**This is a pre-publication version of this article. Please do not quote from it; please quote only from the published version. The article is published in the Journal of French Language Studies.**

# THE ROLLING SNOWBALL: LONE ENGLISH-ORIGIN LEXICAL ITEMS IN GUERNESIAIS

*Professor Mari C. Jones*

*French Section, Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Peterhouse*

*University of Cambridge*

Do not quote from this version.

## 1. Introduction

When two languages are used by the same speech community, linguistic evidence of this contact is commonly present (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988). Matras and Sakel (2007) distinguish what they term "MAT borrowing", defined as "when morphological material and its phonological shape from one language is replicated in another language" (Sakel, 2007:15) from "PAT borrowing", defined as "where only patterns of the other language are replicated i.e. the organisation, distribution and mapping of grammatical or semantic meaning, while the form itself is not borrowed" (Sakel, 2007:15).[1] The present study offers a detailed examination of MAT borrowing, specifically, lone English-origin lexical items, in contemporary

[1] The same distinction is termed "global copying" versus "partial copying" by Johanson (1992) and "borrowing, code-switching" versus "transfer" by Treffers-Daller and Mougeon (2005:95).

Guernésiais, the Norman language spoken in Guernsey. Although the presence of such lexical items is well attested in Guernésiais (cf. Jones, 2015), this is the first study to analyse them systematically using extensive and original data. It examines them in relation to each part of speech and discusses their use in Guernésiais in the broader context of language contact.

Guernsey's Norman speech community has been in contact with English since the installation of a small garrison on the island to protect against the threat of a French attack after the Channel Islands became formally annexed to the English Crown in 1259. Though initially small, the garrison grew steadily as Guernsey's strategic significance as a military base increased when England became more involved in wars outside its shores. During the Napoleonic Wars, for example, almost 6,000 men were stationed in the island, whose local population at the time was recorded as 16,155: the troops inevitably brought tradespeople and other locals into contact with English. From the nineteenth century, trade with England, in particular the development of the horticultural industry, integrated Guernsey's economy firmly with that of the UK and the improvement of regular communication by sea allowed tourism to be set on a serious footing, bringing thousands of people from the UK to the Channel Islands each year. Language contact was accompanied by cultural contact, with English customs being adopted, many local streets being renamed (from French[2] to English) and English influence becoming increasingly visible in Guernsey's architecture. During the Second World War, the evacuation to the UK of over half of Guernsey's population prior to the island's occupation by German military forces also brought islanders – very abruptly - into contact with English, with many of the evacuated children growing up with English, rather than Norman, as their mother tongue. Since the War, immigration from the UK, associated with the expansion of Guernsey's off-shore finance industry, now its largest employer, has resulted in UK-born individuals

Do not quote from this version.

[2] French was the sole official language of Guernsey until 1948.

representing nearly one quarter of Guernsey's population.[3] Today, English is spoken fluently by all 63,448 residents and dominates every domain of island life. Speaker-numbers of Guernésiais, not recorded officially since the 2001 Census, are estimated at no more than a few hundred, most of whom are elderly.

As a result of this extensive and long-term contact, lone English-origin lexical items permeate contemporary Guernésiais. Their presence was noted as far back as the nineteenth century, with one guidebook to Guernsey commenting on how amusing it was "to wait for the English words to peep out of so different a language" (Anonymous, 1847). A contemporary travel writer observed "It [Guernésiais] is a good old dialect, which, during the last century, at least, has proceeded in a steady course of gathering, like a rolling snowball, from everything it encountered, and increasing its vocabulary by various compounds of Latin, Welsh, Scotch, German, English, and Italian, added to the original stock, which was Norman French" (Lane-Clark, 1880:1). That English-origin lexical items were used frequently in the everyday language of the nineteenth century may be seen from their inclusion in a large body of Guernésiais translations of the Bible and theatre dating from this time (see (1) and (2)).

Do not quote from this version.

(1) *Et n'**allouait** pouin aie guiablles de dire qui l'couniesaie* 'And did not allow the devils to say that they knew him' (Mark 1.34).

(2) ***Sharre** auve li meme et donne a tes paeuples* 'Share with himself and give to your people' (*Mahomet*, Voltaire, 1.4) .

(Jones, 2008:107-109).

## 2. Methodology

[3] See the Guernsey annual electronic census report 2022 URL: https://www.gov.gg/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=164619&p=0, retrieved 13 July 2023.

The data analysed in this study were collected from interviews with 46 native speakers of Guernésiais, most of whom – in keeping with the overall demographics of this particular speech community, had close connections to agriculture and farming. All speakers were fluent in Guernésiais although it was not necessarily still their main everyday language. For logistical and ethical reasons, the data presented were collected before the Covid-19 pandemic.[4] Given the advanced degree of language contact in the speech community (as stated in §1, all speakers of Guernésiais are also fluent in English: no monolinguals remain) and the cessation of intergenerational transmission (Jones 2015:§4.2), with most speakers aged over 65 at the time the data were collected, it was not possible to consider usage related to proficiency in English, intensity of contact, age or social stratification.[5] All interviews were conducted by myself and in Guernésiais and took the form of free conversation. In an attempt to obtain naturalistic data and to lessen the observer's paradox (Labov, 1972:32), I was accompanied at all times by a fluent speaker of Guernésiais who was well known to the people being interviewed and who often took the lead in the conversation, a strategy which has, in other contexts, proved an effective way of enhancing the elicitation of casual speech, especially in cases where the researcher is not a native speaker of the variety under investigation (Turpin, 1998:223; Milroy and Gordon, 2003:75; Bowern, 2010:351). Involving a research assistant also made it possible to use social networks to locate speakers (cf. Milroy, 1987), a strategy whose effectiveness has been demonstrated in other studies made of Norman (see Jones, 2001, 2015).

Do not quote from this version.

[4] Since data collection involves conducting interviews indoors, the age of participants has made it inappropriate to conduct fieldwork in Guernsey during the past few years. This study therefore relies on data collected between 2010 and 2018.

[5] For a discussion of the relative homogeneity of many speech communities where an obsolescent language is spoken, see Dorian (1981).

A language takes lexical items from another language when it lacks a word for a particular referent – in other words, when there exists a referential gap (such as in the case of the words *pizza*, taken by French from Italian, or *alligator* and *sushi*, taken by English from, respectively, Spanish and Japanese) (cf. Hock, 1991:408; McMahon, 1994:201). However, this can also occur when a native word for the referent in question does exist but, for reasons of culture or prestige, speakers opt to use instead a form from another language (such as with French *soldat*, taken from Italian despite the presence of indigenous *soudart*) (cf. Hock, 1991:409; McMahon, 1994:202; Jones and Singh, 2005:31-32). Lexical items with both these motivations were examined.

Following other studies, a wide definition of "lone English-origin lexical item" has been adopted. This includes well-established, dictionary-attested loans, which would not be likely to be instantly perceived by all speakers as English-origin (e.g. *allouaïr* 'to allow'), and nonce items that only appear once in the corpus (e.g *subsidy*) (cf. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988; Poplack, 2018:28). To limit its focus, the study only considers i) lone English-origin lexical items and compounds and ii) frozen expressions acting as a unit and thereby functioning as single lexical items. Both i) and ii) occur in otherwise Guernésiais discourse (cf. Turpin, 1998:224; Poplack, 2018:41). Each different lone English-origin lexical item is classed as a "type" and all occurrences of the same lone English-origin lexical item are considered tokens of the same "type" (cf. Poplack, 2018:42; Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988). Multi-word English fragments are not considered (i.e. what would be codeswitches [unmixed donor languages constituents] in Poplack (2018)'s terms and inter-sentential codeswitches for Myers-Scotton (1993:3)).

