1 Introduction: nothing but a contact language . . .

MARIANNE HUNDT AND DANIEL SCHREIER

This book has two major goals: to show that the English language has been contact-derived from its very beginnings onwards and to highlight the immense potential for the field of contact linguistics. We would like to start with four quotes on the origins of Old English:

> In the year of our Lord 449, . . . the Angles, or Saxons . . . arrived in Britain with three long ships, and had a place assigned them to reside in by the same king, in the eastern part of the island . . . Those who came over were of the three most powerful nations of Germany, Saxons, Angles, and Jutes. From the Jutes are descended the people of Kent, and of the Isle of Wight, and those also in the province of the West Saxons who are to this day called Jutes, seated opposite to the Isle of Wight. From the Saxons, that is, the country which is now called Old Saxony, came the East Saxons, the South Saxons, and the West Saxons. From the Angles, that is, the country which is called Anglia, and which is said, from that time, to remain desert to this day, between the provinces of the Jutes and the Saxons, are descended the East Angles, the Midland Angles, Mercians, all the race of the Northumbrians, that is, of those nations that dwell on the north side of the river Humber, and the other nations of the English. (Venerable Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*; quoted in Graddol, Leith and Swann 1996: 44–5)

> Old English dialect differences were slight as compared with those that were later to develop and nowadays sharply differentiate the speech of a lowland Scottish shepherd from that of his south-of-England counterpart. (Algeo and Pyles 2005: 94)

> [W]e must get away from the idea of four more or less homogeneous and discrete speech-communities. (Hogg 1988: 189)

> [T]he origins of the English dialects lie not in pre-migrational tribal affiliations but in certain social, economic, and cultural developments which occurred after the migration was completed. *This does not imply that the continental Germanic dialects are irrelevant to the genesis of English dialects* . . . Only those influences, however, which were felt *after the migrations were relevant to formation* [*sic*] *of the English dialects*. (DeCamp 1958: 232; emphasis added)

These four quotes raise some important issues on the emergence and origins of the English language and thus serve as an ideal starting point to this volume. Following Sweet (1885), scholars have adhered to the idea that there were four major dialect areas in Old English (OE): Northumbrian, Mercian, Kentish and West Saxon, neatly divided and regionally separated by major waterways, the rivers Humber and Thames. Maps of OE dialects were placed in nearly every historical introduction of the English language and are reproduced in textbooks to the present day (e.g. Baugh and Cable 2002: 53; Barber 2005: 105). This common textbook view of the origins of English is closely related to the way that the notion of 'language' is commonly defined, namely with a strong sociopolitical grounding. In other words, the rather homogeneous kingdoms of Anglo-Saxon England (Wessex, Kent, Mercia and Northumbria) would also have been characterized by sociolinguistic unity, thus speaking various dialects (West Saxon, Kentish, Mercian and Northumbrian respectively) of the emerging English language.[1] This traditional idea goes back to Sweet (1885) and has been traced historically by Leith (1997). The common textbook account of OE dialects is somewhat simplified in two respects: first, the four major dialects are highly unlikely to have represented separate unities with their own characteristics, with features and properties that differed from others both quantitatively and qualitatively; second, the dialects were obviously not simply transplanted from the continent as such without undergoing any changes (externally) caused by contact with other migrant communities or the indigenous populations.

As a consequence, it remains subject to much speculation to what extent OE (or rather: the varieties spoken by the earliest Germanic speech communities in the British Isles), the original form(s) of all present-day varieties, was itself the product of contact-induced language change. In fact, scholars reproducing OE dialect maps state, sometimes on the same page, that OE developed as an amalgam of input varieties spoken by the founder populations; one cannot help but notice that this is somewhat at odds with the idea of isoglosses and dialect boundaries. Baugh and Cable (1993: 50), for instance, claim that

> the English language has resulted from the fusion of the dialects of the Germanic tribes who came to England . . . It is impossible to say how much the speech of the Angles differed from that of the Saxons or that of the Jutes. The differences were certainly slight.

