LIST OF PAPERS

• Alonso Almeida, Francisco & Elena Quintana Toledo (University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain)
THE STATUS OF MAY IN MIDDLE ENGLISH MEDICAL WRITING

• Bartnik, Artur (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland)
HEADLESS FREE RELATIVES IN OLD ENGLISH

• Bilynsky, Michael (Ivan Franko Lviv National University, Ukraine)
THE DIACHRONIC RESHUFFLING OF CONSTITUENTS IN THE OED-REFLECTED (DE)VERBAL SYNONYMY FOR MIDDLE ENGLISH

• Borchers, Melanie (University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany)
'QUE MA LANGE LOR EST SALVAIGE': THE STATUS OF FRENCH IN MEDIEVAL ENGLAND

• Buys Lerma, Mª Francisca (Open University, Málaga, Spain) & Castillo, Concha (University of Malaga, Spain)
ON THE V2 TYPE THAT DISAPPEARS IN ME

• Carrillo Linares, Mª José (University of Huelva, Spain)
THE INVESTIGATION OF LEXICAL VARIATION AS A MEANS TO IDENTIFY GENEALOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS: THE CASE OF *THE PRICK OF CONSCIENCE*

• Cole, Kristin Lynn (Penn State York University, USA)
DID WILLIAM LANGLAND WRITE *WILLIAM OF PALERNE*?: AN EXERCISE IN FORENSIC METRICS

• Duda, Bozena (University of Rzeszow, Poland)
THERE ARE *WENCHES* AND *SLUTS*, BUT NO TRACES OF *CATS* OR *BATS*: ON CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MIDDLE ENGLISH CONCEPTUALISATION PATTERNS WITHIN THE CONCEPTUAL CATEGORY **FALLEN WOMAN**

• Esteban-Segura, Laura (University of Murcia, Spain)
THE MALAGA POS TAGGER OF MIDDLE ENGLISH: A DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT

• Gillespie, Vincent (University of Oxford, UK)
FATHERLESS BOOKS: AUTHORSHIP, ATTRIBUTION AND ORTHODOXY IN LATER MEDIEVAL ENGLAND **[PLENARY]**

• Hickey, Raymond (University of Duisburg and Essen, Germany)
LANGUAGE CONTACT AND THE SOUND SYSTEM OF MIDDLE ENGLISH: A REASSESSMENT

• Hotta, Ryuichi (Chuo University, Tokyo, Japan)
THE REPRESENTATIVENESS OF THE *LAEME* CORPUS AND WORD FREQUENCY IN EARLY MIDDLE ENGLISH WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE LEXICAL DIFFUSION OF *S*-PLURALISATION

• Ito, Reiko (Tokiwa University, Japan)
THE FRENCH INFLUENCE ON THE MULTIPLE NEGATION IN MIDDLE ENGLISH: A CORPUS-BASED STUDY

• Johannesson, Nils-Lennart (Stockhom University, Sweden)
'ALPHABETUM ANGLICUM': AN ANALYSIS OF THE RUNIC ALPHABET IN THE ORMULUM MS

• Kida, Ireneusz (University of Silesia, Poland)
A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF THE DYNAMISM OF WORD ORDER CHANGES IN THE MIDDLE ENGLISH PERIOD

• Kolasińska, Paulina (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland)
LATE 11TH AND 12TH CENTURY ENGLISH MORPHOLOGY

• Lass, Roger (University of Cape Town, South Africa) & Laing, Margaret (University of Edinburgh, UK)
THE EARLY MIDDLE ENGLISH REFLEXES OF GERMANIC *IK *I* — UNPACKING THE CHANGES

• Łęcki, Andrzej (Pedagogical University of Cracow, Poland)
PURPOSIVE *SO THAT* IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

• Ljosland, Ragnhild (University of the Highlands and Islands, UK)
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MIDDLE SCOTS IN THE ORKNEY ISLANDS

• López Couso, Mª José (University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain)
EXPLORING LINGUISTIC ACCRETION: MIDDLE ENGLISH AS A TESTING GROUND **[PLENARY]**

• Lutz, Angelika (University of Erlangen, Germany)
THE STRATAL ROLE OF THE OLD NORSE LOANS IN MIDDLE ENGLISH: NEW QUESTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

• Minkova, Donka (University of California at Los Angeles, USA)
DID THE PRINCIPLES OF SYLLABIFICATION CHANGE IN MIDDLE ENGLISH?

• Molencki, Rafał (University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland)
THE COMPETITION BETWEEN *PURVEY* AND *PROVIDE* IN LATE MIDDLE ENGLISH

- Nakayasu, Minako (Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Japan)
SPATIO-TEMPORAL SYSTEMS IN *A TREATISE ON THE ASTROLABE*

- Nevalainen, Terttu (University of Helsinki, Finland)
SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVES ON VARIATION IN LATE MIDDLE ENGLISH **[PLENARY]**

- Rodríguez Ledesma, Mª Nieves (University of Seville, Spain)
THE NORTHERN SUBJECT RULE IN FIRST PERSON SINGULAR CONTEXTS IN 14TH AND 15TH-CENTURY SCOTS TEXTS

- Rutkowska, Hanna (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland)
LATE MEDIEVAL DIALECTAL SPELLINGS IN THE EARLY SIXTEENTH-CENTURY EDITIONS OF THE *KALENDER OF SHEPHERDES*

- Schendl, Herbert (University of Vienna, Austria)
MULTILINGUALISM, MULTILINGUAL TEXTS AND LANGUAGE SHIFT IN LATE MEDIEVAL ENGLAND **[PLENARY]**

- Stenroos, Merja & Thengs, Kjetil V. (University of Stavanger, Norway)
MIDDLE ENGLISH LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND THE GEOGRAPHY OF WRITTEN DIALECTS

- Studer-Joho, Nicole (University of Zurich, Switzerland)
3INC AND *GUNKER*: ON MIDDLE ENGLISH OBLIQUE FORMS OF THE SECOND PERSON DUAL PRONOUN WITH INITIAL /J/

- Vennemann, Theo (University of Munich, Germany)
ON THE RISE OF VO AND SV ORDER IN MIDDLE ENGLISH

- Volkonskaya, Maria (Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia)
ON THE ORIGINS AND FUNCTIONS OF SYNONYMS IN MIDDLE ENGLISH ALLITERATIVE POETRY

- Werthmüller, Gyöngyi (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary)
FINAL *–E* IN GOWER'S AND CHAUCER'S MONOSYLLABIC PREMODIFIERS: A GRAMMATICAL/METRICAL ANALYSIS

- Williamson, Keith (University of Edinburgh, UK)
HISTORICAL DIALECTOLOGICAL REMARKS ON THE SCOTTISH *LEGENDS ON THE SAINTS* IN CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, MS GG.II.6

- Wright, Laura (University of Cambridge, UK)
MIDDLE ENGLISH WILLS – WHOSE LANGUAGE?