Lone English-origin lexical items in contemporary Guernésiais are likely to represent a mixture of borrowings and single-word intra-sentential codeswitches (Jones, 2015:143-154; Winford, 2003:126-167; Turpin, 1998; Poplack and Meechan, 1995:224). Drawing a

Do not quote from this version.

distinction between such forms is not straightforward and, as Poplack and Meechan (1998:127-128) point out, many studies have been written advancing different facets of this debate. To summarise these briefly, according to studies such as Poplack and Meechan (1998) and Poplack (2018), although intra-sentential codeswitches and borrowings may bear some resemblance in their surface manifestation, codeswitches conform to the grammar of the donor language (i.e. the morphosyntax of the donor language is retained) whereas borrowings (whether established or nonce) conform to the grammar of the recipient language. They therefore consider most lone English-origin lexical items to be borrowings on the grounds that they pattern in the same way as their indigenous base-language counterparts. Myers-Scotton, however, sees all nonce borrowings as intra-sentential codeswitches in (donor language – recipient language) mixed constituents, arguing that, when mixed constituents are accessed, interaction of the two grammars necessarily occurs at an abstract level (2002:154-155). She further argues that all such forms occur as part of the same developmental continuum (Myers-Scotton, 1993:63) so that, from a synchronic point of view, there is no need, strictly speaking, to distinguish between borrowings and intra-sentential codeswitches (Myers-Scotton, 2002:153) (cf. also Thomason, 2003 and van Coetsem, 2000). Matras (2009:110), Thomason (2001:133) and others also see borrowings and intra-sentential codeswitches as related points on a continuum rather than in terms of a sharp dichotomy. Rottet (2019:199), for instance, argues that "la binarité traditionelle emprunt – alternance codique est simpliste et ne reflète pas la complexité réelle des communautés profondément bilingues" and Gardner-Chloros writes "[a]t a synchronic level, there is no failsafe method of distinguishing between loans and codeswitches, as only time can tell if a loanword is more generally adopted over time" (2010:186). It is intended, in future research, to explore questions of this kind in relation to Guernésiais and it is hoped that the extensive data presented for the first time in this study will be of interest to the debate. However, given the lack of published data on the lexis of Guernésiais, before research can

Do not quote from this version.

focus on the different "statuses" of these lone English-origin lexical items, it is first necessary to establish a clear picture of their nature and usage. An attempt has been made to offer some illustration of the way in which these data could potentially inform such a debate during the discussion of noun pluralisation (§3.3.1.2.).

In order to make the Guernésiais data accessible to readers more familiar with French than with Norman, the lone English-origin lexical items are transcribed phonetically but the the utterance (with the lone English-origin lexical item in bold) is given an orthographic rendering based on the (largely French-based) spelling system used in the *Dictiounnaire Angllais-Guernésiais* (De Garis, 1982, hereafter DAG: the only contemporary dictionary of Guernésiais).

Do not quote from this version.

## 3. Analysis

### 3.1. Hierarchy of lone English-origin lexical items

The Guernésiais corpus contained 652 types (2,157 tokens) of lone English-origin lexical items. As Table 1 reveals, a clearly demonstrable "hierarchy" was present, with nouns far more likely to be borrowed than any other part of speech and adverbs and discourse markers far less likely.

| | |
|---|---|
| Nouns: | 506 |
| Verbs: | 79 |
| Adjectives: | 53 |
| Adverbs: | 13 |
| Discourse markers: | 1 |

Table 1. Lone English-origin lexical items in the Guernésiais corpus by part of speech.

This is directly comparable to the now almost canonical borrowability scale put forward by Haugen (1950:224) for Norwegian and Swedish immigrant speech in the US and, within the French-speaking context, to Poplack's Ottawa-Hull corpus (2018:48), King's (2000) study of the French of Prince Edward Island, Péronnet's work on the French of New Brunswick (1992) and Flikeid's (1989) study of Acadian French in Nova Scotia. It also correlates broadly with that proposed more recently by Matras (2007:61) on the basis of 27 different languages.[6] In this respect, therefore, despite the advanced degree of language shift, Guernésiais usage seems to conform to commonly observable borrowing patterns. 154 of the 652 English-origin types were recorded in the DAG, suggesting therefore that approximately one quarter of the English-origin lexical items in the data are established or generally accepted forms. In line with other studies such forms, that are "included in the standard lexicography of the receptor language" (Zenner and Kristiansen, 2014:4), are termed "listed" (L) (cf. Muysken, 2000:71; Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988; Deuchar, 2020).

Do not quote from this version

3.2. Frequency

Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988) and Poplack (2018) usefully distinguish lone English-origin lexical items by their frequency and by whether they are used by a single speaker or by several different speakers. By adapting their framework in accordance with the different sizes

[6] The Guernésiais "hierarchy" also matches, in all but one respect, Muysken's (1981) analysis of the Spanish of Quechua speakers, the difference being that Muysken found adjectives to be more readily borrowed than verbs.

of the corpora, the lone English-origin lexical items in Guernésiais were divided into the following five categories:[7]

a) Widespread lone English-origin lexical items (w)

Lone English-origin lexical items uttered once or more by more than 5 speakers – in other words, lexical items that seem to have achieved a certain level of recognition within the speech community (Hasselmo, 1969; Mackey, 1970; Poplack and Sankoff, 1984):

(3) *Nou'va par* ***pleine*** /plem/ 'We go by plane.'[8]

(4) *Nou'n'tait pas* ***allouaïs*** /aluɑj/ *d'allaïr à la maïr* 'We weren't allowed to go to the sea.'

Total number of types in the corpus: 53.

b) Occasional lone English-origin lexical items (o)[9]

Lone English-origin lexical items used more than once but fewer than 5 times in the corpus and by more than one speaker:

(5) *I'peut affectaïr dauve mes* ***tablets*** /tæblɘts/ 'It can affect my tablets.'

Do not quote from this version.

[7] Given the greater size of the Ottawa-Hull corpus compared to the Guernésiais corpus (120 speakers compared to 46 speakers – 19,579 tokens compared to 2,157 tokens), the benchmark for a lone English-origin lexical item to be labelled as "widespread" was reduced from 10 tokens to 5 tokens and as "recurrent" from more than 10 times though not necessarily by as many speakers to more than 5 times though not necessarily by as many speakers.

[8] In contemporary Guernésiais, the impersonal pronoun *nou'* + 3sg. verb is used almost categorically to convey a 1pl. meaning (Jones, 2015:134-139).

[9] This represents an additional category to those included in Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988) and Poplack (2018).

(6) *Énne **cruise** /*kru:z*/ au Caribbean* 'A cruise in the Caribbean.'

Total number of types in the corpus: 121.

c) Idiosyncratic lone English-origin lexical items (i)

Lone English-origin lexical items uttered frequently by a single speaker but not by any other speaker:

(7) *I'soulait s'n allaïr **yodellaïr*** /jəʊdlɑj/ 'He used to go yodelling.'

(8) *Les daeux **teams** /*ti:m*/* 'The two teams.'

Total number of types in the corpus: 30.

d) Recurrent lone English-origin lexical items (r)

Lone English-origin lexical items uttered more than 5 times in the corpus, though not necessarily by as many speakers:

:

(9) *Nou'n'pouvait pas faire des **sentences** /*sɑ̃tɑ̃:s*/ en Angllais* 'We couldn't make sentences in English.'

(10) *A'maettait l'**robish*** /rɔbɪʃ/ *dans la shed* 'She put the rubbish in the shed.'

Total number of types in the corpus: 18.

e) Nonce lone English-origin lexical items (n)

Momentary, "one-off" lone English-origin lexical items uttered by a single speaker and which only appear once in the corpus:

(11) *I'n'voulait pouin ses **chips*** /tʃɪp/ 'He didn't want his chips.'

Do not quote from this version.

(12) *All'a* ***meetaï*** /mitɑj/ *aen haomme* 'She has met a man.'

(13) *J'avais ma* ***scarf*** */skɒ:f/ passequ'il'tait gniet* 'I had my scarf because it was night-time.'

Total number of types in the corpus: 430.[10]

The broad "hierarchy" of part-of-speech borrowability found in the corpus overall (§3.1.) was also found to apply within each individual category:

Widespread (types)

Nouns: 37; Verbs: 10; Adjectives: 4; Adverbs: 1; Discourse markers: 1.

Occasional (types)

Nouns: 94; Verbs: 18; Adjectives: 9.

Idiosyncratic (types)

Nouns: 25; Verbs: 4; Adjectives: 1.

Recurrent (types)

Nouns: 15; Verbs: 1; Adjectives: 1; Adverbs: 1.

Nonce (types)

Nouns: 335; Verbs: 46; Adjectives: 38; Adverbs: 11.

[10] For the nonce lone English-origin lexical items, the number of types is, of course, identical to the number of tokens.

Do not quote from this version.

From the above, it can be seen that nonce lone English-origin nouns account for the largest category by far, making up more than half the lone English-origin lexical items in the corpus.

While the speech sample analysed for this study may be considered representative of the Guernésiais speech community as a whole, somewhat inevitably, it cannot match it exactly. For this reason, a category assigned to a given lone English-origin lexical item in the corpus can necessarily only serve as its statistical descriptor within this particular study rather than as a definitive descriptor within the Guernésiais language in general. A lone English-origin lexical item that is widespread in the corpus may reasonably be assumed to be widespread within the wider speech community since, in such a bilingual community, the stocks of lone English-origin lexical items of any two speakers are likely to contain at least a few words in common, especially if there exists a referential gap (cf. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988:83; Poplack, 2018). However, the same will not necessarily hold true for other categories. For example, although a lone English-origin lexical item labelled "nonce" in the corpus might also be momentary in the context of the wider speech community, it could also be that, by chance, the referent denoted by that particular lexical item was simply not talked about much during the corpus interviews, thereby leading to its labelling as "nonce" for the corpus even though it may prove more frequent within the wider speech community (cf. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988:95). As will be seen (for example in §3.3.2.1.), nonce English-origin lexical items in the Guernésiais corpus do not display any intrinsic properties - other than frequency of use – that distinguish them from other categories of English-origin lexical items (cf. Bouchard, 2023:4).