Crystal (2004: 41) claims that 'we must regard dialect mixing as a normal part of the Old English situation' and Toon (1992: 436) reports evidence from spelling variation within one and the same text written by the same individual, a fact that, likewise, implies mixing (see also Hogg 2006a, b).

We understand this to mean that OE emerged via dialect contact, i.e. that it was a contact-derived variety from its earliest stages onwards; if there was a fusion of dialects, then OE would have emerged via dialect contact and koinéization, resembling varieties that emerged under similar conditions

much later on (e.g. in the US, Australia or New Zealand). Trudgill, Gordon, Lewis and Maclagan (2000: 316), on the basis of synchronic evidence, state that 'the shape of New Zealand English, a fascinating laboratory for the study of linguistic change, can be accounted for in terms of the mixing together of different dialects of English from the British Isles' and Gordon *et al.* (2004) report that the earliest speakers of New Zealand English (henceforth NZE) displayed unusual combinations of features from diverse English inputs (such as *h*-dropping and /hw-/ maintenance, which is not found in the British Isles). So it is legitimate to ask whether, despite all the social and historical differences, political and linguistic parallels between OE and NZE may exist that link their genesis, notwithstanding that the processes involved are 1,300 years apart. Similarly, following DeCamp, one could argue that if OE is the result of interaction between the initial founder dialects brought to the British Isles, i.e. if it is the product of contact and accommodation processes in what is now England, then it would have arisen via well-known patterns of new-dialect formation (Trudgill 1986). And if it can be shown to be structurally and systemically different from its Saxon, Mercian and Frisian inputs, then it must be classified as a koiné (Siegel 1985), which, in fact, can only be interpreted to mean that English has been a contact-derived language from its very beginnings.

The evolution of OE between the fifth and early eleventh centuries, particularly the domain of language contact with Celtic, Old Norse and Norman French, has become subject to engaging discussions over the last decade. We will look at the standard textbook view first. A widely used historical introduction to the English language (Barber 2005) summarizes the outcomes as follows:

> The Anglo-Saxon conquest was not just the arrival of a ruling minority, but the settlement of a whole people. Their language remained the dominant one, and there are few traces of Celtic influence on Old English; indeed, the number of Celtic words taken into English in the whole of its history has been very small. (101)

> what is most striking about the Scandinavian loanwords as a whole is that they are such *ordinary* words ... The total number of Scandinavian loans is in fact rather small, compared with the number of words later borrowed from French and Latin; on the other hand, many of them are words in very frequent use. (133–4; emphasis in original)

> Although French died out in England, it left its mark on English. Its main effect was on the vocabulary, and an enormous number of French loanwords came into the language during the Middle English period. (145)

> When the words were first borrowed, they may have been given a French pronunciation, especially among bilingual speakers. But very soon they were adapted to the English phonological system, and given the English sounds which to the speakers seemed nearest to the French ones. (148–9)

The contact-induced impact of all these languages was, according to Barber, almost totally limited to the lexicon, yet the three scenarios led to very different outcomes. Contact with Celtic was slight and restricted to a few toponymic borrowings, on account of the powerful social and political (superstratal) position of the Anglo-Saxons; contact with Old Norse saw the borrowing of some 200 loanwords, quite a few of them being everyday words (*sky*, *knife*, *bag*, or *cake*) and there were even some pronouns (*them*, *though* and *their*), an unusual process explained by the adstratal relationship of the two varieties and long-term coexistence and mixing of the two populations; and Norman (later Central) French contributed up to 10,000 loans due to superstratal influence and persistent sociohistorical contacts, followed by gradual language shift back to English in the late Middle English (ME) period.