Francisco Alonso Almeida - Elena Quintana Toledo
University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (Spain)

The Status of *may* in Middle English Medical Writing

This paper explores both the semantic and the pragmatic meanings of the verb *may* in Middle English. The data for analysis is excerpted from Taavitsainen et al.'s *Middle English Medical Texts* (MEMT), and from the *Malaga Corpus of Late Middle English Scientific Prose* currently under development at the University of Malaga. Each one of these corpora has their own software to produce searches and interrogate the texts for the occurrences of *may*. Our methodology will combine both computerised searches and manual analyses of the texts to identify the contexts where *may* forms appear. Context is here understood in the sense given in Salager-Meyer (2000). The consideration of context has proven essential in studies on modality, since appropriate contextual enrichment allows us to recover authorial intended meaning, as put forward in Ortega-Barrera and Quintana-Toledo (forthcoming). The framework of analysis includes general work on modality, such as Bybee and Fleischman (1985) and Collins (2009), but also specific literature on the topic, such as Taavitsainen (2001), Alonso-Almeida and Cruz-García (2010), Cornillie (2009), Pic and Furmaniak (2012), and Ortega-Barrera and Quintana-Toledo (forthcoming), among others. Our expected conclusions will go around the identification of earlier evidential meanings of this verb as a result of specific intersubjective, rather than subjective, uses.

References

Alonso-Almeida, Francisco and Laura Cruz-García. 2011. "The Value of *May* as an Evidential and Epistemic Marker in English Medical Abstracts". *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 46.3: 59-73.

Bybee, Joan and Suzanne Fleischmann. 1985. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Collins, Peter. 2009. *Modals and Quasi-modals*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Cornillie, B. 2009. "Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality. On the Close Relationship between Two Different Categories". *Functions of Language* 16.1: 44–62.

MEMT= Taavitsainen, Irma, Päivi Pahta and Martti Mäkinen (compilers). 2005. *Middle English Medical Texts*. CD-ROM with MEMT Presenter software by Raymond Hickey. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ortega-Barrera, I. and E. Quintana-Toledo. forthcoming. "*May* and *Must* as Inferential Evidential Markers in a Corpus of English Scientific Texts". *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*.

Pic, Elsa and Grégory Furmaniak. 2012. "A Study of Epistemic Modality in Academic and Popularised Discourse: The Case of Possibility Adverbs Perhaps, Maybe and Possibly". *Revista de lenguas para fines específicos* 18.

Salager-Meyer, F. 2000. "Procrustes' Recipe: Hedging and Positivism". *English for Specific Purposes* 19.2: 175–187.

Taavitsainen, Irma. 2001. "Evidentiality and Scientific Though-styles: English Medical Writing in Late Middle English and Early Modern English". In Maurizio Gotti and Marina Dossena (eds.). *Modality in Specialized Texts: Selected Papers of the 1st Cerlis Conference*. Bern: Peter Lang. 21-52.

Artur Bartnik
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (Poland)

Headless Free Relatives in Old English

Traditionally, free relatives in Old English fall into two types. The first one is headed because the case of the demonstrative pronoun is that required by the verb in the matrix clause, as in (1) below. The second type of Old English free relatives is headless, as the case of the demonstrative pronoun is clearly assigned by the embedded verb, as shown in (2) and (3) (cf. Allen 1980; Hirschbühler and Rivero 1983). This analysis is questioned by Harbert (1983), who claims that free relatives are uniformly headed. Type 2, exemplified in sentence (2), is the result of inverse attraction, in which the head of a relative clause assumes the case of the following relative pronoun.

This corpus-based study of headless free relatives will show that these analyses cannot explain all the facts. Instead we will argue that these structures behave like correlatives with the following structure:

[$_{\text{correlative clause}}$... relative phrase...] [$_{\text{main clause}}$... correlate...]
(Liptak 2009: 2).

These structures are characterized, among others, by the following properties (cf. Liptak 2009, Allen 1980, Truswell 2008):

1. The relative clause appears in the left periphery.
2. The correlate has to contain a demonstrative (or pronominal) item.
3. The syntactic relation between the two constituents is rather loose though they form one semantic unit.
4. Both the constituents involve movement of the relative and demonstrative/ pronominal element to their surface positions, since the case of these elements is that required by the lower clause.

Although Old English structures are not classic correlatives meeting all the criteria, they still can be subsumed under the family of correlative structures.

(1) ðæt is, ðæt man for-gife, <u>ðam ðe</u> wið hine gegylte
that is that one forgive him-dat. that against him sins
'that is, that one$_2$ forgive him$_1$, who sins against him$_2$'
Ver. 111.170

(2) And <u>ðone ðe</u> ðu nu hæfst, nis <u>se</u> ðin wer
and him-acc. that you now hast not-is he-nom. your husband
'And him who you now have, he is not your husband'
Alc.P.V.37

(3) And <u>swa hwæs swa</u> hierihtlice biddað for ðinum naman & for ðinum gearningum
and so what-gen. as they rightly ask for thy name and for thy merit
hig <u>hyt</u> onfoð.
they it receive
'And whatever they ask rightly, for your name and your merit, they receive it.'
30E p.74.4

References

Allen, Cynthia. 1980. "Movement and Deletion in Old English". *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 261-323.

Hirschbühler Paul and María-Luisa Rivero. 1983. "Remarks on Free Relatives and Matching Phenomena". *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 505-520.

Lipták, Anikó. 2009. *Correlatives Cross-Linguistically*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Harbert, Wayne. 1983. "A Note on Old English Free Relatives". *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 549-553.

Taylor, Ann, Anthony Warner, Susan Pintzuk, and Frank Beths. 2003. *The York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose*. York: University of York.

Truswell, Robert. 2008. *Wh*-Correlatives in Early Modern English. Available at: http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/-rtruswel/correlatives.pdf.

Michael Bilynsky
Ivan Franko Lviv National University (Ukraine)

The Diachronic Reshuffling of Constituents in the OED-Reflected (De)verbal Synonymy for Middle English

A synonymous string is manifested in the fixed sequence of constituents. It is codified by an arbitrary thesaurus. The minimal and sufficient condition for the suggested modelling is the non-alphabetical placement of constituents within a string. The developed framework attempts to ascertain to what extent the sequential placement of the present-day reflexes of the constituents of the ME-relevant (sub-)strings (mis)matches that reconstructed on the basis of the constituents' diachronic textual prototypes in the OED.

Both the present-day synonymous sequence and its (period-limited) diachronic reconstruction(s) can be presented in the form of a vector. The intrinsic characteristic of the latter is its length. For the present-day sequence the vector`s length is measurable as the sum total of weight factor values of each constituent in the semantic domain of the head-word. It takes into account the number of the constituents within the sequence and the ordinal position of the respective set

member. The vector`s length for the diachronic reconstruction of the (near-)synonymous sequence rests, apart from the (period-determined) set`s length, on the chronological order of the constituents initiated by the earliest counterpart. The placement of the respective member admits being treated in terms of relative chronology of the ordinal positions or more precise, and capable of removing the paradox of the same-year attestations in relative placement, absolute dating of the earliest OED quotations. The effect of the diachronic permutation is then the differential between the lengths of the two vectors.