Do not quote from this version.

## 3.3. Parts of speech

### 3.3.1. Nouns

Nouns are the lexical items with most lexical content (Weinreich, 1968; Muysken, 1984; Poplack, 2018:49) and cover the most differentiated inventory of labelling concepts, objects and roles (Matras, 2009:168). As discussed in §3.1., nouns represent the most common lone English-origin lexical items in Guernésiais (506 out of 652 types: 37 widespread, 94 occasional, 25 idiosyncratic, 15 recurrent, 335 nonce) (cf. Matras, 2009:167). They are the easiest English-origin part of speech for Guernésiais to accommodate since nouns are, structurally, relatively less well integrated into the recipient discourse. As can be seen from the above examples, some nouns are phonologically assimilated into Guernésiais (9), (10), whereas others (5), (6), (8), (11), (13) are not. Variable integration between two tokens of the same type (i.e where some tokens of a type are produced with Guernésiais phonology and other tokens of the same type with English phonology) was most common with so-called "international" words. For example, *télévisiaon* (12 tokens) was assimilated phonologically in 9 cases (/televizijaõ/) but its "English" pronunciation (/telɪvɪʒən/) was maintained in 3 cases. No clear overall pattern emerged, however, as most "international" words in the corpus were nonce lexical items. As examples, *recitâtiaon*, *processiaon* and *conversâtiaon* were assimilated to Guernésiais phonology (/rɛzitasjaõ/, /prosɛsjaõ/, /kõvɛrsɑsjaõ/), whereas *invâsiaon* and *programme* kept their "English" pronunciation (/ɪnveɪʒən/, /prəʊgræm/).

Do not quote from this version.

3.3.1.1. Gender

All Guernésiais nouns have grammatical gender (Tomlinson, 2008:4), meaning that all lone English-origin nouns in Guernésiais must be assigned as either masculine or feminine for purposes of specification (i.e. articles, demonstratives) and agreement. However, unlike languages such as Italian and Spanish, gender in Guernésiais is not suggested by a word's

phonological "shape".[11] In theory, therefore, most lone English-origin nouns stand an equal chance of being assigned either masculine or feminine gender in Guernésiais.

In French, most lone English-origin nouns are assigned the unmarked masculine gender (Wise, 1997:93). Some lone English-origin nouns are also assigned masculine gender in Guernésiais (where, like in French, the masculine is also unmarked): examples include *lunch* (w), *ouayeur* (o), *lorry* (w), *pénni* (o), *sacepàn* (o), *wireless* (o), *carre* (w) (all of which are listed) and *bookcase* (n), *carving* (i), *spelling* (n) (all unlisted). However, many lone English-origin nouns are also assigned the (marked) feminine gender: examples include listed lexical items such as (*aero)pleine* (w), *choppe* (w), *gaume* (w), *picture* (w), *grappe* (w). Feminine gender assignation was particularly common with unlisted nonce nouns: examples include *football*, *scarf*, *lighthouse*, *kitchen*, *jelly*, *handbag*, *library*, *fruitcake* and *highlight*. Moreover, some less widespread (and unlisted) English-origin nouns were assigned different genders by different speakers. Examples include (14) – (19):

(14) *Noufait, ch'tait aen **joke*** /dʒowk/ 'Not at all, it was a joke' (m) (r).

(15) *Ch'tait sa p'tite **joke*** /dʒowk/ 'It was his little joke' (f) (r).

(16) *Ouécque mon **shed*** /ʃed/ *est* 'Where my shed is' (m) (o).

(17) *A'maettait l'robish dans la **shed*** /ʃed/ 'She put the rubbish in the shed' (reproduced from (11) above) (f) (r).

[11] Exceptions to this occur in some "international" words with a *-tiaon* ending in Guernésiais, which are usually feminine. However, the fact of being suggested by a lone English-origin noun's "shape" does not guarantee that a particular gender will be assigned by all speakers: cf. for example the form *aen conversâtiaon* 'a conversation' (m.) produced during one of the interviews.

Do not quote from this version.

(18) *J'li dounn'rai mon **jacket*** /dʒækɪt/ 'I'll give her my jacket' (m) (o).

(19) *Ch'est sa bllànche **jacket*** /dʒækɪt/ 'It's her white jacket' (f) (o).

(20) *Pourtchi qué tu n'stayes pas chu **weekend***? /wi:kend/ 'Why don't you stay this weekend?' (m) (n).

(21) *A'viant pâssaïr sa **weekend*** /wi:kend/ 'She comes to spend her weekend' (f) (n).

In order to test whether, as found in the French of Ottawa-Hull (Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988:66), gender assignment became less variable as a lone English-origin noun increased in frequency, the gender of the 20 most widespread lone English-origin nouns in the corpus was examined (Table 2).[12]

| Lone English-origin noun | Number of tokens in the corpus | Number of singular tokens in the corpus | Number of singular tokens assigned masculine gender | Number of singular tokens assigned feminine gender | Listed | Listed gender |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Greenhouse* 'greenhouse' | 90 | 37 | 0 | 37 | Yes | f |

[12] Matras (2009:73) also suggests that, once a word has spread, it will tend to follow fixed morphosyntactic integration patterns.

Do not quote from this version.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Holiday* 'holiday' | 88 | 21 | 1 | 20 | No | |
| *Piti* 'pity' | 75 | 75 | 75 | 0 | Yes | m |
| *Span* (a type of greenhouse) | 62 | 4 | 2 | 2 | Yes | m |
| *Byke* 'bike' | 54 | 19 | 13 | 6 | Yes | m |
| *Choppe* 'shop' | 52 | 24 | 0 | 24 | Yes | f |
| *(Aero)pleine* '(aero)plane' | 51 | 34 | 1 | 33 | Yes | f |
| *Visiteur* 'visitor' | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No | |
| *German* 'German' | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No | |
| *Djob* 'job' | 27 | 17 | 7 | 10 | Yes | m |
| *Carre* 'car' | 26 | 8 | 3 | 5 | Yes | m |
| *Bosse* 'bus' | 24 | 19 | 0 | 19 | Yes | m |
| *Touriste*[13] 'tourist' | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes | m |
| *Chaoux* 'show' | 20 | 18 | 18 | 0 | Yes | m |
| *Groweur* 'grower' | 18 | 2 | 2 | 0 | Yes | m |

Do not quote from this version.

[13] In this study, *touriste* is considered to be a lone English-origin noun rather than a native word of Guernésiais. The *Dictionnaire Jersiais-Français* describes its cognate in the Insular Norman of Jersey (Jèrriais) as being 'd'introduction récente' (Le Maistre 1966:319) and, although it is most frequently pluralised via an oikomorphological strategy (see §3.3.1.2 and, specifially,Table 3), in the present corpus this noun is never integrated into Guernésiais phonologically and is always given an "English" pronunciation (/tʊərɪst/).

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Pictures* 'cinema' | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes | f |
| *Guaine* 'gang' | 14 | 14 | 0 | 14 | Yes | f |
| *Radio* 'radio' | 13 | 13 | 4 | 9 | Yes | m |
| *Télévisiaon* 'television' | 12 | 12 | 0 | 12 | Yes | f |
| *Traffic* 'traffic' | 12 | 12 | 12 | 0 | Yes | m |

Table 2. Gender assignment of the 20 most frequent lone English-origin nouns in the Guernésiais corpus.

The lone English-origin nouns *visiteur*, *German*, *touriste* and *picture* were always used in the plural and without an accompanying variable adjective, which meant that it was not possible to determine which gender these words were being assigned. Of the remaining 16, 9 showed complete gender agreement across speakers. However, despite their frequent use, 7 lone English-origin nouns were assigned both masculine and feminine gender – and, in the case of *djob* and *carre*, different genders were assigned by the same speaker at different points in the same interview ((22) – (25)).

(22) *I'print son prumier* ***djob*** /dʒɒb/ 'He took his first job' (m).

(23) *Il a acouore sa maesme* ***djob*** /dʒɒb/ 'He still has his same job' (f).

(24) *Aen* ***carre*** /kɒ:/ *qui est pâssaï à draïvaïr* 'A car that is passed to drive' (m).

(25) *J'ai acataï ma* ***carre*** /kɒ:/ *en Anglléterre* 'I bought my car in England' (f).

Do not quote from this version.

It seems therefore that, in Guernésiais, for some nouns, more widespread usage determines a conventionalised gender (cf. *bosse*) which, for listed forms, usually corresponds to that documented in the DAG (cf. *greenhouse*, *piti*, *choppe*, *chaoux*, *groweur, guaine*, *radio*, *télévisiaon*, *traffic*) but, for others, gender remains variable despite their widespread use (cf. *holiday*, *span*, *byke*, *djob*, *carre*). Moreover, the gender most frequently assigned to a noun in the corpus did not always correspond to its listed gender (cf. *djob*, *carre*, *bosse*, *radio*).

