



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

**Language, law and loanwords in early medieval Gaul:
language contact and studies in Gallo-Romance phonology**
Kerkhof, A.E.

Citation

Kerkhof, A. E. (2018, October 9). *Language, law and loanwords in early medieval Gaul: language contact and studies in Gallo-Romance phonology*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66116>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66116>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

4 Language Contact and Pippinid prestige

4.1 introduction

In the Early Middle Ages, just as in any other time period of human history, the primary functions of language were representation, communication, and the expression of identity (cf. Joseph 2004). Whereas the first function is mainly a linguistic and cognitive matter, the latter two clearly have implications for our interpretation of how historical people thought about themselves, their community, and the world around them.

When speakers of different languages are in contact, a whole range of possible interactions can follow, and depending on the intention of the speakers, their non-verbal communication skills, and their linguistic aptitude, a successful dialogue can or cannot be established. Historical languages partly preserve the outcomes of these past interactions in the form of loanwords and lexical and structural calques, evidence which might be used to reconstruct the dynamics between historical speech communities. It therefore comes as no surprise that many generations of historical linguists have turned to evidence for historical language contact, primarily loanwords, as additional information on (pre-)historic migration and intercultural interactions. We may think of scholars such as Gamillscheg (1970) for the study of Germanic loanwords in Romance, Kiparsky (1934) for Germanic loanwords in Slavic, and Kenneth Jackson (1953) for Romance loanwords in British Celtic.

For a long time, though, the theoretical grounding for linguistic discussions on language contact was rather limited and only few dared to define socio-linguistic mechanisms and principles of possible outcomes (cf. Haugen 1950; Weinreich 1953; Gamillscheg 1960; Milroy & Milroy 1985). Fortunately, in recent decades the scholarly interest in language contact has surged, and new theoretical frameworks that might explain and contextualize its dynamics have been laid out (e.g. Van Coetsem 1988; Johanson 1992; Thomason & Kaufmann 1995; Winford 2005). We can therefore point to several handbooks that set out the generally accepted concepts (Thomason 2001; Trudgill 2001), and many monographs have appeared in recent years that reap the benefits of these advances in historical sociolinguistics (see Kiparsky 2015). It is important to note that some of these publications have also explored the sociocultural implications of (pre-)historic language contact, and even sought support in neighboring disciplines like archaeology and archaeogenetics. Especially noteworthy in this regard are several monographs on early medieval language contact, e.g. Schrijver (2014) on prehistoric substrate influence on Germanic, Celtic and Romance phonology, Lindqvist (2015) on Celtic interference in Old Norn, and De Vaan (2017) on Frisian substrate influence on Old and Middle Dutch.

In this chapter, I will try to reconcile the linguistic data of Old French that suggest contact-induced interference from Germanic with the new theoretical frameworks of historical sociolinguistics. They will allow us to lay out possible historical scenarios that might account for the linguistic facts, which can then be confronted with the historical data from the early medieval sources. It will be argued that it is exactly this historical dimension that might yield new sociolinguistic insights into how Old French acquired its decidedly Germanic signature, both on a lexical and a structural level. This may serve to illustrate how the scholarly debate on the issue of Romance – Germanic language contact can contribute to the historical debate on the infiltration and acculturation of Germanic speakers in Early Medieval Gaul.

4.2 Language contact

When we state that languages are in contact, we can distinguish several levels on which this may be the case:

- Different linguistic codes may be in contact in the mind of a bilingual or multilingual individual.
- Speakers of different linguistic codes may be in contact personally, a contact which is conditioned by its specific social setting.

The second level can be extrapolated to include the language community as a whole, in which different linguistic codes may be used both within the linguistic community itself and in contact with other linguistic communities. All of these types of language contact might entail instances of contact-induced language change. These instances are traditionally divided into two categories:

- Lexical copies or the ‘transfer of lexemes’
- Schematic copies or the ‘transfer of linguistic structure’ including phonology, morphology and syntax

The first kind of contact-induced change is traditionally known as **borrowing**, and the second kind as **interference** (Weinreich 1953: 30), although valid objections might be raised to this terminology (cf. Johanson 1992; Pakendorf 2007). The language from which material is copied is traditionally called the donor or **source language** and the language receiving the copies is called the **recipient language**.

In the interaction of the different linguistic codes, scholars use the term L1 for the language that the speaker knows best (the dominant code), and L2 for the language that the speaker knows not as well as the L1 (the dominated code). It is important to note that the dominant code (L1) and the dominated code (L2) need not directly correspond to the

speaker's native language and his/her secondarily acquired language respectively.¹⁴² On the social level, we may distinguish a speaker's primary code (or **emblematic language**) from his secondary code. It is a well-known fact that bilingual individuals can and do often switch between their different codes and insert lexical items, phrases and collocations from one code into the base frame of the other code. This process is known as **code switching**, and may affect both high- and low-fluency bilinguals.

Thomason and Kaufmann (1991) describe the operation of contact-induced change on the level of the linguistic community, and make a distinction between **language maintenance** and **language shift**. In the first case, a language underwent contact-induced change but endured. In the second case, a language died out because the linguistic community switched to a different code, and it is this new code that shows the signs of contact-induced change. They note that, in the case of **language maintenance**, we might expect lexical copies to occur first and only later schematic copies (which are mainly transmitted through the lexical copies). In the case of **language shift**, they expect schematic copies to be the main trace of historical contact which are independent of the lexical copies that may be absent all together.

However, it was convincingly argued by Gumperz & Wilson (1971), Aikhenvald (1999), and Ross (1996) that linguistic communities are more often than not stably multilingual, and also in these cases we might be dealing with substantial transfer of linguistic structure. The question remains how these instances of language contact might be modelled, and more importantly, how we might envision the interaction between different linguistic codes not on the level of the community, but on the level of the individual.

Van Coetsem (1988), later followed by Winford (2005), therefore takes another perspective, and describes the operation of contact-induced change on the level of the bilingual individual. Important in their approach is the concept of agentivity of either code that the speaker knows, which is determined by the relative proficiency of the speaker in these codes. When the speaker transfers elements from his/her non-dominant language (the source language) into his/her dominant language (the recipient language), the transfer of linguistic material is called **borrowing**, and the recipient language is agentive and pulls the material from the source language. This transfer will primarily concern lexical material, but also linguistic structure might be liable for borrowing. When the speaker transfers elements from his/her dominant language (the source language) into his/her non-dominant recipient language, **imposition** has taken place, and the source language is agentive and pushes the material into the recipient language.

Van Coetsem's model also helps us understand another outcome of language contact, which Ross called metatypy (cf. Ross 1996: 182). Metatypy may lead to bilingual communities

¹⁴² Lucas (2015: 522-525), however notes that in most cases it seems appropriate to see the L1, the dominant code, as equivalent to the native code.

levelling their morphosyntactic structure across the two codes, leading to almost direct morpheme-to-morpheme translatability. Here, according to Ross, we might be dealing with the result of long-term bilingualism, in which morphological, semantic and syntactic features of a non-dominant L1 (often the emblematic identity-giving language) were transferred (or imposed) onto a dominant L2 (the more frequently used communication language).

It may seem clear that questions of language as an identity marker directly impinge on the subject of social prestige. Here the socio-linguistic concepts of **overt prestige** and **covert prestige** and **in-group** and **out-group** should be mentioned (Labov 1966; Trudgill 1972). Linguistic features associated with the speech of a socio-culturally dominating group in society (e.g. a warrior elite) may be accepted as prestigious on all levels of society and therefore carry 'overt prestige', both to the in-group and the out-group. In contrast, linguistic features of a socio-culturally dominated group in society (e.g. a slave population) may only carry prestige in the in-group and function as an important socio-cultural identity marker for this group. These features can be said to carry 'covert prestige' and are not accepted as prestigious by the society as a whole. It is interesting to note that linguistic features carrying covert prestige (e.g. features due to imperfect language acquisition by social new-comers) may become conventionalized and spread through the speech community as a whole (i.e. also to the mother tongue speakers), thereby acquiring overt prestige (see Lindqvist 2015: 78).

When a large speech community switches for prestige purposes to the language of a smaller but socially dominating group, we speak of **elite dominance** (Renfrew 1987); this model may be invoked to explain the spread of Hungarian among the Slavs in the Carpathian Basin, and Anglo-Saxon among the Britons in low-land Britain. Essential for the process of elite dominance to be successful, thereby causing the spread of an invasive language, is whether the elite maintain a social system that is open to recruitment among the bilinguals of the receiving society (Anthony 2007: 118-19). Conversely, a segregated and socially inward-looking elite is unlikely to be successful in spreading its language (see also Heggarty 2015: 618).

