CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

ARTICLE

A PAT- on the back?: "Invisible" borrowing in Guernésiais

Mari C. Jones[1,2] (ORCID)

[1]French Section, Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom and [2]Peterhouse, Cambridge, United Kingdom
Email: mcj11@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

Languages in contact commonly leave an imprint on one other. The most straightforward of these imprints to identify is MAT-borrowing, which results in clearly identifiable lexical items of one language (the donor language) being used in utterances of another language (the recipient language). This stands in contrast with PAT-borrowing, which does not involve any such incorporation of "other language" material but rather results in the reshaping of existing structures of the recipient language on the model of the donor language. This type of language change is therefore arguably more "invisible" to speakers since no easily identifiable "other language" material is present.

This study presents a detailed examination of PAT-borrowing in Guernésiais, the Norman variety spoken in Guernsey (British Channel Islands), which is now at an advanced state of language shift. It also highlights a major difference between MAT- and PAT-borrowing, namely that, whereas MAT-borrowing can only be explained with reference to the dominant language, PAT-borrowing can on occasion admit an internal explanation.

Résumé

Les langues en contact laissent souvent une empreinte l'une sur l'autre. L'empreinte la plus simple à identifier est celle des emprunts MAT, à savoir, l'utilisation d'éléments lexicaux d'une langue (la langue donatrice) dans des énoncés d'une autre langue (la langue réceptrice). Ces emprunts s'opposent aux emprunts PAT, qui n'impliquent pas une telle incorporation de matériel « étranger », mais qui résultent plutôt de la refonte des structures de la langue réceptrice sur le modèle de la langue donatrice. Ce type de changement linguistique est donc sans doute plus « invisible » pour les locuteurs.

Cette étude présente un examen détaillé de l'emprunt PAT en guernésiais, la variété normande parlée à Guernesey (îles anglo-normandes), qui se trouve aujourd'hui à un stade avancé de "shift" linguistique. L'étude met également en évidence une différence majeure entre l'emprunt MAT et l'emprunt PAT, à savoir que, alors que l'emprunt MAT ne peut être expliqué qu'en référence à la langue dominante, l'emprunt PAT peut aussi, à l'occasion, admettre une explication interne.

Check for updates

1. Introduction

Languages in contact commonly leave an imprint on one other. The most straightforward of these imprints to identify is what Matras and Sakel term MAT (ter)-borrowing, defined as "when morphological material and its phonological shape from one language is replicated in another language" (Sakel 2007: 15). MAT-borrowings (lexical borrowing, code-switching), therefore result in clearly identifiable lexical items of one language (the donor language) being used in utterances of another language (the recipient language). See, for example (1)–(2), which illustrate English MAT-borrowings in Guernésiais, the Norman variety spoken in Guernsey, one of the British Channel Islands (see Jones 2024).[1]

(1) *J'avais ma **scarf** passequ'il'tait gniet* 'I had my scarf because it was night-time.'
(2) *All'a **meetaï** aen haomme* 'She has met a man.'

This stands in contrast with PAT(tern)-borrowing, defined as "where only the patterns of the other language are replicated – i.e. the organisation, distribution and mapping of grammatical or semantic meaning, while the form itself is not borrowed" (Sakel 2007: 15).[2] As will be demonstrated in the present study, PAT-borrowing does not involve any such incorporation of "other language" material but rather results in the reshaping of existing structures of the recipient language on the model of the donor language (see §3).

While many languages in contact display evidence of both types of borrowing, some display a propensity towards only one. Aikhenvald (1996) for example, describes how Tariana, spoken along the Vaupés river in Amazonas, Brazil, has been dramatically restructured on the model of the Tucanoan languages of the same area almost entirely without lexical borrowing of any kind (cf. also Kroskrity 1993; Thomason 2007; Aikhenvald 2006: 40) although, as Sakel notes (2007: 26n2), the inverse situation of MAT-borrowing without any PAT-borrowing is relatively rare. Commenting on this dichotomy, Matras and Sakel (2007: 841–842) state that "Disentangling the two types of processes, MAT and PAT, seems essential if one is to try and compare the cross-linguistic outcomes of contact induced change". In an attempt to contribute to such disentangling by exploring and further informing this dichotomy, I have undertaken a detailed study of the linguistic outcomes of language contact in Guernésiais, drawing on original data from many years of extensive fieldwork. The results obtained for Part I of this study (which examined MAT-borrowing) are presented in Jones (2024). The present analysis (which represents Part II of the study) complements and completes that work by presenting a detailed examination of PAT-borrowing in Guernésiais.

---

[1]As illustrated in (2), MAT-borrowings may be modified by grammatical morphemes of the recipient language but they nevertheless remain identifiable as material drawn from the donor language.

[2]An early reference to this distinction is Weinreich's use of "transfer" and "interference without outright transfer" (1963: 7). The dichotomy has been taken up by many others, including as "global" vs "selective" copying (Johanson 2002: see discussion later in this section) and "borrowing, code-switching" versus "transfer" (Treffers-Daller and Mougeon 2005).

1.1 Guernsey

Guernsey's Norman speech community has been in contact with English since the installation of a small garrison on the island to protect against the threat of a French attack after the Channel Islands became formally annexed to the English Crown in 1259. Though initially small, the garrison grew steadily as Guernsey's strategic significance as a military base increased when England became more involved in wars outside its shores. During the Napoleonic Wars, for example, almost 6,000 men were stationed in the island, whose local population at the time was recorded as 16,155: the troops inevitably brought tradespeople and other locals into contact with English. From the nineteenth century, trade with England, in particular the development of the horticultural industry, integrated Guernsey's economy firmly with that of the UK and the improvement of regular communication by sea allowed tourism to be set on a serious footing, bringing thousands of people from the UK to the Channel Islands each year. Language contact was accompanied by cultural contact, with English customs being adopted, many local streets being renamed (from French to English) and English influence becoming increasingly visible in Guernsey's architecture. During the Second World War, the evacuation to the UK of over half of Guernsey's population prior to the island's occupation by German military forces also brought islanders – very abruptly – into contact with English, with many of the evacuated children growing up with English, rather than Norman, as their mother tongue. Since the War, immigration from the UK, associated with the expansion of Guernsey's off-shore finance industry, now its largest employer, has resulted in UK-born individuals representing nearly one quarter of Guernsey's population.[3] Today, Guernésiais is at an advanced state of language shift. Current estimates put the number of speakers at no more than a few hundred (less than 0.5% of the island's 63,448 residents), most of whom are elderly and all of whom are fluent in English (see, among others, Jones 2008, 2015, 2024).[4] It goes without saying therefore that English now dominates every domain of island life.

Although French served as the de facto standard language of the Channel Islands up until the twentieth century,[5] enjoying exclusive use in so-called "High" domains from the Middle Ages right up until the time when English started to predominate (Brasseur 1977; Jones 2001, 2008, 2015), it has always functioned as an exoglossic standard. Today, French remains functionally differentiated from both Norman and English, being reserved for formulaic, ceremonial usage, such as for the opening prayers and oral voting in meetings of the Channel Island parliamentary assemblies. For most contemporary speakers of Guernésiais, therefore, the linguistic relationship with French is akin to that which one would have with a "foreign" language. Like other British citizens, islanders will have encountered French via the education system, albeit generally a few years earlier than in the UK, but they do not speak it natively nor, for the most part, does French have much relevance for their

---

[3]See the Guernsey annual electronic census report 2022 URL: https://www.gov.gg/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=164619&p=0, retrieved 3 April 2025.

[4]Speaker numbers have not been recorded officially since the 2001 Census of Guernsey, which listed a figure of 1,327 (some 2% of Guernsey's population at that time).

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

daily lives.[6] For this reason, French does not play a significant role in contact-induced language change in the Channel Islands.

