

FRENCH INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH PREPOSITIONS:  
A STUDY OF *ANCRENE WISSE*

ANA M<sup>A</sup> HORNERO CORISCO

*University of Zaragoza*

1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In the past it has been customary for languages to be regarded as separate entities and for lexical borrowing from one to another to be considered as an external phenomenon. However, this view is rooted in the modern coincidence of language and nationality. In Europe nation and language coincide as a whole. But when we go back to the medieval period this equation has not the same force as in the post-medieval world, and the whole question of lexical borrowing in the Middle Ages must be studied in a multilingual context.

2. Social context

*Ancrene Wisse* and the works contained in the *Katherine Group* were written in late 12th – early 13th century England, under the following sociolinguistic conditions.

The Norman influence was strong, but not strong enough to ‘Normanize’ the whole nation. From the 11th to the 13th centuries, in spite of Norse invasions followed by Norman domination, the English language and literary tradition were preserved in the West, where these works were produced.<sup>2</sup>

Of course there are still divergences as to what the real extent was to which English and French were used in England during the three centuries and a half

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper forms part of a more extensive (unpublished) research work, in which an analysis was undertaken on the influence of French on Early Middle English vocabulary, noun and verb phrases, prepositions and sentence word order within *Ancrene Wisse* and the *Katherine Group*.

<sup>2</sup> On the possible geographical location see studies by Tolkien (1929), Serjeantson (1938), Brewer (1965), Shepherd (1959), d’Ardenne (1961), Zettersten (1965) and Dobson (1976).

following the Norman Conquest. What is a fact is that the Normans and settlers from other French territories constituted a small minority whose numerical strength never seemed to exceed a 10% of the whole population of England (Berndt 1965: 145). There is no doubt of the continued use of English after the Conquest, spoken mainly by the lower strata of society (namely, the native population).

The author of *Ancrene Wisse* seems to have been a man belonging to the regular clergy,<sup>3</sup> an Augustinian to be more specific. For people like him, French very probably remained the first language until far into the 12th century, but never ousted English entirely in the monasteries, so English continued to be the mother tongue of part of them. At the end of 12th century bilingualism (and even trilingualism) was not rare in the clergy. And although French was no longer the mother tongue of all the most important clerical landlords, the best educated members of the regular clergy of early 13th century England held French as one of the means of oral as well as written communication.<sup>4</sup> For native-born Englishmen, their grasp of French often appeared to reflect their position, education or aspirations in the world. And for those who chose a career in ecclesiastical government French and Latin were essential.

Latin, French and English must have been in daily contact in a number of spheres – administration (royal and ecclesiastical), the law, education – and given such a degree of close contact, a good deal of borrowing from one language to another must inevitably have taken place. The cultural and prestigious influence of the French-speaking court is responsible for many French borrowings which tend to reflect the sociolinguistic status of the donor language: since French in this context was the superstratum, loans tend to come from the more prestigious sections of the lexicon and their connotations tend to reflect that prestige.

### 3. Effects of the linguistic contact

The first thing which comes to mind when we think of borrowing is the adoption of lexical items. But the fact is that through vocabulary borrowing other linguistic elements may be acquired, so that linguistic contact may have further-reaching effects on general linguistic structure. If we come to analyse the effect of language contact on the production *Ancrene Wisse*, the conclusion is that, as far as vocabulary is concerned, the author's performance is placed half-way between linguistic borrowing and code mixing. But the case of prepositions presents a different picture. As Appel – Muysken (1987: 171) state,

<sup>3</sup> See Dobson (1976).

<sup>4</sup> As Wilson (1943) states, by the end of the 12th century Anglo-French was increasing in importance and works were translated into it from English. As a spoken language it must have been fairly widespread, but there is little evidence that it was commonly used amongst the lower classes.

More generally, content words ... will be borrowed more easily than function words ... since the former have a clear link to cultural content and the latter do not ...

Since, as function words, prepositions are crosslinguistically hardly ever borrowed, the process taking place here is one of calquing: these formations do not introduce foreign elements into the language, but they do introduce new forms (Hock 1991: 399). Calquing presupposes a certain familiarity with the donor language (French) and its grammatical structure, something which, as stated above, the author must have mastered.