When we are dealing with the dynamics of contact-induced change, we may also ask how speech innovations of the bilingual individual become accepted in the linguistic community as a whole. These questions were addressed by Milroy and Milroy (1985), who proposed that linguistic innovators are likely to be marginal individuals maintaining a large social network with a lot of weak ties, thereby exposing themselves to more linguistic diversity than individuals maintaining a smaller social network of strong ties. As the amount of marginal innovators grows, a central 'prestigious' member of the group (the so-called 'early adopter') may adopt the innovations, make them fashionable and help them spread through the group. It stands to reason that a central member might only be tempted to adopt marginal innovations, if some gain could be had by adopting them, that is, they must have become numerous enough to be no longer associated with the marginal elements of society.

When we consider the social attitudes of a linguistic community to linguistic change, we may distinguish between exocentric speech communities that are relatively open to external linguistic influences, and endocentric speech communities that tend to hold on to their own norm (Pakendorf 2007: 38). This distinction explains why some speech communities even though they are submitted to extensive exposure from contact languages, may retain their own linguistic individuality (Andersen 1988).

If we want to model the different levels of impact of language contact in the languages of the world, we may turn to a four-part scale as provided by Thomason (2001), which analyzes the contact phenomena on the basis of the intensity of the contact.

- Casual contact
 - Very few bilinguals in the community
 - Borrowing of specialized content words
 - No structural influence
- Slightly more intense contact
 - Minority of fluent bilinguals in the community
 - Borrowing of content words and function words
 - Minor borrowing of structure
- More intense contact
 - Reasonable amount of bilinguals in the community, social factors favor bilingualism
 - Borrowing of content words, function words and basic vocabulary
 - Significant borrowing of structure
- Intensive contact
 - Extensive bilingualism in the community
 - Heavy borrowing of all kinds of words
 - Heavy borrowing of structure and/or typological restructuring of the recipient language

Some additional comments to the concept of borrowing in the narrow sense of the word, that is the transfer of lexical material, are in order. The diachronic borrowing of lexical material can be assumed to originate in synchronic code switching, and it may happen whenever a lexical item from a different code is inserted into a base frame of the recipient language (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002; Kossmann 2013). This might happen because the word adds a concept to the recipient language as is for example the case with the adoption of a new technological innovation or cultural practice (additive borrowing). It might also happen because the word replaces another word in the recipient language, as is the case if an L1 term is subjected to taboo avoidance or if the new term is felt to be more expressive or semantically fitting (substitutive borrowing). On a final note, we may point to the observation that, although lexical items are the first linguistic elements to be transferred in language contact, the

lexicon is in many cases also the most salient feature of a language, and often plays a role as identity marker (“we in this village use word X, but our neighbors use word Y”). It is therefore conceivable that depending on the sociocultural situation, significant constraints might be in place on the extent and nature of inserting foreign lexis into the emblematic language.

4.3 Contact with Gallo-Romance

In the case of northern Gaul, before the settlement of Germanic-speaking Franks in the fifth century, we may assume that spoken Gallo-Romance, a colloquial dialect of Late Latin, functioned as the emblematic language for the majority of the population (high-register Latin being restricted to the elite). Nevertheless, we should realize that the historical sources offer us very few metalinguistic comments that explicitly state that this is the case. Our assumption is mainly based on the general image of society that elite-biased written sources provide us, and on the identification of the term *sermo rustica* as a low-register variety of Latin, which in many cases might be true but does not rule out the possibility that occasionally different vernaculars such as Gaulish or Germanic are meant (*contra* Blom 2009).

The situation gets more difficult when we take into account the complicated case of the Rhine frontier zone, where Germanic – Romance bilingualism will have been common ever since the establishment of the Roman border (see section 1.6). In the more central areas of northern Gaul, bilingualism in rural communities will have been rarer, with the exception of isolated areas that held on to spoken Gaulish (see section 1.13). During the tetrarchy, the Roman government employed a policy of settling foreigners within the borders of the empire. This way, Germanic-speaking communities of *coloni* or *laeti*, along with Germanic-speaking soldiers who were settled as *foederati*, found themselves in a mainly Gallo-Romance-speaking environment, which may have prompted them to quickly adopt Gallo-Romance as a secondary communication language. However, although the sociocultural factors promoting Gallo-Romance as a secondary code may have been substantial, e.g. because of the links to the Romance-speaking urban centers, sociolinguistic typology teaches us that this not necessarily entails the abandonment of a primary emblematic code.

Another thing to consider in this regard, is that the Germanic speech community may have been reinforced by a steady influx of Germanic-speaking newcomers via chain migration. Here we should note that the rivers above the Somme-Aisne-Oise line, i.e. the Scheldt, the Lys, and the Meuse and its tributaries, all run northwards to the river delta of the Low Countries, facilitating return migration and a counter flow of goods and information downstream. Apart from the push factors in place on the other side of the river Rhine (possibly endemic warfare, seasonal raiding, and climate change), we also should not underestimate the pull factors of the Gallo-Roman countryside, not in the last place its abandoned agricultural fields belonging to the former villa system, and the proximity of the

Roman military offering work and protection. Furthermore, it would have made sense for the Germanic-speaking communities in the uncertain economic and political landscape of Late Roman Gaul to maintain large social networks with numerous weak ties; ties both with Gallo-Romance and Germanic-speaking rural communities, and both within and beyond the border of the Roman empire. Now that archaeologists and historians have abandoned the idea of a Late Antique Rhine border that was constantly controlled and policed, we may envision the communication lines between immigrant networks and their home communities to have been a lot more stable than has previously been assumed. If Guinet (1982) is right in his assertion that the majority of Germanic loanwords that are restricted to northern Gaul should be attributed to the period before the Frankish settlement, then it would be these Germanic-speaking farmer communities that are responsible for introducing the lion's share of Germanic lexis into Gallo-Romance.

This situation may not have changed drastically when Roman central authority collapsed in the middle of the fifth century. It was in this period that Germanic-speaking groups that we now identify as Franks moved into northern Gaul, a process that was more like a 'trickle' than a 'flood' (cf. Van Thienen 2016). But even if these demographic shifts were small-scale, evidence from toponymy, onomastics and history suggests that the Frankish political take-over had considerable effects on the Gallo-Roman socio-cultural landscape. After all, the Frankish takeover brought along new Germanic settlement names that make up the majority of the rural toponyms above the Somme-Aisne-Oise line and were prominent in the area to the north of the river Seine (Wartburg 1939: 300). The infiltration of Germanic-speakers also introduced a Germanic naming fashion that was extremely influential in Merovingian Francia and remained in place for most of the Middle Ages (cf. Bergmann 1997).

The question here is how this demographic upheaval would relate to the role that the Germanic language of the Franks may have played within this new Gallo-Frankish cultural landscape. Traditionally, this question has been put in terms of the demographic balance between indigenous and incoming population, that is, the percentage of Germanic settlers as opposed to the percentage of the Gallo-Romance receiving demographic (Wartburg 1939: see also Petri 1973 and Flobert 2002).¹⁴³ However, modern sociolinguistics has shown us that this approach is not productive, and the question actually comes down to the attitudes of the immigrant communities, their social prestige, and their relations both to the receiving society and their home country. As shown by numerous studies, small immigrant languages, especially languages associated with elites, may actually have significant influence on a larger speech community if the socio-cultural circumstances allow it.

¹⁴³ Wartburg estimated that no less than 15 percent and no more than 25 percent of early Gallo-Frankish society may have been Germanic-speaking (Wartburg 1939: 300) and Flobert (2002: 422) sticks to an estimate between 5 to 15 percent, although it is unclear on which he bases this estimate.

Here we are confronted with the problem that we do not have access to written sources outlining the attitudes and social strategies of Germanic-speaking immigrants (see also Lindqvist 2015: 78; Lucas 2015: 524). We therefore have to reconstruct these attitudes and strategies based on the traces of Germanic-Romance language contact that we accept as plausible, and by doing that we run the risk of turning our argumentation circular. Our inferences regarding the social context of the language contact should therefore be supported by typological evidence from other cases of language contact that may or may not share characteristics with the case that we try to understand.

4.4 Northern Gallo-Romance

This brings us to the Germanic superstrate hypothesis, a sociolinguistic hypothesis that aims to explain the presence and distribution of possible Germanic-like features in especially the northern dialects of Gallo-Romance. One of the first proponents of this hypothesis, Walther von Wartburg (1939; 1950; 1971) has argued that the historical dominance of the Frankish superstrate in Roman Gaul was one of the main reasons for the linguistic separation of northern Gallo-Romance from the wider Romance dialect continuum. Since the border between French and Provençal roughly coincides with the historical boundary of the Frankish realm in the early sixth century (486-507 CE), and since Frankish place names dominate in the north of France, this seems like an attractive solution (Wartburg 1939; Wartburg 1950b: 16-25; Elcock 1960: 231-35; Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 127).