1.2 PAT-borrowing

MAT-borrowing can attract value-judgements, such as accusations of speaking "darn 'leth Gàidhlig, darn 'leth Beurl" ('half-Gaelic, half-English') (Dorian 1981: 98) (cf. King 2001: 195). This may lead to speakers consciously self-correcting or calling attention to the fact that they are using other-language lexical material, as illustrated by the following examples of English MAT-borrowings in Jèrriais, which is spoken in Jersey, Guernsey's Channel Island neighbour. In (3), the MAT-borrowing from English is followed by its equivalent in Jèrriais and, in (4), it is followed by a metalinguistic comment (Jones 2005a: 13). In other words, when they MAT-borrow, speakers seem to be aware that they are not keeping their languages materially separate.

(3) *Tout l'monde pâlait l'Jèrriais dans l'**playground**, dans l'bel dé l'école* 'Everyone spoke Jèrriais in the playground.'
(4) *Pèrsonne n'voulai(en)t l'acater sinon les pèrsonnes tchi voulaient changi l'affaithe en **flats**, comme qué nou dit* 'No-one wanted to buy it apart from the people who wanted to change the thing into flats, as we say.'

In contrast, PAT-borrowing does not involve the incorporation of any identifiable "other language" material and it is therefore arguably more "invisible" to speakers. Indeed, since this form of borrowing allows speakers not to deviate from the language choice parameter which they, their interlocutor or the sociolinguistic context set for the conversation, it is usually less overtly stigmatised and, aside from within the educational setting, when prescriptive usage is usually more of a focus than in everyday conversation, it often passes without comment (cf. Muysken 2000: 41; Aikhenvald 2006: 40).

The motivation for PAT-borrowing has been described as "an individual speaker's scan for an optimal construction through which to communicate local meanings" (Matras 2009: 243) or even "bilingual speech appearing in the disguise of monolingual speech" (Bolonyai 1998: 23). Further, it supports Muysken's view (2000: 252) that there is no "on-off" syntagmatic relation between the languages a speaker speaks but, rather, a co-existence between them. In French, this concept may be illustrated by the existence of compounds such as *auto-école* ('driving school'), *mini-jupe* ('mini skirt'), *ciné-club* ('cinema club'), and *grève attitude* ('strike attitude') (cf. Loock 2013), where lexical material from French is cast in the morphosyntactic frame of English (in these examples, the English pattern of right-headedness is substituted for the French pattern of left-headedness). Arguably, therefore, the English term that motivated the French term is not replaced but, as Muysken puts it, is "merely altered in its outer shape" (2000: 266), with contact thus having the effect of "pairing the lexical shape of one language with the syntax of

---

[6]However, its structural similarity to Norman means that most speakers of Guernésiais can understand French reasonably well.

another" (ibid: 266). Indeed, the gradual replacement in French of left-headed *club de tennis* by right-headed *tennis club* would presumably not have occurred had it not been for the existence of the term *tennis club* in English and, as seen with the example of *ciné-club* above, this syntactic pattern is now commonly used in French with the names of clubs. In such contexts, therefore, even though a bilingual speaker may be speaking one language, they are nevertheless able to draw on the grammars of both their languages, which are accessed simultaneously rather than sequentially. Processing two grammars with a single system can thus lead to similar linguistic organisational patterns being used for both languages (cf. Aikhenvald 2006: 45). As Matras (1998: 90) puts it, "languages in contact stimulate one another to generalise iconic structures, thereby promoting structural compatibility among them", with the ultimate criterion of equivalence being, according to Johanson, "the speaker's subjective assessment of what he or she feels to be close enough" (2002: 294). Ostensibly, the speaker is therefore still maintaining the situational constraints on their choice of language (Matras and Sakel 2007: 832), with their languages separated in terms of lexical material but, in practice, the PAT "skeleton" (Muysken 2000: 278) of one language being, in some part, taken from a different language.

Johanson considers contact-induced language change within his code-copying framework, casting the MAT-/PAT- dichotomy as a distinction between global copies (i.e. MAT-borrowing), where "a unit of the model code is copied as a whole, including its form and functions" (2002: 291),[7] and "selective" copying (i.e. PAT-borrowing), which involves "only selected structural – material [i.e. phonic properties], semantic [the denotative and connotative content], combinatorial [the internal constituency or external combinability] or frequential [frequency pattern] – properties of foreign blocks" (ibid: 292, insertions mine).

Matras and Sakel discuss the way in which what they term "pivot matching" (see §3.1 and elsewhere for examples) might provide a possible mechanism for some instances of PAT-borrowing. It is claimed that speakers identify a structure in the model language that plays a pivotal role in a particular construction and match it with a structure in the replica language, to which they assign a "pivotal role" in the replica construction (2007: 829) in a way that respects the grammatical constraints of the replica language. In other words, the process of syncretisation between the languages in contact "will selectively target a point of reference which is perceived as 'carrying' the construction" (ibid: 836). They further suggest that the concept of pivot matching could explain why PAT-borrowing does not always involve a wholescale matching of constructions between the two languages involved in a given contact situation – and why the outcomes often result from a change in the distribution of an established organisational pattern.

2. Methodology

As discussed in §1, the present study represents the second part of an extensive examination of the different outcomes of language contact in Guernésiais. The data

---

[7]"Units" are defined here as "segmental items that possess a material shape: stretches of speech, morphological, lexical, phrasal and phraseological items of various kinds" (Johanson 2002: 291).

are therefore mainly drawn from the corpus presented in Jones (2024) although, for the sake of completeness, in certain cases they are supplemented with data drawn from Jones (2002) and (2015), corpora with a very similar age- and socioeconomic make up, which are here analysed within the framework of the current study. Accordingly, for the most part, the methodology followed in this study is identical to that set out in Jones (2024), with the data being collected from interviews with 46 native speakers of Guernésiais, most of whom – in keeping with the overall demographics of this particular speech community – had close connections to agriculture and farming. All speakers were fluent in Guernésiais although it was not necessarily still their main everyday language. For logistical and ethical reasons, the data presented were collected before the Covid-19 pandemic.[8] Given the advanced degree of language contact in the speech community (all speakers of Guernésiais are also fluent in English: no monolinguals remain) and the cessation of intergenerational transmission (Jones 2015: §4.2), with most speakers aged over 65 at the time the data were collected, it has not been possible to consider usage related to proficiency in English, intensity of contact, age or social stratification.[9] All interviews were conducted by myself and in Guernésiais and took the form of free conversation. In an attempt to obtain naturalistic data and to lessen the effect of the observer's paradox (Labov 1972: 32), I was accompanied at all times by a fluent speaker of Guernésiais who was well known to the people being interviewed and who often took the lead in the conversation, a strategy which has, in other contexts, proved an effective way of enhancing the elicitation of casual speech, especially in cases where the researcher is not a native speaker of the variety under investigation (Turpin 1998: 223; Milroy and Gordon 2003: 75; Bowern 2010: 351). Involving a research assistant also made it possible to use social networks to locate speakers (cf. Milroy 1987), a strategy whose effectiveness has been demonstrated in other studies made of Norman (see, for example, Jones 2001, 2015).

Since PAT-borrowing does not involve the incorporation of tokens drawn from other-language material but rather, a "grafting" of the outer "shape" of one language onto the syntax of another, often involving no more than a difference in distribution of an existing organisational pattern, it is not only more difficult to identify than MAT-borrowing but also more difficult to "prove" and to discuss in a quantitatively meaningful way (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2005: 261). Moreover, unlike with the MAT-borrowings discussed in Jones (2024), the different types of PAT-data cannot be as usefully compared in terms of their overall frequency, given the impossibility of establishing meaningfully at which precise point a particular minority distribution pattern, for example, has become a majority one for all members of a given speech community, precisely because it is difficult to determine exactly when two patterns come to mean the same thing for each individual speaker (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2005: 75). Thus, in an attempt to confirm that a particular organisational pattern in Guernésiais represents a PAT-borrowing, usage is compared, where possible, to a

---

[8]Since data collection generally involves conducting interviews indoors, the age of participants made it inappropriate to conduct fieldwork in Guernsey during the years of the pandemic. This study therefore relies, for the most part, on data collected between 2010 and 2018.