In the context of post-Conquest England two basic structural principles affected the English language:

- a. the number of inflections decreased in favour of periphrases
- b. sentence word order gradually fixed

Both factors were intimately connected: the gradual loss of inflections had a double effect on syntactic structure: on the one hand the use of prepositions increased to a large extent, and eventually became indispensable. On the other hand and as a consequence of the former situation, word and phrase order in the sentence became gradually more fixed. The new syntactic relationships were (about) to be expressed fundamentally by means of word order and prepositions.

It is generally asserted that despite the great number of French loanwords, English is still a Germanic language in its grammatical system: its pronouns, conjunctions and prepositions betray a Germanic origin. Being all that true, the fact that many of them have felt the impact of French in their functions deserves, however, due attention. As an instance, let us consider the case of the preposition *of*: under the influence of the French preposition *de* it suffered a change from its beginnings in Old English. In Middle English *of* had the added values or meanings of 'by' and 'with regard to'. It was also very useful for the formation of the possessive: *The lady of the house* (cf. Fr. *la dame de la maison*). Chaucer uses the expression *of newe* (< OFr. *de nouvel*, now *anew*), or the partitive use (*Of smale houndes had she* < Fr. *de petits chiens*).

These changes, greatly due to French influence, were hardly perceptible during the 12th century and became more frequent in the course of the 13th century – the stage at which *Ancrene Wisse* was written.<sup>5</sup> But it is mainly from the first half of the 14th century when they are clearly seen and characterise the standard of English, constituting one of the differences between it and Early Middle English. These changes ran parallel to the increase of French vocabulary in Middle English.

<sup>5</sup> See studies by Talbot (1956), Shepherd (1959) and Dobson (1976).

In this stage of continuous growth of prepositions, each consolidates the old values, acquiring at other times a new series of values and functions, mainly due to contact with French and Latin. Let us analyse the state of prepositions in *Ancrene Wisse*:

The total sum of occurrences of prepositions found in the sample<sup>6</sup> amounts to 1163, the most frequent being *of, i/in, to, o/on, wid, for/uore* → 58.37%.

All the prepositions, dating from the early 13th century, are of Germanic origin, something that appears as perfectly natural, especially at this stage of English.

42 different prepositions appear in *Ancrene Wisse*. We will point out here only those in which the influence of French seems justified.

**BI:** It seldom appeared in Old English. Its instrumental value increased in Middle English. Its new higher frequency may be due to the influence exerted by the French preposition *par*. To illustrate it, let us see some correspondences between the French version of MS Cotton Vitellius and the English version of MS Corpus Christi College Cambridge 402, where preposition *bi* acquires the *local* sense of 'along' or 'through':

CCCC	<i>he seo oder here idele gomenes ant wundres bi þe weie</i> (178.10)
Vitellius	<i>qil veie ou oie oiseaus et merueilles par la voie</i> (250.22)
CCCC	<i>Bi þe wei as ha geað</i> (218.25)
Vitellius	<i>Par la voie sicome ele veit</i> (311.29)

The presence of *bi* in oaths has its origin in this local value, whereby *bi* denotes proximity: 'next to, close to'. Here the influence of Fr. *par* seems unquestionable. In its *instrumental* use *bi* indicated the person or thing by means of whom/which the action took place. In this context some of the correspondences between both versions have been selected:

CCCC	<i>bi hwucche me climbeð to þe blisse of heouene</i> (181.9)
Vitellius	<i>par les queus len monte a la ioie de ciel</i> (255.10)
CCCC	<i>bi þeos leaddre</i> (181.22)
Vitellius	<i>par ceste eschiele</i> (255.35)

Not a few expressions which bear this instrumental value seem to be direct 'imitations' of French models: *by force, by heart, by virtue of*, etc.

An innovative use of *bi* is to indicate the *agent of a passive action*. This value, that became frequent in the 15th and 16th centuries, is already present in *Ancrene Wisse*, although the number of occurrences here is very limited. In

<sup>6</sup> The sample was obtained by selecting a 15% of the whole text. Four different extracts were taken from four chapters of *Ancrene Wisse*, namely, chapters II, IV, VI and VIII.

this use *bi* must have been influenced by the French preposition *par*:

CCCC	<i>þis ilke is bitacnet bi cherubines sweord</i> (181.28)
Vitellius	<i>Cest meismes ensemment est signifie par lespee cherubin</i> (256.13) 'There is the same meaning in the Cherubim's sword' <sup>7</sup> (Salu, 157)

**ED (AT):** It shows a variety of uses in Middle English, which generally correspond and are influenced by the French preposition *a*, Lat. *ad* and *apud* and ON *at*. Its presence from Old English was strengthened and its values expanded due to contact with other languages.