3.3.1.2. Number

The expression of plurality requires speakers either to retain English plural morphology alongside the English-origin noun or else use a native strategy (cf. Turpin, 1998:228). Inflectional morphemes are generally considered to be less open to transfer than derivational morphemes (Matras, 2014:1) however, plural morphemes seem something of an exception (Roseano, 2014:3; Gardani, 2012; Matras, 2012:17). Roseano describes three strategies for pluralising borrowed nouns (2014:5-6). The oikomorphological strategy (described as the highest level of integration) occurs when other-language nouns "behave" morphologically like native nouns, forming a plural in the same way as in the recipient language (for example, English *cactus* - *cactuses*, *fungus – funguses*, *formula – formulas*, *index* - *indexes*). The lowest level of integration, or the xenomorphological strategy, is when the inflectional morpheme of the donor language is maintained (in other words, MAT borrowing) (for example, English *cactus – cacti*, *fungus – fungi*, *formula – formulae*, *index – indices*). The third strategy, allomorphological integration, occurs when plurals are formed neither as in the recipient language nor as in the donor language (for example, Chilean Spanish *mall – mall* cf. Castillo Fadic, 2002:486-487) (Roseano, 2014:6). Roseano claims that, where a language has only one strategy for pluralising other-language nouns, it will be oikomorphological (2014:7). Xenomorphological plurals are described as being typical of many bilingual societies and are

Do not quote from this version.

seen as the "Trojan horse" that makes other inflectional morphological borrowing possible (Roseano, 2014:1, 6).

Guernésiais traditionally marks plurality in several ways. Where a singular noun ends in a vowel, plurality is usually marked by lengthening this vowel: *cat* /kɑ/ 'cat' – *cats* /kɑ:/ 'cats'. Where a singular noun ends in a consonant, plurality is marked by a phonologically null morpheme, and number is expressed by an accompanying determiner *lé père* /l pejr/ 'the father' - *les pères* /lɛ: pejr/ 'the fathers' (cf. Tomlinson, 2008:5). A small number of nouns have irregular plurals involving an /ɛ/- /jo:w/ (*é – iaux*) singular - plural opposition (cf. *baté* /batɛ/ 'boat'– *batiaux* /batjo:w/ 'boats') (Tomlinson, 2008:5).[14] In the corpus, 380 out of the 591 tokens of plural lone English-origin nouns (64%) bore "Guernésiais" plural-marking (the oikomorphological strategy) - examples include *pénnis* /pɛni:/ (o, L), *pictures* /pɪktyr/ (w, L) and *greenhouses* /grinaʊs/ (w, L). 211 out of the 591 tokens (36%) featured plural morphology borrowed from English (the xenomorphological strategy) – examples include *flats* /flæts/ (r), *carres* /kɑ:z/ (w, L), *Germans* /dʒɜ:rmənz/ (w) and *freesias* /fri:ʒəz/ (o, L). Poplack (2018:52) found a similar majority tendency for oikomorphological plurals (92%) in the Ottawa-Hull corpus and Turpin's findings for Acadian French were, respectively, 58% oikomorphological and 52% xenomorphological (1998:230). English ablaut plurals were sometimes maintained in Guernésiais (*the grandchildren* /lɛ: græntʃɪldrən/ - o, xenomorphological: 3 tokens) and sometimes not (*the policemen* /lɛ: pəli:smən/ - o,

[14] /ɛ/ - /ja:w/ in south-western Guernésiais (Jones, 2015:93-95).

Do not quote from this version.

oikomorphological: 4 tokens). The fact that the latter form, with a plural definite article but no ablaut, is produced by speakers who are also fluent in English and therefore familiar with the vowel change, is evidence that, despite the advanced degree of language shift in Guernsey, Guernésiais morphological patterns can still hold strong. Turpin documents similar instances of plurals formed oikomorphologically and with no ablaut for Acadian French, describing them as forms which are only partially integrated into the recipient language (1998:230).

Although the plural of some lone English-origin nouns (such as *greenhouse* (w, L), *holiday* (w), *cottage* (w), *bathing suit* (o)) were consistently formed according to the same (oikomorphological) strategy across the speech community, in certain cases different speakers (26) - (31), or indeed the same speaker (32) - (37), were found to adopt different pluralisation strategies with the same nouns:

(26) *J'n'ai jomais ôimai les* ***bananas*** */*bənɑːnə*/* 'I have never liked bananas' (o, oikomorphological).

(27) *Les* ***bananas*** */*bənɑːnəz*/* *'taient acouore dans les choppes* 'Bananas were in the shops again' (o, xenomorphological).

(28) *A l'Eisteddfod, il'enactent souvent des* ***plays*** */*pleɪ*/* 'At the Eisteddfod [Guernsey's main cultural festival], they often put on plays' (o, oikomorphological).

(29) *All'écrit des* ***plays*** */*pleɪz*/* *et des sketchs* 'She writes plays and sketches' (o, xenomorphological).

Do not quote from this version.

(30) *Il'avaient tous les* ***carres***[15] /kɒ:/ *plloînes* 'They all had full cars' (w, L, oikomorphological).

(31) *Tu n'peux pas draïvaïr des* ***carres*** /kɒ:z/ *en Serk* 'You can't drive cars in Sark' (o, L, xenomorphological).

(32) *Les* ***pleines*** /pleɪn/ *'taient boutchies naturellement* 'Naturally, the planes were booked' (w, L, oikomorphological).

(33) *Quànd nou-s oyait les* ***pleines*** /pleɪnz/ 'When we heard the planes' (w, L, xenomorphological).

(34) *Les* ***lorries*** /lɒri:/ *faisaient aen amas d'camas* 'The lorries were making a lot of noise' (w, L, oikomorphological).

(35) *Les* ***lorries*** /lɒriz/ *v'naient dauve l'baté* 'The lorries came on the boat' (w, L, xenomorphological).

(36) *En Serk i'draïvent des* ***tractors*** /træktə/ 'In Sark, they drive tractors' (w, oikomorphological).

(37) *Tous les groweurs avaient des p'tits* ***tractors*** /træktez/ 'All the growers had little tractors' (w, xenomorphological).

Do not quote from this version.

[15] Note that in this utterance, it is clear from the accompanying adjective *pllôines* (/pjɔ̃in/) (which is phonologically distinct from the masculine *pllôins (/*pjɔ̃ⁿ/) that *carre* is assigned feminine gender (it is listed as masculine in the DAG).

Using one pluralisation strategy did not necessarily trigger the use of the same strategy within a given utterance (38) - (40):

(38) *All'écrit des **plays** /*pleɪz*/ et des **sketchs** /*sketʃ*/* 'She writes plays and sketches' (o, xenomorphological - n, oikomorphological) (reproduced from (29) above).

(39) *Nou-s a des **raspberries** /*rɑ:zbri:*/ et des **logans** /*ləʊgənz*/* 'We have raspberries and logans' (n, oikomorphological – n, xenomorphological).

(40) *Des **fermiers** /*fɛrmje:*/ et des **groweurs** /*greʊərz*/* 'Farmers and growers' (native noun, oikomorphological – w, L xenomorphological).

In order to determine whether frequency of usage had a bearing on the pluralisation strategy applied, the plurals of the 20 most frequent lone English-origin nouns were examined (Table 3).

| English-origin noun | Number of tokens of English-origin noun in the corpus | Number of plural tokens in the corpus | Oikomorphological pluralisation strategy | Xenomorphological pluralisation strategy | Listed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Greenhouse* | 90 | 53 | 53 | 0 | Yes |
| *Holiday* | 88 | 67 | 1 | 66 | No |
| *Piti* | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| *Span* | 62 | 58 | 58 | 0 | Yes |

Do not quote from this version.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Byke* | 54 | 35 | 13 | 9 | Yes |
| *Choppe* | 52 | 28 | 28 | 0 | Yes |
| *(Aero)pleine* | 51 | 17 | 10 | 7 | Yes |
| *Visiteur* | 45 | 45 | 9 | 36 | No |
| *German* | 29 | 29 | 5 | 24 | No |
| *Djob* | 27 | 3 | 3 | 0 | Yes |
| *Carre* | 26 | 18 | 10 | 8 | Yes |
| *Bosse* | 24 | 5 | 5 | 0 | Yes |
| *Touriste* | 21 | 21 | 19 | 2 | Yes |
| *Chaoux* | 20 | 2 | 2 | 0 | Yes |
| *Groweur* | 18 | 16 | 4 | 12 | Yes |
| *Pictures* | 15 | 15 | 15 | 0 | Yes |
| *Guaine* | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| *Radio* | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| *Télévisiaon* | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| *Traffic* | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |

Table 3. Pluralisation strategy used with the 20 most frequent lone English-origin nouns in the Guernésiais corpus.

Do not quote from this version.