This is as far as the traditional story of English goes, but researchers have recently begun to address – and at times substantially challenge – these views, asking for nothing less than a wholesale revision of the historical evolution of the English language. As for the first claim, Filppula, Klemola and Pitkänen (2002), Filppula, Klemola and Paulasto (2008), Filppula and Klemola (2009), Filppula (2010), or Tristram (1997, 2000, 2003, 2006) argue that, against conventional wisdom in English historical linguistics, there has been persistent Celtic substratal influence (for examples, see below). The introduction of the verbal noun into the verbal system has also attracted attention, and it is suggested that this was triggered via contact with Celtic (discussion in Vennemann 2001: 354 ff.).

As for the impact of Old Norse, Kroch, Taylor and Ringe (2000: 381) claim that contact may have caused syntactic differences between northern and southern ME varieties, namely with regard to the grammatical implementation of so-called 'verb-second' constraints. The order of negator and pronoun object reflects modern Mainland Scandinavian-type object shift of pronominal objects and is common in modern Mainland Scandinavian, German and Dutch. Dialects in southern England, by contrast, were much more conservative in that ME V2 constraint resembles the one found in OE. The authors

> feel confident, therefore, in maintaining . . . , on grounds of dating as well as of linguistic analysis, that the V2 syntax of northern Middle English arose out of contact with Norse and that the specific trigger for the change was the reduction of the relatively rich Old English agreement system to one with almost no person distinctions, due to imperfect learning of Old English by the large number of arriving Scandinavian invaders and immigrants of the 9th century and later. (Kroch *et al.* 2000: 385)

The structural impact of Old Norse may therefore, too, have been more deep-rooted and persistent than has been traditionally assumed (see also McWhorter 2002).

There has been so much recent research in the area of English historical linguistics that we feel it is time to take a fresh look at its origins and evolution, and issues such as these are discussed prominently in the present volume. For one, contact linguistics has emerged as a field in its own right (Thomason and Kaufmann 1988) over the last three decades and insights from this dynamic discipline will further our understanding of historical processes. Moreover, it is now generally assumed that there is a considerable overlap of branches such as historical linguistics, variationist sociolinguistics, typology and universals, pidgin and creole linguistics, new-dialect formation, language acquisition, etc. and that the interplay and complexity of these fields underlies much of what we understand as contact-induced language change. Our aim is to approach language change from as broad a viewpoint as possible.

The contributions in this volume will address the following aspects of English contact linguistics: the historical evolution of the language, with a focus on OE and ME; the emergence of new varieties as a result of colonization and post-colonization (in areas such as Ireland or the United States); contact-induced change in migrant and/or mobile communities; agency (processes of accommodation in adults and adolescents); substrates and universals, population ecologies and learning strategies; the emergence of new regional epicentres, and learning processes in bilingual settings. Our goal is not to develop a unified theory, particularly not since some of the theories are conflicting or controversial, but the fresh ideas offered here will help cast new perspectives on the history of and ongoing change in one of the best-studied languages in the world.

Olga Fischer, in Chapter 2, 'The role of contact in English syntactic change in the Old and Middle English periods', focuses on the influence of Latin, Old Norse and Norman French[2] on Old and Middle English morphosyntax. She addresses some general issues, such as differences between phonological, lexical and syntactic borrowing (permeability of the syntactic level) and the general manifestation of syntactic borrowing (salience). Special attention is paid to the diverse sociocultural and demographic settings in which language contact occurred. Fischer points out that deciding whether or not a particular construction is borrowed may not necessarily be straightforward. She argues in favour of comparative research, i.e. to single out qualitative morphosyntactic differences between English and its Germanic sister languages (particularly German, Dutch and Swedish) and to determine how their historical development may affect the rate of changes taking place.[3] A second approach is to identify present-day English constructions that have no equivalent in OE or the respective sister languages and which can be investigated with respect to (substratal) contact-induced change from other languages or alternatively via internal developments. With this objective, Fischer discusses three candidates for contact-induced syntactic change: (i) the influence of Old

Norse on the emerging determiner system, and the pronoun system and on the development of particle verbs, (ii) the influence of French on adjectival position and prepositional phrasal expressions, and (iii) the influence of Latin on new infinitival constructions. She suggests that most of these constructions can be explained not just by contact alone, but rather by a combination of contact-induced and internal developments. In other words, we need to look at the system as a whole in order to understand the complex nature of structural 'borrowing'. Moreover, her case studies show that some contact-induced (or supported) syntactic changes are highly specific with respect to register (learned vs everyday language use). A final factor she considers is frequency: how frequently the 'foreign' construction may have been heard (or in the case of reading: seen) had an impact on whether the native construction was replaced or kept when new and old forms coexisted and competed.