The paper will focus on the partitioning of the overall database of the first OED quotations into the OE-, ME- and ENE-relevant sections of the chosen thesauri as well as exemplary and exhaustive on-site downloading of the outcomes of the run queries with the respective manipulative visualizations (curvatures) as regards the diachronically reconstructed/present-day vectors lengths and their differentials. The queries envisage arbitrary groupings of the strings according to their length and interpretation-justifiable discreteness of the obtained numeric data as regards parent and derived synonymy with due attention to the issues of categorial affiliation and suffix rivalry.

The developed framework is an extension of Michael Samuels` idea of the docking(s) between the historical (OED) and onomasiological dictionaries which with due software and multiple inventory support based on virtually all of the available thesauri of verbs are capable of offering new possibilities for the reconstruction of parent and derived synonymy over time. It seems to be adjacent to the diachronic onomasiology of the monumental Historical Thesaurus in the currently developed OED-3. The chronological data is also replaceable by that from the MED.

Melanie Borchers
University of Duisburg-Essen (Germany)

'Que ma langue lor est salvaige': The Status of French in Medieval England

The languages spoken in Medieval England have been at issue in Middle English studies for a long time. However, in line with Rothwell (2001: 9) I also still consider the picture not yet ideally framed. To better understand, for instance, the imprint that the French language has left on the English language, this paper will shed some more light on the status of the French language in England.

While the assumption that Middle English was a creole (cf. Bailey and Maroldt 1977 or Milroy 1984) has long been discarded, the assumption that Medieval French was a degenerate version of French by the time of 1204 still proves itself to be very persistent (cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1991, Kibbee 1991, Burnley 2003 or Baugh and Cable 2012). In order to contribute further proof to the interpretation that places French in Medieval England on the dialect continuum with Continental French (cf., for instance, Trotter 2003 and Ingham 2010), this study will investigate medieval attitudes towards French.

While most former studies have been based on English data, this paper will enrich our understanding of the status of French by focussing on contemporary French data. It will thus be based on *eye-witness* data that contain evaluations of Medieval French. In doing so, the presentation will provide not only corpus-based evidence (for example from the *Nouveau Corpus d'Amsterdam*) but also other textual data in favour of the fact that French in England – long after the suggested date of decline in 1204 – still remained an intact language and not a degenerate version of it – as the following lines might lead us to believe.

> Mon langage ont blasmé li François,
>
> Et mes chansons, oiant les Champenois,
>
> Et la contesse, encor, dont plus me poise.
>
> La reïne n'a pas fait que cortoise
>
> Qui me reprist, ele et ses fiz li rois.

> Encore ne soit ma parole françoise,
>
> Si la puet on bien entendre en françois, [...].[1]

Just like the famous lines from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* where the Prioress's French is mocked, we might expect this quote to be a reference to an Englishman's French. It is, however, a reference to a contemporary Frenchman's French. The investigated data show that while only Parisian French was considered to be *good* French, all other dialects of French – and hence also the variety of French spoken in Medieval England – were considered *poor* French. The French spoken in Medieval England was thus characterised as *bad* a French as any other native variety of French on the Continent that deviated from Parisian French.

This study does not only complete the mosaic of the status of French in Medieval England by adding another piece to it, it also proves the importance of interdisciplinary investigations, the results of which uncover key details that lead to a more fine-grained interpretation of the interaction of English and French after the Norman Conquest.

References

Bailey, Charles-James N. and Karl Maroldt. 1977. "The French Lineage of English". In Jürgen M. Meisel (ed.). *Langues en contact - Pidgins - Creoles - Languages in Contact*. Tübingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr. 21-53.

Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. 2012. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge.

Burnley, John D. 2003. "French and Frenches in Fourteenth-century London". In Dieter Kastovsky and Arthur Mettinger (eds.). *Language Contact in the History of English*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 17–34.

---

[1] In front of the Champenois, the French people of Paris and - what offended me the most - particularly the countess blamed my language and my songs. The Queen, alongside with her son, the King, did not show any courtesy when she criticised me. Even though my language is not the French of the Ile-de France, one can still understand it as French. [my translation].

Ingham, Richard. 2010. "Later Anglo-Norman as a Contact Variety of French?" In Richard Ingham (ed.). *The Anglo-Norman Language and its Contexts*. York: York Medieval Press. 8–25.

Kibbee, Douglas A. 1991. *For to Speke Frenche Trewely. The French Language in England, 1000-1600: Its Status, Description and Instruction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Milroy, J. 1984. "The History of English in the British Isles". In Peter Trudgill (ed.). *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: University Press. 5–31.

Rothwell, William. 2001. "English and French in England after 1362". *English Studies* 82: 539-559.

Stein, Achim, Pierre Kunstmann and Martin-D Gleßgen. 2006. *Nouveau Corpus d'Amsterdam*: *Corpus informatique de textes littéraires d'ancien français (ca. 1150-1350), établi par Anthonij Dees (Amsterdam 1987), remanié par Achim Stein, Pierre Kunstmann et Martin-D. Gleßgen*. Stuttgart.

Thomason, Sarah G. and Terrence Kaufman. 1991. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Trotter, David. 2003. "L'Anglo-Norman: Variété insulaire ou variété isolée?" *Médiévales* 45: 43-54.

Mª Francisca Buys Lerma and Concha Castillo
University of Málaga (Spain)

On the V2-type that Disappears in Middle English

This paper deals with the type of V2-phenomenon that ME inherits from OE and that happens to disappear in late ME/EMnE, and argues that the verb is in C whenever it actually surfaces in second position, contra influential works in the literature like van Kemenade in Fischer et al. (2000), following Pintzuk (1999), or Haeberli (2002), where the verb is claimed to occupy a node in between C and T. The V2-phenomenon in question, which is illustrated in (1a), is analysed in a crucial way in the cited literature as covering two types, depending on the nominal (1a) vs. pronominal (1b) status of the DP subject. It is argued that each subject-type

occupies a different structural position, a theory or hypothesis that we do not agree with.

(1) a. On þis gær <u>wolde þe king Stephne</u> tæcan Rodbert
In this year wanted the king Stephen seize Robert (C12; *ChronE* (Plummer) 1140,1; Fischer et al. 2000: 130).
 (1) b. for more ioyge <u>þei myhte</u> not haue
for more joy they could not have (The Wyccliffitte sermons.382.106; van Kemenade 1997: 349).

The underlined portion of the hiearchical structure in (2) is argued in van Kemenade (2000) or Haeberli (2002) to account for (1a) and (1b) above. The verb is claimed to occupy F in both types, the difference being that nominal subjects are raised to Spec,T whereas pronominal ones are raised to Spec,F.

(2) [$_{CP}$XP   C   [$_{FP}$Subject 1 [$_F$V]   [$_{TP}$Subject 2   T ... [VP]]]]

Once we acknowledge that nominal subjects can actually occur either to the right (as in (1a)) or to the left of V, whereas pronominal subjects are strongly restricted to the position to the left of V (as in (1b)), we make the claim that (1) does not primarily illustrate the tension between two types of subjects (and their respective information structure properties – see e.g. Los 2009), but the tension between a structurally T-based vs. a C-based configuration. If pronouns are considered to contain in themselves in an inherent way case-features, in contrast to non-pronominals, then the restriction that subject pronouns are subject to can very plausibly be a manifestation of the regularisation of the EPP-property of the D-feature of T, which forces a nominative argument to occupy Spec,T throughout the history of English. Actually, the loss of expletive pro-drop, which also takes place in ME, together with the loss of (1a), must be analysed as another manifestation of the cited regularisation of the EPP property (see van Kemenade 1997 and prior work, Fischer et al. 2000 for expletive pro-drop in ME).