15 of the 20 most widespread lone English-origin nouns in the corpus occurred in plural form. Of these, 7 plurals were formed exclusively via the oikomorphological strategy. The plurals of 8 lone English-origin nouns were formed variably via both strategies but unlike Turpin's findings (1998:231), none were formed exclusively via the xenomorphological strategy. It was striking that a large degree of variation in plural formation was found in such widespread

English-origin nouns: indeed, 5 of the 8 nouns with varying plurals (*byke*, (*aero)pleine, visiteur*, *carre*, *touriste*) were established enough to be listed in the DAG. Since the Guernésiais speech community consists entirely of bilinguals, it may be that it is so easy to produce and to understand different plural forms of these nouns with reference to English - the other language in which both the speaker and interlocutor are fluent - that they remain beneath the notice of speakers to the extent that no pressure exists in favour of the establishment of a single "normalised" plural form.

At the other end of the frequency spectrum, unlisted nonce lone English-origin nouns in the corpus were found to occur with both oikomorphological plurals (examples include *pies* /paɪ/, *cesspits* /sɛspɪt/, *boats* /bəʊt/) and xenomorphological plurals (examples include *earphones* /iəfəʊnz/, *meetings* /mi:tɪŋz/, *peatbags* /pi:tbægz/). Interestingly, the lone English-origin plural form *chips* (n), a noun which speakers would presumably be more used to hearing (in English) in its plural rather than singular form, occurred with an oikomorphological plural (/dɛ: tʃɪp/) (see (11) above). This is further evidence that, despite the advanced degree of language shift, the morphological patterns of Guernésiais remain strong for its speakers.

In her study of Acadian French, Turpin suggests that, following Poplack, it may be possible to determine the status of lone English-origin nouns in otherwise French discourse by examining whether they are integrated both syntactically and morphologically into the recipient language (1998:221, 223). In other words, do they conform (i) to the grammar of French but not to that of English (in which case they are considered to be borrowings) or (ii) to the grammar of English but not to that of French (in which case they are considered to be intra-sentential codeswitches). In relation to plurality specifically, Turpin sees codeswitching as entailing both the presence of the English plural morpheme /s/, /z/ and the absence of the

Do not quote from this version.

French determiner as, for example, in the utterance *Il y avait une des filles qui avait* ***spike heels*** (Turpin, 1998:229, after Béniak, Mougeon and Valois, 1985), where the lone English-origin noun is conforming to the grammar of English but not to that of French. In contrast, a lone English-origin noun is considered a borrowing if both a French article and a zero plural mark are present (Turpin, 1998:228) as, for example, in the utterance *Des* ***hatch-back Ø*** *de rouvert, c'était après de boire* (1998:229). The use of the French plural article in combination with the English affix /s/, /z/ is seen as indicating an intermediate degree of morphological integration.

As discussed, the Guernésiais corpus revealed a greater tendency overall to opt for oikomorphological plural marking. However, drilling down, the relative proportions of plural marking strategies were found to vary from one speaker to another (cf. Turpin, 1998:231). Although most speakers tended to favour the oikomorphological strategy (29 used this strategy for more than 60% of their English-origin noun plurals), some clearly did not (8 used the xenomorphological strategy for more than 60% of their English-origin noun plurals), and others showed no clear preference for either strategy (9 used both these strategies for fewer than 60% of their English-origin noun plurals). Indeed, 7 speakers used variable pluralisation strategies for the same word (cf. (32) – (37) above).[16] According to Turpin, such variation in strategy may suggest that, for some of these speakers, several of the /s/or /z/-marked lone English origin nouns may be codeswitches at the equivalence site between the determiner and the noun.

Of all the plural lone English-origin nouns in the corpus, only 4 examples were found to fit Turpin's definition of an intra-sentential codeswitch unambiguously, namely where, in

[16] It did not prove possible to establish any clear correlation between a speaker's preferred pluralisation strategy and their social characteristics.

Do not quote from this version.

otherwise Guernésiais discourse, they occurred with both the absence of a determiner and xenomorphological plural marking (41) – (44):

(41) *At least y en a **bykes** /*baɪks*/* 'At least there are bikes.' (w, L).

(42) *I'craissaient **spider plants** /*spaɪdə plɑnts*/* 'They grew spider plants' (n).

(43) *Ch'tait rioqué **holiday homes** /*hɒlideɪ həʊmz*/* 'It was nothing but holiday homes' (n).

(44) *Ch'est **privettes** /*prɪvɪts*/* 'They are privets' (i, L).

3.3.2. Verbs

After nouns, verbs are usually placed highest in most borrowability scales (cf. §3.1.). The Guernésiais corpus contained 79 borrowed verbs (10 widespread, 18 occasional, 1 idiosyncratic, 1 recurrent, 46 nonce), some filling referential gaps ((45) - (49)) and others occurring as synonyms of native words ((50) - (54), where the native words are given in parentheses):

(45) *Les jonnes filles saont terjous à **dietaïr*** /daɪətɑj/ 'Young girls are always dieting' (n).

(46) *J'n'peux pas **crochetaïr** /*krəʊʃeɪɑj*/* 'I can't crochet' (n).[17]

(47) *J'vais **choppaïr** /*ʃowpɑj*/ dauve mon carre* 'I go shopping in my car' (w, L).

[17] The indigenous verb would be *croch'taïr /*krɔʃtɑj*/* (cf. DAG, p.39).

Do not quote from this version.

(48) *A'**lectureaït*** /lɛktʃərɛ/ *dans l'University* 'She was lecturing at the University' (o, L).

(49) *I'**machine gunnait*** /məʃi:n gønɛ/ *les haommes* 'He machine gunned the men' (o).

(50) *Il'éprouvent à la **reviveaïr*** /rɪvaɪvɑj/ 'They are trying to revive it' [i.e. the language] (n) (*ravigottaïr*).

(51) *I'**startirent*** /stɑ:rti:r/ *l'affaire en 1936* 'They began the matter in 1936' (w, L) (*c'menchier*).

(52) *J'ôime aen p'tit **knittaïr*** /nɪtɑj/ *dans l'arleuvaïe* 'I like to knit a bit in the afternoon' (o) (*ouvraïr*).

(53) *Tu peux **hireaïr*** /haɪərɑj/ *aen baté* 'You can hire a boat' (n) (*louaïr*).

(54) *I'**travellait*** /trævlɛ/ *dans la bosse tous les jours* 'He travelled in the bus every day' (o) (*viagier*).

3.3.2.1. Morphological assimilation

Lone English-origin verbs must acquire Guernésiais inflectional morphology in order to be conjugated. As Bouchard found in her 2023 study of English-origin verbs in Québec French (cf. also Poplack, 2016, 2018), most are structurally assimilated into the most regular verb conjugation (which, in Guernésiais, bears the infinitival ending *-aïr*). Examples from the corpus include *chewaïr* /tʃɪuɑj/ 'to chew' (n), *draïvaïr* /draɪvɑj/ 'to drive' (o, L), *r'tireaïr* /rɪtaɪərɑj/ 'to retire' (o, L), *choppaïr* /ʃɒpɑj/ 'to shop' (w, L), *dietaïr* /daɪətɑj/ 'to diet'

Do not quote from this version.

(n), *settlaïr* /setlɑj/ ‘to settle’ (o, L), *treitaïr* /tri:tɑj/ ‘to treat’ (o, L), *meetaïr* /mi:tɑj/ ‘to meet’ (n), *knittaïr* /nɪtɑj/ ‘to knit’ (o), *rentaïr* /rentɑj/ ‘to rent’ (n), *slidaïr* /slaɪdɑj/ ‘to slide’ (o). However, verbs whose stem, sometimes via phonological assimilation, ends in a palatal are usually incorporated within the Guernésiais *-er* conjugation: examples from the corpus include *souitchier* /swɪtʃje/ ‘to switch’ (o, L), *tchôtcher* /tʃotʃe/ ‘to choke’ (o, L), *djotcher* /dʒotʃe/ ‘to joke’ (o, L), *coutcher* /kutʃe/ ‘to cook’ (n, L), *crusher* /krɔʃe/ ‘to crush’ (n). Lone English-origin verbs were formally indistinguishable from each other in terms of their inflectional morphology regardless of their frequency in the corpus (cf. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988:68) and, as (55) - (62) illustrate, they are conjugated in an identical way to native verbs (cf. Poplack, 2018:125 and Bouchard, 2023:4 who found that nonce borrowings could be integrated into Québec French even if uttered just once and by a single speaker). This supports Dauzat’s claim (1927) that morphological elements often withstand pressure from contact.

Do not quote from this version.

(55) *Sais pas coume tchi qu’vous* ***pronounceaïz*** /prənaʊnsɑj/ *chéna* (2pl. present) ‘I don’t know how you prononce that’ (n).

(56) *Ch’tait en* ***djotchànt*** /dʒotʃẽ/ (present participle) ‘It was said in a jokey way’ (o, L).

