

overSEAS 2022

This thesis was submitted by its author to the School of English and American Studies, Eötvös Loránd University, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. It was found to be among the best theses submitted in 2022, therefore it was decorated with the School's Outstanding Thesis Award. As such it is published in the form it was submitted in **overSEAS 2022** (<http://seas.elte.hu/overseas/2022.html>)

ALAPSZAKOS SZAKDOLGOZAT

Gerber Dominika Zsófia
Anglisztika alapszak
Angol szakirány

2022

EÖTVÖS LORÁND TUDOMÁNYEGYETEM
Bölcsészettudományi Kar

ALAPSZAKOS SZAKDOLGOZAT

Francia eredetű dublettek az angolban
Doublets in English of French origin

Témavezető:
Dr. Starcevic Attila
Egyetemi adjunktus

Készítette:
Gerber Dominika Zsófia
Anglisztika alapszak
Angol szakirány

2022

A HKR 76. § (2) pontja értelmében:

„... A szakdolgozat a hallgató önálló munkája, melyben be kell tartani a jelen Szabályzat 74/A–74/C. §-okban foglalt rendelkezéseket. A szakdolgozat feltöltésekor a hallgatónak nyilatkozatot kell tennie, amelyben kijelenti, hogy ez az önálló szellemi alkotása megfelel a jelen Szabályzat 74/A–74/C. §-okban, valamint a (3) bekezdésben foglalt rendelkezéseknek...”

SZERZŐSÉGI NYILATKOZAT

Alulírott **Gerber Dominika Zsófia** (név) **B1HACI** (Neptun-kód) ezennel kijelentem és aláírásommal megerősítem, hogy az ELTE BTK **anglisztika** alapszakján **angol** szakirányon/specializáción írt jelen szakdolgozatom saját szellemi termékem, amelyet korábban más szakon még nem nyújtottam be szakdolgozatként, és amelybe mások munkáját (könyv, tanulmány, kézirat, internetes forrás, személyes közlés stb.) idézőjel és pontos hivatkozások nélkül nem építettem be.

Budapest, 2022.04.13.

Gerber Dominika s.k.
a szakdolgozat szerzőjének neve

A nyilatkozatot a szakdolgozathoz kell csatolni.

Abstract

This thesis aims to examine the influence of French on English through the phenomenon of doublets, a type of loanwords in English. In order to understand the historical relationship of the two languages, French contribution to the English phoneme inventory as well as to morphology is investigated, which can be used in the identification of loanwords. Then a definition and categorisation of doublets is presented, and selected English doublets of French origin are analysed, showcasing phonological changes in the two languages. Finally, the limitations of etymological dictionaries in research are discussed.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Contact between French and English.....	2
3. Nativisation of loanwords.....	3
4. Sound changes.....	5
4.1. Consonants.....	5
4.2. Vowels.....	8
5. Morphological changes.....	11
6. Definition of doublets.....	15
7. Analysis of selected doublets.....	17
7.1. Doublets from French and/or Latin.....	18
7.2. Doublets from various French dialects.....	19
7.3. Early and later French borrowings.....	20
7.4. Stress-related phenomena.....	21
8. The limitations of etymological dictionaries.....	22
9. Conclusion.....	23

1. Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the influence of French on English through the phenomenon of doublets in English. After an overview of the historical relationship of French and English, the possible ways of identifying French loanwords in English based on phonological and morphological clues will be presented. A part of the essay is dedicated to the analysis of various doublets in English of French origin which bear witness to sound changes in the two languages. Lastly, some challenges of the investigation will be discussed.

2. Contact between French and English

During its centuries-old history, English has been in contact with a number of languages which have had extensive impact on the English lexicon, as well as on morphology, phonology, and syntax. Among the numerous donor languages that English was influenced by, French is one that has contributed considerably to English vocabulary and morphology.

It is known that French was first introduced in England following the Norman Conquest in 1066, which marks the end of Old English (OE), and a beginning of a period of intense borrowing from French. One of the causes of English linguistic change can be found in a significant transformation of society, since the upper classes in England were replaced with a Norman aristocratic minority who spoke French. More specifically, the language spoken by this social class was Norman French, a dialect of Old French (OF).

After the Norman Conquest, late medieval England was characterised by a trilingual society. During this era, Latin was the language of the church, French was used by the government, while most of the population spoke English. The multilingual environment, which promoted code-switching, was key in the process of borrowing. Durkin (2014: 10) draws attention to the complexity of this process, since the relationship of borrowing and

code-switching is disputed. He defines code-switching as “when bilingual or multilingual speakers mix elements from more than one language within a single act of communication, whether within a sentence or in successive sentences”. Though these are two distinct processes, the way bilingual and multilingual speakers use the language can result in borrowings which will, with time, appear in monolingual speakers’ language use as well.