The issue of coexistent constructions is taken up and discussed in more detail by Herbert Schendl in Chapter 3, 'Multilingualism and code-switching as mechanisms of contact-induced lexical change in late Middle English'. He looks into code-switching and code-alternation between Latin, French and English in ME manuscripts. Code-switching as well as code-alternation have been widely recognized as important mechanisms of linguistic change in contemporary and recent varieties of English (Thomason 2001). Their manifestation in older stages of English (and other languages), on the other hand, has largely remained hypothetical and been rather neglected by historical linguists, though the attested widespread multilingualism of medieval England must have provided ideal conditions for these mechanisms to have lasting effects. Schendl argues that recent research on the large number of mixed-language texts from the history of English (both literary and non-literary) has shown that they indeed provide important evidence for written historical code-switching (Schendl 2002a, b; Wright 2000a). These manuscripts attest to the often intimate mixing of Latin, French and English in various combinations and are the products of bi- and multilingual scribes, who produced them for an equally multilingual readership. The texts and the sociohistorical contexts in which they were produced throw light on the intensity of linguistic contact and leave no doubt that mixing was part of everyday linguistic activities for the literate part of medieval society. Schendl discusses how mixing may have affected the rate and direction of lexical borrowing in ME and illustrates the processes on the basis of various types of mixed-language texts from medieval England, embedding his findings into a general theory of code-alternation and contact-induced change.

In the third chapter with a historical focus, Laura Wright looks at 'The contact origins of Standard English'. In earlier work, she researched multilingual writing practices of traders and account-keepers in London in the

centuries prior to the standardization of English (Wright 1999a, b, 2000a, b, 2001a, b). Analysing internal constraints on the 'switch-points' (of all the languages involved: ME, Medieval Latin and Anglo-Norman French), she found that there was an essentially stable structure for several centuries and that this was one of the most prevalent forms of medieval writing. In the present volume, Wright shows how the multilingual situation changed once Standard English evolved and how the mixed-language business variety became subsequently abandoned. This process is first documented in the fifteenth and continues until the end of the sixteenth century. The theory she develops here is that the process of standardization was directly linked to changes in trading practices, not in London, or even England, but on the Continent (Wright 1999a, 2000b). In consequence, Standard English is a contact language in the sense that it is the result of traders from London meeting traders from abroad, with a crunch-point in the late fifteenth century when foreign traders and British regional traders came to deal with London traders via the medium of (written Standardizing) English, rather than Anglo-Norman French or Medieval Latin as had hitherto been the practice. The London dialect in the ME period has elsewhere been identified as 'an urban amalgam drawing on non-adjacent dialects' (Kitson 2004: 227). Wright goes on to adapt this description to Standard English in general (and not only to London English).

In sum, Chapters 2–4 discuss the multifaceted nature of contact settings in the Old and Middle English periods. They contextualize the various social settings in which there was contact between English and other languages, and provide an overview of the existing literature while going on to develop new insights into the structural outcomes of contact-induced change, with a strong focus on effects of bi- and multilingualism.