However, when in the second half of the twentieth century the historical paradigm on the transition from Antiquity to Middle Ages shifted from mass migrations to accommodation of warrior elites many scholars rejected the superstrate solution as incongruent with the historical sources (Goetz 2003: 317). The demographic balance between indigenous and incoming population would therefore have been unfavorable to language shift, and possibly even to contact-induced change. This is why most romanists nowadays assume that the Frankish speaking aristocrats only made out a small fraction of the population of Gaul, and that Frankish was quickly abandoned for the more prestigious Gallo-Romance of the urban elites (Müller 1971; Pfister 1972, 1974; Posner 1995: 220).¹⁴⁴ This point of view is aptly summarized by Marius Sala in the following question: “how would imperfect use of a language more prestigious than Frankish have been so keenly imitated by the great mass of Romance native speakers, especially when it is reasonable to believe that the Franks themselves would have been at pains to learn Latin/Romance as ‘correctly’ as possible?” (Sala 2013: 203).

The position of the romanists, which we may summarize as the quick-shift-to Gallo-Romance hypothesis, is, apart from the historical demographic assumptions, mainly based

¹⁴⁴ See Galdi (2011) for a different opinion that better aligns with the Germanic superstrate hypothesis.

on the observation that Gallo-Romance was the only language remaining between Somme and Seine when in the ninth century the vernacular text traditions start. This would prove the greater prestige of Gallo-Romance, and hence the quick abandonment of Frankish among the ruling elite, which in its turn would preclude any structural influence of the superstrate language on Gallo-Romance (Sala 2013: 203). In this regard, the contact situation in Gallo-Romance would be comparable to the other Romance languages which had also endured Germanic-speaking elites and adopted numerous loanwords, but kept their Romance grammatical structure intact. However, does the absence of a Frankish vernacular in the ninth century indicate that the Franks shifted to Gallo-Romance within a couple of generations after moving to Gaul? Not by itself, since it is still possible that the Frankish language survived until the eighth century before the onset of the vernacular text tradition and could have influenced the Romance of Gaul with two centuries of far-reaching Romance-Germanic bilingualism (see also Green 1998: 169). This seems to agree with the fact that different strata of Frankish loanwords can be found in the French lexicon (Gamillscheg 1950: 9-10; Gamillscheg 1933; Guinet 1982).

Flobert (2002), in his article on Latin – Frankish bilingualism, discusses the case of the Frankish loanwords, but concludes that from the Gallo-Roman population only passive bilingualism could be expected, since the prestige of Roman culture would have made it very unlikely that a large amount of Gallo-Romans chose to speak Frankish actively (Flobert 2002: 421-22). Here, as well as elsewhere, the proposed sociolinguistic scenario is strongly biased by the scholarly narrative of Gallo-Roman continuity and Germanic assimilation; a narrative that, we should not forget, is almost completely informed by the highly programmatic Latin texts of a small literary elite.

We therefore need further evidence to support either position in the debate, whether it be the Germanic superstrate hypothesis or the quick-shift-to-Gallo-Romance hypothesis. Here the issue becomes difficult, since the interpretation of the historical and archaeological record which would shed further light on the Frankish take-over is ambiguous. Between the river Somme and Loire, archaeological research shows both signs of continuity and resettlement (Van Ossel 1997: 81-91; Van Thienen 2016), and the same historical sources, which scholars used to cite in order to support their view on mass migrations, are now cited in order to corroborate peaceful accommodation of warrior elites. On the sociolinguistic side however, our understanding of the mechanisms of language contact have improved greatly since the days of Wartburg. Whereas Wartburg believed that substantial flood-like migrations and demographic shifts were needed in order to explain far reaching contact-induced language change, we now know that the issue all comes down to social attitudes, social prestige, and the social structure of the elite group in question. Unfortunately, since the days of Wartburg, Gamillscheg and Petri, very few scholars have revisited the data from this new

perspective, with Martina Pitz (2000: 76) rightly calling the issue of Frankish influence on French a “chantier en friche” (abandoned construction site).

In order to make Frankish superstrate influence on French plausible, we need to consider the linguistic phenomena which can be attributed to such an influence, and the sociolinguistic situation which would have facilitated such an influence. In the rest of this chapter, I will outline the features of French which have been connected to Germanic superstrate influence and their discussion in the scholarly literature. Then, I will provide my own sociolinguistic scenario on the contact situation in Early Medieval Gaul and its consequences. Finally, I will discuss how possible contact-induced features of Walloon might substantiate my proposal.

4.5 Frankish influence

Walther von Wartburg (1950: 6–12) starts his argument defending the Germanic superstrate theory with the case of lexical borrowing from Frankish into Gallo-Romance. Between the first edition of the FEW in 1934 and the second revised edition in 1970, his etymological dictionary presently contains 497 Frankish lemmata marked with ANFR (Altniederfränkisch). Wartburg points out that the Frankish loanwords are not only limited to the semantic domains associated with a military aristocracy such as words for military titles, institutions of state, and law and military duties. The loanwords also extend into the semantic domains of flora and fauna, house building, the farmstead, agriculture, food, tastes, and human emotions. If only the kings and a small aristocracy had settled between the Canche and the Loire, we would expect limited domains of borrowing, but, as Wartburg points out, this is not what we find (Wartburg 1950b: 9). Only people who were concerned with menial tasks, such as tending the farm and tilling the soil, may have brought these words along and transferred them to the Gallo-Romance hinterland (Schmidt-Wiegand 1981: 12–13). However, it has often been noted that the amount of “rural” words, which derives from Germanic, is rather humble, constituting just a fraction of the terminology that Old French had at hand. For example, a look in the Anglo-Norman dictionary under the category ‘agricultural terms’ gives us 524 lemmata of which only 12 are Frankish in origin and only 6 English.¹⁴⁵ Legros (1942: 197) is therefore right in stressing that despite the Frankish settlement, the majority of the northern French lexicon remained firmly ‘Latin’.

The strongest part of the argument of lexical borrowing is the geographical distribution of the loanwords, which, as far as they do not concern words for the feudal system and clothing items, rarely cross the river Loire, and are firmly rooted in the dialects of France that belonged to the sixth-century Frankish empire (Wartburg 1950b: 10; Pfister

¹⁴⁵ The Anglo-Norman dictionary was consulted online via the search function of the Anglo-Norman Online Hub: URL: [http:// www.anglo-norman.net/](http://www.anglo-norman.net/).

1978: 83). The stereotypical lexical isogloss in this regard is the *hêtre* ~ *fau* line, with the northern dialects continuing the Germanic etymon **haistra-* or **haisa* (cf. ModDu. *heester*) and the southern dialects continuing the Latin etymon **fagus* (cf. Müller & Frings 1968: 207). Later Romanists have sought to downsize the amount of Frankish lexis present in the French lexicon (see Jänicke 1991 for the *Forschungsgeschichte*), and indeed modern sociolinguistics teaches us that the transfer of lexical material does not necessarily imply wide-spread bilingualism (Thomason & Kaufman 1988). Nevertheless, the wide range of semantic domains and the different chronological layers of the Germanic loanwords suggest that the lexical transfer was more than just a short lived fashion. Furthermore, the fact that the amount of loanwords grows stronger the closer we get to the Germanic language border is significant, with Walloon and Picardian containing a substantially larger amount of Old Germanic lexis. The importance of the geographical argument will play a decisive role later on in the discussion of the syntactical features that have been attributed to Germanic influence.

On the phonological level, Wartburg (1950) and Gamillscheg (1982) have attributed several phenomena in Gallo-Romance to the Frankish superstrate influence.

- Diphthongization of the Romance high mid vowels because of Germanic stress
- Far-reaching deletion or reduction of unstressed vowels because of Germanic stress
- Introduction of loan phonemes /h/ and /w/
- Hypercorrect extension of Romance substitute phoneme /f/ for Germanic /h/ to Romance lexis
- Formation of etymological hybrids

Wartburg's assumptions on the effects of Germanic prosody have been sharply critiqued by Romanist scholars (see Sala 2013). Wartburg argued that the Frankish accent in Gallo-Romance produced exaggerated lengthening of vowels in stressed open syllables, which would have facilitated diphthongization. However, it has often been noted that accent-induced syncope was already underway in Proto-Romance, and reduction and deletion of unstressed vowels is also characteristic of the northern Italian dialects. Frings (1939) theory that these phenomena in northern Italy should therefore also be attributed to a Germanic superstrate, in this case Langobardic, is not in consonance with the occurrence of these phenomena in Italian dialects beyond the confines of former Langobardic rule (Sala 2013: 207).