(57) *Nou’****shiftera*** /ʃɪftra/ *pas* (3sg. future) ‘We won’t shift’ (n).

(58) *All’a* ***meetaï*** /mitɑj/ *aen haomme* (3sg. present perfect) ‘She has met a man’ (n) (reproduced from (12) above).

(59) *Nou'les* ***peelait*** /piːlɛ/ *et les mettait dans les carres* (1pl. imperfect) 'We peeled them and put them in the cars' (n).

(60) *Quand* ***startis*** /starti/ *l'école* (1sg. past definite) 'When I started' (w, L).

(61) *I'****pressit*** /presi/ *lé wrong boutaon* (3sg. past definite) 'He pressed the wrong button' (n).

(62) *I'* ***dranirent*** /drɑniːr/ *les courtis* (3pl. past definite) 'They drained the fields' (n, L).

Sometimes, the Guernésiais morphological ending was found to attach to an unmodified English root: *lectureaïr* /lɛktʃərɑj/ 'to lecture' (n, L), *cheataïr* /tʃɾːtɑj/ 'to cheat' (i, L), *travellaïr* /trævəlɑj/ 'to travel' (o), *peelaïr* /piːlɑj/ 'to peel' (n) or, particularly with more established, listed lone English-origin verbs, sometimes the stem was also modified: *tchôtcher* /tʃotʃe/ 'to choke' (o, L), *stonnaïr* /stɔnɑj/ 'to (with)stand' (n, L), *patcher* /pɑtʃe/ 'to pack' (o, L), *allouaïr* /aluɑj/ 'to allow' (w, L).

3.3.2.2. Phonological assimilation

Listed lone English-origin verbs often showed less phonological integration of the stem than the forms recorded in the DAG. For example, although listed as *tchêtaïr* (suggesting the pronunciation /tʃɛtɑj/) 'to cheat', the form produced during the interviews showed less evidence of assimilation (63). Similarly, *évacuaïr* (/evakwɑj/) 'to evacuate', *lecteuraïr*

Do not quote from this version.

(/lɛktøraj/) ‘to lecture’, *pâtchi* (/pɑ:tʃi/) ‘to park’, and *bllâmaïr* (/bjɑmaj/) ‘to blame’ (64) – (67):

(63) *Nou’n’ les* ***cheaterait*** /tʃɪ:tərɛ/*pas* ‘We wouldn’t cheat them’ (i, L).

(64) *Y en avait aen amas qui* ***évacuaitit*** /ɪvækueɪti/ ‘There were many who evacuated’ (w, L).

(65) *Il s’en va* ***lectureaïr*** /lɛktʃəraj/ *à l’University dé Southampton* ‘He’s going to lecture at Southampton University’ (n, L).

(66) *Il avait* ***parkaï*** /pɒ:kaj/ *l’môto* ‘He had parked the car’ (o, L).

(67) *Ch’n’est pas les écoles qui saont* ***blameaïes*** /bleɪmaj/ ‘It’s not the schools which are blamed’ (o, L).

Poplack and Sankoff (1984) describe such variable integration of lone other-language lexical items as occuring when those lexical items are newly incorporated in the recipient language. Mougeon and Béniak, on the other hand, report that Haugen (1953) “found that bilinguals could “touch up” the form of older nativised loanwords to bring them more in line with donor-language phonology” or even “reborrow” them, and they provide compelling evidence of the phonological “denativisation” of loanwords as a minority language community undergoes language shift over successive generations (1989:304-306). The fact that, in the Guernésiais corpus, vacillation was found in both listed and less established forms seems to corroborate Mougeon and Béniak’s view that “the answer is not as simple as … only incipient loanwords are able to show variable phonological integration” (1989:307). As all speakers are fluent in both languages, the degree of phonological integration is presumably a matter of choice. If

Do not quote from this version.

listed lone English-origin lexical items can be considered as forms which have been accepted by the speech community to the extent that they have to all intents and purposes "become part" of Guernésiais, then their use with non-assimilated stem-forms suggests that, speakers may be sourcing lexical items such as (63) – (67) "afresh" from their English mental lexicon, presumably in a similar way to nonce lexical items. In such a fully bilingual community, differently integrated forms are, of course, all readily understood.

Do not quote from this version.

3.3.2.3. Bare forms

Bare forms (lone English-origin verbs with no overt Guernésiais inflectional morphology and therefore structurally unintegrated into the language) were also present in the corpus, although these were extremely rare (6/221 verb tokens): examples include (68) – (69). Such forms are also attested in the French of Québec (Bouchard, 2023) and Louisiana (Picone, 1994, 1997; Dubois and Sankoff, 1997; Rottet, 2016, 2019; Root, 2018).

(68) *Nou pouvait* ***wangle*** /wæŋgl/ *l'affaithe* 'We could wangle the thing' (n).

(69) *J'l'ai* ***record*** /rikɔ:d/ 'I recorded it' (r, L).

In some cases, it was not possible to tell whether or not the Guernésiais verb had been integrated morphologically since any inflectional morphology would be phonetically null (cf. Poplack, 2016:391). See, for example, (70) – (73) (where the phonetically null morphology has been added orthographically).

(70) *Nou* ***breed(e)*** /bri:d/ *coum des lapins* ***breed(ent)*** /bri:d/ 'We breed like rabbits breed' (n).

(71) *Ch'est les bànques qui* ***control(ent)*** /kəntrəʊl/ *tout* 'It's the banks that control everything' (o, L).

(72) *Saïs pas coum-tchi qu'tu* ***spell(es)*** /spɛl/ *chéna* 'I don't know how you spell that' (n).

(73) *Pourtchi qué tu n'****stay(es)*** /steɪ/ *pas chu weekend*? 'Why don't you stay this weekend?' (n) (reproduced from (20) above).

3.3.3. Adjectives

53 lone English-origin adjective types were present in the corpus (4 widespread, 9 occasional, 1 idiosyncratic, 1 recurrent, 38 nonce). Some were adapted phonologically (74) – (76) though many were not (77) – (80). Even though the adjectives of Guernésiais are marked for (masculine/feminine) agreement, gender was not detectable on any of these forms ((74) – (85) and specifically (81) – (85)) (cf. Poplack, Sankoff and Miller, 1988:68). The fact that many attributive adjectives are pre-posed may also be attributable to English influence (cf. Jones, 2015:132-134).

(74) *J'sis* ***clever*** /klɛvœr/ 'I am clever' (n).

(75) *La maïr 'tait* ***roffe*** /rɔf/ 'The sea was rough' (o, L).

(76) *Ton père 'tait aen* ***proper*** /prɔpœr/ *Guernésiais* 'Your father was a proper Guernseyman' (o).

(77) *I'creient qu'nou-s est backward* /bækwərd/ *ichin* 'They think that we are backward here' (n).

(78) *Si ch'est* ***wrong*** /rɒŋ/, ch'est ***wrong*** /rɒŋ/ 'If it's wrong, it's wrong' (o).

Do not quote from this version.

(79) *A'pâlait énne langue* ***foreign*** /fɒrɪn/ 'She was speaking a foreign language' (n).[18]

(80) *Ch'n'est pas* ***free*** /friː/ 'It's not free' (n).

(81) *Ch'est mes* ***show*** /ʃaʊ/ *flleurs* 'They are my show flowers' (o).

(82) *Ch'est des* ***show*** /ʃaʊ/ *batchaoux* 'They are show boats' (o).[19]

(83) *Ch'est aen* ***nice*** /naɪs/ *pair, enne* ***nice*** /naɪs/ *daume* 'They are a nice pair, a nice woman' (w, L).

(84) *Il'aont fait énne* ***spécial*** /speʃɑl/ *affaire pour naons* 'They put on a special thing for us' (o, L).

(85) *L'Eisteddfod, ch'est aen* ***spécial*** /speʃɑl/ *meis ichin* 'The Eisteddfod [Guernsey's main cultural festival] is a special month here' (o, L).

Apart from not showing gender agreement, lone English-origin adjectives were otherwise integrated morphosyntactically into Guernésiais in a similar way to native forms. (86) – (90), for example, demonstrate how they are modified by the same qualifiers (underlined).

(86) *Si-fait* <u>*aen p'tit*</u> ***roffe*** /rɔf/, *la hair* 'Yes indeed, the hair is a bit rough' (o, L).

[18] Although Jones (2015:133) documents a number of post-posed adjectives in the Insular Norman spoken in Jersey and Sark, the study does not record any for Guernésiais. *Foreign* therefore seems to be unusual in this regard.

[19] In these utterances, *show* is not, strictly speaking, performing the role of an adjective in English, where both *show flowers* and *show boats* would be considered as noun + noun compounds.

Do not quote from this version.

(87) *Ch'est <u>aen amas</u>* ***nice*** /naɪs/ *haomme* 'He's a very nice man' (w, L).

(88) *I'saont <u>bian pus</u>* ***strict*** /strɪkt/ *en Guernési* 'They are much stricter in Guernsey' (n).