French had the most significant effect on English in the ME period. There was an influence of French orthography thanks to scribes. Concerning the vocabulary, the main source of borrowings in the 12th and 13th centuries was Anglo-Norman (AN) or OF. Later, in the 14th and 15th centuries, the role of French declined somewhat, which can be explained by historical events leading to the loosening contact with continental France, such as the loss of Normandy in 1204 or The Hundred Years’ War between 1337 and 1453. During this time, English as the national language re-emerged. Meanwhile, the significance of borrowing from Latin grew. During the Renaissance, in the 15th and the 16th centuries, (O)F and Latin were important donors of loanwords. French continued to be a source of borrowings later as well, and the process is ongoing.

3. Nativisation of loanwords

Loanwords go through a process of nativisation in the recipient language. This means that they assimilate to its spelling, pronunciation, orthographical and phonological system (Schultz 2012): in English, they become anglicised. During the assimilation process, the borrowed word loses its “foreign” quality, and as a result, becomes fully integrated into the English lexicon. There is a correlation between the amount of time elapsed since the adoption of a foreign word and its degree of nativisation (e.g., Katamba, 1994; Schultz, 2012). It is

understandable that the longer a borrowing is present in English, the more advanced its anglicisation.

The nativisation of borrowings can be so extensive that at one point the fully nativised word is not even considered a borrowing any more. From there on, the origin of the word remains either unknown or ambiguous to speakers who do not delve into etymological research. In some cases, words can be respelled based on analogy or false etymological assumptions. Since English has been in contact with French for several centuries, we find a vast collection of borrowings of French origin, and understandably, it is more difficult to spot older borrowings.

The process of nativisation is a gradual change, therefore in cases of recent borrowings which have not been fully integrated into English yet, the “foreignness” can be more easily perceived. Moreover, the use of distinctly foreign words can be deliberate. It might be motivated by cultural considerations, i.e., in the case of words of French origin, the prestige of French culture and the French language is associated with a desire to appear more refined.

All that said, the degree of assimilation of borrowings cannot be objectively measured, since this depends on the subjective judgment of individual speakers. The issue is closely related to the fundamental difference between code-switching and borrowing. Code-switching means the use of foreign words in English, while in the case of borrowing, the word is already a part of the English lexicon. Noticing whether a word is of native English or foreign origin poses a challenge: at what stage a word is considered a native English word or a borrowing is not obvious. Katamba (1994) states that there is no precise method for the distinction of foreign words and anglicised borrowings, however, there are a number of clues which help to detect and identify them.

Schultz (2012) draws attention to various clues which point to the orthographical and phonological assimilation of French loanwords, as well as their degree of integration. In the case of very recent borrowings, there can be obvious typological choices, such as the use of italics, quotation marks, and/or capitalization, which can emphasize the foreign nature of the word. Besides that, signalling terms such as *called* or *known as* can be used. The presence of diacritical marks is also a tell-tale sign of the French origin of loanwords, since the English spelling system does not have these. However, as Schultz (2012: 105) stated, “a detailed analysis of the orthographical and phonological reception of all French borrowings which are used in present-day English still constitutes a desideratum in linguistic research.”

Cruttenden (2014) states that by borrowing words from a foreign language, new sounds can be imported, which is made more complex by the fact that foreign spelling conventions can also have an effect on sound changes in the recipient language. This was the case as French introduced some new phonemes into ME and also had an influence on ME spelling. Cruttenden (2014) gives an overview of the phonemes of English including their historical origin and typical spelling forms. The next section deals with the phoneme inventory of English with special focus on its French input, and how this information can be used in identifying French loanwords in English.

4. Sound changes

4.1. Consonants

During the history of English, phoneme splits happened concerning the fricatives due to French influence. In OE, [f] and [v] were allophones of /f/. As for their distribution, the voiceless allophone occurred word-initially, word-finally, and when followed by a voiceless consonant; by contrast, the voiced allophone occurred in a voiced environment. At the same

time, in OF, [f] and [v] were separate phonemes. Since a number of French words beginning with [v] were borrowed, the two allophones now began to show contrast and /v/ as a separate phoneme emerged in ME. As a result, a new letter was needed to differentiate it from [f] in spelling: <v>. Consequently, the majority of ModE words beginning with [v] are of French or Latin origin. It should be noted though that there are a few exceptions, e.g., *vixen*, which came from certain non-Southern OE dialects.

A similar phoneme split happened with [s] and [z], which were originally allophones of /s/. A rather varied spelling characterises the fricatives /s/ and /z/. Both can derive from either OE or OF. The sources of /s/ are OE [s, ss] > ME [s] (*kiss, mice, soon, sun, wasp*) and OF [s] (*beast, false, lesson, pace, strange, sudden*). While /z/ originates in OE /s/ which was [z] between voiced sounds > ME [z] (*rise, thousand, wisdom, wise*), and OF [z] (*cause, dozen, easy, zeal*). As Freeborn (1998) explains, words where [s] is marked by the letter <c> are of French origin (*centre, city, evidence*), thanks to the influence of F on ME. In OF, <c> was pronounced [ts] before <i> and <e>. In the 13th c., this phoneme (among other sibilants) lost its stop element, resulting in [s].