The other examples of phonological interference of Germanic on Romance are virtually uncontested. Especially interesting is the erroneous application of the Germanic phoneme /h/ to etymological /f/ in Romance formations (cf. *Hinges* < Lat. *finibus*, *dehors* < Lat. *deforis*), thereby inverting the Romance substitution process of using /f/ for Germanic /h/. This seems to be a sociolinguistic strategy to emulate a Germanic accent. A similar sociolinguistic mechanism seems to be at play in the intrusion of Germanic /w/ in Old French words like *waine/gaine*, *wêpe/gêpe* and *wuivre/guivre*.

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------|
| • OFr. <i>waine/gaine</i> | < * <i>waine</i> | << * <i>vagina</i> | ‘sheath’ |
| • OFr. <i>wêpe/gêpe</i> | < * <i>wespa</i> | << * <i>vespa</i> | ‘wasp’ |
| • OFr. <i>wuivre/guivre</i> | < * <i>wipera</i> | << * <i>vipera</i> | ‘viper’ |

Finally, we should consider the case of the etymological hybrids, where Gallo-Romance words were deformed under influence of phonologically similar Germanic words with the same meaning:

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------------|
| • OFr. <i>haut</i> | < Rom. * <i>alt-</i> + Gm. * <i>hauh-</i> | ‘high’ |
| • OFr. <i>wast</i> | < Rom. * <i>vast-</i> + Gm. * <i>wōst-</i> | ‘barren land’ |
| • OFr. <i>quez</i> | < Rom. * <i>vadu-</i> + Gm. * <i>wad-</i> | ‘ford’ |
| • OFr. <i>puiz</i> | < Rom. * <i>pottju-</i> + Gm. * <i>puttja-</i> | ‘water well’ |

These constitute intriguing evidence for the close semantic associations between Germanic and Romance lexis, and might be evidence for a situation in which bilingual individuals were proficient in two native languages (cf. Legros 1942: 180-81).

Another interesting voice in the Germanic superstrate debate comes from Gerold Hilty (1968), who has tested Wartburg’s hypothesis of Frankish superstrate influence by highlighting three syntactic features where French shows a remarkable deviation in linguistic structure from the norm in most surrounding Romance dialects (see also Rickard 1989: 57).

- Germanic color adjectives preceding the noun in Old French texts
- The prolonged survival of the case system in the Old French dialects closest to the linguistic border with Germanic
- Germanic-like V2 word order and pro-drop in Old French

According to Hilty, Frankish influence might be at play here as the decisive factor, in that it might have helped define tendencies that were already present in the Gallo-Romance proto-language. The possibility of Germanic influence on the syntax of Gallo-Romance has long been recognized and would make a good case for the structural influence of the Germanic superstrate on Gallo-Romance (Meyer-Lübke 1899: 697-698; Dauzat 1930: 434; Holmes & Vaughn 1933).

As regards the Old French color adjectives, Hilty has shown that, in the case of color adjectives of Germanic origin (*blanc, brun, blue, blond, fauve, gris, sor*), Old French almost always lets the adjective precede the noun (Hilty 1968: 496). This situation is continued in the border dialects of Picardian, Walloon and Lorraine French, where the same syntactic constraint is found; not only for color adjectives but for all adjectives, herein showing the same word order as their Germanic counterparts across the border (Sala 2013: 208).

The second phenomenon that Hilty (1968: 505-506) highlights is the survival of a nominative-oblique case system in Old French, whereas the case system is lost in most

western Old Romance languages such as Old Catalan, Old Spanish, and the Old Italian dialects. He argues that the living case system of Frankish might have slowed the process of collapse which the other Romance dialects endured. An argument against this view would be that this reduced case system also survived in Old Provençal where Frankish superstrate influence must have been significantly less than in the north. In order to counter this argument, Hilty argues that Germanic linguistic islands beneath the river Loire might have exerted superstratal influence on their surrounding Gallo-Romance environment. While admitting that this argument is not particularly strong, Hilty adduces another piece of evidence; the Old French nouns that belong to the *-a/-ane* and *-o/-one* declension, which largely consists of Germanic etyma. Here, there seems to be a geographical distribution which would support the Germanic superstrate hypothesis (Jud 1907: 113), namely the dialects closest to the Germanic language border possess a lot of these nouns and the further west one goes their amount diminishes. Pitz (2009: 192) expressed herself a bit more carefully when she argued that interference with Germanic may merely have reinforced the already existing *-a/-ane* and *-o/-one* nouns in Romance, but the geographical argument for northern Gallo-Romance still holds true.

This geographic distribution is also found in another argument of his. He notes that in Old French the case system survived the longest in the northeastern dialects. Froissart, an early fifteenth-century Walloon author, still employed the case system in his writings, whereas at that time it has disappeared in the more central dialects (cf. Jensen 1990). Other places where traces of the case system survive are found in some Franco-Provençal dialects in Switzerland, where the nominative-oblique contrast is retained in the demonstrative pronouns. Although this evidence is not uncontroversial (cf. Sala 2013: 209), the geographical argument is hard to ignore.

The final piece of evidence that Hilty discusses is possible Germanic influence in Old French V2 word order and the related phenomenon of pro-drop, a topic that has enjoyed considerable interest in scholarship on Romance syntax in the past few decades. Generally speaking, syntactic interference has often been the strongest candidate for contact-induced change in Gallo-Romance (cf. Legros 1942: 197; Mathieu 2009). In short, the following topics have been assumed to represent syntactic phenomena in which Gallo-Romance acts more like a Germanic-type language than a Romance-type language:

- V2
- Stylistic Fronting
- Do-Support
- OV orders
- Loss of Null Subjects

Without going into too much detail, I want to remark that most linguists would nowadays acknowledge that the earlier stages of Romance and Germanic were more similar in their

syntactic structure than the present-day languages (Mathieu 2007; Franco 2009; Varga 2017). However, the reason for this similarity is still hotly debated, with language contact, common inheritance, inter genus drift and pure coincidence being considered as possible explanations. Some scholars argue that we should be careful in trying to explain these features in terms of language contact as long as the inner-Romance typology of the syntactic features has not yet been fully charted out (cf. Wolfe 2015). Still, the intriguing fact remains that the word order constraints in Old High German and Old French are surprisingly similar (Eggenberger 1961: 142; Axel 2007).

A possible way to navigate the controversies about contact-induced Germanic-like syntax as opposed to internal Romance evolution, is connecting the issue with the concept of enhancement as proposed by Aikhenvald (2002: 238). Enhancement or frequential copying (cf. Johanson 1999: 52) is the facilitation of contact-induced change when the feature of the donor language is already present in the recipient language, albeit in a marginal, low frequency state. Under influence of the donor language, the recipient language may promote the use of the formerly marginal structure and thereby increase its use. It seems like this scenario, although the proper theoretical terminology was lacking at the time, was also envisioned by Hilty, and this way also the inner-Romance typology and the evidence of Late Latin can be incorporated into the diachronic explanation for Germanic-like features in Romance syntax (cf. Pitz 2004: 168).

Now that the possible contact-induced Germanic-like features of Gallo-Romance have been reviewed, we can turn to the evaluation of the Germanic superstrate hypothesis. Rebecca Posner (1995) has argued that the geographical distribution of the above discussed structural features, namely that the features are more prominent in the dialects nearest the language border, makes coincidental occurrence of these features on either side of this border unlikely. In general, the scenario of contact-induced change as the reason for the structural similarities between Germanic and French has the advantage of explaining the geographical contiguity of the phenomena in the Gallo-Romance dialect continuum with the neighboring Germanic languages. Their opponents have either ignored or trivialized the importance of the geographical argument. To my mind, Hilty and Posner are right in stressing the elegance and scope of the superstrate hypothesis, and these structural similarities between French and Germanic might very well originate in schematic copies due to the imposition of Germanic-like L1 features on a Romance L2.