On the present approach, then, (1a) is the CV2-type that disappears in English on the language becoming T-fixed, and (1b) is a TV2-type featuring a nominative argument in Spec,T, as has always been the case ever since OE.

As is well known, the loss of (1a) is responsible for English not being considered a (regular) V2-language, as opposed to remaining languages in the Germanic family. Together with the plausible change from OV to VO, and the loss of expletive pro-drop (which is a relevant phenomenon in the present discussion, as just mentioned), the loss of V2 as in (1a) is a crucial property of the syntax of ME.

References

Fischer, O., A. van Kemenade, W. Koopman and W. van der Wurff. 2000. *The Syntax of Early English*. Cambridge: University Press.

Haeberli, E. 2002. "Observations on the Loss of Verb Second in the History of English". In J.W. Zwart and A. Werner (eds.). *Studies in Comparative Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 245–272.

Kemenade, A. van 1997. "V2 and Embedded Topicalization in Old and Middle English". In A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent (eds.). *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: University Press. 326–352.

Los, B. 2009. "The Consequences of the Loss of Verb-Second in English: Information Structure and Syntax in Interaction". *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 97-125.

Pintzuk, S. 1999. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*. New York: Garland Publishing.

María José Carrillo Linares
University of Huelva (Spain)

The Investigation of Lexical Variation as a Means to Identify Genealogical Relationships: The Case of the *Prick of Conscience*

This paper is part of a more ambitious project on Middle English word geography that my colleague Edurne Garrido-Anes and I have been carrying out for several years. Our aim is to study the dialectal distribution of several lexical items during the late Middle English period. The Prick of Conscience, surviving in a large number of copies with a wide-spread geographical distribution, provides us with valuable data for this purpose.

Nevertheless, the large number of extant copies and the potential huge number of them which have not survived, makes it difficult to classify these copies genealogically. Lewis and McIntosh (1982) offers the current best classification, but even this is inadequate in many respects to make good judgments about the nature of the occurrence or the absence of a lexical item.

The comparison of one copy, presumed to be close to the original Northern version, with the rest of the extant manuscripts, involves a collation of 1173 lines throughout the whole work. In these lines potential dialectal items could occur or could have been altered. Variation in the copies might have a dialectal nature or not, but without knowing the relationships among the extant manuscripts, the nature of an occurrence is difficult to assess. The collation that originally was aimed at discovering dialectal variation in the lexis has proved to serve a two-fold purpose: first to gain the register of dialectal variation of lexical items, and second, to make a more accurate grouping than that of Lewis and McIntosh. Our data work in both directions and mutually reinforce both aims.

The subgroup within group IV contains four manuscripts datable in the second part of the 14th century, two datable in the first half of the 15th century and another one dated 1405. Six of them have been localised in the North and only one of them can be localised slightly more southerly, in Lincolnshire.

Although McIntosh and Lewis did not attempt to classify these manuscripts within any group, they claimed that all of them were related, at least in some sections. Nevertheless, they do not identify any common element that links them, and their relationship was established by collating several parts of these texts. Even if most of them were copied in the North, they do not seem to be very closely related to the supposed original version of the poem. The original version seems to have been similar to some manuscripts now classified within group I.

My own collation shows many similarities between the subgroup in group IV and copies classified under group II. Group II is varied and contains different subgroups. Some of the group II manuscripts where I have found similarities are said to be closely connected to each other, but others are classified as not being close to any other extent manuscripts. In this paper I will try to make a more accurate

classification of these manuscripts in groups IV and II as well as give an account of the lexical choices in them.

Secondary sources

Carrillo Linares, M.J. 2010. "Interpreting and Mapping Raw Data for Middle English Word Geography: The case of the *Prick of Conscience*". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 321-244.

Lewis, R. and A. McIntosh. 1982. "A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*. Oxford: Medium Aevum Monographs 12.

Primary sources

(Mainly group IV)
London, BL, Harley 6923, ff. 2-117v
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 99, ff. 1-120v
Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Library, Taylor Ms of the Prick of Conscience, ff. 1-126v
London, BL, Egerton 657, ff. 1-95v
London, BL, Additional 32578, ff. 1-103
London, BL, Cotton Appendix VII, ff. 3-145v
San Marino, California, Huntington Library, HM 139, ff. 144a-187a
(Mainly group II)
Cambridge, University Library, ll.2.17, ff. 2-145
London, BL, Additional 25013, ff. 1-136
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashmole 60, ff. 1-138v
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 87, ff. 1-133v

Kristin Lynn Cole
Penn State York University (USA)

An Exercise in Forensic Metrics

In "Langland and the Problem of *William of Palerne*," Lawrence Warner speculates as to whether the self-named scribe William who wrote the Middle English

alliterative poem *William of Palerne* is actually William Langland.[2] Warner is less interested in answering this question of authorship, which he considers in fact unanswerable, than he is in complicating the place of authorial attribution and the value of speculation in Middle English studies. I agree with Warner in principle; however, I have decided to take his article as a challenge and attempt an exercise in forensic metrics not only to see whether what we have learned about Middle English Alliterative Revival meter in the past thirty years, thanks in large part to Thomas Cable and Hoyt Duggan, can help us determine individual poetic styles among Alliterative Revival poems, but also simply to test the robustness of these theories. I will use about 500 lines from *Piers Plowman*, B version, and *William of Palerne*, along with another 500 lines from *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* as a control, and I will measure through statistical tests a variety of metrical choices that these authors make in their a-verses and b-verses to include:

1. how often the poet uses a-verses with more than two beats (which I call *heavy a-verses*);
2. how often the poet uses alliteration to promote a word to a beat in the a-verse (which I call *light a-verses*);
3. how often the required long dip in the b-verse occurs before or after the first beat;
4. how often the poet uses alliteration to promote a word to a beat in the b-verse (what I call *light b-verses*);
5. how often a word with lexical stress is demoted to a dip in the b-verse (which I call *heavy b-verses*).

My paper will first establish the historical contest of the Revival, summarize its metrical rules as currently accepted, and then demonstrate through tests of statistical significance what we can know about meter, authors, and poetic styles. Through these tests, I will answer as best I can the question posed in the title of my paper and discuss the birth of the Alliterative Revival and its metrical rules.

---

[2] In *Viator* 37, 2006, 497-415.

Bożena Duda
University of Rzeszów (Poland)

There are *wenches* and *sluts* but no traces of *cats* or *bats*: On Characteristics of the Middle English Conceptualisation Patterns within the Conceptual Category <u>FALLEN WOMAN</u>

The phenomenon of sex for sale has been part of the human civilisation since antiquity. Lexicographic sources vary as to the quantitative value of historical synonyms of *prostitute*. For example, Schulz (1975), following Farmer and Heleny (1965), argues that there have been around 500 lexical items in the lexico-semantic system of English which have been used in the sense 'a prostitute'. The majority of the historical synonyms of *prostitute* are either auspicious or inauspicious in their illocutionary force. This paper aims at analysing whether all mechanisms that may be involved in the formation of cover terms in general (structural, semantic and rhetorical devices) were at work in the formation of the Middle English synonyms of *prostitute*, especially when compared with the mechanisms working in the Old English, Early Modern English, Late Modern English and Present-day English periods.