In Chapter 5, 'English as a contact language in the British Isles', Juhani Klemola argues that the development of the English language in the British Isles, from the *adventus Saxonum* onwards, has been shaped by contact with other languages. The linguistic consequences of these contacts vary depending on the type and intensity of the contact (Thomason 2001). While it is generally acknowledged that Latin, French and Scandinavian influence have played a major role in the development of English (see above), it is traditionally believed that the Insular Celtic language(s) left virtually no traces in the English language. Klemola calls for a revision of this traditional view. He argues that it is based on an outdated view of the nature of contact-induced language change and old-fashioned ideologically charged claims such as 'Our whole internal history testifies unmistakably to our inheritance of Teutonic institutions from the first immigrant' (Stubbs 1870: 1; quoted from Higham 1992: 3). The Celtic contacts in the British Isles represent the type of language shift situations that, according to Thomason and Kaufman (1988), result in moderately heavy substratum influence in the phonology

and syntax of the target language rather than lexical borrowings as argued, among others, by Filppula, *et al.* (2008) and the contributions in Filppula and Klemola (2009). In his contribution to this volume, Klemola provides an in-depth analysis of three features, (1) the Northern Subject Rule, (2) *self*-forms as intensifiers and reflexives, and (3) the third-person singular pronoun *en* in south-western dialects of English, and claims that all of them are the legacy of structural transfer in a long-term contact scenario.

Raymond Hickey, in Chapter 6, 'English as a contact language in Ireland and Scotland', tracks historical language shift processes in Ireland and Scotland in speakers of Irish and Scottish Gaelic. His aim is twofold: (1) to provide the historical and demographic background necessary to understand the direction and speed of the shift that occurred; and (2) to use such knowledge as a basis for a more general discussion of contact scenarios. The discussion has a strong taxonomic orientation and looks at no fewer than seven aspects: (1) category and exponence; (2) transfer in language shift, with focus on second language acquisition; (3) the search for categorial equivalence; (4) neglect of distinctions in language shift; (5) lack of transfer in language contact; (6) non-binary categories in contact, and (7) permeability of linguistic systems. Hickey discusses these factors in great detail and exemplifies them with the historical spread of English into Ireland and Scotland.

In Chapter 7, 'The contact dynamics of socioethnic varieties in North America' Walt Wolfram describes long-term effects of accommodation, such as the emergence of new ethnolects, in bi-ethnic and bilingual settings. He emphasizes that one of the dynamic outcomes of language contact in North America is the long-term incorporation of structural traits from a British-derived model language into varieties of the replica language, so-called substrate effects. These structural effects may in turn become associated with regional and/or socioethnic group membership and thus come to assume symbolic ethnolinguistic significance. The central questions, hence, are how such long-term contact effects figure in trajectories of convergence and divergence over time, place and socioethnic group, and how this process takes place. Wolfram considers the relative role of long-term contact effects in several representative socioethnic varieties in the United States, ranging from well-studied African American English to relatively obscure varieties of Native American Indian English (such as North Carolina Lumbee English). As a foil for these long-term situations, he examines the dynamic effects of contact on an emerging socioethnic Hispanic English variety in the South Mid-Atlantic region to which large numbers of Latino immigrants have been migrating in the last two decades. He compares emerging structural traits of these recent Hispanic varieties with those attested in scenarios of long-standing historical continuity elsewhere and postulates principles that favour or disfavour substrate accommodation in the process of constructing a socioethnic variety.

The data provided by Wolfram indicate that patterns of ethnolinguistic convergence and divergence cannot be reduced to a unilateral model of accommodation principles, which is in line with the processes singled out and discussed by Hickey.

Similar processes can be observed in the emergence of the so-called 'New Englishes'. In Chapter 8, 'English as a contact language: the "New Englishes"', Edgar W. Schneider argues that the New Englishes are products of prolonged contact between English-speaking settlers and indigenous populations in colonial and postcolonial settings. They have emerged through the increasing contact and mutual accommodation between these groups (Schneider 2007). Essentially, the New Englishes tend to partake in nativization processes, i.e. they are characterized by distinctive features on the levels of lexis, pronunciation and grammar, many of which can be accounted for as products of contact with indigenous languages. His chapter surveys and systematizes the contact conditions and effects that have played a substantial role in the emergence of the New Englishes. Schneider first looks at extralinguistic conditions (historical background; colonization types; characteristic contact conditions in situations of colonial settlement; demographic factors; power relationships; changing conditions in the course of time; nation building; elitist diffusion of English in some countries; increasing demand for and grassroots spread of English in recent decades; attitudes and language policies) and then goes on to investigate widespread structural outcomes (as documented, for instance, by Kortmann, Schneider, Mesthrie and Burridge 2004 or Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008), asking in particular to what extent these can be accounted for as products of language contact (or, alternatively, of internal developments or other factors). He claims that the New Englishes are influenced but not exclusively shaped by language contact conditions.