The Old French preposition *a* must have been easy to calque, since it reminded the speaker of *at*.

*At* is present in a great number of adverbial phrases, many of which are calques of Latin, Old French or Old Norse. Scholars like Sykes (1899: 54) support the idea that the semantic development undergone by *at* in Middle English is mostly due to French influence:

These changes are paralleled with the utmost exactitude by the use of *à* in corresponding syntactical phrases in Old French. They occur for the first time chiefly in works having French originals. Hence it must be concluded that this development of meaning of *at* and the extension of its phrasal power are the direct result of French influence upon the native language.

In the Middle English period *at* acquires new values: from its original local sense it develops an instrumental function: e.g.,

*witeð ed ower meiden* (35.19)  
'find out from your maid' (Salu, 28)

or indicates the *time* when an action takes place: e.g.,

*speare me ed tis time* (186.9)  
'spare me now' (Salu, 161)

French influence, moreover, can be perceived by looking at the correspondences between the French and the English version of *Ancrene Wisse*:

CCCC	<i>ed his ehþurl</i> (30.20)
Vitellius	<i>al ouerture de son oil</i> (35.8)
CCCC	<i>Silence eauer ed te mete</i> (37.23)
Vitellius	<i>Silence tenez touz iours a mangier</i> (58.12)

<sup>7</sup> The translation into Present Day English is made explicit in all those instances for which there is one such, undertaken by Mary Salu.

CCCC *þe leaue ed hame* (218.23)  
 Vitellius *qe touz iours demoerge a maisone* (311.25)

**FOR:** It expressed the purpose or the addressee of an action in Old English, but becomes more frequent in Middle English, surely due to the influence of French *pour* (Mustanoja 1960: 380). Einkenel also considered the possibility that the use of *for* plus infinitive without *to* may be due to that influence.

Let us compare again the two manuscripts:  
 Expressing the *addressee* of an action:

CCCC *þat ha bidden for þe* (37.2)  
 Vitellius *qil prient pur vous* (57.5)  
 CCCC *Godd schedde his blod for alle* (184.13)  
 Vitellius *Dieu expandi son sang pur touz* (260.12)  
 CCCC *crie crist mearci for ow* (36.5)  
 Vitellius *crie ihesu crist merci pour vous* (55.30)

Expressing the *purpose* of an action:

CCCC *forte geouen þe opre forbisne* (37.17)  
 Vitellius *pur doner as altres ensample* (57.32)  
 CCCC *forte warni wummen of hare fol ehnen* (32.27)  
 Vitellius *pur munir femmes de lour fols oilz* (39.37)

In the Middle English period *for* adds a new temporal value to the one it presented formerly (meaning 'before'): now it comes to express *duration*. This may be a native development encouraged by a parallel use of the OFr. *pour*, but the possibility that it may be entirely due to French influence cannot be excluded:<sup>8</sup>

*leoson for an dei tene oder tweolue* (217.12)  
 'to lose ten or twelve days instead of one' (Salu, 188)

Its use in exclamations reveals likewise the influence of French *par*.

**IN:** It is very likely that the Fr. *en* and Lat. *in* have exerted an influence on the E *in*, helping it strengthen its position and gain some of the ground formerly occupied by *on*. This is the case, for instance, of the phrase *in a book* (OFr. *en un livre*, Lat. *in libro*, but WS *on bec*). A similar case is found in

*bute i godes rode* (180.9) (replacing *on*)  
 'but in God's cross' (Salu, 156)

As a contrast to its limited value in Old English, when *in* served a local function, the number of uses in Middle English is considerably broadened. Thus, it comes to express a span of *time* for the development of an action:

*sum oðer dei i þe wike* (38.5)  
 'some other day of the week' (Salu, 31)  
*i þe ariste of domes dei* (185.16)  
 'at the resurrection on the Day of Judgement' (Salu, 160)

Let us compare the French and English version for this temporal value:

CCCC *Dauid ... meande i sum time* (29.12)  
 Vitellius *Dauid ... se pleint quen ascun temps* (34.29)  
 CCCC *I þe aduenz ... I þe lenten* (38.5)  
 Vitellius *En les aduenz ... En le karasme* (58.30)

Or it may indicate *condition, state of being*:

*hwen ze beoð in heale ant i ful strengðe* (211.13)  
 'if you are in health and your strength is unimpaired' (Salu, 183)