The phoneme /ʃ/ is a result of palatalisation in OE as well as OF. On the one hand, the palatalisation of /sk/ to /ʃ/ happened in OE as in *bishop, English, fish, shadow*, and *ship*. Another source is OF [s] which was palatalised (*cash, cushion, finish, radish*). Furthermore, ME [s] + [j] in the 17th c. also gave rise to this sound, as in *ambition, ocean, patient, special, sugar, sure*. Finally, (OF [tʃ] >) MF [ʃ] also contributed (*charlatan, chemise, chic, machine, moustache*).

The adoption of the palatal fricative [ʒ] is a relatively recent development. As Minkova (2014) states, this consonant became part of the English consonant inventory quite late, and it is the rarest consonant. /ʒ/ arose from two sources. On the one hand, ME [z]

palatalised before [j] in the 17th c. (*measure, occasion, treasure, usual*). On the other hand, during the transition from OF to MF, [dʒ] changed to [ʒ] (*beige, bijou, prestige, rouge*), borrowed as such by ModE. /ʒ/ word-finally exists only in recent French borrowings (*beige, rouge, prestige, garage*), and the fully anglicised form of these words contains /dʒ/. In the ME period, many OF words were borrowed which began with /dʒ/. This sound turned into /ʒ/ in continental French in the 13th c., which is present in these words in ModF. So these words must have been early borrowings, before this change happened in French. There were other sources of /ʒ/ in English too.

The affricates /tʃ, dʒ/ originate in OE (*bridge, child, chin, church, edge, kitchen, teach*), and OF (*age, branch, chair, chamber, change, chief, choice, judge, major, merchant, village*). Besides this, ME [tj, dj] changed into [tʃ, dʒ] in the 18th c.: *creature, grandeur, nature, question, soldier, virtue*. Cruttenden (2014) notes that this change did not happen in some words or was reversed later, such as in the cases of *bestial, odious, piteous, and tedious*. Word-initial /dʒ/ however is a clue that the word is a French borrowing, e.g., *judge*.

/h/, whose pronunciation was inconsistent, derives from two main sources. For one, OE had /h/ (*help, high, home, horse*). OE also had word-initial consonant clusters beginning with /h/, which eventually dropped the /h/: /hn, hl, hr, hw/. The other source is OF. Interestingly, even though /h/ was lost in Latin and remained only in spelling, OF still had this phoneme from Germanic loans, where it was pronounced up until the 16th c. (Rickard, 1989). This led to the distinction between the French “h muet” and the “h aspiré” respectively. English has borrowed words with both types from French, though it does not distinguish between them, e.g., *habit, harass, herb, host, humour* (F inheritance from L) and *hardy, haste, herald* (F borrowing from Germanic).

/w/ derives from several sources. It was present in OE as [w] (*dwarf, twin, wash, way, widow, wolf*) as well as part of the [hw] cluster, which dropped [h] in the 18th c., thus *whale, wheel, when, where, which, whistle*. However, a quite a number of borrowings came from Anglo-Norman (*wage, war, ward, warrant*). The /w/ from Germanic developed into /gw/ in central French, later resulting in doublets such as *guard/ward, gage/wage, guarantee/warranty*. OF [k, g] followed by [w] and a vowel resulted in words like *squadron, squire, squirrel*.

Sources of /k, g/ include OE, OF, Old Norse and AN. There is a great variation in spelling of these sounds. It should be noted that early French borrowings from OF kept the /w/ from [kw] (*quit, squadron*). More recent borrowings do not contain /w/ (*bouquet*) because it was lost from ModF. Occasionally, <c> was inserted in Early ModE, which is a ‘learned’ (Latin-based) spelling (*perfect, subject*).

In some cases, [t, d] was inserted after voiceless fricatives and [n], mostly in French words (*astound, graft, parchment, peasant, sound*).

A number of other consonant sounds can be found in French borrowings which do not help in the identification of their origin.

4.2. Vowels

Cruttenden (2014) also provides a summary of the origins of the English vowel phonemes. In general, the vowel inventory of English went through a more complex range of changes (chain shift) compared to the consonants. Consequently, loanwords which had been borrowed before certain changes started also underwent the changes along with the native English vocabulary. The fact that later borrowings do not showcase the sound changes that were completed before their borrowing can aid one in establishing the relative chronology of

doublets. In this section, a summary of the development of the English vowels will be presented, with focus on French contribution, based on Cruttenden (2014).

A handful of changes happened during the transition from OE to ME. French had an effect on the spelling of ME vowels. [u:], which was represented <u> in OE, was now spelled with <ou> or <ow>, e.g., OE *hus*, ME *hous*. In return, <u> (or sometimes <o> for ease of legibility) was used to represent short [u]. Many OE diphthongs turned into ME monophthongs, and at the same time, new diphthongs were also created. In accented syllables, OE [ɑ:] changed to ME [ɔ:], e.g., *home* [hɑ:m] > [hɔ:m].

ME vowels went through significant changes in EModE. The Great Vowel Shift affected long vowels. [i:] (*time*) and [u:] (*mouth*) diphthongised, [e:] (*feet*) and [o:] (*moon*) became higher. [ɛ:] (*bead*) either remained, or turned into [e:] or [i:]. [a:] (*name*) turned into [ɛ:], then [e:] (still to be found in certain dialects), finally diphthongised: [eɪ]. [ɔ:] (*stone*) became higher [o:] (which also remained in certain dialects) then also diphthongised: [əʊ]. There were fewer changes in the short vowels.