Daniel Schreier, in Chapter 9, 'English as a contact language: lesser-known varieties', calls for more focused attention to be paid to hitherto overlooked varieties of English. He argues that research on English as a world language has traditionally concentrated on 'inner-circle' varieties. Even though varieties from the outer and expanding circles (Kachru 1986) have been added to the research canon over the last twenty years (see Kortmann *et al.* 2004), a number of fully nativized varieties have simply been overlooked to the present day. The chapter takes a closer look at the so-called 'lesser-known varieties of English' (LKVEs; Schreier, Trudgill, Schneider and Williams 2010). LKVEs share a number of characteristics: (1) they are typically spoken by minorities, delimitated (not necessarily 'isolated' but socially or regionally distinct) to small communities embedded into a larger (regional) population ecology; (2) many of them were originally transmitted by settler communities or adopted by newly formed social communities that emerged early in the colonial era, so that they substantially derive from British inputs; and (3) they were formed by processes of dialect and/or

language contact (which makes it impossible to ascribe to them genetic status, e.g. as either creoles or koinés). On a macro-level, LKVEs thus pose a challenge to existing models of English as a world language; on a micro-level, they allow for in-depth case studies of contact-induced language change, both with its internal conditioning factors (input characteristics, structural features, systemic patterns, etc.) and its external correlates (socio-demographics, settlement movements, etc.). Drawing on case studies from North America, the Caribbean and the South Atlantic, Schreier argues that the study of English around the world will benefit considerably from analysing varieties that have not or hardly been researched to date. Documenting and studying LKVEs encourages researchers both to rethink (and perhaps revise) existing models and to assess their significance for the classification of English as a contact language.

Chapter 10, 'The role of mundane mobility and contact in dialect death and dialect birth' by David Britain, looks into the role of increasing mobility in the emergence and disappearance of dialects. Britain starts his line of argument by stating that dialect contact has been implicated as a major contributor to ongoing convergence of varieties of English, especially since the mid twentieth century, but convergence has not occurred in all cases. Britain argues that sociolinguists need to place speakers at the forefront of our understanding of contact in order to account for 'failure of convergence'. His aim is to examine dialect contact by looking at the linguistic consequences of the diverse, socially imbued mobilities that speakers engage(d) in as they go about their everyday lives. Britain thus examines evidence that sociogeographical processes such as migration, urbanization and counterurbanization, as well as mobilities resulting from institutional policymaking, routinized consumption choices and travel patterns, have triggered forms of dialect contact that *can* lead to convergence, but can equally, in the right social, geographical and historical circumstances, lead to dialectal diversification, creating new dialects on the way. Dialect contact may well have a set of fairly well-established outcomes, but the mobility events that cause contact are historically, socially and geographically contingent, and so the linguistic outputs of that contact will reflect the diverse times, places and contexts of their making. This contingency enables contact itself to produce a rich tapestry of outcomes from one common process. Britain's central concern is speakers and their mobilities, rather than decontextualized contact processes, and this not only allows us to understand how contact can lead to dialect birth as well as dialect death, but also how centrally dialect contact should be placed in explanations of language change in general.

Marianne Hundt, in Chapter 11, 'The diversification of English: old, new and emerging epicentres', looks at the development of English from a mono- to a bi- and finally to a pluricentric language. In addition to the well-established regional norms of British and American English, various