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

corresponding construction in Mainland Norman, which is not in contact with English, and also to the data for Guernsey recorded in the *Atlas Linguistique et Ethnographique Normand* (Brasseur 1980, 1984, 1995, 1997, 2010, 2019, hereafter ALEN).[10] For the sake of completeness, the number of instances in the corpus is also calculated when it is possible to do so meaningfully.

In order to make the Guernésiais data accessible to readers more familiar with French than with Norman, the utterances cited from the data are given an orthographic rendering based on the (largely French-based) spelling system used in the *Dictiounnaire Angllais-Guernésiais* (De Garis 1982, hereafter DAG: the only contemporary dictionary of Guernésiais). The linguistic feature being discussed is highlighted in bold.

3. Results

Since this study complements and completes Jones (2024), as in that study, the results are presented here by part of speech.

3.1 Verbs

Muysken (2000: Chapter 7) describes verb compounds that combine elements from two languages as "bilingual verbs". Such a description could arguably be extended to the verbs of Guernésiais that combine Guernésiais lexical material with an English underlying structure. This section illustrates some of the different types of PAT-borrowing found in the corpus in the context of the verbal system.

3.1.1 Prepositional verbs

Prepositional verbs are idiomatic expressions that combine a verb and a preposition to create a new verb with a distinct meaning: for example, from the English verb *cut* we have *cut off* ('to stop the provision of something/to isolate something') and *cut down* ('to reduce something in size/to fell a tree'). Calqued English prepositional verbs are common in the corpus (186 tokens), even when indigenous equivalents exist. See, for example, (5)–(14), where the indigenous word is given in brackets. Sometimes (as in (6)), the calqued preposition accompanies a MAT-borrowing. As seen in (8) and (9), calqued prepositional verbs are so common in Guernésiais that some are even listed in the DAG (and are marked here as (L)) (cf. Jones 2015: 153). Heine and Kuteva (2005: 53) describe preposition calquing as a frequent feature of languages in contact.

(5) *Il fut **copaï bas*** 'It was cut down' (*abattre*).
(6) *Il a **slidaï à bas*** 'He slid down' (*drissaïr*).[11]
(7) *J' **mettrai** l' naom **bas*** 'I'll put the name down' (*enrégistraïr/écrire*).
(8) *Pour ne la **lâtcher** pas **hors*** (L) 'In order not to let her out' (*lâtcher*).
(9) *All'a **pitché hors** la djougue* (L) 'She threw out the jug' (*peltaïr*).

---

[10]The *Atlas Linguistique de la France* has not been consulted for this analysis as there is evidence to show that the speaker interviewed by Edmont for that study was from Jersey rather than from Guernsey (cf. Collas 1931: 9; Jones 2015: Chapter 5).

[11]Note the additional presence of MAT-borrowing in (6), (9) and (13).

(10) *Ch'tait chéna qui **mit** aen p'tit mes éfànts **hors*** 'That's what put my children out a bit' (*gueurvaïr*).

(11) *Nou **dounnit à haut** les tomates* 'We gave up [growing] tomatoes' (*r'nonchier/abàndounnaïr*).

(12) *Nou-s a **dounnai à haut** l'sécrétaire dé l'Assembllaïe* 'We gave up [being] the Assembllaïe secretary'(*r'nonchier /abàndounnaïr*).

(13) *I **baillit à haut**, i retireit* 'He gave up, he retired'(*r'nonchier/abàndounnaïr*).

(14) *L'Condor nous **lesse avaout*** 'The Condor [ferry] lets us down' (*bâtcher*).

In utterances such as these, the "pivot" is the abstract meaning that can be assigned to the English preposition that forms part of these verbs, which is then matched with the preposition's concrete meaning in Guernésiais (cf. Matras and Sakel 2007: 852). For Johanson, the verbs in (5)–(14) would be examples of combinatorial copying, with the combinatorial properties of English – here, the fact that these particular verbs may be combined with these particular prepositions – being copied onto units of Guernésiais. Such isogrammatism does not occur in Mainland Norman, where there is no contact with English and hence the corresponding verbs are never accompanied by these prepositions (cf. Trésor de la Langue Normande 2013).

3.1.2 Pronominal reflexive verbs

Certain Guernésiais verbs can have both reflexive and non-reflexive forms (Tomlinson 2008: 105). *L'vaïr*, for example, means 'to raise (something)' in its non-reflexive form but 'to get up' in its reflexive form (*s'l'vaïr*). When not being used reflexively, *l'vaïr* can only be transitive: in other words, *il lève (with the meaning 'he gets up') is an impossible structure. In this context, the clitic pronoun therefore forms part of the lexical specification of the verb. Like French, the conjugation of Guernésiais reflexive verbs requires a different reflexive pronoun for different persons of the verb (De Garis 1983: 343). The infinitive takes the 3SG/3PL reflexive pronoun *sé* in its base form (or in its citation form) but, as seen in (15), the person of the verb and the reflexive pronoun are co-referential. In other words, the pronoun varies if the infinitive refers to a non 3SG/3PL person of the verb.

(15) *Ch'n'tait pas aisi d'**m**'l'vaïr de bouanne haeure* 'It wasn't easy for **me** to get up early' (1SG reflexive pronoun).

Although, in most cases, the traditional reflexive pronoun is used with pronominal verbs, as in (15) (368 tokens), the corpus contains 112 instances where the reflexive pronoun is omitted (illustrated in (16)–(22)). These are presumably PAT-borrowings from English, with the "pivot" in this case being the lack of a reflexive pronoun in the corresponding verbs of English, which is leading to the absence of such a pronoun in Guernésiais. In Mainland Norman, these verbs are always accompanied by a reflexive pronoun when used with the meanings in (16)–(22) (cf. Jones 2020: 300–302; see also ALEN maps 1184, 1185; Brasseur 1995: map 14; Collas 1931: Q CCXVIII).

(16) *Si vous **avaïz** l'vaï à quatre haeures* 'If you had got up at four o' clock.'
(17) *Il' **tait** l'vaï à six haeures* 'He got up at six o' clock.'[12]
(18) *Nou soulait **l'vaïr** à huit haeures* 'We used to get up at eight o'clock.'
(19) *L'baté **arrête** à Jèrri* 'The boat stops in Jersey.'
(20) *Il **appeule** "open market"* 'It's called "open market".'
(21) *Des "pinche-tchu" qu'il' **app'laient*** ' "Pinch bottoms" as they are called.'
(22) *Entertchié qu'il' **ont lavaï** laeux moïns* 'Until they have washed their hands.'

Interestingly, this pivot also seems to motivate a second outcome, namely that finite reflexive verbs conjugated in the second person plural systematically feature the reflexive pronoun of the base form of the infinitive (*sé*) rather than the traditional (co-referential) 2PL reflexive pronoun (*vous*) (23)–(27) (cf. De Garis 1983: 343).[13] The fact that this replacement of the co-referential pronoun is documented by Tomlinson (2008: 40) suggests that such usage is relatively well established. Here therefore, the fact that the English verb does not change from the infinitive form when it is conjugated is leading, in Guernésiais, to PAT-borrowing of the English structure, with the *sé* reflexive pronoun seemingly reanalysed as part of an "invariable" infinitive. The use of *sé* as the reflexive pronoun of 2PL verbs is not documented for any other variety of Channel Island Norman, nor for Mainland Norman, although Heine and Kuteva (2005: 52) point to a similar change in the speech of some German speakers in Trieste who, under the influence of Slovenian, extend the 3PL reflexive pronoun to 1PL and 2PL referents.

(23) *Quaï langue vous **s'**en allaïz d'visaïr?* 'Which language are you going to speak?'
(24) *Vous **s'**n allaïz pas gognier* 'You are not going to win.'
(25) *Eiouque vous **s'**n allaïz auch't'haeure?* 'Where are you going now?'
(26) *Vous **s'**entrecomprenaïz pas* 'You don't understand one another.'
(27) *À moins que vous ne **s'**levaïz* 'Unless you get up.'