For this value here are some parallelisms in the two MSS:

CCCC *i se derf ordre* (177.17)  
 Vitellius *en si grieue ordre* (249.14)  
 CCCC *liuiende i blisse* (178.25)  
 Vitellius *viuanz en ioie* (251.15)

Other times *in* may indicate *place* or *position* (Moignet 1988: 311 stands out this value in the French preposition *en*). In this case there is a large number of parallelisms between the two versions:

CCCC *þu art in eue point* (31.23)  
 Vitellius *vous estes en le point de eue* (38.16)  
 CCCC *i þe deofles curt* (109.18)  
 Vitellius *en la court del diable* (139.14)  
 CCCC *from þe eappel iparais* (32.7)  
 Vitellius *de la pome en paradis* (38.38)

Other values of *in* in Middle English are manner, instrument or cause.

As has been shown, the number of functions served by this preposition increase remarkably in the Middle English period, sometimes due to French influence.

<sup>8</sup> Mustanoja (1960: 383) also supports this idea.

**OF:** A common philological assumption is that the genitive periphrastic construction with *of* reveals itself as highly frequent in works written under a clear French influence. Bödtker (1908: 5) was one of the first to support this idea: "... the great intrusion of *of* upon the old domain of the genitive ... was mainly due to the influence of French *de* ..."

Another fact worth pointing out is that the *of*-phrase is more frequent after French loans. As an instance:

*repentant neauer nes of mine sunnen* (36.20)

Its value as *concerning, regarding X* is due in part to the tendency of *of* to occupy some of the semantic territory formerly covered by *on*, but another reason is no doubt the French influence. Moignet (1988: 303) shows some examples of the French use:

*Assez parlerent cele nuit li dui cousin de ceste chose* (Mort Artu 89, 13)

*Et ne dites rien de Lancelot* (Mort Artu 87, 53)

With this value *of* is frequently found after verbs of the type *spoken, þenchen*,<sup>9</sup> *seggen, writen, heren, tellen, wrezen, warnien, þunchen*:

*we schulen spoken of alle* (29.7)

'we shall speak of all these' (Salu, 21)

*teleð lutel þrof* (103.12)

*Of þeose bemeres seið Ieremie* (109.12)

'of these trumpeters Jeremias speaks' (Salu, 94)

On this score, a good number of correspondences have been found between the English and the French manuscript:

CCCC *þenne mot ha þenchen of þe kuues foddre of heordemonne hure* (213.1)

Vitellius *lui couendra penser del forage la uache del louer le pastour* (307.19)

'in such a case she has to think of the cow's fodder and the herdsman's wages' (Salu, 185)

CCCC *as ich seide of pilgrim* (178.20)

Vitellius *Sicome ieo dis de pelerin* (251.4)

'as I have said of the pilgrim' (Salu, 155)

<sup>9</sup> *þenchen* may be followed other times by preposition *on*. This is a sign/proof that the work belongs to a transition period of gradual changes. The possibility that *on* and *of* are interchangeable may have been strengthened by their early reduction to *o/a*. The weakening process of *on* to *a/o* takes place in Old English. That of *of* to *o* comes later, in the Middle English period (Bödtker 1908).

CCCC *as we redeð of hire* (34.1)

Vitellius *sicome nous lisoms de lui* (48.36)

CCCC *we spoken of ower mete* (35.16)

Vitellius *nous parlum de vostre mangier* (53.15)

'we are discussing your food' (Salu, 28)

The use of *of* to indicate the *means* or *instrument* of an action is already present in Old English, but the number of occurrences increases remarkably in Early Middle English, especially in *Ancrene Wisse*. This is possibly due to the influence of French *de*. Moignet (1988: 305) shows how *de* can introduce several verb complements:

- a complement indicating instrument

*Fier de ta lance e jo de Durendal* (Roland 1, 120)

- a complement indicating means

*Celui jor demora Lancelos leanz et fu serviz et aiesiez de quanque*  
'en preudome aiesier et servir' (Mort Artu 13, 1)

Notice the following correspondence between CCCC and Vitellius MSS:

CCCC *of hire ehsihðe* (31.12)

Vitellius *de sa vewe* (37.31)

From the late Old English period to 1600, (when *by* becomes more common), *of* is by far the most frequently used preposition to indicate the *agent of a passive action*. In this sense, *Ancrene Wisse* appears as a modern work. Let us see an example in the comparison between both languages:

CCCC *Of hire ahne suster haueð sum ibeon itemptet* (34.14)

Vitellius *De sa soer demeisne ascune est tempte* (48.4)

'an anchoress has sometimes been led into temptation by her own sister' (Salu, 27)

The use survives at present in expressions of the type *well thought of you*, etc.