4.6 The Pippinid Hypothesis

If these syntactic features should be attributed to Germanic influence, are we then not back at the problem with which we started? Namely, do we need a substantial influx of Germanic-speaking immigrants in order to explain the possibility of Germanic influence on French? Here I would like to refer back to the above discussed theoretical models of language contact from Van Coetsem (1988), Thomason & Kaufmann (1988), and Johanson (1992), who made it clear that substantial population replacement is not necessary for contact-induced change. I therefore would like to present my own theory in the form of a historical scenario that finds support in the aforementioned sociolinguistic literature; a scenario that does not preclude the possibility of a sizeable Frankish colonization in the north of France, but may act independently of it, thereby bypassing the demographic controversy. This theory is based on the assumption that there must have been linguistic consequences of the historical divide in the northern part of the Frankish realm, i.e. the divide between Austrasia in the northeast and Neustria in the southwest; after all, evidence from history, archaeology and toponymy gives us every reason to assume that there was a difference between the influence of the Frankish demographic element in these northern border regions of Gaul and in the rest of Gaul.¹⁴⁶



Figure 3 Austrasia and Neustria in Merovingian Gaul

At the start of Frankish rule in Roman Gaul only a relatively small amount of Frankish-speakers will have infiltrated Gallo-Romance society and superimposed themselves on existing power structures. These warrior elites, who took control from Flanders to the present-day Provence were followed by groups of Frankish colonists who settled in the sparsely populated countryside in the north of Gaul (Wartburg 1965: 66-67; see section 1.5, 1.6).

¹⁴⁶ In this regard, Wartburg's observes (1950b: 22-23) that in the north and east of the Gallo-Romance realm (and a small strip in the Midi area) the Frankish toponyms in *-anges* and *-ens* were maintained, while in the center of Gaul the Frankish toponyms of the *-iacum* and *-court*-type dominate. Wartburg assumes that the Frankish colonies with the suffix *-inges* were largely substituted with the suffix *-iacum* and *-court* during the romanization of the later Merovingian period.

We may assume that near the present-day Romance-Germanic language border, in historical Austrasia, the linguistic contact between speakers of Gallo-Romance and Frankish was mainly adstratal, i.e. neither Frankish nor Gallo-Romance was socially dominant. Further south, in historical Neustria, the Gallo-Romance populace outnumbered the Franks, and the prestige of Gallo-Roman culture and language was reinforced by the presence of the Gallo-Roman walled towns. In those regions, the Frankish language stood in a superstratal relationship to Gallo-Romance and the linguistic influence of Frankish on Gallo-Romance was in all likelihood restricted to lexical borrowing. It is conceivable that in Merovingian Neustria, the Frankish language mainly functioned as an elite in-group language, a situation which may have lasted for just a couple of generations.

In the adstratal situation in Austrasia, in the northeastern part of the Merovingian realm, the consequences of the Frankish settlement were more profound; we may assume that Germanic-speaking Franks acquired Gallo-Romance as a second language (L2), and because the Franks adopted Gallo-Romance in adulthood, structural features from Frankish, their dominant emblematic code (L1), were imposed on Gallo-Romance as their secondary code (L2). This engendered a variety of Gallo-Romance (L2^a = FG), which exhibited traces of schematic copying from Germanic phonology and somewhat less from Germanic morphology and syntax. The result was a defective Frankish variety of Gallo-Romance, that was used for communication with the Gallo-Romance speech community.

- Austrasian situation

- Germanic-speakers = L1 Germanic, L2a 'Germanic-like' Gallo-Romance
- Romance-speakers = L1 Gallo-Romance > L1 'Germanic-like' Gallo-Romance

Because Germanic speakers were socially dominant in the northeast corner of the Frankish realm, the Gallo-Romance-speaking communities copied the defective Gallo-Romance of the Germanic speakers, and Germanic-induced L2 features became conventionalized throughout society (i.e. Frankish Gallo-Romance acquired overt prestige). The result was an Austrasian dialect of Gallo-Romance, spoken by both ethnic Franks and ethnic Gallo-Romans, that showed traces of heavy structural borrowing from Germanic.

In the southwestern part of northern Gaul, the demographic balance will have been less favorable for the conventionalization of Frankish accents. We may assume that in Neustria, the Frankish aristocrats shifted to Gallo-Romance within a few generations, and their accent in spoken Romance exhibited less interference from their Germanic L1. As stated above, it seems likely that the prestige of urban Gallo-Roman culture will have precipitated the language shift. This does not mean that a Frankish accent in Gallo-Romance had never existed in Neustria, it merely means that it has left no traces.

- Neustrian situation
 - Germanic-speakers = L1 Germanic, L2 Gallo-Romance > L1 Gallo-Romance
 - Romance-speakers = L1 Gallo-Romance, L2 Germanic

In order to explain the ‘Germanic-like’ features in French, I would like to suggest that the Austrasian ‘Germanic-like’ dialect of Gallo-Romance spread to the rest of northern Gaul. Neustrian communities would have copied structural features from the Austrasian dialect in the wake of the Pippinid rise to power (*contra* Schrijver 2014: 108).¹⁴⁷

In principle, this theory is reminiscent of Rebecca Posner’s view that the structural Germanic influence on French should not be attributed to language contact in the Migration Age, but to language contact in the Carolingian period (750-950 CE, Posner 1995: 220). Although I would like to place this ‘Frankish’ influence somewhat earlier (700-750 CE), this largely agrees with my view. Another difference between her scenario and mine is that she argues that the Germanic of the Rhineland Franks exerted superstrate influence. I would argue, on the other hand, that it was substratum influence from the ‘Germanic-like’ Romance variety that developed in these border regions. This is in consonance with Gamillscheg’s idea, that it was a Frankish-influenced Romance, which, as a prestige dialect, was responsible for the Germanic influence on French linguistic structure (Gamillscheg 1960: 543).

4.7 Historical framework

In order to substantiate this hypothesis, we must look to the historical sources. The Pippinid family had its power base in the valley of the Sambre, the area around Cologne and in the valleys of the Moselle and the Meuse (Costambeys e.a. 2011: 39). The Pippinid rise to power was accompanied by the investiture of Austrasian family members and allies on key positions in the Frankish realm (Riché 1993: 28; Werner 1965: 93-94). In this period, strategic key-points were monasteries and abbeys, which were the anchor points of local aristocratic families, and whose landed properties provided the financial basis for military and political adventures. Almost all the important noble families loyal to Charlemagne can be traced back to the Meuse-Moselle area and acquired their offices outside this realm by grace of Pippin II and Charles Martel (Werner l.c.). As Pierre Riché puts it: “Pippin lived in Austrasia, and from there, he drew his power, that is, his followers” (Riché 1993: 28).

When in 690 CE the see of Reims became vacant, Pippin installed the Ripuarian nobleman Rigobert. A few years later his Austrasian ally Griffo was made archbishop of Rouen, and another Austrasian nobleman Hildebert was put on the abbacy of St. Wandrille

¹⁴⁷ We should also consider the case of the adoption of two remarkable Germanic adjectives in Old French, which seem to imply a significant amount of social prestige for a Germanic contact language. In my opinion, OFr. *maint* ‘very many’ from OFrnk. **manigibo* ‘multitude’, and OFr. *ne (...)* *guère(s)* ‘hardly any’ from OFrnk. **ne (...)* *weigiuro* ‘not much’, originally belonged to Austrasian Gallo-Romance and were only later adopted in Neustria (see FEW XVI: 512-14, XVII: 469-471).

(l.c.). These ecclesiastical and political appointments were part of a purposeful strategy to consolidate power in order to expand their influence into Neustria (cf. Hummer 2005: 34).

His son Charles Martel continued the policy of replacing Neustrian noblemen with Austrasian allies. When he defeated his enemies, he consolidated his rule on Neustria by granting the most important power centers there to his nephew Hugh, an Austrasian family member (Claussen 2004: 32; Wood 2006: 212). Fulrad, an Austrasian noblemen who owned large estates in the Alsace and Saarland, was entrusted in 754 by Pippin of Herstal, Charles Martel's son, with the abbey of St. Denis, the symbolic center of the former Merovingian realm (Riché 1993: 65-66). These Pippinid vassals from Austrasian stock will have brought along dependents, friends and soldiers to their new estates. The noblemen and their dependents were Austrasian Franks, who all spoke Gallo-Romance with the Austrasian 'Germanic-like' dialect.¹⁴⁸ We should consider that the Germanic element in Austrasian Gallo-Romance was continually strengthened by the cultural orientation of these bilingual regions to the Germanic-speaking north and east. In this regard, we may note that the family networks of the Pippinids stretched far into southern Germany (Werner 1982: 31).

Pippin's sons Carloman and Charles continued this strategy of using landed property often usurped or taken from ecclesiastical estates, to reward their Austrasian family and allies in order to entrench their new authority in 'foreign' Neustrian territory. In the eighth century, the clan members of the Austrasian Hugobert-Irmina family, who were intermarried with the Pippinid family, acquired leading positions in the entire Frankish realm, including the regions of Champagne, Burgundy, Provence and Aquitaine (Werner 1982: 32).