It is also worth mentioning another possible motivating factor here, namely that, unlike in Jersey and Sark, the 1PL pronoun *jé* is virtually obsolete in Guernésiais (Jones 2015: 136), where the impersonal pronoun *nou(s)* (= French *on*) is used instead, and almost categorically, to convey a 1PL meaning (Tomlinson 1981: 93, 2008: 39; De Garis 1983: 322ff). In other words, in contemporary Guernésiais the traditional 1PL form (28) is usually rendered as in (29).

(28) *J'nous lavîmes* 'We washed ourselves.'
(29) *Nou s'lavit* 'One washed themselves.'

Since the reflexive impersonal pronoun of Guernésiais (*sé*) is shared with the third person plural, the extension of its use to the 2PL pronoun could also be interpreted as internal simplification of the system of reflexive pronouns by way of levelling. Such levelling might be reinforced by the fact that the pronouns of the three persons

---

[12]For the difference in auxiliary usage with *l'vaïr* in (16) (*aver*) and (17) (*ête*) see Jones (2015: 119–121).
[13]As in French, the Guernésiais 2PL pronoun also serves as a 2SG polite form.

plural show no variation in English. Indeed, as illustrated in utterances such as (30), the reanalysis of the Guernésiais plural structure as "subject pronoun + invariable verb stem prefix (*sé*) + verb"[14] could well account for the doubling of the reflexive pronoun that sometimes occurs (4 tokens).

(30) *J'**nous** s'assiévimes* 'We sat down.'

To summarise, the lack of a reflexive pronoun in English in many verbs that would traditionally include one in Guernésiais seems to produce different types of PAT-borrowing in Guernésiais. One of these outcomes is the elimination of the reflexive pronoun of the Guernésiais construction while another results in the reflexive pronoun of the base form of the Guernésiais infinitive becoming invariable for the persons plural of the paradigm. From these results, it may be seen that PAT-borrowing does not always merely produce a copy of the model code in the replica code: it can also create new patterns of usage in the replica code from material available in that code.

3.1.3 Word order

In English, the verb *to be* may occupy the final position in an emphatic utterance such as *yes, they are*. In traditional Guernésiais, the corresponding verb, *ête,* tends not to occur in final position. However, as illustrated in (31)–(33), in the corpus, emphatic phrases with forms of *ête* in final position are relatively common (42 tokens), with the English structure underlying the Guernésiais lexical material. The pivot in this case is the fact that, although Guernésiais and English both have a verb 'to be', its distribution in both languages is different. Guernésiais therefore seems to be becoming influenced by the distribution of *to be* in the English model code, a further example of what Johanson defines as combinatorial copying (2002: 292). Such usage is not found in Mainland Norman (cf. Université Populaire Normande du Coutançais 1995).

(31) *Oui, mes daeux gràn'pères **étaient**!* 'Yes, my two grandfathers were!'
(32) *Ah, oui, **ch'tait*** 'Ah yes, it was.'
(33) *Oui, ma fomille **était*** 'Yes, my family was.'

3.1.4 3PL Verb conjugations

The corpus contains several instances of 3PL verbs being used in Guernésiais in place of 1PL verbs (10 tokens) (34)–(35). Here, the invariability of the persons plural of the English verb paradigm seems a likely pivot, leading to combinatorial copying involving the redistribution of the 3PL verb form. Again, no evidence of such usage is found in Mainland Norman.[15]

---

[14]For a discussion of the reinterpretation of target language morphemes during language shift, see Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 114–115).

[15]The near disappearance of the 1PL *jé* form from contemporary Guernésiais may of course not be without relevance here.

(34) *Ch'est bouan pour naons qui **pâlent** l'Guernésiais* 'It's good for us who speak Guernésiais.'

(35) *Ma soeur et mé **s'en furent*** 'My sister and I went.'

3.1.5. Semantic copying

Formal similarity between a word of English and a word of Guernésiais can sometimes lead to semantic copying, whereby what Johanson (2002: 292) terms the "denotative or connotative content elements of model code [English] units" (my insertion) are copied onto Guernésiais words. This type of PAT-borrowing, also documented by Weinreich (1963: 48), is termed "loan shift" by Appel and Muysken (1993: 165) and is considered by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 76, 90) as an indication that speakers of the recipient languages are under reasonably intense cultural pressure from another speech community.

The corpus contained many examples of loan shifts (107 tokens) (cf. (36)–(40)). In these cases, the pivot is created by the fact that the English verb can have two meanings: often one concrete or literal and the other abstract. The polysemous meaning of the English verb becomes grafted onto the Guernésiais verb so that it too becomes polysemous. For example, in (36) and (37) the verb *run/courre* has the meaning of 'to proceed rapidly on foot' in both English and Guernésiais. However, in traditional Guernésiais, *courre* does not share the extended meaning of the English verb *run*, namely 'to organise/make happen, function' (36) or 'to travel' (37), extended meanings which become copied onto Guernésiais (cf. *les bosses tcheurent* 'the buses run', DAG p. 155). In (38), the Guernésiais verb *saver* means 'to know' in the sense of 'to know a fact' but, on the model of English, its meaning has been extended in Guernésiais to encompass 'to be familiar with a person, place or thing' and, similarly, in (39), the meaning of *passaïr* 'to pass' [movement or time] has been extended in Guernésiais to 'to succeed in an exam' (cf. DAG p. 127). In (40), the English meaning 'to show one's allegiance to' has been copied onto *supportaïr*, which traditionally only meant 'to support, to endure' (cf. DAG p. 283). These utterances would not be understood by a speaker of Mainland Norman.

(36) *Ch'est iaeux qui **courrent** l'île* 'It is they who run the island.'

(37) *Quànd les bosses c'menchaient à **courre*** 'When the buses started to run.'

(38) *J'n' **savais** pas grànd'ment les mouissaons* 'I didn't know much about birds.'

(39) *Mon p'tit fils pâssit s'n exâmàn à l'university* 'My grandson passed his exam at university.'

(40) *J'ai terjous **supportaï** lé team dé Wales* 'I have always supported the Welsh team.'

Although no examples were found in the corpus, an instance of loan shift has also been recorded with the verb *travailler*, where the meaning of the Guernésiais verb 'to work' (in the sense of employment, labour) is extended to encompass the English meaning of 'to function' – *sht ologe travail pas* 'that clock doesn't work' (Sallabank 2013: 127) [her spelling].

3.1.6 The subjunctive

No consensus exists between the metalinguistic sources on Guernésiais as to the use of the subjunctive, which is more restricted than in French (see Jones 2000; cf. Tomlinson 1981: 91). As indicated in Table 1, which compares usage in a corpus of Guernésiais and Mainland Norman (Jones 2015: 127–130), the subjunctive still forms part of contemporary Guernésiais (cf. (41)) but – as is further demonstrated in a large-scale study of the Guernésiais subjunctive (Jones 2000) – it is also frequently replaced by the indicative (cf. (42)), holding ground in only two of the contexts examined, and even then not completely.

Table 1. Use of the subjunctive in Guernésiais and in Mainland Norman (tokens of the indicative are given in brackets)

	Guernésiais	Mainland Norman
Il faout qué 'it is necessary that'	10 (12)	21 (3)
Pour qué 'so that'	0 (4)	8 (0)
Verbs of influence	7 (2)	7 (0)
D'vànt qué 'before'	0 (6)	2 (0)
Ête + adjective + *qué* 'to be + adjective + that'	0 (4)	1 (1)
Verbs of thinking/believing in the negative	0 (10)	6 (1)

(41) *Arrête que j'maette chén'chin hors d'la vaeue* 'Wait while I put this out of your sight' (1SG present subjunctive).

(42) *Faout qu'j'lé lliés* 'I have to read it' (1SG present indicative).

The combinatorial properties of the English structures are clearly being copied onto Guernésiais and this is resulting in increasingly distinct usage from Mainland Norman, where the subjunctive predominates in the same contexts (cf. Jones 2015: 128).

Table 2, from Jones (2000), illustrates that, in Guernésiais, the conditional may be substituted for both the present subjunctive (cf. (43)) and the imperfect subjunctive (cf. (44)). As will be discussed, this may also be explained in terms of pivot matching.