The Great Vowel shift was complete by Late ModE, and further changes followed: coda /r/ disappeared, which resulted in the development of new diphthongs: [ɪə], [eə] (> [ɛ:]), [ɔə] (> [ɔ:]), [ʊə], along with [ɜ:]. In the following, a few phonemes which received French input will be presented.

/i:/ derives from various sources, most importantly OE vowels, however, it can be found in a handful of words of OF or AN origin, developed from [ie] and [e:] respectively, as in *siege*, *niece*, *grief*.

In some cases, the source of [a] was OF [a] or [au], e.g., *salmon* (< (O)F *saumon*), *savage* (< (O)F *sauvage*). Minkova (2014) notes that the source of OF [au] was the

vocalisation of [l] + consonant clusters, and in some Early ModE borrowing, the original Latin form was returned (*fault, vault*).

/ʌ/ can be found in various words of French origin, which had OF [u] (*colour, cousin, cover, dozen, touch*), [o] before nasals (*comfort, front, money, uncle*), or [y] (*judge, just, public, study*).

/a:/ derives from two OF phonemes: [ɛ] and the nasal [ã] which made their way into ME. ME [a] lengthened before [f, θ, s, ð, n]: *after, staff; bath, path; ask, cast, pass; rather, father; dance*. The OF nasal [ã] de-nasalised and turned into ME [au] > [v:] (*aunt, branch, chant, command*), or ME [a] + [t] (*balm, calf, half, palm*).

Sources of English /ɒ/ include OE [ɔ] and [o:], and OF [ɔ] (*jolly, lodge, offer*). Some recent French borrowings are pronounced with [ɒ], though (*restaurant, fiancé*). There are various English sources of /ɔ/, and two main OF sources: [ã] or [a] followed by [o, u] (*autumn, cause, haunt, lawn, sauce*), and OF [a] + [v] (*laundry*).

The sound /ʊ/ can be found in some French loans, from OF [u]: *bullion, butcher, courier, cushion, pullet, pulley, push, sugar*, while /u:/ originates in OF [o:] *proof, prove*; OF [iu, eu, y, ui] contributed to /ju:/ as in *adieu, lieu; due, view, accuse, deluge, duke; pew, nuisance, suit*.

Even though /ɜ:/ is of native English origin, we have to note that French borrowings ending in [œʁ] can be assimilated by changing into /ɜ:/ (*connoisseur, liqueur*). Lastly, /ə/ occurs very frequently, representing the reduced, unstressed form of any vowel or diphthong.

Let us now turn to diphthongs. A number of words containing /ei/ are of French origin, such as *cave, male, nature, state*, where /ei/ comes from OF [a:]. Another group is words like *chamber, change, safe, strange*, with /ei/ from OF [au]. Finally, words like *chain, pay* or *faith*

and *obey* used to have OF [ai, ei]. This diphthong can be found in recent borrowings as well (*ballet, bouquet, beige, crepe, fiance, soiree*). A source of /aɪ/, among others, is OF [i:]: *arrive, fine, licence, price*. /ɔɪ/ is the only vowel which does not have native English origin, it came into English exclusively from OF loans such as *choice, noise*. Another source is OF [ui], which became ME [ʊɪ] (*boil, coin, joint, point*). A source of /əʊ/ is OF /ɔ/ (*coat, gross, robe, rose, toast*). However, this diphthong has various other OE sources as well. Later French borrowings include *beau, bureau, hotel*. The origins of /əʊ/ include OF or AN [u:] (*allow, powder, couch, count, mountain*). /ɪə/, /ʊə/ are vowels which have only ME sources.

5. Morphological changes

It is important to keep in mind that not only did French often serve as a donor to English vocabulary, but it was a source of affixes as well. Therefore, recognizing some of these can be helpful in identifying French loans in English. However, the fact that English borrowed many affixes from French and Latin leads to some complications in studying etymology. The issue is that a word with a certain morphological form is not necessarily an actual loanword from French (native French, or ultimately going back to e.g., Latin): it might equally be a newly derived word formed within English using borrowed prefixes and/or suffixes, or a word which was created through the substitution of affixes.

It should also be noted that the pronunciation of certain word endings of French origin might not be obvious based on their spelling. As an example, let us analyse a pair of loans containing the French diminutive suffix *-et*: *bullet* **bʊlɪt** and *ballet* **bæleɪt**. Even though both are French borrowings, their spelling does not indicate that the final *-et* is pronounced differently in the two words. An English speaker (whether a language learner or a native speaker) who has not heard these words before might presume that *ballet* and *bullet* are

minimal pairs, differing only in their first vowel. Consequently, assuming that the pronunciation of *ballet* is **bælt**, similarly to *bullet* **bolit** could be perfectly reasonable based on the spelling. The reverse could be asked as well: why is not *bullet* pronounced ending in a diphthong, as **boler**? It is not possible to guess that the two words are pronounced differently without background knowledge about French diminutive suffixes and their assimilation into English.