The analysis of the mechanisms involved in the formation of M.E. synonyms of *prostitute* shows that such formative mechanisms as circumlocution, eponymy, metonymy and zoosemy (animal metaphor) are virtually non-existent while borrowing and, to a lesser extent, understatement are relatively common. In contrast, in Early Modern English, for example, the growth in the productivity of the mechanism of zoosemy, metonymy and eponymy is observable with the continuous working of the processes of borrowing and understatement. The question that this paper will try to answer is why the M.E. synonyms of *prostitute* do not show the working of the zoosemic metaphorical extensions which are evidenced to be particularly prevalent in the formation of the lexical items onomasiologically related to the conceptual category <u>FALLEN WOMAN</u> in the later periods of the history of English.

References

Allan K. and K. Burridge 1991. *Euphemism and Dysphemism, Language Used as Shield and Weapon*. Oxford: University Press.

Burchfield, R. 1986. "An Outline History of Euphemisms in English". In Dennis J. Enright (ed.). *Fair of Speech: the Uses of Euphemisms*. Oxford: University Press. 13-31.

Chamizo Dominguez, P.J. 2005. "Some Theses on Euphemisms and Dysphemisms". *Studia Anglica Resoviensia* 3: 9-16.

Chamizo Dominguez, P.J. and F. Sánchez Benedito. 2005. *Conceptual Networks of English Bawdy Euphemisms and Dysphemisms*. Unpublished.

Fisiak, J. 2000. *An Outline History of English: External History*. Poznán: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie.

Garton, S. 2004. *Histories of Sexuality*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Kiełtyka, R. 2008. *On Zoosemy: The Study of Middle English and Early Modern English Domesticated Animals*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Kleparski, G.A. 2008. "The Joys and Sorrows of Metaphorical Consumption: *mozarellas*, *prostisciuttos*, *muttons* and *yum-yum Girls* – Foodsemy with a Romance accent". *Studia Anglica Resoviensia 5*: 45-59.

Kleparski, G.A. 2013. "Historical Semantics: A Sketch on New Categories and Types of Semantic Change". In J. Fisiak and M. Bator (eds.). *Historical Word-Formation and Semantics*. Frankfurt - New York: Peter Lang.

Schulz, M. 1975. "The Semantic Derogation of Woman". In B. Thorne and N. Henley (eds.). *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers Inc. 64-75.

Warren, B. 1992. "What Euphemisms Tell Us about the Interpretation of Words". In *Studia Linguistica* 46.2: 128-172.

Laura Esteban Segura
University of Murcia (Spain)

The Malaga POS-Tagger of Middle English: A Description and Assessment

The value of annotated corpora for the historical study of English has been more than acknowledged, as they can provide detailed information on different linguistic aspects including morphology, syntax and semantics, amongst others. The annotation of a Middle English corpus can be nonetheless a time-consuming and cumbersome task when done manually, which has been the traditional procedure. In recent years, developments in computational tools have proved their potential for accurately tagging corpora. This paper is concerned with a specific part-of-speech (POS) tagging programme for Middle English texts, namely the *Málaga POS Tagger of Middle English*. We set out to provide a description and to carry out a practical demonstration in order to appraise its advantages and possible shortcomings.

Vincent Gillespie
University of Oxford (UK)

Fatherless Books: Authorship, Attribution and Orthodoxy in Later Medieval England

The recurrent concern for 'sound doctrine' in later medieval English religious texts has often been seen as a distinguishing characteristic of books produced by or for the Carthusians and Birgittines. But I want to suggest that their prominent espousal of such priorities is in fact not only a reflection of the distinctive textual cultures of those orders, but also, and perhaps more tellingly, a reflection of a wider concern among those responsible for the production, transmission, dissemination and reception of fifteenth-century vernacular books of religion to mark out their religious productions from those suspicious books soiled with heterodoxy and Lollard opinions. One of the most significant manifestations of that interest, I wish to argue, is an increasing concern to establish and promulgate the attribution of vernacular

religious texts and books, whether through the inclusion of colophons that claim parentage for certain texts, or increasingly through comments in wills and benefactions that create chains of provenance for books being passed on to a new generation of readers and users, to generate comfort and security about their authority and orthodoxy. A new look at the 'fatherless books' of the fifteenth century, and at the increasing number of books, texts and readers that claim filiation with authoritative writers, and construct for themselves patrimonies of authorship, ownership, and transmission, is surely overdue.

Raymond Hickey
University of Duisburg and Essen (Germany)

Language Contact and the Sound System of Middle English: A Reassessment

The Middle English period is characterised externally by contact with forms of French, earlier northern forms and later more central forms. In addition, the contact with the Scandinavians was not long ago and the assimilation process of all Vikings was just completed before the beginning of the Middle English. Changes in the lexicon of English are very obvious from the many loanwords of Scandinavian and French origin which appear in the textual record of English from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. However, where phonology is concerned the matter is somewhat less obvious. On the one hand there are cases of sounds which came into the language with the loan-words from French, cases like *point* for the /oi/ diphthong and *zeal* for initial /z-/ or *veal* for initial /v-/ appear to document this clearly. But it is known from modern Germanic languages like German or Swedish that the intake of foreign sounds requires a nuanced and differentiated view of possible borrowing on the phonological level.

For the current paper the evidence will be examined carefully for just what sounds might have an origin outside the input sound system of early Middle English. But internal arguments from the continual development of the sound system of late Old English into the Middle English period will be considered carefully and a re-assessment of contact and its consequences in the Middle English sound system with

be offered. Here contemporary on the nature and process of language contact (Trudgill 2011a, b; Hickey 2010) will be examined carefully.

References

Hickey, Raymond (ed.). *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Hogg, Richard and David Denison (eds). 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.

Horobin, Simon and Jeremy Smith. 2002. *An Introduction to Middle English*. Edinburgh: University Press.

Horobin, Simon. 2006. *Chaucer's Language*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, Charles. 1989. *A History of English Phonology*. London: Longman.

Lass, Roger. 1976. *English Phonology and Phonological Theory. Synchronic and Diachronic Studies*. Cambridge: University Press.

Lass, Roger. 1984. *Phonology*. Cambridge: University Press.

Lass, Roger. 1994. *Old English. A Historical Linguistic Companion*. Cambridge: University Press.

Lass, Roger. 2006. "Phonology and Morphology". In Hogg and Denison (eds.). *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.43-108.

McMahon, April. 2000. *Lexical Phonology and the History of English*. Cambridge: University Press.

Minkova, Donka. (ed.). *Phonological Weakness in English. From Old to Present-day English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ritt, Nikolaus. 1994. *Quantity Adjustment. Vowel Lengthening and Shortening in Early Middle English*. Cambridge: University Press.

Ritt, Nikolaus and Herbert Schendl. (eds). 2005. *Rethinking Middle English*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Smith, Jeremy. 2007. *Sound Change and the History of English*. Oxford: University Press.