(89) *Nou-s est <u>trop</u>* ***hygienic*** /haɪdʒi:nɪk/ 'We are too hygienic' (n).

(90) *Nou'n'est pas <u>si</u>* ***posh*** /pɒʃ/ *par ichin* 'We are not so posh around here' (n).

3.3.4. Adverbs

Unlike in Poplack's data (2018:55), the 13 lone English-origin adverbs present in the Guernésiais corpus (1 widespread, 1 recurrent, 11 nonce) were all unadapted morphologically.

(91) *J'les mettais* ***alphabetically*** /alfəbɛtɪkli/ 'I placed them alphabetically' (n).

(92) *Les gens d'visaient* ***seriously*** /sɪriəsli/ 'People were talking seriously' (n).

(93) *Tout hauchit* ***straightaway*** /streɪtəweɪ/ 'Everything went up straightaway' (n).

(94) *Nou-s a aen amas d'mots différents,* ***obviously*** /ɒviəsli/ 'We have many different words, obviously' (n).

(95) *La maïr 'tait* ***right*** /raɪt/ *au mur* 'The sea was right up to the wall' (w).

(96) *Nou-s est pusse* ***at home*** /æt həʊm/ *ichin* 'We are more at home here' (n).

3.3.5. Discourse marker

Do not quote from this version

The only example in the corpus of a lone English-origin discourse marker was the consecutive conjunction *so*, which was present in the speech of 14 interviewees (97) – (100). *So* is also borrowed in the variety of Insular Norman spoken in Jersey (Jèrriais) (Jones, 2015:147).

(97) *J'sis Guernésiais* ***so*** /səʊ/ *quànd j'marris j'voulais restaïr ichin* 'I am from Guernsey so when I got married I wanted to stay here' (w).

(98) *Les Germans voulaient qué dans l'école, ch'tait l'German* ***so*** /səʊ/ *l'affaire fut arrangiée* 'The Germans wanted it to be German at school so the thing was arranged' (w).

(99) *I'voulait allaïr dans l'finance* ***so*** /səʊ/ *il est accountant* 'He wanted to go into finance so he is an accountant' (w).

(100) *I'n'pouvait pas aver aen djob ichin* ***so*** /səʊ/ *i'retireit à chinquànte aens* 'He couldn't get a job here so he retired at fifty years of age' (w).

Mougeon and Béniak describe the use of *so* in Ontarian French as an example of core lexical borrowing occurring in a setting of intensive language contact. They suggest it "may serve to symbolise the advanced state of acculturation of bilingual speakers who experience high levels of contact with a superordinate language" (1991:212). Put another way, *so* is used by active bilinguals who speak both varieties equally in a context which they term "unpatterned bilingualism" (1987:40). Thomason and Kaufman (1988:74) consider such usage to be evidence that contact has intensified beyond the casual level (cf. Dawkins, 1916; Sitaridou, 2013).

Do not quote from this version.

3.4. Motivation and usage

Having examined the lone English-origin lexical items found in the different parts of Guernésiais speech, this discussion concludes by examining how differently motivated English-origin lexical items are used within the contemporary speech community. Of the 30 most frequently used lone English-origin lexical items, 18 (17 nouns, 1 verb) filled a referential gap and 12 (9 nouns, 1 verb, 2 adjectives) were used despite the existence of an indigenous word (Table 4). In other words, lone English-origin lexical items with both types of motivation are common in Guernésiais.

| Lone English-origin lexical item | Number of speakers who produced the lone English-origin lexical item | Number of tokens of lone English-origin lexical item in the corpus | Referential gap | Listed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Greenhouse* | 18 | 90 | No | Yes |
| *Piti* | 46 | 75 | No | Yes |
| *Span* | 19 | 62 | Yes | Yes |
| *Choppe* | 24 | 52 | Yes | Yes |
| *(Aero)pleine* | 22 | 51 | Yes | No |
| *Visiteur* | 16 | 45 | Yes | Yes |
| *Byke* | 20 | 44 | Yes | Yes |
| *German* | 9 | 29 | No | No |
| *Bosse* | 14 | 24 | Yes | Yes |
| *Nice* | 13 | 23 | No | Yes |
| *Carre* | 13 | 22 | Yes | Yes |

Do not quote from this version.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Touriste* | 16 | 21 | No | Yes |
| *Holiday* | 13 | 21 | Yes | No |
| *Chaoux* | 9 | 20 | Yes | Yes |
| *R'tireaïr* | 11 | 19 | Yes | Yes |
| *Groweur* | 13 | 17 | Yes | Yes |
| *Pictures* | 11 | 15 | Yes | Yes |
| *Guaine* | 8 | 14 | Yes | Yes |
| *Radio* | 6 | 13 | Yes | Yes |
| *Télévisiaon* | 10 | 12 | Yes | Yes |
| *Traffic* | 11 | 12 | Yes | Yes |
| *Tracteur* | 9 | 11 | No | No |
| *Evacuataïr* | 9 | 11 | No | Yes (but only as *évacuaïr*) |
| *Lorry* | 5 | 11 | Yes | Yes |
| *Belt* | 9 | 10 | No | Yes |
| *Lunch* | 9 | 10 | No | Yes |
| *Cottage* | 5 | 9 | No | No |
| *Airport* | 6 | 9 | Yes | No |
| *Baiqueur* 'biker' | 6 | 8 | No | Yes |
| *Aisi* 'easy' | 8 | 8 | No | Yes |

Table 4. Motivation of the 30 most frequent lone English-origin lexical items in the Guernésiais corpus

Do not quote from this version.

Even when looking at the corpus more broadly, a particular type of motivation did not seem to correlate at all with the production of widespread lone English-origin lexical items, which occurred in 7% of "referential gap" contexts (19/288 types), compared to 9% of "prestige" contexts (34/364 types). The percentages of nonce lone English-origin lexical items with both motivations also proved similar (188/288 "referential gap" types (65%) and 250/364 "prestige" types (69%)). A lone English-origin lexical item's degree of linguistic integration seemed equally unaffected by motivation, with one or more token of 121 of the 288 "referential gap" types in the corpus (42%) undergoing phonological and/or morphosyntactic assimilation compared to 160 of the 364 "prestige" types (44%).

As discussed in §3.1., 154 of the 652 lexical types (24%) were listed in the DAG. Of these, 64 (42%) filled a referential gap. Unlike motivation, listedness did seem to show some correlation with integration, with 115 of the 154 listed types (75%) showing phonological assimilation in at least one of their tokens compared to only 74 of the 498 unlisted types (15%). Interestingly, the 13 speakers making least use of lone English-origin lexical items (defined as producing fewer than 20 such lexical items during the first 20 minutes of the interview) tended to confine their usage to listed forms and usually assimilated them to the phonology and morphosyntax of Guernésiais (in other words, they treated them like "native" words). The 4 speakers who used most lone English-origin lexical items (defined as producing more than 60 such lexical items during the first 20 minutes of the interview) all used large numbers of nonce lexical items, seeming to consider any word of English as having the potential to be used in

Do not quote from this version.

Guernésiais.[20] These speakers also displayed more of a tendency to treat lone English-origin lexical items phonologically as words of English.

## 4. Conclusion

Lone English-origin lexical items are present in Guernésiais for all the parts of speech analysed, with an overall "hierarchy" similar to that observed in other situations of language contact, namely that "content-heavy" lone English-origin lexical items (nouns and verbs) were more common than lone English-origin adjectives, adverbs and discourse markers. The fact that both phonologically assimilated and non-assimilated forms of the same lone English-origin lexical item are present in the corpus is probably because all speakers of Guernésiais are active bilinguals who speak both languages on a frequent basis. Speakers do not therefore have to rely on recalling the more established form of lone English-origin lexical items in order to be understood by their interlocutor and can, instead "source" items spontaneously from their English mental lexicon. Nouns are assigned gender and plural morphology - although here again some variability is present, even with frequent lexical items - and most verbs acquire Guernésiais morphological endings. In contrast, English-origin adjectives, adverbs and the discourse marker *so* usually keep their "English shape". The presence of these lexical items is commonly motivated by a referential gap but they also often occur as synonyms of Guernésiais words. Insofar as the items in the corpus are concerned, motivation has no apparent bearing on a lone English-origin lexical item's likelihood of being listed in the DAG, suggesting that

Do not quote from this version.

[20] As in the discussion of pluralisation strategies above (§3.3.1.2.), it did not prove possible to to establish any clear correlation between a the frequency with which a speaker used lone English-origin lexical items and their social characteristics.

inclusion is based on an lexical item's perceived sociolinguistic acceptance within the speech community rather than on being the only term available to denote a particular referent.

Word count: 8963 words, not including references.

References

Anonymous (1847) [1970]. Economy or a Peep at out neighbours. In: J. Stevens Cox (ed), *Guernsey in Queen Victoria's Reign*. Guernsey: Toucan Press.