The subjunctive has all but been eliminated from spoken English and this seems likely to be playing a part in its reduced usage in contemporary Guernésiais (cf. among others, Heine and Kuteva (2005: 20), who state that "categories for which there is no equivalent in the model language are in danger of being lost"). Yet, if the pivot in Guernésiais is the finite expression of an action combined with the expression of a modality, the replacement of the eliminated subjunctive form by conditional substitution in these contexts (cf. (43) and (44)) may indicate that Guernésiais is in fact replicating this pivot via a different formula – namely by copying the mood of the model language whilst preserving modality-marking.

Table 2. Contexts in which the conditional is substituted for the subjunctive in Guernésiais speech (number of tokens in brackets)

Context and number of tokens	Contexts in which conditional substitution occurred as a percentage of the total number of occurrences of this context	Conditional substitution occurring for the present subjunctive as a percentage of the total number of conditional substitutions	Conditional substitution occurring for the imperfect subjunctive as a percentage of the total number of conditional substitutions
Oîmaïr qué 'to like that' (14)	100% (14)	0%	100% (14)
I' faout qué 'it is necessary that'	10% (12)	33% (4)	66% (8)
Negative antecedent (24)	8% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)
À mouôins qué 'unless' (60)	8% (5)	100% (5)	0%
Vouller qué 'to want that' (61)	8% (5)	40% (2)	60% (3)
Pour qué 'so that' (108)	22% (24)	25% (6)	75% (18)
I' (m') r'semblle qué 'it seems (to me) that'	14% (5)	0%	100% (5)
Verbs of thinking/believing in the negative	7% (7)	71% (5)	29% (2)

(43) *I' faout qu' tu **verrais** tout chena* 'You must see all that.'
(44) *A voulait qu'j'**arrêtrais** mon travas* 'She wanted me to finish my work.'

The fact that conditional substitution is also found in *français populaire* and some regional varieties of French (cf. Gadet 1992: 89; Brunot and Bruneau 1969: 320; Cohen 1965: 3; Grevisse 1988: §869) suggests that, in this context, some form of broader internal simplification may be reinforcing any PAT-borrowing that may be present in Guernésiais. Nevertheless, in Guernésiais, conditional substitution occurs in a greater number of contexts than in French and it is also found in contexts where it would not usually occur in French, such as after verbs of volition (such as *vouller qué* 'to want that') and phrases that express purpose (such as *pour qué* 'so that'). Pivot matching therefore also provides one possible interpretation of these results.

3.1.7 Future tense expression
Like French, Guernésiais has two verbal paradigms to express future action: a synthetic form (45) (Tomlinson 2008: 81) and a de-allative periphrastic form (46). The latter is traditionally used to express an action taking place in the near future and, like the future tense of English, it is formed from the present tense of 'to go' and the infinitive (ibid: 84).

(45) *J'**vendrai** la maisaon* 'I will sell the house.'
(46) *J'm'en **vais vendre** la maisaon* 'I'm going to sell the house.'

349 examples of future tense usage were recorded in the corpus. 94 of these were synthetic forms and 255 were periphrastic forms. Given that both types of forms are used in a grammatically correct way, it is difficult to determine quantitatively the extent of any PAT-borrowing. However, since nearly three out of four future tense forms produced by speakers were de-allative, the data do suggest that PAT-borrowing from English may be causing an increase in frequency of this form, to the detriment of the synthetic future tense.[16] In this case, therefore, no obvious change in structural constituency has occurred, merely that a construction which already exists in Guernésiais is gaining ground and seems to be becoming less marked. Johanson describes this as frequential copying (2002: 292). This development also conforms to the widespread increase in transparency observed in obsolescent languages whereby synthetic forms may be replaced by analytic structures (Jones 1998: 251, cf. Schmidt 1985: 61; Dimmendaal 1992: 119). Indeed Heine and Kuteva (2005: 106–107) describe a similar outcome in the system of future tenses used in Pennsylvanian German and in the Yiddish of the Los Angeles area. The present study agrees with Thomason (2014: 43), *contra* authors such as Heine (2008), that, although it does not introduce an entirely new component into the language, a change in the frequency of a particular structure should still be considered as language change. Of course, it is not impossible to discount the fact that, as discussed above in the case of the pronominal reflexive verbs and the subjunctive (see, respectively, §§3.1.2 and 3.1.6), the change in use of the Guernésiais de-allative future tense form may also have an internal motivation, namely the simplification of a system with two "competing" future tense forms (cf. Kroch 1989).

3.2 Adjectives

Unmarked monosyllabic attributive adjectives and unmarked attributive adjectives of colour are traditionally pre-posed in Guernésiais. Other adjectives are traditionally post-posed (Tomlinson 1981: 47). However, recent studies have documented that, in the contemporary language, the pre-nominal position is becoming unmarked for all adjectives (cf. (47)–(49)), a development which does not occur in Mainland Norman (cf. Jones 2002: 154–155, 2015: 132–134).[17] These results were confirmed in the corpus, where 27 of the 80 tokens of the aforementioned adjective types are pre-posed. The change in word order in Guernésiais indicates the presence of PAT-borrowing in the form of both combinatorial and frequential copying with the pivot being that, in English, only one position (pre-nominal) is available for adjectives. Since the pre-nominal adjectival slot is already available in Guernésiais, albeit as a restricted pattern, the fact that it is increasingly becoming the unmarked position for all adjectives is likely

---

[16]Although the French de-allative future is also gaining ground in *français populaire*, this is unlikely to be motivating the increase in usage of the same form in Guernésiais since, as discussed in §1.1, the sociolinguistic setting is such that French does not play a significant role in contact-induced language change in Guernsey.

[17]Adjectives of nationality represent an exception to this (Tomlinson 2008: 23).

to remain un-noticed by speakers since, rather than representing new usage, it is simply the extension of a minority-use pattern in the language to a majority-use pattern (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2005: 41).

(47) *Ch'est aen **têtu** cat* 'It's a stubborn cat.'
(48) *All' a énne **différente** vie auch't'haeure* 'She has a different life now.'
(49) *Ouécqu'est la **pllate** terre* 'Where the flat ground is.'

Borrowed adjectives are also pre-posed (cf. (50)–(52)).

(50) *Ch'est énne **nice** persaonne* 'He's a nice person.'
(51) *Des **extras** lifts* 'Extra lifts.'
(52) *Ch'est des **china** coupes* 'They are china cups.'

An alternative explanation, of course, is that this change may be occurring via internal simplification, with the choice of two available adjective positions in contemporary Guernésiais being reduced to one.

3.3 Adverbs

Analysis of the adverbs in the corpus revealed the presence of different kinds of PAT-borrowing.

3.3.1 Semantic copying

Two forms were found of what Johanson defines as adverbial semantic copying (cf.§3.1.5 above). The first of these, illustrated in (53)–(55), takes the form of straightforward calquing, which gives these utterances meanings which would not be easily understood by a speaker of Mainland Norman.

(53) *Pas **terribllément*** 'not terribly.'
(54) *Ch'tait coum chena **dans les dix neuf sésàntes*** 'It was like that in the nineteen sixties.'
(55) *J'tais **à mon tout seu*** 'I was on my own.'[18]

The second type of adverbial semantic copying present in the data is the use of adjectives for adverbial functions (cf. (56)–(58) which illustrate each of the three types present in the corpus, with the tokens of *différent* (44 in number) being particularly common). Such usage is a well-documented feature of Guernsey English (Ramisch 1989: 161) and therefore makes PAT-borrowing a likely motivation. Indeed, the corpus also contains several English adjective MAT-borrowings conveying an adverbial function (cf. (59)–(60)). This type of PAT-borrowing therefore introduces new usage into Guernésiais rather than affecting the distribution of an existing pattern of usage.

(56) *I d'visent **différent** à chu q'nou d'vise* 'They speak differently to how we speak.'

---

[18]In contemporary Guernésiais, this expression has become the main way of conveying this particular meaning.