The influence of Fr. *de* is also possible after the verb *þankien*:

CCCC *þonke him of his inturn* (37.1)

Vitellius *merciez lui de sa venue* (57.3)

'thank him for coming' (Salu, 30)

Godefroy (1969, 5: 253) shows some instances of the combination *mercier + de* in Old French:

*Nostre sire ne fust mie si honnoures ne si merciez del travail que li baron et li autre pelerin uvoient souffert* (Godefroi de Buillon, *Richel.* 22495, f<sup>o</sup> 52c)

*J'ay receu voz lettres par le sieur de Molambiez avec la consolation que par lui il vous a pleu me donner, dont je vous mercie de tres bon cueur* (Lett. de François Ier, Arch. Belg. Audience, *Négociations de France*, t. I).

While the inflected genitive gradually settled before the noun, the periphrastic genitive requiring *of* started to increase its frequency of use. According to Williams (1975) in the year 900 *of*-phrases amounted to less than 0.5% of all the genitive constructions. Towards 1200 they had only increased to 6%. But from 1250 onwards a remarkable increase to 32% took place and by 1300 nearly 85% was achieved. In other words, whereas the inflected genitive acquired a fixed position before the noun, from the mid 13th century the periphrastic construction was preferred after the noun.

Among the reasons for the rapid development of the periphrastic genitive the growing importance of prepositional phrases could be counted. But also the French genitive construction with *de* could have been a model to imitate.

Let us compare again the French and English versions of *Ancrene Wisse*:

CCCC	<i>delit of sunne</i> (31.22)
Vitellius	<i>delit de pecchee</i> (38.14)
CCCC	<i>þe riche of heouene</i> (108.21)
Vitellius	<i>la regne de ciel</i> (136.18)
CCCC	<i>þe þridde best of alle</i> (178.3)
Vitellius	<i>li tierz vunqueore meilloure de touz</i> (250.9)

Where a *partitive genitive* construction appears, French influence may be playing a part, too. Godefroy (1969, 10: 388) shows several quotations where the construction is present:

*Douce dame, en pouc d'oure  
Fu ma joie accomplie,  
se j'eusse le don  
ki tousjours me demore* (Guiot, Chans., III, 40)  
*Depars li aucun pu de ce que de li tiens* (Jeh. De Meung, *Test.*, 374)

The parallel may be seen in the English version of *Ancrene Wisse*:

*þ euch efter his stat borhi ed tis frakele worlde se lutel se ha  
least mei of mete. of clað. of ahte. of alle hire þinges* (106)

'that each according to his condition should take from this wretched world as little as he possibly can of food, clothing, possessions, and of all else that it has'

**TO:** The dative case follows the same non-return voyage as the instrumental: it gradually disappeared from the Late Old English period onwards. It is then that *to* appears in prepositional phrases which replace the former dative case. Therefore, a gradual tendency to a more analytic structure of the language is perceived when the inflections decay as a result of the evolution of English itself on the one hand, and on the other as a consequence of the influence of the French language. There are not a few occurrences in which *to* replaces the former dative case:

*deð leasse eil to þe ehnen* (30.10)  
'is less harmful to the eyes' (Salu, 22)  
*to ower wummen ze mahen seggen* (38.8)  
'You may speak to your women' (Salu, 31)  
*þo þe forme gredeð seinte peter* (178.4)  
'To the first St. Peter cries' (Salu, 154)

When it comes to comparing the French and the English version, the English preposition *to* seems to correspond mostly to French *a*:

CCCC	<i>þe ane mahe beon to gode pilegrimes ieuenet</i> (178)
Vitellius	<i>Les vns poient estre comparez as bons pelerins</i> (250/1.2) 'The first may be compared to good pilgrims'
CCCC	<i>þe opre to deade</i> (178)
Vitellius	<i>Les altres as mortz</i> (250/1.4) 'the second to the dead'

#### 4. Conclusions

After the Conquest French obviously gained some ground in England, although it was mostly as a (foreign)<sup>10</sup> language spoken by the influential people: the upper classes of the secular clergy, a greater part of the regular clergy (where the author of *Ancrene Wisse* belonged) and a very small minority within the urban oligarchy. English felt the impact of French gradually in its vocabulary, and while it maintained its grammatical structure, syntax, pronouns and basic structure Germanic in nature, it is true that basic elements like prepositions felt the influence of this superstratum language:

<sup>10</sup> Although not a few scholars prefer to consider this language as a familiar way of speech for the invaded citizen. We must remember that for a time French and Latin were the common languages of written documents, even more common than the native English language.