We should note that the women had a special role to play in connecting local Neustrian aristocracies with the Pippinid family (Wemple 1981: 54). Pippin married his son Drogo to Ansfléd, the daughter of the Neustrian ruler Waratto, a long-time enemy of his. The son of Drogo and Ansfléd was the aforementioned Hugh, Charles Martel's nephew, who was instrumental in securing the Pippinid grip on Neustria. The sister of Pippin II, Bertrada, married into a ruling Neustrian family as well and her son Charibert became count of Laon in the Aisne region. It seems reasonable to assume that the offspring of these mixed Neustrian-Austrasian marriages will have opted for the dialect of their influential Pippinid family and not for the dialect of their region.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ Here, it should be mentioned that, in this time period, the valley of the Moselle was still partly Romance-speaking and, in all likelihood, will have belonged to the Austrasian Gallo-Romance sphere (Pfister 1992).

¹⁴⁹ The linguistic consequences of a Pippinid rise to power were also considered by Maurice Broëns (1963), who assumed that the installation of Austrasian elites in the south of Frankish Gaul entailed the spread of another wave of Frankish place-names over the southern Gallo-Roman countryside: "*Ainsi (Germanic place-names preceded by an article) ne sont sans doute que des emprunts romans au vocabulaire des colons austrasiens que les Pippinides ont établis un peu partout à travers la Gaule par ceux-ci réunifiée*" (Broëns 1963: 58).

When the Austrasian vassals of Pippin and Charles Martel built up networks of their own in the communities in which they settled, local powerholders, vying for the favor of the




figure 4 diffusion of Austrasian influence from the above-mentioned Austrasian controlled abbacies

new Austrasian overlords, would have adopted the more prestigious Gallo-Romance dialect of the Austrasian Franks as communication language. In sociolinguistic terms, the Pippinid speech communities in Neustria were endocentric yet open communities, which allowed local power holders to become part of the new ruling elite. It is well conceivable that, in the period that followed, these local Neustrian noblemen switched completely to Austrasian Gallo-

Romance as their new primary code. Alternatively, we may envision that the Neustrian elites emulated the speech habits of their Austrasian overlords and imposed the sociolinguistically marked features of the Austrasian dialect onto their local dialect.

Furthermore, we should appreciate the role which itinerant kingship and ecclesiastical visitations may have played in the diffusion of the new Frankish Gallo-Romance standard. The Austrasian king and his *optimates* travelled through the Frankish realm, ruling the kingdom from local assemblies. So too did the bishops and the abbots, who toured the churches and monasteries that belonged to their ecclesiastical office. It is plausible that on these occasions the standard was the Austrasian border dialect.

This would provide us with a plausible sociolinguistic explanation for the heavy Germanic influence that we find in Old French (*contra* Schrijver 2014: 108); the southwestern dialects of northern Gallo-Romance, having withstood structural linguistic influence of Germanic during the sixth century (just like their southern-French counterparts), will have been replaced in the course of the eighth century by the more prestigious border dialects of Gallo-Romance which did undergo structural influence of Frankish.

Finally, we may note that in the Old French language, two sociolects are distinguished. The Old French word *franceise* (or *langue francor*) is used for the high variety of Old French, and the Old French word *romanz*, *romance* is used for vulgar speech and the subparisian variety of Old French (Rickard 1989: 41-42). It is at least suggestive that the word *romanz* (< **romanice*), which historically referred to the Gallo-Roman demographic element, seems to have been

less prestigious.¹⁵⁰ Initially, in the prehistory of the Old French language, the word *romanz/romance* would have been the normal word for colloquial Gallo-Romance. We may hypothesize that, after the Pippinid take-over, the term *romanz* may have been associated with the Neustrian Gallo-Romance dialect and stood in contrast with the new, more prestigious, Austrasian standard. The bilingual Austrasian Franks called their Romance variety *Franceise*, in the same way that they called their Germanic variety *Frenkisk*. In the later Middle Ages, the word *franceise*, as the term for the high variety of Old French, came to be identified with the Francien dialect of Old French.

4.8 The Dawn of Walloon

As stated above, southeastern Belgium belonged to the core lands of the Pippinid family and its dialect was without a doubt of the Frankish Gallo-Romance-variety. The toponyms in this region give evidence for bilingual communities far into the ninth century (Devleeschouwer 1957) and the networks of the aristocrats, who ruled the area extended into the Germanic-speaking regions of Brabant in the north and the Rhineland in the east. This Germanic orientation might explain why, in the High Middle Ages, innovations from the Francien dialect, which became dominant with the rise of the Capetians (1000-1100 CE), were not accepted by the speakers of the Frankish Gallo-Romance variety. The ruling families mainly consisted of aristocrats related to the Carolingians, and therefore had a strong regional pride, as is also known from the historical record. In sociolinguistic terms, we may assume that Walloon constituted an endocentric speech community, maintaining an open social network in relation to its Germanic neighbors. When the rest of the Gallo-Romance dialect continuum innovated, the Walloon dialects in south-eastern Belgium rejected the innovations of the neighboring Romance communities and therefore stayed remarkably archaic. This ushers in the dawn of Walloon, as it is marked by its archaism vis-à-vis the more central French varieties and its participation in later Germanic innovations.

4.9 Walloon and the Germanic influence thesis of Wilmotte

How could the case of Walloon provide more background and substance for the above proposed Pippinid theory? First we should recognize that not all French dialects that are spoken in Wallonia are properly Walloon: the Romance dialect that is spoken in the far west of Belgium, around Tournai, shares most of its evolution with Picardian French. It is therefore often regarded as a Picardian dialect, although a label Wallo-Picardian could also be applied. The Romance dialect in the far south-east of Wallonia (also called Gaumais), most often sides

¹⁵⁰ We may note that Kramer (1998) has a completely different take on the issue; he argues that Old French *romanz/romance* and *français/françois* were practically synonyms in the Old French period.

with Lorraine French and can therefore be regarded as a Lorraine dialect. Only the two remaining dialect areas can properly be called Walloon:

- Central Walloon = Namurois
- East Walloon = Liégeois

Of those dialects, East Walloon, the language spoken around Liège, is often the most archaic. It is in the Liégeois dialect that we find a word for ‘night’ that must have been remodelled on the Old Dutch word **naht* ‘night’, because its vocalism presupposes a Gallo-Romance /a/ before /çt/:

- Lat. *facta* > Gallo-Rom. **façta* > EWall. *fé* ‘done’
- ODu. **naht* → Gallo-Rom. **naçt* > EWall. *né* ‘night.’

We may note that the native Walloon development would have yielded Wall. *nüt* [ny] (< **nachte* < Lat. *noctem*), which is the normal word for ‘night’ in the other Walloon dialects (Tuttle 1915). This quite remarkable example of lexical contamination in East Walloon exemplifies the bilingualism that must have been common in Wallonia since the Late Roman period.

The Belgian philologist Wilmotte was one of the first scholars to consider Romance-Germanic bilingualism as a contributing factor to the evolution of Walloon. In his 1893 monograph *Le Wallon : histoire et littérature des origines à la fin du XVIIIe siècle*, he made the following remark:

“La première série (de traits distinctifs) est commune aux dialectes wallons, d’une part, et, de l’autre, aux dialectes français de l’extrême Est, ainsi qu’aux dialectes parlés à l’Ouest par des populations qui ont subi le contact des Germains d’une manière plus durable ou plus profonde.”
(Wilmotte 1893: 24).

In his book, he provides a list of archaic traits in Walloon which are not found in the central dialects of French. According to him, these traits might be explained from Germanic influence in the northern border zone between Germanic and Romance. The features, which he explicitly connects to influence of Germanic, are listed below.

- Diphthongization of Rom. /ɛ/ in *-ella > Old Wall. -eal, -ial
- Monophthongization of Gallo-Rom. /iɛ/ > Wall. /i/
- Diphthongization of /o/ > /uo/ in closed syllables
- Rom. /u/ withstands Gallo-Rom. palatalization, i.e. absence of Gallo-Rom. /u/ > /y/
- Initial /w/ of Germanic origin is preserved
- Initial /h/ of Germanic origin is preserved
- Monophthongization of Gallo-Rom. /iu/ > Wall. /ȳ/
- Retention of Gallo-Rom. /kʷ/
- Retention of preconsonantal /s/
- Rom. /sC/ withstands Pan-Romance prothesis

- Rom. /sk/ > OWall. /sɣ/ > East Wall. /χ/,/h/
- Walloon final devoicing

Whether these features can plausibly be attributed to substratum influence from Germanic remains to be tested, and in the following section this will be attempted. Below, several of these items will be evaluated in relation to the relative chronology of both Gallo-Romance and Germanic historical phonology. This way, we might establish how probable the status of each specific item as a contact-induced feature really is.