As Upward and Davidson (2011) mention, French *-et* and *-ette*, masculine and feminine diminutive suffixes are the source of the English ending *-et*. Concerning their French pronunciation, word-final **t** following a vowel was lost before the OF period, and unstressed vowels were regularly lost word-finally, therefore *-et* and *-ette* resulted in **ɛ** and **ɛt** respectively. They occur in many French borrowings in English. Their assimilation into English did not happen the same way. For one, **ɛt** did not cause any problems. The reason for this is that any English short vowel can be followed by a consonant. **ɛ**, however, is more problematic, which can be traced back to a key difference between French and English phonology: English phonology does not allow checked vowels to occur word-finally. The closest English vowel sound which can occur word-finally is the diphthong **ɛɪ**.

Let us now analyse *bullet* and *ballet* in detail. The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology (ODEE) provides two meanings for *bullet*. The first one, ‘cannon-ball’ (as F *boulet*) is obsolete. The other one is ‘ball for small fire-arms’. This meaning was first attested in the 16th c. It is a borrowing, coming from F *boulette* **bulɛt**, a diminutive of F *boule* ‘ball’, developed from (O)F *bulle*, which itself had been borrowed (L *bulia*). (O)F *bulle* had been in fact borrowed earlier in English as *bull* ‘papal edict’ (13th c.) and ‘official seal’ (14th c.). This means that English *bullet* and *bull* are doublets. (Not to be confused with *bull* ‘male of the ox’ which is not a French borrowing; it can be traced back to Old Norse.)

The ODEE states that English *ballet* originates in the 17th c., it is a borrowing of F *ballet* **baɛ**. Final **ɛ** had to be assimilated into English, as has been mentioned earlier. Thus, the English pronunciation is **baɛlɛɪ** and not **baɛlɪt**. Interestingly, F *ballet* is not a native French word either. It is a borrowing from Italian *balletto* (diminutive of *ballo* ‘ball’). This illustrates the complex relationship of the Romance languages, many of which possess a cognate of this diminutive suffix.

Bullet and *ballet* are not the only examples where *-et* occurs in English. Other such French borrowings include *budget*, *crotchet*, *fillet*, *gibbet*, *gullet*, *hatchet*, *mallet*, *pocket*, *pullet*, *sonnet*, *tablet*, *turret*, some of which end in **ɛɪ** while others have **ɪt**. In many cases, English *-et* derives from F *-ette*, however, as the ODEE states, the difference between feminine and masculine French words was not indicated in ME. The reduction of the ending *-ette* to *-et* might be explained by the change in stress to an earlier syllable. In French words, which are stressed on their last syllable, stress shifts as they become anglicised.

Upward and Davidson (2011) observed that more recent loans, i.e. from the 18th c. tend to keep the French ending with a silent **t**.

The ending *-et* can also be added to native English words. According to the ODEE, this suffix started to become productive in English in the 16th c. Thus, new words developed that resemble French borrowings based on their ending, but were actually formed within English (using the F suffix): *smilet* ‘little smile’, or *kitchenette* from *kitchen* + *-ette*. In return, *kitchenette* was borrowed by French, its native synonym being *cuisinette*, which bears witness to the mutual influence of the two languages on each other.

As it has been mentioned before, some French borrowings were respelled or refashioned. An example of this is *dulcet* ‘sweet’, first attested in the 14th c. However, this

word had an earlier form *doucet*, also borrowed from (O)F. (O)F *doucet* was a diminutive form of *douce*. In English, *doucet* was respelled as *dulcet* after L *dulcis*, which shows the influence of Latin.

The suffix *-age* mentioned earlier represents (O)F *-age* which developed from L *-āticus*. A word containing this suffix can be a loan from French or it can be a native (or already borrowed) base formed with the suffix. Again, it is not easy to interpret whether English words containing a certain affix such as *-age* come from (Anglo-)French or Latin. As Durkin (2014) explains, they might have several inputs, and suffixation with *-age* continued to be significant in late ME as well, in the 16th and 17th centuries. In these later cases, however, it is likely that instead of borrowing, words were newly created with the suffix. The pronunciation is either **ɪdʒ** (*baggage*) or **ɑːʒ** (*camouflage*). In some words, such as *garage*, both variants are possible. More recent borrowings ending in this suffix are pronounced as **ɑːʒ** as Cruttenden (2014) noted, therefore we know that *camouflage* was borrowed later than *baggage*.

To give an example for prefixes as well, as the ODEE states, words containing the prefix *re-* were often borrowed in the 13th c., and later the prefix itself became productive in English as well. This resulted in the formation of new words beside old borrowings e.g., *re-cover* ‘cover again’ and *recover* ‘bring back, regain’. *Cover* was borrowed from OF *cuvrir*, first recorded in the 13th c., ultimately it goes back to L *cooperire*. *Recover* (14th c.), from OF *recovrer*, is a borrowing of L *recuperate*. Ultimately, the double forms *re-cover* and *recover* cannot be called doublets, since they do not originate in the same source. Word pairs like this are called fake doublets and thus fall outside the scope of this thesis. Nonetheless, the aforementioned examples illustrate the highly complex interaction of French/Latin and English.