Stockwell, Robert and Donka Minkova. 2009. *English Words, History and Structure*. Cambridge: University Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011a. *Sociolinguistic Typology: Social Determinants of Linguistic Complexity*. Oxford: University Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 2011b. "Social Structure, Language Contact and Language Change". In Ruth Wodak, Barbara Johnstone and Paul Kerswill (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Ryuichi Hotta
Chuo University, Tokyo (Japan)

The Representativeness of the *LAEME* Corpus and Word Frequency in Early Middle English with Special Reference to the Lexical Diffusion of *s*-Pluralisation

The present study addresses three issues regarding the text database of *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* (hereafter the *LAEME* Corpus): 1) to evaluate how representative the corpus is of Early Middle English; 2) to compile a word frequency list from the corpus in preparation for lexicological studies of the period; 3) to use the word frequency list to see whether there is a correlation between word frequency and the schedule of nominal plural formation transfer.

Firstly, I present the basic statistics derived from the corpus, paying particular attention to its diachronic and/or diatopic representativeness. To make the best use of a corpus, it is necessary not only to learn its tagging scheme (if it is tagged at all) but also to understand its representativeness, or the range of texts it contains, as well as its basic statistical facts. This is no less true of historical English corpora such as the *LAEME* corpus than of Present-Day English corpora. One specific question regarding the *LAEME* corpus is the extent to which it represents various dialects and subperiods, as its main contribution is claimed to be, along with its predecessor *LALME* (*A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* by McIntosh et al.), to the study of dialectal variation. For the corpus to be a reliable tool for linguistic studies of the period, it is essential that it be evaluated critically.

Secondly, after evaluating the corpus, I will attempt to compile a word frequency list for the period. Many word frequency lists for PDE are available thanks to a growing number of large corpora, but earlier varieties of English lack their counterparts. I take this initial foray into EME lexical statistics by producing a word frequency list from the *LAEME* corpus.

Thirdly, I will put the obtained list to use by surveying *s*-pluralisation during the Early Middle English period (Hotta 2009, 2012) in terms of word frequency. The survey is intended to determine whether there is a correlation between word frequency and the schedule of *s*-pluralisation, as has been suggested, for some other language changes, in Phillips's series of studies (1984, 1998, 2006) on lexical diffusion (Wang 1969).

References

Hotta, Ryuichi. 2009. *The Development of the Nominal Plural Forms in Early Middle English*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Hotta, Ryuichi. 2012. "The Order and Schedule of Nominal Plural Formation Transfer in Three Southern Dialects of Early Middle English". In Irén Hegedüs and Alexandra Fodor (eds.). *English Historical Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 16)*. Pécs, 22–27 August 2010. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 94-113.

Laing, Margaret and Roger Lass. 2007. *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150–1325*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh. Accessed on 9 January 2012. Available at

http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html.

McIntosh, Angus, Michael L. Samuels and Michael Benskin. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*. 4 vols. Aberdeen: University Press.

Phillips, Betty S. 1984. "Word Frequency and the Actuation of Sound Change". *Language* 60: 320-42.

Phillips, Betty S. 1998. "Word Frequency and Lexical Diffusion in English Stress Shifts". In Richard Hogg and Linda van Bergen (eds.). *Germanic Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 223-32.

Phillips, Betty S. 2006. *Word Frequency and Lexical Diffusion*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wang, William S-Y. 1977 [1969]. "Competing Changes as a Cause of Residue". *Language* 45: 9–25. (Rpt. in *Readings in Historical Phonology: Chapters in the*

Theory of Sound Change, ed. Philip Baldi and Ronald N. Werth, Pennsylvania State University Press, Pennsylvania, 236–57).

Reiko Ito
Tokiwa University (Japan)

The French Influence on the Multiple Negation in Middle English. A Corpus-Based Study

Jespersen (1917: 9-14) describes the historical development of the English negation as in the following progression: (1)Ic *ne* secge. (2)I *ne* seye *not*. (3)I say *not*. (4)I do *not* say. (5)I *don't* say. (1) is a typical Old English negative expression in which the negative adverb *ne* is placed before a finite verb. (2) became dominant in Middle English, adding *not* to emphasize the negative meaning, and this followed historically in the 15th century by (3) in which *ne* disappeared. Though Jespersen accounts *not* insertion for an emphasis of negation, the multiple negations, such as *ne V ne* and *ne V not*, are used in OE (Strang 1970: 312).

Previous studies on the negative development in Middle English have focused on the selected texts (Jack 1978, Iyeiri 2001). Ito(2007) and Ito and Kiyomi (2009), while searching '*ne V not*' through ME period of the Helsinki Corpus of English(HC) using KWIC Concordance for Windows Ver.4.7, obtained evidence that French influenced the multiple negations during ME. We found no examples of '*ne V not*' relevant to French or Latin in ME1(1150-1250) of HC, so the multiple negations, which had been employed in OE, were still in use during that period. However, in ME2(1250-1350), the occurrence of '*ne V not*' relevant to French or Latin numerically increased.

In this paper, primarily the French influence on Middle English is considered. Though many scholars are devoted to the historical change of the negative constructions, only a few (Jack 1978, Joly 1982) have commented on the French influence, searching through their limited selections. The method used herein was to investigate the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English Second Edition (PPCME2) employing the Treebank as a search engine. PPCME2 is an annotated

corpus and contains approximately 1.2 million words of 55 text samples with a text file, a part-of-speech tagged file and a parsed file.

Initially, the multiple negations were extracted using NEG as POS tag and *ne* and *not* with their variants as keywords for basic syntactic tags. Then the data were classified into Type(1)*ne V*, Type(2)*ne V not* and Type(3)*V not,* with parameters, and also the clause types. Finally, the French influence on the negative constructions was analyzed comparing the three types throughout 4 periods of ME.

References

Ito, Reiko. 2007. "On the Negative Particle 'ne' in ME –Searching for the Helshinki Corpus". *Bulletin of Nihonbashi Gakkan University* 6: 107-13.

Ito, Reiko and Setsuko Kiyomi. 2009. "On the Disappearance of the Negative Adverb 'ne' in Middle English". *Tsuda Journal of Language and Culture* 24.

Iyeiri, Yoko. 2001. *Negative Constructions in Middle English*. Fukuoka, Japan: Kyushu University Press.

Jack, G. B. 1978a. "Negative Adverbs in Early Middle English". *English Studies* 59: 295-309.

Jack, G. B. 1978b. "Negation in Later Middle English". *Archivum Linguisticum* 9: 58-72.

Jespersen, Otto. 1917. *Negation in English and Other Languages*. Copenhagen: A.F. Host.

Joly, Andre. 1992. "The System of Negation in Later Middle English Prose". In A. Ahlqvist (ed.). *Papers from the 5th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 176-89.

Strang, B.M.H. 1970. *A History of English*. London: Methuen.