Béniak, É., Mougeon, R. and Valois, D. (1985). *Contact des langues et changement linguistique: Étude sociolinguistique du français parlé à Welland (Ontario)*. Québec: Centre International de Recherche sur le Bilinguisme.

Bouchard, M.-E. (2023). J'va share mon étude sur les anglicismes avec vous autres!: A sociolinguistic approach to the use of morphologically unintegrated English-origin verbs in Quebec French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 33.2: 168-196.

Bowern, C. (2010). Fieldwork in contact situations. In: R. Hickey (ed.) *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 340-358.

Castillo Fadic, M.N. (2002). El préstamo léxico y su adaptación: un problema lingüístico y cultural. *Onomazein*, 7: 469-496. (Cited in Roseano 2014).

Do not quote from this version.

Dauzat, A. (1927). *Les Patois. Evolution, classification, étude.* Paris: Delagrave.

Dawkins, R. M. (1916). *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadoccia and Phársa with Grammars, Texts, Translations, and Glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Cited in Thomason and Kaufman 1988).

De Garis, M. (1982). *Dictiounnaire Angllais-Guernésiais* (revised and enlarged third edition). Chichester: Phillimore.

Deuchar, M. (2020). Code-switching in linguistics: a position paper. *Languages*, 5.2. URL: https://doi.org/10.3390/languages5020022, retrieved 13 July 2023.

Dorian, N.C. (1981). *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dubois, S. and Sankoff, D. (1997). L'absence de flexion sur les emprunts de l'anglais dans le français cadjin. In: J. Auger and Y. Rose (eds), *Explorations du lexique*. Quebec: CIRAL, pp.163–176.

Flikeid, K. (1989). Moitié anglais, moitié français? *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée*, 8: 177–228.

Gardani, F. (2012). Plural across inflection and derivation, fusion and agglutination. In: L. Johanson and M. I. Robbeets (eds), *Copies versus Cognates in Bound Morphology*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 71-97.

Do not quote from this version.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2010). Contact and code-switching. In: R. Hickey (ed), *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 188–207

Hasselmo, N. (1969). On diversity in American Swedish. *Svenska Landsmal och Svenskt Folkliv*, 1969: 53-72.

Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26: 210-232.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behaviour*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hock, H. H. (1991). *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (second edition, revised and updated). Berlin, Amsterdam and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Johanson, L. (1992). *Strukturelle Faktoren in Türkischen Sprachkontakten*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Jones, M. C. (2001). *Jersey Norman French: A Linguistic Study of an Obsolescent Dialect*. Oxford: Blackwell (Publications of the Philological Society, 34).

Jones, M. C. (2008). *The Guernsey Norman French Translations of Thomas Martin: A Linguistic Study of an Unpublished Archive*. Louvain: Peeters.

Do not quote from this version.

Jones, M. C. (2015). *Variation and Change in Mainland and Insular Norman: A Study of Superstrate Influence*. Leiden: Brill.

Jones, M. C. and Singh, I. (2005). *Exploring Language Change*. London: Routledge.

King, K. (2000). *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lane-Clark, L. 1880 [1978]. *Guernsey French*. Guernsey: Toucan Press.

Le Maistre, F. (1966). *Dictionnaire Jersiais-Français*. Jersey: Don Balleine.

Mackey, W. F. (1970). Interference, integration and the synchronic fallacy. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 23: 195-227.

Matras, Y. (2007). The borrowability of structural categories. In: Y. Matras and J. Sakel (eds), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 31-74.

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Y. (2012). An activity-oriented approach to contact-induced language change. In: C. Chamoreau and I. Léglise (eds), *Dynamics of Contact-induced Language Change*. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 7- 52.

Do not quote from this version.

Matras, Y. (2014). Why is the borrowing of inflectional morphology dispreferred? In: F. Gardani, P. Arkadiev and N. Amiridze (eds), *Borrowed Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 47-80.

Matras, Y. and Sakel, J. (2007). Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language*, 31.4: 829-865.

McMahon, A.M.S. (1994). *Understanding Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and Analysing Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Milroy, L. and Gordon, M. (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation* Oxford: Blackwell.

Mougeon, R. and Béniak, É. (1987). The extralinguistic correlates of core lexical borrowing. In: K. M. Denning, S. Inkelas, F. C. McNair-Knox and J. R. Rickford (eds), *Variation in Language: NWAVR-XV at Stanford*. Stanford: Dept. of Linguistics, pp. 337-347.

Mougeon, R. and Béniak, É. (1989). Language contraction and linguistic change: the case of Welland French. In: N.C. Dorian (ed), *Investigating Obsolescence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 287-312.

Do not quote from this version.

Mougeon, R. and Béniak, É. (1991). *Linguistic Consequences of Language Contact and Restriction. The Case of French in Ontario, Canada.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Muysken P. (1981). Halfway between Quechua and Spanish: the case for relexification. In: A. Highfield and A. Valdman (eds), *Historicity and Variation in Creole Studies*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma, pp. 52–78.

Muysken, P. (1984). The state of the art in interlinguistics. *Revue québecoise de linguistique*, 14.1: 49–77.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling Languages.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Péronnet, L. (1989). Analyse des emprunts dans un corpus acadien. *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée*, 8: 229–251.

Picone, M. D. (1994). Code-intermediate phenomena in Louisiana French. *Chicago Linguistics Society*, 30: 320–334

Picone, M. D. (1997). Code-switching and loss of inflection in Louisiana French. In: T. Nunnally, R. Sabino and C. Bernstein (eds), *Language Variety in the South Revisited*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, pp. 152–162.

Do not quote from this version.

Poplack, S. (2018). *Borrowing, Loanwords in the Speech Community and in the Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Poplack, S. (2016). L'anglicisme chez nous: une perspective sociolinguistique. Recueil des actes du Colloque du réseau des Organismes francophones de politique et d'aménagement linguistiques (OPALE). *Les anglicismes : des emprunts à intérêt variable? (Québec, 18 et 19 octobre 2016)*. Montréal: Publications de l'Office québécois de la langue française, pp. 375–403.

Poplack, S. and Meechan, M. (1995). Patterns of language mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse. In: L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 199–232.

Poplack, S. and Meechan, M. (1998). How languages fit together in code-mixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2.2: 127–138.

Poplack, S. and Sankoff, D. (1984). Borrowing: the synchrony of integration. *Linguistics*, 22: 99–135.

Poplack, S. Sankoff, D. and Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics*, 26: 47-104.

Root, J. (2018). Des fois ça dit des mots en anglais et en français mêlés: on the variable morphosyntactic integration of English-origin lexical verbs in Louisiana French. Indiana University dissertation.

Do not quote from this version.

Roseano, P. (2014). Can morphological borrowing be an effect of codeswitching? Evidence from the inflectional morphology of borrowed nouns in Friulian. *Probus*, 26.1: 1-57.

Rottet, K. (2016). Les verbes à particule d'origine anglaise en français louisianais. In: R. Calvo, L. Minverini and A. Thibault (eds), *Actes du XXVII^e Congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes (Nancy, 15–20 juillet 2013).* Nancy: ATILF, pp. 207–215.

Rottet, K. (2019). L'anglicisme lexical dans la lexicographie du français louisianais. In: E. Szlezák and K. S. Szlezák (eds), *Sprach-und Kultur-kontaktphänomene in der Romania – Phénomènes de contact linguistique et culturel dans la Romania: Festschrift für Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh zum 65*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, pp.185–204.

Sakel, J. (2007). Types of loan: matter and pattern. In: Y. Matras and J. Sakel (eds), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 15-29.

Sitaridou, I. (2013). Greek-speaking enclaves in Pontus today: The documentation and revitalisation of Romeyka. In: M. C. Jones and S. Ogilvie (eds), *Keeping Languages Alive*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 209-237.

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, S. G. (2003). Contact as a source of language change. In: R. D. Janda and B. D. Joseph (eds), *A Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 687–712.

Do not quote from this version.

Thomason, S. G. and Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolisation, and Genetic Linguistics.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press.

Tomlinson, H. (2008). *A Descriptive Grammar of Guernsey French*. Guernsey: Melody Press.

Treffers-Daller, J. and Mougeon, R. (2005). The role of transfer in language variation and change: evidence from contact varieties of French. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 8.2: 93-98.

Turpin, D. (1998). 'Le français, c'est le *last frontier*': the status of English-origin nouns in Acadian French. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2.2: 221-233.

Van Coetsem, F. (2000). *A General and Unified Theory of the Transmission Process in Language Contact.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Weinreich, U. (1953) [1968]. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Winford, D. (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wise, H. (1997). *The Vocabulary of Modern French*. London: Routledge.

Zenner, E. and Kristiansen, G. (2014). Introduction: onomasiological, methodological and phraseological perspectives on lexical borrowing. In: E. Zenner and G. Kristiansen (eds), *New Perspectives on Lexical Borrowing*. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-5.

Do not quote from this version.