6. Definition of doublets

Bloomer (1998) explains that there exists no universally accepted definition of the term doublet. In an attempt to summarize, compare, and reconcile existing definitions, he established a set of criteria. According to him, the description of doublets needs to refer to ten key properties:

- (i) where they occur,
- (ii) the number of their forms,
- (iii) the word classes they are from,
- (iv) their morphological structure,
- (v) their possible phonological differences,
- (vi) the recursiveness of the phonological difference,
- (vii) their possible semantic difference,
- (viii) their means of transmission,
- (ix) the way they are created, and
- (x) their source.

In the following, the descriptive apparatus for doublets set up by Bloomer will be summarized. He established three main categories: etymological, morphological, and lexical doublets. Concerning etymological doublets, two sub-categories can be distinguished: so-called pure etymological doublets and mixed etymological doublets. Etymological doublets are labelled “pure” if they can be traced back to an etymon with or without the same inflection, while in the case of “mixed” doublets, the words derive from the same etymon

bearing different inflections. Within morphological doublets, the sub-categories of inflectional, morphosyntactic, and derivational doublets can be found. Even though there are no sub-categories in lexical doublets, Bloomer emphasizes that further subtypes can be defined within all categories based on connotational and/or denotational differences in meaning.

It needs to be noted that not all doublet types occur among English doublets of French origin, however, a number of words can be found in Bloomer's findings. Examples of pure etymological doublets with a different denotation and different connotation are *beef* and *cow*; *cattle*, *chattel*, and *capital*; *frail* and *fragile*; *catch* and *chase*; as well as *peer* and *pry*. In the case of lexical doublets, which have the same denotations but different connotations, *calf* and *veal*; *kingly* and *royal* are cited.

For the purposes of this thesis, while bearing in mind the list of features by Bloomer, special focus will be on the last two aspects: the question of how doublets are created, as well as their origin. Therefore, I have chosen to base my work on the findings of Allen (1918: 184). According to him, doublets can be defined as "pairs of words in the English language, derived by different courses from the same base". Nevertheless, in such cases where more than two words can be ultimately traced back to the same original etymon through different paths, it would be more appropriate to refer to them as triplets or quadruplets. The diverse nature of doublets in English makes it possible for them to be grouped into several categories. Allen (1908) provides a list of doublets in English based on their origin. In the following section of the thesis, three main types will be analysed with examples.

Firstly, there are doublets in English which come from French and Latin. A member of this type of pairs had developed in French from Latin through regular sound changes or had

been borrowed from Latin, and then entered English from French. Whereas the other word of the doublet is a direct English borrowing from Latin.

Secondly, another source of doublets in English is French, more specifically different dialects of French, such as Anglo-Norman and continental French, both of which were dialects of OF. These can be differentiated according to phonological properties that characterise the various French dialects. Nonetheless, certain linguists do not support such a stark division of Norman French and continental French influence, due to the lack of uniformity in spelling (Miller, 2012).

Thirdly, due to the fact that English and French have been in prolonged contact, a number of words have been re-borrowed, borrowed several times from French during the course of the history of English. Doublets of this type showcase the various sound changes that English and French went through between the different occasions of borrowing.

It can be noted that the sources mentioned thus far were not the only ones contributing to the emergence of doublets: different dialects of Middle English (northern and southern), as well as cognates in Italian and French served as sources of doublets in English. However, the following section will focus on the analysis of doublets from the aforementioned three main French sources.

7. Analysis of selected doublets

As it has been discussed, loanwords go through a process of assimilation, including phonological assimilation. Not only do they assimilate into the phonological system of the recipient language, but they are affected by its active sound changes. Consequently, earlier borrowings bear witness to more changes than newer ones. The phenomenon is illustrated by the existence doublets. In return, based on some observable phonological features, it is

possible to determine which member of a set of doublets was borrowed earlier, or which dialect of the donor language they came from. The following section presents sets of doublets according to the categories mentioned in the previous chapter.

7.1. Doublets from French and/or Latin

Doublets which have a member of French and another from Latin origin ultimately go back to Latin. In these, one is a direct borrowing from Latin, and the other comes indirectly through French, which acquired the word from Latin through regular development. It has been mentioned that establishing whether a loanword is of Latin or French origin can be difficult, since the two languages are already in a complex relationship of borrowing and inheritance. Solodow (2010) lists various examples for this type of doublet, e.g., *feat* and *fact*.

Let us first see *mauve* and *mallow*. English *mallow* ‘wild plant, genus *Malva*’ was inherited from OE *mealuwe*, which had been an early borrowing from L *malva*. L *malva* then went on to become part of French through direct inheritance, showcasing some regular sound changes that happened during its development, for instance, the loss of [l], the reduction of final [a], resulting in *mauve*. When F *mauve* was borrowed by English in the 19th c., a doublet emerged. A semantic change, specialisation can be observed, as English *mauve* is defined in the ODEE as a ‘bright but delicate purple dye’, while F *mauve* denotes both the flower and the colour.