Nils-Lennart Johannesson
Stockholm University (Sweden)

'Alphabetum Anglicum': An Analysis of the Runic Alphabet in the *Ormulum* MS

In the *Ormulum* manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 1) from the late 12th century, folio 2 recto carries the owner signature "Jani Vlisij" and the place and

date "Bredae 1659 6 Feb.". On folio 2 recto there are, in addition, two nearly identical rows of characters, the second somewhat smaller. First in each row comes a group of 21 runes, those in the top row each superscribed with a letter in the Latin alphabet. Next in each row follows a cross, after that a group of eight characters (nine in the lower row, because the seventh one is repeated) which appear to be additional characters added to the Latin alphabet (the characters are superscribed 'heng', 'he', 'ho', 'hethe', 'has', 'ge', 'che', and 'and'). After a division mark follow seven more runes, followed by another (different) division mark and the word 'AMEN' in Latin characters. The last section is superscribed 'Alphabetum Anglicum'.

To the best of my knowledge, no one has previously analysed this runic inscription. It is not mentioned in Page 1999, nor in any other of R.I. Page's works. The nearest analogue that I have been able to find is in Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42. In my paper I will try to identify the writer, present an interpretation of the inscription in terms of the sound system it represents, and show how the 'alphabet' can be used to make sense of at least one other English runic inscription.

References

Jacobsen, Lis and Erik Moltke. 1941–42. *Danmarks runeindskrifter*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Page, R.I. 1999. *An Introduction to English Runes*. 2nd ed. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Ireneusz Kida
University of Silesia (Poland)

A Corpus-Based Analysis of the Dynamism of Word Order Changes in the Middle English Period

In my presentation, I am going to discuss the changes that started to take place in the English word order around the time of the Norman Conquest, that is, when more or less the Early Middle English period begins, and that continued until the Late Middle English period. It is going to be a corpus-based analysis on the basis of my own electronic annotated corpus. For a start, I will have a look at the entries

1067-1121 of the Peterborough Chronicle. Although this part of the Chronicle still belongs to the Old English period, at least as far as can supposed on the basis of the kind of English it was written in, it offers a very interesting picture of the English word order in transition, which fact I partly ascribe to the influence of Norman French and partly to the influence of Old Norse. Afterwards I will move on to the First and to the Second Continuation of the Peterborough Chronicle to observe even more, and more dynamic, changes towards the VO pattern. Other texts that will be taken into consideration are Juliana, Ancrene Wisse, the Astrolabe, Prose Treatises, as well as the Wycliffe Bible. The texts that I will take into account will be organised more or less chronologically in order to be able to notice the diachrony and dynamism of word order changes that took place in the Middle English period.

Paulina Kolasińska
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań (Poland)

Late 11th and 12th Century English Morphology

It is conventional to divide the history of English into three major periods: Old English, Middle English and Modern English. The end of the Old English period and the beginning of the Middle English period are associated with the Norman conquest of 1066 and its aftermaths (Hogg 2002:VIII)- replacing English with French as the official language of court, literature and politics. Thus, the representation of English texts in late 11th and 12th centuries is limited and consequently the language of this period is generally disregarded as a subject of scholarly interest. As has been lately pointed out by Faulkner (2011) and Treharne (2012), this state of affairs stems from the prejudice against unoriginal manuscripts, as well as ignorance as to the abundance of prose produced and reproduced in English in 11th and 12th centuries. On the other hand, during the same period, English underwent profound changes, and so 11th and 12th centuries, generally disregarded for the reasons mentioned above, are at the same time of great linguistic interest.

It is generally assumed that the earlier, the more original version of the manuscript the better, and so late 11th and 12th centuries are regarded as uninteresting, as the period is abundant in copies of Old English manuscripts with few new original English texts. However, contrary to the widespread prejudice, copies of Old English manuscripts produced during the period in question offer themselves as rich sources of information on language change and development, indicating changes in the lexicon, morphology and phonology. A comparative study of one manuscript, copied throughout the whole century, such as the one conducted by Kathryn Lowe of University of Glasgow concerning four manuscripts of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, should be illuminating as to how English changed under the Norman conquest. Also, thanks to new research tools and databases, such as the project "The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220", there is a chance that 11th and 12th centuries may cease to be a white spot in the history of English.

The aim of this paper is to present, discuss and summarize the current state of studies concerning 11th and 12th century English morphology, to present theoretical and general historical aspects of this period, as well as to propose future research possibilities, which would aim at eliminating this white spot on the map of the history of the English language.

References

Blake, Norman (ed.). 1992. *Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume 2: 1066-1476.* Cambridge: University Press.

Boyd Goldie, Matthew. 2003. *Middle English Literature: A Historical Sourcebook.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Faulkner, Mark. 2011. "Archaism, Belatedness and Modernisation: 'Old' English in the Twelfth Century", *Review of English Studies* 63: 179-203.

Fisiak, Jacek (ed.). 1996. *Middle English Miscellany: from Vocabulary to Linguistic Variation.* Poznań: Motivex.

Hogg, Richard. 2002. *An Introduction to Old English.* Edinburgh: University Press.

Laing, Margaret (ed.). *Middle English Dialectology: Essays on Some Principles and Problems.* Aberdeen: University Press.

Malone, Kemp. 1930. "When Did Middle English Begin?" *Language* 6.4: 110-117.

Treharne, Elaine. 2012. *Living Through Conquest. The Politics of Early English, 1020-1220.* Oxford: University Press.

Roger Lass and Margaret Laing
University of Cape Town (South Africa) – *University of Edinburgh* (UK)

The Early Middle English Reflexes of Germanic *ik *I* — Unpacking the Changes

The phonological shape of the PDE first person nominative singular pronoun *I* is assumed to have a simple history. The final consonant of WGmc ***ik** 'palatalises' (i.e. fronts and assibilates), and later the palatalised consonant drops, yielding [i:], which develops through the Great Vowel Shift into something like [ai]. However, the late Old English and early Middle English evidence indicates that such a simple narrative does not yield the attested data. Rather, there are significant temporal, geographical and variational aspects, including complex lexical diffusion.

For instance, the standard historical handbooks do not lead us to expect that inventories of the first person singular pronoun in a single text language would look like this:

London, British Library, Royal 2.F.viii, fol. 1v, lyric (W Wilts, C13b2): *ic, hic, ih, yh, ig, yg, hi, hy, y.*

The LAEME Corpus of Tagged of Texts contains 145 texts that include one or more variants of the pronoun *I*. Both simple and highly complex systems occur. Between them, the tagged texts exemplify an intricate history for the first person singular pronoun. Here we unpack the changes that have brought about the attested complexity. As a basis we use the etymology of this item created for the forthcoming Corpus of Narrative Etymologies (CoNE), which itself interfaces with its accompanying Corpus of Changes (CC).

Of course the history of this small grammatical word ultimately needs to be considered against the wider background of velar palatalisation in general and in relation to the reflexes of other commonly occurring items of a similar structure (e.g. *ditch*, *pitch* etc. and the suffix *-ly*, as well as grammaticalised versions of it that occur

the items *such*, *each*, *which*). But the changes visible in *I* seem not to be fully replicated in any of these other items, and here we confine ourselves to its particular and apparently unique history.

References

CoNE = Lass, R., Alcorn, R., Laing, M. and Williamson, K. (eds.) forthc. *A Corpus of Narrative Etymologies from Primitive Old English to Early Middle English and A Corpus of Changes*. Edinburgh: © The University of Edinburgh.