4.10 Developments shared with Germanic

The first listed development concerns the Walloon diphthongization in the suffix *-*ella*. This development is peculiar, because in Standard French, diphthongization of /ɛ/ > /ea/ only occurred before /lC/:

- Pre-French *-*els* > OFr. -*eals* > ModFr. -*eau*
- Pre-French *-*ella* > OFr. -*elle* > ModFr. -*elle*
- Pre-French *-*ella* > OWall. -*ealle* > Wall. -*eal*

If we want to explain this by interference from Germanic, we might argue that Germanic-speakers imposed a Germanic pronunciation on a Pre-French stressed vowel. In this regard, Wilmotte noted that the Walloon diphthongization runs parallel to the West Germanic diphthongization of /ē²/ > /ia/ and /ie/. However, in this particular case, we could also argue that the diphthong of the masculine suffix was analogically extended to the feminine suffix. The development is therefore not convincing as a Germanic induced phenomenon.

Another feature that Wilmotte considered as a possible influence from Germanic is the diphthongization of the low mid vowel /ɔ/ > /uo/ in closed syllables. We may note that Walloon diphthongization in closed syllables is unique within the French dialect continuum. Here, we could argue that Walloon-Dutch bilinguals extended the positions liable for diphthongization, since Old Dutch underwent a general diphthongization of /o/ > /uo/.

The Walloon monophthongization of /iu/ > /ȳ/, and in some Walloon dialects of /iε/ > /i/, is also paralleled in the Dutch dialect continuum, as may be clear from the following examples (see Remacle 1948: 49):

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------|---------|
| • Pre-French * <i>tiule</i> | > Wall. <i>tül</i> | [ty:l] | ‘tile’ |
| • Pre-French * <i>festa</i> | > OWall. <i>fiesta</i> > EWall. <i>fièsse</i> , <i>fise</i> | [fjes], [fi:s] | ‘feast’ |
| • WGM. * <i>fiur</i> | > MidDu. <i>vuur</i> | [vy:r] | ‘fire’ |
| • WGM. * <i>sliep</i> | > MidDu. <i>sliep</i> | [sli:p] | ‘slept’ |

The monophthongization in Old Dutch is generally placed relatively late (Van Loon 2014: 125), so if Germanic influence is at play here, we would have to assume that Romance-

Germanic bilingualism persisted into the High Middle Ages (see also Schrijver 2014: 147). The same can be said for the /sk/ > /sx/ change, which affected the Dutch dialects in the later Middle Ages (Van Loon 2014: 238).

The next feature is the preservation of /s/ in preconsonantal position. In Old French, preconsonantal /s/ had been voiced to /z/ before voiced consonants, and remained /s/ before voiceless consonants (Pope 1934: 151).

- Lat. *insula* > Pre-French **izla* > OFr. *isle* [izlə] ‘island’
- Lat. *testa* > Pre-French **tēsta* > OFr. *teste* [tɛstə] ‘head’

Already in the twelfth century, in Old French, the preconsonantal /z/ was being dropped and a few centuries later, preconsonantal /s/ disappeared as well. Walloon remained impervious to this medieval French innovation, and retained the /s/ before consonants, although word final /st/ was eventually assimilated to /s/ (Remacle 1948: 74).

- Latin *ministerium* > Pre-French **mestjer* > Wall. *mèstî* [mɛstɪ] ‘job’
- Lat. *testa* > Pre-French **tēsta* > OWall. *tieste* > Wall. *tièsse* [tjɛs] ‘head’

It seems plausible that also this retention was supported by Germanic-Romance bilingualism; since the cluster /st/ was not altered in Germanic, Germanic-Romance bilinguals may have rejected the innovations when it reached their speech communities. In syllable-initial position, preconsonantal /s/ was also preserved in Walloon, and, more surprisingly, was not affected by Pan-Romance prosthesis (Remacle 1948: 40-42).

- Latin *scribere* > Pre-French **eskrirə* > Wall. *scrîre* [skɾir] ‘to write’

In my opinion, interference from Germanic is the most probable explanation for this; we may imagine that Germanic L1 speakers ignored the syllable-conditioned rule of vowel prosthesis and generalized the syllable onset without the prosthetic vowel (see section 3.20). This Germanic L1 feature was then continued in Walloon.¹⁵¹

Final devoicing was common to both Old Dutch and Old French, which might be explained from the scenario that the phonetic devoicing rule originally belonged to Old Frankish, and was imposed by Frankish bilinguals on their pronunciation of Gallo-Romance. We may note that, in Walloon, final devoicing is continued as a synchronic rule, whereas the other French dialects lost the rule in the course of the Middle Ages. In my opinion, it is very unlikely that final devoicing in Walloon is not connected to final devoicing in Dutch.

¹⁵¹ We should note however that Walloon at a later point still adapted the initial sequences /sk/, /sp/ and /st/ to the Old French syllable-constraint. This rule is preserved in Walloon, where the form *scrîre* occurs after vowels, and *sucrîre* after consonants (Remacle 1948: 41).

Devoicing	Latin	Romance	Walloon		Modern French
*-b > -p	<i>barba</i>	* <i>barba</i>	> <i>bēp</i>	“beard”	<i>barbe</i> [baʁb]
*-d > -t	<i>chorda</i>	* <i>kōrda</i>	> <i>kwet</i>	“cord”	<i>corde</i> [kɔʁd]
*-v > -f	<i>faba</i>	* <i>faβa</i>	> <i>fēf</i>	“bean”	<i>fève</i> [fɛv]
*-z > -s	<i>rosa</i>	* <i>rōsa</i>	> <i>rōs</i>	“rose”	<i>rose</i> [roz]

4.11 Walloon archaisms

Another characteristic of the Walloon dialect area is its archaism in comparison to standard French, both in its lexicon and its phonology (see Legros 1942; Remacle 1948). Remacle (1948) provides a list of distinctive Walloon features that represent archaisms from before the year 1000 CE. I will highlight these features and explain how they might be connected to contact with Germanic:

- Special treatment of Gallo-Rom. /kk/
- Special treatment of labial + yod, i.e. Rom. *-pj-, *-bj-, *-mj- > Wall. p, b, m
- The retention of the loan phonemes /w/ and /h/
- non-fronting of Gallo-Rom. /u/
- non-delabialization of Gallo-Rom. /k^w/ and /g^w/

The first development on the list concerns the Romance suffix *-kko (< Gaul. *-kkos), which is degeminated in Gallo-Romance and yields /k/ in Old French. However, in Walloon the Gallo-Romance geminate is palatalized to /tʃ/, as can be illustrated by the following examples:

- Rom. **bekko* (< Gaul. **bekkos*) > Wall. *bètch* [betʃ] ‘beak’
 o > OFr. *bec* [bɛk]
- Rom. **sakko* ‘sack’ (< Gk. *σάκκος*) > Wall. *satch* [satʃ] ‘sack’
 o > OFr. *sac* [sak]

As this palatalization is only found in Walloon, Lorraine French and Burgundian, dialects that immediately border the Germanic dialect continuum, interference from Germanic might be considered as an explanation. Schrijver (2014: 106) argues that the palatalization of the *bec/bètch* contrast can be connected to a language shift from Germanic to Romance; the aspirated Germanic [k:^h] would then have been substituted by Romance-speakers with [k^ɕ], which later merged with [ts] (see section 3.23). This scenario is in consonance with my

proposal that, in the course of the sixth century, a language shift from Frankish to Frankish Gallo-Romance took place.

The next feature on our list is the special treatment in Walloon of Gallo-Romance labial + yod sequences. The following examples show the expected outcome of these sequences in Old French:

- WGM. **hapja* → OFr. *hache* [haʧə] ‘axe’
- WRom. **simja* (cf. Lat. *simius*) > OFr. *singe* [sɛ̃ndʒə] ‘monkey’
- WRom. **raβja* (cf. Lat. *rabiēs*) > OFr. *rage* [radʒə] ‘rage, madness’
- WRom. **kaβja* (cf. Lat. *cavea*) > OFr. *cage* [kadʒə] ‘animal pen’

In Walloon, however, the labial consonants are preserved:

- WGM. **hapja* → Wall. *hèp* [hɛp]
- WRom. **simja* > Wall. *hèm* [hɛm]
- WRom. **raβja* > Wall. *rèp* [rɛp]
- WRom. **kaβja* > Wall. *tchèf* [tʃɛf]

Wilmotte (1893: 29) has argued that the preservation of the labial consonant in Walloon might be connected to the loss of post-consonantal yod in ninth-century Old High German (Braune-Mitzka 1967: 108). We may note, however, that this suggestion is contradicted by the preservation of the yod following WRom. /β/:

- WRom. **roβjəla* (cf. Lat. *rubeola*) > Wall. [rovjul] ‘measles’
 o > ModFr. *rougeole* [ruʒəl]
- Rom. **goβjone* (cf. Late-Lat. *gobio*) > EWall. [govjɔ̃] ‘goby’ (species of fish)
 o > ModFr. *goujon* [guʒɔ̃]

Nevertheless, it is still possible that interference from Germanic phonology played a role in the preservation of the labial stops in these sequences; since in the West Germanic languages the post-consonantal yod does not transfer its palatal features to the preceding labial, it is possible that when the affrication of labial stops spread over the dialect continuum, bilingual Walloon speakers were less inclined to innovate their pronunciation.

