frisian substrate words surviving in 20th-century dialects of Dutch spoken in formerly Frisian speaking areas (see Van Bree, 2017).

4. For historical morphological details, see Schumacher (2009) and Stiles (2021).

5. For example, Latin *sum* 'I am' versus *ero* 'I will be' versus *fio* 'I become'; Middle Welsh *ywf* 'I am' versus *bydaf* 'I will be', and so forth. The mechanism would be the same as when lower-level English speakers of German tend to overuse the *werden*-future based on analogy with English, which tends to mark the future categorically. Mostly, German speakers use the simple present tense in combination with a time reference when referring to the future, for example, *ich fliege morgen nach Hamburg*, literally, 'I fly tomorrow to Hamburg' (König & Gast, 2009, p. 83).

6. The use in English of *do* in declarative sentences tends to have the effect of emphasizing or contradicting. However, in southwestern dialects of English, where *do*-periphrasis is (or was) more common, regular declarative sentences are formed with *do* and do not carry any special emphasis (see Klemola, 2018).

7. Note, however, that the same development occurred in most dialects of Dutch, including the standard language: *ik heb m'n arm gebroken* (cf. German *ich habe mir den Arm gebrochen*, which—together with Low German, West Frisian, and Sater Frisian—still has the old dative external possessor construction). See Allen (2019) for details on the decline of the dative external possessor construction in English.

8. Keller's study compared Old English and Old Icelandic and argued that the distance is not great. However, the phonology of the Norse spoken in 9th–10th century England was more archaic than Old Icelandic, as shown by Coates's reconstruction based on place-names (2006), such that the distance between Old English and Viking-age Norse ought to be somewhat closer than the results of Keller's study. For a more critical opinion on early English–Norse mutual intelligibility, see Ringe (2021, pp. 96–97).
9. During the second half of the 1st millennium, English and Frisian were rather like dialects of the same language in the sense that the linguistic distance between, for example, West Saxon and Northumbrian was probably little more than that between, for example, Northumbrian and Frisian. The early runic evidence from the 5th and 6th centuries is often indistinguishable. All these dialects stem from the same North Sea Germanic dialect continuum, and many linguistic traits set them apart from other inland West Germanic varieties such as Dutch and German. Because of this shared heritage, Old and Modern Frisian dialects act as a control when studying the etymology of English words as well as other historical developments in English. Note, however, that Bede does not mention the Frisians when referring to the early Anglo-Saxon settlements but instead writes about the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes (Benskin, 2002; Bremmer, 1990). Elsewhere, he does refer to the continentals, especially as traders in 7th- and 8th-century London and York, respectively; in York they even had their own quarter in the town (see Bremmer, 2001, p. 378).
10. Note that the *OED* only includes Old English words if they continued to be used in English after 1100. Hence, the complete number of Norse loans in Old English is somewhat higher than the 100 given in the *OED* and may be closer to 150 (see Pons-Sanz, 2013).
11. Palatalized consonants are often indicated in editions of Old English texts with a superscript dot, for example, <ċ> and <ċġ>. For these, most handbooks—an exception are those of Henry Sweet—still usually recommend assibilated pronunciations ([tʃ] and [dʒ], respectively) as in Modern English.
12. Exceptions, of course, are later loans from French, which retain the affricate [tʃ] even in the Danelaw area, for example, Chestnut Hill (Cumberland), Cherry Burton (Yorkshire), Chain Bridge (Lincolnshire).
13. British did not have palatalized or assibilated consonants either, so it is quite likely that in some areas, and among some communities, British had a similar blocking effect on assibilation.
14. As Latin loans, *kirk* and *kist* are less likely to be from Norse. It is harder to determine *kirn*.
15. Only the development of the voiceless velar [c] in initial position is discussed here, but the same circumstances applied to other positions and also to the voiced velar plosive, for example, *brigg* 'bridge', *rigg* 'ridge', *segg* 'sedge' (see Stenbrenden, 2020). Most likely, a Norse (or earlier British) blocking influence played a role in the non-assibilation (or there were other paradigmatic reasons, see Laker, 2007, pp. 182–183). Finally, not all words with /sk/ in the North are necessarily Norse loans either. Instead, Norse (or British) could have hindered the development of OE <sc> to /ʃ/ (Laker, 2010, pp. 152–153; similarly, John Insley personal communication in Laker, 2021, p. 105).

Related Articles

[Early Modern English](#)

[History of the English Language](#)

[Englishes in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland](#)

[Dialectology](#)

Pidgins and Creoles

English Language

External Influences in the History of English