Frail/fragile have been mentioned earlier as they are an example of pure etymological doublets. For *frail*, the ODEE denotes two meanings. The meaning ‘rush basket for figs, raisins, etc.’ was first attested in the 13th c., and it is of unknown origin. The meaning ‘morally or physically weak’ is from the 13th c., and later ‘liable to break’ from the 14th c. The word form was *frele*, *freel* in ME, and it was a borrowing from OF *fraile*, *frele*. OF *fraile*

developed from L *fragilis*. The modern French word is *frêle*. The origin of the other pair of this doublet is not obvious. *Fragile* was first attested in the 17th c., it was used by Shakespeare. The ODEE does not give a definite answer whether *fragile* can be ultimately traced back to French or Latin. The origin of the word is either (O)F *fragile* or L *fragilis*.

7.2. Doublets from various French dialects

There were some differences between AN and central French which later became the standard variety. Borrowing from both dialects lead to the formation of doublets in English.

The English doublets *chattel* (from the central dialect of OF, first attested in the 13th c.) and *cattle* (from the AN dialect, 13th c.) illustrate the difference. OF *chatel*, along with its AN variant *catel* came from L *capitāle* to French through direct inheritance. The difference between the two variants is explained by a sound change which occurred in the more innovative continental variety of OF but not in the AN dialect. In central French, L [k] before [a] was palatalized: [tʃ], which can be seen in *chattel* **tʃætəl**. This change did not happen in AN, [k] remained, as *cattle* **kætəl**. We have to note that these constitute a set of triplets, if we include *capital*, as this was also borrowed from (O)F in the same century, and all three words can be traced back to the same L *capitāle*. A similar process can be observed in the case of *catch/chase*, ultimately representing L *captāre*.

Another example of such doublets from AN and central French is words with alternating [g] and [w], such as *wage/gage*. In central French, word-initial [w] changed into [gw] and later [g], while this change did not occur in AN. Hence, doublets such as *wage* (from AN, first recorded in the 15th c.) and *gage* (central F, 14th c.) can be found in English. Similar doublets include *warranty* and *guarantee*. According to the ODEE, the earliest use of

guarantee might have been an example of Spanish influence, but *guaranty* is probably a borrowing from AN. *Reward/regard* also share a similar history.

7.3. Early and later French borrowings

There are English doublets which emerged through the borrowing of French words on different occasions. An example of these is *chief* **tʃi:f** (first attested in the 13th c.) and *chef* **ʃef** (16th c.). The common French etymon of both is OF *chef*, which developed from vulgar L *capum* through Romance with regular sound changes: word-initial *ca-* [ka] in open syllables changed to *ch(i)e-*, intervocalic [p] turned into [b], then [v], which later went through devoicing word-finally.

The pronunciation differences between the two English words can be explained by further French and English sound changes. Concerning word-initial *ch*, [tʃ] in *chief* represents the OF affricate. The OF sound changed into [ʃ] during the 13th c., resulting in the fricative which can be found in ModF *chef* and the more recent borrowing English *chef*.

A significant change which happened between the borrowing of these two words was the English Great Vowel Shift. This affected long vowels, including [e:], therefore, in *chief*, we can note the quality change of [e:] to [i:].

Another example of doublets, or more precisely in this case, triplets is *gentle* (13th c.), *genteel* (16th c.), and *jaunty* (17th c.), all of which can be traced back to F *gentil* (< L *gentilis* through regular development). Note that *gentile* is not part of this set of triplets as it was a direct borrowing from Latin. Other doublets of French origin include *hospital/hostel/hotel*.

7.4. Stress-related phenomena

Intense borrowing from French also affected the English stress pattern system. Lass (1999) discusses the occurrence of stress doublets. As he explains, OE words were characterized by a Germanic stress pattern (Germanic Stress Rule, GSR). However, French has a different type of stress pattern, governed by the Romance Stress Rule (RSR). The adoption of French loanwords made a profound effect on the stress system of English: the GSR was overwritten by RSR. The complex interaction of the Germanic and Romance stress patterns resulted in stress doublets, i.e. loanwords which were incorporated into certain dialects of English with a different stress pattern. Stress doublets can be observed in American and British English. In American English, where the Germanic pattern stayed, Lass cited examples such as *cápillary*, *fritillary*, *íventory*, *cóntroversy*, *láboratory*, *miscellány*. Whereas in most British English dialects, these words are stressed according to the RSR (*capillary*, *fritillary*, etc.).

Another type mentioned by Lass is doublets which are the result of syncope. The loss of weak vowels in ME resulted in the development of such word pairs as *courtesy/courtsy*; *fantasy/fancy*, *lightening/lightning*, *perilous/parlous*. The pairs exemplify the phenomenon when the original and the new word were both kept after deletion, with a semantic difference. Since the members of these pairs can be derived from each other instead of coming through different channels, it might be argued whether they are in fact doublets or not.