The next feature concerns the retention of the loan phoneme /h/. It is beyond doubt that the preservation of Germanic /h/ and /w/ in Germanic loanwords in the northeastern French dialects is due to language contact with Germanic (cf. Dalola 2015). It is well-known that Latin lost the /h/ in the first centuries CE, and Gallo-Romance acquired a new /h/ as a loan phoneme from Old Frankish (see section 3.33):

- OFrnk. **hagja* → Gallo-Rom. **haja* > OFr. *haie* [hajə] ‘hedge’

This initial /h/ was preserved into modern French until the sixteenth century, but later disappeared from the spoken language.¹⁵² East Walloon and Gaumais preserve this /h/ up to the present day, e.g. Gallo-Rom. **hagja* > East Wall. *haj* (: Fr. *haie* [ɛ]). It seems plausible to me that the wide geographical distribution of the initial aspiration in Old French can be connected to the prestige of the Austrasian Gallo-Romance dialect in the Pippinid period.

The loan phoneme /w/, however, did not enjoy such a wide acceptance in the Gallo-Romance dialect continuum. Generally, Germanic words that had initial /w/ were substituted by Romance speakers with /g^w/, the closest articulatory counterpart in their consonant system. Only in Picardian, Lorraine French and Walloon do we find Germanic /w/ continued as /w/ (cf. Pope 1934: 228):

- WGM. **wardōjan* → Gallo-Rom. *(g)*wardar* > Wall. *wârdé* ‘to guard’
 o > ModFr. *garder*
- WGM. **want* → Gallo-Rom. *(g)*wanto* > Wall. *want* ‘glove’
 o > ModFr. *gant*

In my opinion, Germanic-Romance bilingualism in the Merovingian period is the only convincing explanation for the retention of the loan phonemes /h/ and /w/ in the northeastern border dialects of French.

The next feature concerns the resistance of Walloon to Gallo-Romance fronting of /u/ > /y/. The approximate date of this shift in the prehistory of French is unclear, but most scholars assume that it happened relatively early (see section 3.13). It is striking that Walloon escaped this palatalization, thereby keeping Romance /u/ as Walloon [u] up to the present day:

- WRom. **kulo* (cf. Lat. *cūlus*) > Wall. *kou* [ku] ‘anus’
 o > ModFr. *cul* [kyl]
- WRom. **nudo* (cf. Lat. *nūdus*) > Wall. *nou* [nu] ‘naked’
 o > ModFr. *nu* [ny]

In recent years, several scholars have argued that Germanic influence might be responsible for this Walloon archaism (e.g. De Vaan 2017: 36). Although other explanations have also been proposed (e.g. Schrijver 2014: 140), to me this seems like the most probable explanation.

The next feature concerns the Walloon resistance to delabialization of Romance /k^w/ and /g^w/ following nasals. These Romance phonemes were preserved in Early Old French, but were delabialized to /k/ and /g/ around the twelfth century:

- WRom. **k^wando* > OFr. *quand* > Fr. *quand* [kã] ‘when’
- WRom. **lingwa* > OFr. *lingu* [lɛ̃ngw] > Fr. *langue* [lãg] ‘tongue, language’

¹⁵² Note that the aspirated *h*- in modern French still prevents elision, e.g. *le havre* [ləʔavʁə] : l’homme [lɔm].

In East Walloon, however, this /k^w/ is still there, thereby maintaining the Romance phoneme up to the present day. Similarly, Gallo-Romance /gw/, instead of losing its labial element, shifts to /w/ in all Walloon dialects (see Remacle 1948: 73).

- Rom. **k^wando* > EWall. [kwā] ‘when’
- Rom. **lingwa* > Wall. [lɛw] ‘tongue, language’

In my opinion, it seems plausible that also the preservation of the labialized velars in Walloon is connected with Germanic-Romance bilingualism: since Early West Germanic possessed a /k^w/ phoneme, Germanic-Romance bilinguals may have withheld the Gallo-Romance /k^w/ phoneme from innovation. Similarly, since Early West Germanic also possessed a sequence /ng^w/ (e.g. WGM. **sing^wan* ‘to sing’), this may have protected the Gallo-Romance /g^w/. When the nasalization in Walloon was phonemicized by the loss of the preconsonantal nasals, Early Old French /g^w/ was simplified to /w/ in Walloon, a development that was also common in the prehistory of the West Germanic languages.

4.12 Bilingualism in medieval Wallonia

When we take the above discussed issues into consideration, a complicated picture emerges as to the contact situation that gave rise to the shared features between Walloon and the neighboring Germanic dialects. What follows is an attempt to provide a simplified sociolinguistic scenario that would account for the data and sketch a socio-historical background to how the Frankish Gallo-Romance variety came into being and evolved into Walloon.

Before the infiltration of Frankish-speaking elites into the Roman empire, a northern variety of Gallo-Romance was spoken in Wallonia, in all likelihood as the emblematic L1 code of the Gallo-Roman population. At that moment, there were already Germanic-speaking communities there, the results of earlier incursions and the purposeful settlement of Germanic-speaking farmers and soldiers by the Roman government. When the Franks settled in Wallonia in the fifth and sixth century, the social status of Germanic overtook that of Gallo-Romance, and a situation of intensive contact and widespread bilingualism ensued. Practices like exogamic marriages and fosterage will have facilitated the integration of the different genetic input groups and thereby consolidated a sociolinguistic situation of stable bilingualism.

In the hybrid Germano-Gallo-Roman peasant society of the Merovingian period, Germanic may have been socially dominant, but both Romance and Germanic would have constituted useful communication languages (depending on the needs of the specific situation). This is when bilinguals whose dominant code was Frankish imposed Germanic-like features on the Romance variety of Wallonia and at that moment Frankish Gallo-Romance

was born. It is possible that, in the resulting bilingual society of Merovingian Wallonia, in many communities, both Germanic and Romance were taught in childhood, leading to a situation where bilingual individuals were equally proficient in either code. Under these conditions, it is very well conceivable that Germanic and Romance underwent phonological and structural convergence, which might explain some of the shared features between Walloon and Germanic that we have discussed above.

Frankish Gallo-Romance and its successor, Pre-Walloon, did participate in the Romance innovations of the Merovingian period, thereby undergoing Gallo-Romance diphthongization, Gallo-Romance syncope, and the Gallo-Romance palatalizations (except for the palatalization of labial stops). This would agree well with the above sketched scenario in which Frankish Gallo-Romance was in the Merovingian period still at the periphery of the dialect continuum. However, from the late seventh century onwards, the Romance dialect of northeastern Gaul became the new prestigious norm. This new Austrasian prestige norm spread over Francia, when the Pippinid rulers installed Austrasian noblemen in key positions of early Carolingian power structures. This would explain why from the Post-Carolingian period onwards the border dialects remained impervious to innovations from the center, as there was little motivation for speakers of the erstwhile prestige norm, whose culture was oriented towards Germanic-speaking regions, to adopt new speech habits from Reims and Paris.

4.13 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that the ‘Germanic-like’ features of Standard France, should not be attributed to a Frankish superstratum in the Merovingian period, but to the Pippinid installation of Austrasian elites in the greater Frankish realm. This solution bypasses some of the traditional complications of the debate. When the Austrasian dialect of Gallo-Romance became the prestige dialect and new standard language of the Carolingian period, ‘Germanic-like’ features of Austrasian Gallo-Romance were imitated in Neustria.

After the Carolingian period, the Francien dialect became the new center of new linguistic innovations. However, the Austrasian periphery (Wallonia and Lotharingia) rejected the innovations from Paris; Wallonia and Lorraine, for a time at least, remained oriented to the Germanic-speaking north and east. Structural interference from Germanic is exhibited by the Walloon dialect in both its linguistic archaisms, which date back to the Carolingian period, and its linguistic innovations, which are mirrored in Middle Dutch and Middle High German.