(57) *Si vous d'vizaïz aen p'tit pusse* **tràntchille** 'If you speak a little bit more slowly.'
(58) *I' pâle* **parfait** 'He speaks perfectly.'
(59) *Ch'n'est pas tous qui écrivent si* **plain** 'It's not everyone who writes so plainly.'
(60) *I'va en Frànce* **direct**[19] 'He goes to France directly.'

3.3.2 Broadening of meaning

Like French, but unlike English, Guernésiais makes use of a marked variant of the affirmative adverb *oui* 'yes' to emphasise an affirmative response or to contradict a negative (DAG p. 281; Tomlinson 2008: 61). This form, /sie/ (often spelt *si-est)*, is illustrated in (61).[20]

(61) *Tu n'vians pas? –* **Si-est** 'Aren't you coming? – Yes, I am.'

Jones (2002: 156) notes how, in an analysis of 43 speakers producing utterances that contradicted a negative, only 32 speakers used the form *si-est*, with 11 speakers using instead the unmarked affirmative adverb *oui*. The lack of an equivalent "strong" affirmative in English seems to be the pivot contributing to the broadening of meaning of *oui* in Guernésiais, whose use is being extended to contexts that would traditionally require the marked variant. This is another example of frequential copying, with a majority-use pattern replacing a minority-use pattern. No such usage is recorded for Mainland Norman (cf. ALEN map 1493).

3.4 Prepositions

A similar broadening of meaning is apparent in the prepositional system of Guernésiais, specifically with regard to the prepositions that denote the different meanings of English 'with'.[21] *Dauve* is the unmarked preposition (cf. (62)) but, to convey an instrumental meaning, the form used in traditional Guernésiais is *atou* (cf. (63)) and, for a comitative meaning, it is *à quànté* (cf. (64)). Like the affirmation structures described in §3.3.2, this therefore also represents a case where English lacks the oppositions that are present in Guernésiais.

(62) *Counnis-tu chut haomme* **dauve** *l's bllus iaers?* 'Do you know that man with blue eyes?'
(63) *J'ai copaï l'pôin* **atou** *l'couté* 'I have cut the bread with the knife.'
(64) *Va* **à quànté** *li* 'Go with him.'

---

[19]This use of *direct* (rather than *directement*) in this context may also be heard in spoken French.

[20]The adverb *vère* is also used in affirmation, as a confirmatory 'yes' (= 'verily') (Tomlinson 1981: 82, DAG p. 217).

[21]Heine and Kuteva, among others, refer to this process whereby "variability in the arrangements of meaningful elements is narrowed down to one particular arrangement" (2005: 6) as "narrowing" or "semantic bleaching" (cf. ibid: 15).

Notwithstanding the descriptions in metalinguistic sources such as the DAG (p. 214) and Tomlinson (2008:21), only one of these three prepositions, *dauve*, is present in the 64 tokens of 'with' prepositions analysed in Jones (2015) (38 unmarked, 10 instrumental, 16 comitative). Examples of the contemporary usage found are given in (65)–(67).

(65) *Aen scabet **dauve** treis pids* 'A stool with three feet' (unmarked).

(66) *Nou veyait pas d'vielles gens par les càmps, i n'marchaient pas **dauve** des bâtaons* 'We didn't see old people going round about, they didn't walk with sticks' (instrumental).[22]

(67) *Il allait **dauve** sa gràn'mère* 'He used to go with his grandmother' (comitative).[23]

Although the English word *with* has not been copied into Guernésiais in these examples (as a MAT-borrowing), the fact that English only has one preposition, rather than three, to denote the functions of 'with' has led to a reduction in the use of *atou* and *à quànté* in contemporary Guernésiais. In other words, one of the three 'with' patterns of traditional Guernésiais has increased in frequency to become the only pattern. *Dauve* is therefore undergoing progressive desemanticisation as the distinct semantic contents of *atou* and *à quanté* (and indeed, the forms themselves) are lost under the influence of English. This development is, of course, in line with the well-known tendency in obsolescent languages for speakers to overgeneralise unmarked categories to contexts that historically require marked variants (cf. Jones 1998: 251–252).

The change in use of 'with' prepositions in contemporary Guernésiais represents another example of frequential copying in that the form being generalised is not created on the basis of English but is, rather, extending its usage on the basis of English. A similar tendency is described by Dorian (1981: 136), who notes a marked reduction in the 11 pluralisation strategies of East Sutherland Gaelic via the generalisation of simple suffixation, the pluralisation device used in English – the language with which East Sutherland Gaelic is in contact.

Interestingly, and notwithstanding the descriptions contained in many metalinguistic works, including Dumeril and Dumeril (1849: 3), Decorde (1852: 45), Robin et al (1879: 32–33), Romdahl (1881), De Fresnay (1881: 29), Fleury (1886: 73), Barbe (1907: 10) and von Wartburg (1922– 1946 vol 2, II: 1417), Jones (2015: 139) found that a single preposition (*d'aveu*) is also becoming increasingly used to convey all the different meanings of 'with' in the Mainland Norman of the Cotentin peninsula (197 tokens [118 unmarked, 40 instrumental, 39 comitative]). This is presumably because Mainland Norman is displaying PAT-borrowing from French, which uses the sole form *avec* for all three of the 'with' functions described above.

---

[22]Collas (1931: Q CXI) records the use of *dauve* for instrumental usage but *ibid*: QQ LXV and CXXVII also document the presence of instrumental *atou* in south-western Guernésiais.

[23]Collas (1931: Q CLXXII) records that *dauve* is used to express the comitative function in the speech of all the parts of Guernsey that he examined.

3.5 Pronouns

3.5.1 Gender-marking

Like French but unlike English, Guernésiais marks masculine and feminine gender on its 3SG subject and object pronouns when these refer to inanimate referents, as such referents always carry gender (cf. (68) and (69), where the pronoun and its referent are given in bold).

(68) **L'couté**$_M$ *est sus la table.* **Il**$_M$ *est aidgu* 'The knife is on the table. It is sharp' (lit. 'he').

(69) **La paomme**$_F$ *est dans l'ponier.* **All'**$_F$ *est p'tite* 'The apple is in the basket. It is red' (lit. 'she').

Traditional gender-marking is generally observed in the corpus, with 223 of the 230 tokens of referential pronouns respecting such usage. However, seven speakers each produced one token of a masculine pronoun when referring to a feminine referent. This non-traditional usage is illustrated in (70) and (71).[24]

(70) *L'aoute* **fomille**$_F$, **i**$_M$ *continuit supareillement autour de l'eghise* 'The other family, it continued especially around the church' (lit. 'he').

(71) *Chaque* **paraesse**$_F$ *faisait coum* **i**$_M$ *voulait* 'Each parish did as it wanted' (lit. 'he').

The (albeit slight) variation that exists in this context may be indicative of an incipient change which could be interpreted as PAT-borrowing from English. Since, in most cases, only one noun topic occurs in a given utterance, it is unlikely that any ambiguity will exist for the interlocutor in terms of the pronoun's referent. Therefore, when the referent is inanimate, the low functional load that gender carries in such utterances allows for its effective "neutralisation" in these contexts without any resulting difficulties of comprehension. Whilst the phonetic form of the referential pronoun is therefore unmistakably Guernésiais, its use in utterances such as (70) and (71), where it keeps its referential function but seems to have lost its gender specification, is more aligned with English *it*, which thus represents the pivot.

3.5.2 Pronoun calquing

When the argument of a verb does not match in Guernésiais and in English, PAT-borrowing may take the form of pronoun calquing. Although relatively infrequent in the corpus (18 tokens), examples of non-traditional usage are found with five different verbs, each of which is illustrated in (72)–(76). No such usage is found in Mainland Norman (cf. Jones 2020: 298–300).

---

[24]The occasional gender neutralisation of the 3SG subject pronoun is recorded by Frei for *français populaire* (1929:145–146, 151).

(72) *I mànchtait Guernési* 'He missed Guernsey', where the experiencer [in bold] has changed from indirect object to subject (1 token of non-traditional use in the corpus).

(73) *Ch'est énne mappe qué mon haomme **lé** dounnit* 'It's a map that my husband gave him', where the recipient [in bold] has changed from indirect to direct object (1 token of non-traditional use in the corpus).