The doublets *perilous/parlous* also exemplify a qualitative and quantitative sound change. According to the ODEE, *perilous* was borrowed from OF in the 13th c. *Parlous* ‘exposed to danger’ was first recorded in the 14th c., later ‘dangerously cunning’ (15th c.). We can tell that *perilous* shows no effects of syncope, as opposed to *parlous*, which shows a late ME phonological change affecting words containing [ɛr]{#, C}. Cruttenden (2014) explains that today these can be found with [ɑ:] (< [ɑr]) e.g., *parlous*, *clerk*, *sergeant*. In other

cases, where syncope could not occur, [ɛr] > [ɜ:] remained as e.g., *herd*, *servant*.

Concerning more recently borrowed (or re-borrowed) words, the mentioned sound rule does not work.

8. The limitations of etymological dictionaries

Etymological dictionaries provide comprehensive information about the history and origin of words, which was essential in studying the phenomenon of doublets in English as well.

However, there are limitations to using etymological dictionaries.

One of the issues is that the source language of a word cannot always be determined with absolute certainty. This is especially the case with donor languages such as French and Latin, which themselves are in a complex relationship. French, being a Neo-Latin language, gained a significant amount of its lexicon through direct development ('inheritance') from Latin. Nevertheless, borrowing from Latin to French was frequent as well. Due to these layers, differentiating between English words which have been directly borrowed from French and Latin loans in French proves difficult. The issue is reflected in the ODEE, as it is sometimes hesitant concerning whether a word is from Old French or Modern French, or Latin. Thus, words are labelled (O)F or L, based on all the available information.

Another problem is that however extensive the recordings, we cannot be sure exactly how and when a word entered the lexicon (Miller, 2012). Etymological dictionaries do not show the difference between popular borrowings learned borrowings. However, we can suspect that earlier loans entered the lexicon mostly by popular borrowing, and later, with the spread of literacy and the rise of dictionaries, the amount of learned borrowings grew.

Besides, the spoken use of a word might predate its first written attestation. The etymological dictionary is not a pronunciation dictionary, it presupposes familiarity with the sound changes

of the (donor, as well as the recipient) language. Even though sound changes are said to be universal, there are some exceptions, pronunciation issues can arise. Finally, orthography can also hide etymological origins, or lead to false assumptions, since during history, numerous changes in spelling were made based on analogy (e.g. *delight* from ME *delite*, from F *delite*), or etymological respellings which did not reflect the changes that actually happened in the spoken language.

For these reasons, even though general changes and rules exist, exceptions need to be taken into consideration, and it is important to analyse each word on its own.

9. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to investigate the historical relationship of French and English, focusing on a type of loanwords: doublets. It gave an overview of the influence of French which can be observed in English phonology, orthography, and the lexicon. It provided a categorization of doublets which appeared thanks to the repeated borrowing of French loanwords into English. Lastly, the analyses of certain doublets showcased a variety of sound changes that occurred in English and French, and illustrated that these can be used in the investigation of the origin and development of the doublets. While the analyses were carried out with the help of an etymological dictionary, the thesis drew attention to its limitations.

References

- Algeo, J., & Pyles, T. (2010). *The origins and development of the English language* (6th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Allen, E. A. (1908). English Doublets. *PMLA*, 23(2), 184–239. <https://doi.org/10.2307/456687>
- Baugh, A. C., Cable, T., & Baugh, A. C. (2010). *A history of the English language* (5th ed., reprinted). Routledge.
- Bloomer, R. K. (1998). Types of linguistic doublets. *Studia Neophilologica*, 70(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393279808588214>
- Boyd-Bowman, P. (1980). *From Latin to Romance in sound charts*. Georgetown University Press.
- Cruttenden, A., & Gimson, A. C. (2014). *Gimson's pronunciation of English* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Current British English pronunciation dictionary*. (n.d.). Retrieved 9 April 2022, from <http://cube.elte.hu/>
- Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed words: a history of loanwords in English*. Oxford University Press.
- Freeborn, D. (2005). *From Old English to standard English: a course book in language variations across time* (2nd ed.). Palgrave.
- Hogg, R. M., Blake, N. F., Lass, R., Romaine, S., Burchfield, R. W., & Algeo, J. (Eds.). (1992). *The Cambridge history of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hogg, R. M., & Denison, D. (Eds.). (2006). *A history of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.

- Katamba, F. (1994). *English words*. Routledge.
- Lass, R. (1994). *Old English: a historical linguistic companion*. Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, D. G. (2012). *External influences on English: from its beginnings to the Renaissance*. Oxford University Press.
- Minkova, D. (2014). *A historical phonology of English*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Onions, C. T., Friedrichsen, G. W. S., & Burchfield, R. W. (1992). *The Oxford dictionary of English etymology*. Oxford University Press.
- Pope, M. K. (1973). *From Latin to modern French with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman: phonology and morphology* (2nd., rev. ed; Repr). Manchester University Press.
- Rey, A., & Rey-Debove, J. (2007). *Le nouveau petit Robert: dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française* (new ed). Le Robert.
- Rickard, P. (1989). *A history of the French language* (2nd rev. ed). Unwin Hyman.
- Schultz, J. (2012). *Twentieth century borrowings from French to English: their reception and development*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Solodow, J. B. (2010). *Latin alive: the survival of Latin in English and the Romance languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Upward, C., & Davidson, G. W. (2011). *The history of English spelling*. Wiley-Blackwell.