- in a larger use of prepositional phrases
- in new values being added to them
- in clear cases of calquing from French to English,

as we have seen by comparing the French version of MS Vitellius and the English of Corpus Christi College Cambridge 402 MS. The author of *Ancrene Wisse* must have been a bilingual (or even maybe a trilingual) speaker, who at times thought in French speech units, and carried those French thought-and-speech patterns into English.

#### REFERENCES

- Appel, René – Pieter Muysken  
 1987 *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Arnold.
- Berndt, Rolf  
 1965 "The linguistic situation in England from the Norman Conquest to the loss of Normandy (1066-1204)", *Philologia Pragensia* 8: 145-163.
- Bödtker, A. T.  
 1908 *Critical contributions to Early English syntax*. Christiania. [No indication of publisher.]
- Brewer, Derek S.  
 1956 "Two notes on the Augustinian and possibly West Midland origin of the Ancrene Riwle", *Notes and Queries* 101: 232-236.
- D'Ardenne, S.R. (ed.)  
 1961 *Pe Liflade ant Te Passim of Seinte Iulienne* (E.E.T.S. 248.) London: OUP.  
 1977 *The Katherine Group edited from MS. Bodley 34*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres".
- Derocquigny, Jules  
 1904 *The French element in English*. Lille: Le Bigot Bros. Printers & Publishers.
- Dobson, Eric J.  
 1966 "The date and composition of Ancrene Wisse" *PBA* 52: 187-193.  
 1976 *The origins of Ancrene Wisse*. Oxford: OUP.
- Godefroy, Frédéric  
 1937-1938 *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IXe. au XVe. siècle*. 10 Vols. Paris: Librairie de sciences et des arts.  
 1969 [Reprinted New York, Kraus.]
- Herbert, J.A. (ed.)  
 1944 *The French text of the Ancrene Riwle* (ed. from British Museum Ms. Cotton Vitellius Fvii). (E.E.T.S. O.S. 248.) London: OUP.  
 [1967] [Reprinted London: OUP.]
- Hock, Hans H.  
 1991 *Principles of historical linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lefevre, Yves  
 1973 "De l'usage du français en Grande Bretagne à la fin du XIIIe siècle", *Études de langue et de littérature du Moyen-Age offertes à F. Lecoy*. Paris: Champion.
- Moignet, Gérard  
 1988 *Grammaire de l'ancien français*. Paris: Klincksieck.

- Mustanoja, Tauno F.  
 1960 *A Middle English syntax. Part I: Parts of Speech*. Helsinki: Société Neophilologique.
- Salu, Mary (trans.)  
 1955 *The Ancrene Riwle. The Corpus MS.: Ancrene Wisse*. London: Burns & Oates.
- Serjeantson, Mary S.  
 1938 "The dialect of the Corpus Manuscript of the Ancrene Riwle", *London Medieval Studies* 1,2: 225-248.
- Shepherd, Geoffrey (ed.)  
 1959 *Ancrene Wisse. Parts 6-7*. London: Nelson & Sons.
- Sykes, F.H.  
 1899 *French Elements in Middle English*. Oxford: Hart.
- Talbot, C.H.  
 1956 "Some notes on the dating of the Ancrene Riwle", *Neophil.* 40: 38-50.
- Tolkien, John Ronald R.  
 1929 "Ancrene Wisse and Hali Meidhad", *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* 14: 104-126.
- Tolkien, John Ronald R. (ed.)  
 1962 *The English text of the Ancrene Riwle. Ancrene Wisse. (CCCC MS. 402)* (E.E.T.S. 249). Oxford: OUP.
- Williams, Joseph M.  
 1975 *Origins of the English language*. New York: Free Press.
- Wilson, R.M.  
 1943 "English and French in England, 1110-1300", *History N.G.* 28: 37-60.
- Zettersten, Arne  
 1965 *Studies in the dialect and vocabulary of the Ancrene Riwle*. (Lund Studies in English 34.) Lund: University of Lund.