(74) *J'**lé** répaonds en Guernésiais* 'I answer him in Guernésiais', where the recipient [in bold] has changed from indirect to direct object (1 token of non-traditional use in the corpus).

(75) *Nou s'en va **les** apprendre lé Guernésiais* 'We are going to teach them Guernésais', where the recipient [in bold] has changed from indirect to direct object (3 tokens of non-traditional use in the corpus).

(76) *J'**les** pâlais souvent* 'I spoke to them often', where the recipient [in bold] has changed from indirect to direct object (12 tokens of non-traditional use in the corpus).

4. Conclusion

This study completes a detailed examination made of the linguistic outcomes of language contact in contemporary Guernésiais, a language currently in an advanced stage of shift. It is undertaken using the theoretical framework of MAT- and PAT-borrowing, devised by Matras and Sakel (see, for example Matras and Sakel 2007) and complements the findings of Jones (2024), which centres on the more easily-identifiable MAT-borrowing (lexical borrowing and code-switching). In contrast to Jones (2024), the present study has focused on language change where structural patterns are transferred but not the morphemes themselves (cf. Thomason 2014: 31). As has been stated, this type of language change is arguably more "invisible" to speakers since no easily identifiable "other language" material is present.

Evidence of PAT-borrowing from English is found in the Guernésiais of all the speakers interviewed and also in all the parts of speech examined (verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions and pronouns). This finding is consistent with the long history of intensive contact between Guernésiais and English and with the advanced degree of bilingualism that exists within the Guernésiais speech community (cf. Thomason 2014: 42; Heine and Kuteva 2005: 13). The analysis in this study has illustrated instances of where i) a category of Guernésiais has been restructured to align more with a corresponding category in English (see, for example §§3.1.2 [pronominal reflexive verbs], 3.2 [adjective position], 3.3.2. [affirmation strategies], 3.4 ['with' prepositions] and 3.5.1 [gender-marking in pronouns]); ii) a new pattern of usage has been assigned to an existing category, thereby extending its range (see, for example §§3.1.3 [word order], 3.1.4 [3PL verb conjugations], 3.1.7 [future tense expression], 3.2 [adjective position], 3.3.2. [affirmation strategies], 3.4 ['with' prepositions] and 3.5.1 [gender-marking in pronouns] and 3.5.2 [pronoun calquing]); and iii) a new category replaces an existing one (see, for example §§3.1.1 [prepositional verbs], 3.1.3 [word order] and 3.1.6 [subjunctive]). In some cases, the "new" and "old" structures may co-exist side-by-side (see, for example, §§3.1.4 [3PL

verb conjugations], 3.1.6 [subjunctive], 3.1.7 [future tense expression], 3.5.1 [gender-marking in pronouns] and 3.5.2 [pronoun calquing]).

Unless its history is well documented, it may be impossible to pinpoint the origin of a PAT-borrowing (cf. Csato 2002: 326), which is likely to start life as a momentary (nonce) innovation on the part of a bilingual speaker. Since no difficulties of comprehension arise, such usage may remain uncommented upon by an interlocutor and, if replicated by a significant enough proportion of the speech community, it may become incorporated as a long-term change, with its ultimate adoption depending on its acceptability to the speaker (Matras and Sakel 2007: 852). It is important to underline, however, that Guernésiais is not being completely restructured in that, although change may be seen in a number of its patterns of usage, it has not adopted a wholly English morphosyntax.

Johanson discusses how copies may become conventionalised in the usage of individuals and/or speech communities, with new patterns becoming normal (2002: 298) as what started life as non-conventionalised phenomena become accepted, leading to the establishment of new sets of norms. As Romaine puts it, "although the semantic differences in the bilinguals' system are originally attributable to contact, they now provide the basis for an emergent set of norms" (1989: 163). It would seem that there might potentially be most scope for such a development in a fully bilingual speech community such as that of Guernésiais, where the linguistic norms remain to some extent uncodified and where, as yet, no formal mechanism exists for any norms that might be established to be transmitted within the community.[25] In such cases, "however startling or reprehensible they may appear to unilinguals or individuals only familiar with the unilingual norm, interference-induced innovations […] in time may come to constitute instances of new community norms" (Mougeon and Beniak 1991: 220; cf. Haugen 1977; Jones 2005b).

As discussed, therefore, some PAT-borrowings will probably become new norms – for example, certain calqued prepositional verbs, such as those cited in §3.1.1 some of which are already listed in the DAG, the generalisation of *sé* as the invariable plural reflexive pronoun, now recorded in Tomlinson's grammar (2008: 40) (cf. §3.1.2), certain loan shifts (cf. §3.1.5 for an example which is now listed in the DAG) and the pre-nominal position of adjectives (cf. §3.2, Tomlinson 2008: 23). However, others may remain more idiolectal – see, for example, the use of 3PL verbs in traditional 1PL contexts (cf. §3.1.4), the broadening in meaning of the affirmative adverb (cf. §3.3.2) and gender-marking in 3SG referential pronouns (cf. §3.5.1). Idiolectal PAT-borrowing, in the form of underlying English organisational patterns in Guernésiais, do not of course pose any difficulties to comprehension since the fully bilingual nature of the Guernésiais speech community means that any structure that may emerge as dominant already forms part of its (English) linguistic repertoire. As Matras (2014: 54) comments, "In structural and functional terms, pattern replication facilitates the generalisation of constructions across the

---

[25]At the time of writing, Guernésiais is not taught in schools and the literature that has been produced (see Jones 2008, 2022 for details) is not easily accessible, either because many islanders acquire their primary basic literary skills in English and have no opportunity to develop them in their mother tongue or because the literature is deposited in inconvenient formats and locations (see Jones 2015: 78, 2017: 79–81).

repertoire while maintaining the overt separation of form."[26] In other words, speakers will still understand the PAT-borrowed components of Guernésiais as Guernésiais since any morphosyntactic differences from the traditional language that may occur will still map onto a morphosyntax that they know well. Although therefore Guernésiais and English are kept separate functionally, in practice the speech community seems open to, or is at least uncritical of, some degree of overlap between these languages in terms of shared combinatorial structures and frequential patterns.[27] Indeed, the absence of comments on the presence of PAT-borrowings suggests that speakers may not even notice that it is occurring. In such a context, it is easy to see how idiolectal usage in the form of "nonce" PAT-borrowings from English (or, to use Heine and Kuteva's term, "spontaneous replication" (2005: 116)) may come to be used in Guernésiais as unproblematically as nonce MAT-borrowings (cf. Jones 2024) and how such forms have the potential to propagate within the speech community (cf. Matras and Sakel 2007: 851). As Aikhenvald writes, "Innovations have a better chance in a situation where there is little, or no, resistance to them" (2006: 41). As discussed in §1.2, it is interesting to consider whether, in a context of language shift, PAT-borrowings may represent a way of enabling speakers to continue speaking within the language choice parameter set for the conversation even when the sociolinguistic setting may have led to a different language holding sway in their internal grammar.

This study has also highlighted a major difference between MAT- and PAT-borrowing, namely that, whereas MAT-borrowing can only be explained with reference to the dominant language (cf. Jones 2024), some apparent instances of PAT-borrowing can also on occasion admit an internal explanation, such as simplification, without any clear means of determining which motivation predominates (see, for example, §3.1.2 [pronominal reflexive verbs], §3.1.6 [subjunctive], §3.1.7 [future tense expression], §3.2 [adjective position], §3.4 ['with' prepositions]; cf. also Jones 2005b:168–170). It is therefore interesting to consider whether some of the changes discussed herein might have occurred in Guernésiais even if it had not been in contact with English (cf. Burridge 2006:188) and whether, in contexts such as this, language contact and what we might term the general tendencies of language change may, in fact, be serving to reinforce one another.

Competing interests. The author declares none.

References

Aikhenvald, A.Y. (1996). Areal diffusion in Northwest Amazonia: The case of Tariana. *Anthropological Linguistics*, **38**.1: 73–116.

Aikhenvald, A.Y. (2006). Grammars in contact. A cross-linguistic perspective. In: A.Y. Aikhenvald and R. M.W. Dixon (eds), *Grammars in Contact. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–66.

Appel, R. and Muysken, P. (1993). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Arnold (1st edition 1987).

Barbe, L. (1907). *Dictionnaire du patois normand en usage à Louvier et dans les environs*. Louviers: Izambert.

---

[26]Matras's comment is made in relation to morphology but is equally pertinent here.

[27]For a discussion of attitudes towards non-native forms see, among others, Aikhenvald (2006: 39–42).

Bolonyai, A. (1998). In-between languages: Language shift/maintenance in childhood bilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, **2**: 21–43.

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

Brasseur, P. (1977). Le français dans les îles anglo-normandes. *Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature*, **16**: 97–104.

Brasseur, P. (1980, 1984, 1997, 2010, 2019). *Atlas linguistique et ethnographique normand*. Paris: CNRS (2010: Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2019: Strasbourg: ELiPhi).

Brasseur, P. (1995). Les pronoms personnels dans l'Atlas linguistique normand. In: M.-R. Simoni (ed.), *Dialectologie et littérature du domaine d'oïl occidental [Seillac, 5–7 mai 1993]*. Fontaine-lès-Dijon: A.B.D.O., pp. 323–351.

Brunot, F. and Bruneau, C. (1969). *Précis de grammaire historique de l'ancien français*. Paris: Masson.

Burridge, K. (2006). Language contact and convergence in Pennsylvania German. In: A.Y. Aikhenvald and R.M.W. Dixon (eds), *Grammars in Contact. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 179–200.

Cohen, M. (1965). *Le subjonctif en français contemporain*, 2nd edn. Paris: SEDES.

Collas, J.P. (1931). A critical examination of the "Atlas Linguistique de la France" in so far as it concerns the Island of Guernsey. Unpublished B.Litt dissertation, University of Oxford.

Csató, E. (2002). Karaim: a high-copying language. In: M.C. Jones and E. Esch (eds) *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-linguistic Factors*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 315–327.

De Fresnay, A.G. (1881). *Memento du patois normand*. Rouen: Ch. Métérie.

De Garis, M. (1982). *Dictiounnaire Angllais-Guernésiais* (revised and enlarged 3rd edn). Chichester: Phillimore.

De Garis, M. (1983). Guernesiais: a grammatical survey. *Report and Transactions of La Société Guernesiaise*, **21**.3: 319–353.

Decorde, J.-E (1852). *Dictionnaire du patois du Pays de Bray*. Available online at: http://gutenberg.ca/ebooks/decorde-dictbray/decorde-dictbray-00-h-dir/decorde-dictbray-00-h.html, retrieved 3 April 2025.

Dimmendaal, G. (1992). Reduction in Kore reconsidered. In: M. Brenzinger (ed) *Language Death: Factual and Theoretical Explorations with Special Reference to East Africa*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 117–135.

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

Dumeril, E.P. and Dumeril, A.E.S. (1849). *Dictionnaire du patois normand*. Caen: B. Mancel.

Fleury, J.F.B. (1886). *Essai sur le patois normand de la Hague*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Leclerc.

Frei, H. (1929). *La Grammaire des fautes: introduction à la linguistique fonctionnelle, assimilation et différenciation, brièveté et invariabilité, expressivité*. [1993 printing] Geneva: Slatkine.

Gadet, F. (1992). *Le Français populaire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Grevisse, M. (1988). *Le Bon Usage*, 12th edn. Paris and Gembloux: Duculot.

Haugen, E. (1977). Norm and deviation in bilingual communities. In: P.A. Hornby (ed), *Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Educational Implications*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 91–102.

Heine, B. (2008). Contact-induced word order change without word order change. In: P. Siemund and N. Kintana (eds), *Language Contact and Contact Languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 33–60.

Heine, B. and Kuteva, T. (2005). *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Johanson, L. (2002). Contact-induced change in a code-copying framework. In: M.C. Jones and E. Esch (eds), *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-linguistic Factors*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter pp. 285–313.

Jones, M.C. (1998). *Language Obsolescence and Revitalisation. Linguistic Change in Two Sociolinguistically Contrasting Welsh Communities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, M.C. (2000). The subjunctive in Guernsey Norman French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, **10**.2: 177–203.

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

Jones, M.C. (2002). Mette a haout dauve la grippe des Angllaïs: English/French convergence on Guernsey. In: M.C. Jones and E. Esch (eds), *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-linguistic Factors*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 143–168.

Jones, M.C. (2005a). Some structural and social correlates of single word intrasentential codeswitching in Jersey Norman French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, **15**.1: 1–23.

Jones, M.C. (2005b). Transfer and changing linguistic norms in Jersey Norman French. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, **8**.2: 159–175.

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

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

Jones, M.C. (2017). Langue et espace socio-langagiers à Guernesey. In: G. Ledegen (ed.), *Sociolinguistique urbaine, sociolinguistique d'intervention : apports et innovations. Hommage scientifique à Thierry Bulot*. Paris : L'Harmattan (Espaces discursifs series), pp. 63–110.

Jones, M.C. (2020). Mainland and Insular Norman: Pronoun sharing and pronoun sparing. In: S. Wolfe and M. Maiden (eds), *Variation and Change in Gallo-Romance Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 279–304.

Jones, M.C. (2022). *A Pocketful of Guernésiais*. Guernsey: Blue Ormer.

Jones, M.C. (2024). The rolling snowball: lone English-origin lexical items in Guernésiais. *Journal of French Language Studies*, **34**.2: 155–179.

King, K.A. (2001). *Language Revitalisation Processes and Prospects. Quicha in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kroch, A.S. (1989). Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language Variation and Change*, **1**:199–244.

Kroskrity, P.V. (1993). *Language, History and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Studies of the Arizona Tewa*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

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

Loock, R. (2013). The emergence of Noun + Noun constructions with a regressive order in contemporary French? *Journal of French Language Studies*, **23**.2: 259–279.

Matras, Y. (1998). Convergent development, grammaticalization, and the problem of "mutual isomorphism". In: W. Boeder, C. Schroeder, K. H. Wagner and W. Wildgen (eds), *Sprache in Raum und Zeit: In memoriam Johannes Bechert*, vol **2**. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, pp. 89–103.

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

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

Matras, Y. and Sakel, J. (2007). Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language*, **31**.4: 829–865.

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

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

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

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

Ramisch, H. (1989). *The Variation of English in Guernsey, Channel Islands*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Robin, P.-E., Le Prévost, A., Passy, A.-F. and De Blosseville, E.P. (1879). *Dictionnaire du patois normand en usage dans le département de l'Eure*. Evreux: Hérissey.

Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Romdahl, A. (1881). *Glossaire du patois du Val de Saire (Manche)*. Linköping: Ridderstads Boktryckeri.

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

Sallabank, J. (2013). *Attitudes to Endangered Languages: Identities and Policies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, A. (1985). *Young People's Dyirbal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomason, S.G. (2007). Language contact and deliberate change. *Journal of Language Contact*, **1**.1: 41–62.

Thomason, S.G. (2014). When is the diffusion of inflectional morphology not dispreferred? In: N. Amiridze, P. Arkadiev and F. Gardani (eds), *Borrowed Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 27–46.

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

Tomlinson, H. (1981). Le Guernesiais – étude grammaticale et lexicale du parler normand de l'île de Guernesey. Unpublished Ph.D thesis: University of Edinburgh.

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

Treffers-Daller, J. and Mougeon, R. (2005). The role of transfer in language variation and change: evidence from contact varieties of French. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, **8**.2: 93–98.

Trésor de la Langue Normande (2013). Marigny: Eurocibles.

Turpin, D. (1998). "Le français, c'est le *last frontier*": the status of English-origin nouns in Acadian French. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, **2**.2: 221–233.

Université Populaire Normande du Coutançais (1995). *Essai de grammaire de la langue normande*. Périers: Garlan.

Von Wartburg, W. (1922–) *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr.

Weinreich, U. (1963). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. [Second printing]. The Hague: Mouton.