LAEME = *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English 1150–1325*. Compiled by Margaret Laing. Electronic text corpus with accompanying software (Keith Williamson) index of sources and theoretical introduction (with Roger Lass). http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html. Edinburgh: ©The University of Edinburgh 2008–.

Andrzej Łęcki
Pedagogical University of Cracow (Poland)

Purposive *so that* in Middle English

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 727), the constructions introducing finite clauses expressing purpose are *in order* and *so*. The history of the former structure has recently been studied by Łęcki and Nykiel (in press), while the development of the purposive *so (that)* subordinator has not attracted particular attention on the part of historical linguists. That the history of *so (that)* deserves a proper analysis can be shown by the very fact that in present-day English it is the second element that can readily be omitted (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 727), whereas in Middle English *so* introducing purpose clauses does not seem to have been especially popular when set against *that* alone, e.g. in select illustrations of modally marked forms in final clauses in Middle English Visser (1963-1973 [2002]: 863f.) supplies twenty eight cases of *that* alone and only one of *so that* and one of *so* alone and MED (s.v. *sō* (adv.)) does not even mention the possibility of *so* introducing purpose clauses. Yet *swa þæt*, however uncommonly, was used to introduce final clauses already in Old English.

The main objective of this paper is to investigate the extent to which the purposive *so that* construction was grammaticalised in Middle English. This is achieved by referring to the mechanisms and principles of grammaticalisation propounded by Hopper (1991) and Heine (2003) [2005]. The secondary aim of this work is to provide a quantitative analysis of *that* and *so that* introducing final clauses in Middle English. The language data are taken mostly from the electronic corpora of the English language such as the CMEPV and ICAME corpora.

References

CMEPV *Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse*. 1997- Developed by the Humanities Text Initiative. <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme/>

Heine, Bernd. 2003 [2005]. "Grammaticalization" In Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda (eds.). *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Padstow: TJ International Ltd. 575-601.

Hopper, Paul J. 1991. "On Some Principles of Grammaticalization". In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.). *Approaches to Grammaticalization: Focus on Theoretical and Methodological Issues*. Vol. I. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 17-35.

Huddleston Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press.

ICAME. 1999. *The International Computer Archive of Modern and Medieval English*. Knut Hofland, Anne Lindebjerg, Jørn Thunestvedt et al. (eds.) (2nd edition) University of Bergen, Norway: The HIT Centre. <http://icame.uib.no/cd/>

Łęcki Andrzej and Jerzy Nykiel. Firthcoming. "Grammaticalisation of the English Prepositional Conjunction *in order to/that*". In Hubert Cuyckens, Lobke Ghesquière and Daniël Van Olmen (eds.). *Aspects of Grammaticalization: (Inter)Subjectification, Analogy and Unidirectionality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

MED *Middle English Dictionary*. 1956-2001. Hans Kurath and Sherman Kuhn et al. (eds.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/mec>

Visser, Frederikus Theodor. 1963-1973 [2002]. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden: EJ Brill.

Ragnhild Ljosland
University of the Highlands and Islands (UK)

The Establishment of Middle Scots in the Orkney Islands

This paper combines historical sociolinguistics with studies of Middle English and Middle Scots syntax in exploring the history of how and when the Scots language was established in the formerly Old Norse speaking archipelago of Orkney in the north of Scotland. The archipelago is a language contact area where Middle Scots was in contact with the local dialect of Old Norse for several centuries, both before and after the islands were officially passed from Dano-Norwegian to Scottish rule in 1468. Using historical sources, the paper shows that Middle Scots was brought to the islands both through official administration and the church, but also largely through trade. The paper also uses Orkney dialect texts to show how aspects of the syntax of Middle Scots survived in Orkney into modern times as linguistic relicts. The presence or lack of do-support in questions and negative imperatives in 19th and 20th century Orkney dialect texts is compared to Ellegård's (1953) classical study of do-support in English from the 15th to 18th century, showing that the modern Orkney dialect is a syntactic relict area. The paper also probes whether syntactic relicts can be used as tentative evidence for estimating when the Scots language was established as an indigenous language in Orkney.

María José López-Couso
University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)

Exploring Linguistic Accretion: Middle English as a Testing Ground

In recent years, increasing attention has been given to a cross-linguistic phenomenon variously referred to in the literature as 'accretion' (Kuteva 2008), 'pleonasm', and 'hypercharacterization' (Lehmann 2005), among other terms. Such labels typically encompass a wide range of disparate phenomena attested at different levels of the linguistic system which involve the accumulation of *redundant* linguistic material. Examples of linguistic accretion comprise cases of multiple relativization markers in

languages such as Swahili, Ngemba, and Singlish (Kuteva 2008), double determination in definiteness marking in some Scandinavian languages (Dahl 2004, 2009), stem reduplication in certain Latin pronominal forms (Sornicola 2006), and the use of expletive subject pronouns in languages which mark person on the verb (Lehmann 2005; Sornicola 2006).

As can be gathered from these and similar examples, linguistic accretion phenomena are interesting not only in and of themselves, but also and especially because they may be at the origin of new grammatical structure and because they provide appealing instances of linguistic competition between options. In this context, my aim in this talk is to look into a range of cases of accretion documented in the Middle English period in different domains. After briefly revisiting some well-known examples of hypercharacterization at the levels of vocabulary (e.g. synonym compounding patterns such as *for routhe and for pitee*) and inflectional morphology, including adjective gradation (e.g. *more older*) and double plurals (e.g. *children*), I will focus on less familiar instances of accretion, mostly from the domain of syntax. Among these, I will consider the following: 'redundant' or 'strengthened' adverbial subordinators of the type shown in *for because* and *and if*, the use of so-called 'double locative overlap constructions' and their relevance for the grammaticalization of existential *there*, and the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in extraction contexts. By comparing these patterns with their counterparts not containing the 'surplus' element, attention will be paid to the motivations and the functions of these hypercharacterized forms and constructions, both at the level of communication and at the level of grammatical structure.

References

Dahl, Östen. 2004. *The Growth and Maintenance of Linguistic Complexity*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dahl, Östen. 2009. "Increases of Complexity as a Result of Language Contact". In Kurt Braunmüller and Juliane House (eds.). *Convergence and Divergence in Language Contact Situations*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 41-52.

Kuteva, Tania. 2008. "On the Frills of Grammaticalization". In María José López-Couso and Elena Seoane (eds.). *Rethinking Grammaticalization. New Perspectives*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 189-217.

Lehmann, Christian. 2005. "Pleonasm and Hypercharacterisation". In Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds.). *Yearbook of Morphology 2005*. Dordrecht: Springer. 119-154.

Sornicola, Rosanna. 2006. "Expletives and Dummies". In Keith Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd ed., vol. 4. Oxford: Elsevier. 399-410.

Angelica Lutz
University of Erlangen (Germany)

The Stratal Role of the Old Norse Loans in Middle English: New Questions and Explanations

In Lutz 2012, it is argued that the influence of Old Norse on English is very similar to that of Old French and that both influences are clearly superstratal. The most obvious lexical evidence for Norse rule consists of words referring to legal and administrative power in the Danelaw and later, during Cnut's reign, also in the remaining country. Most of these words are attested in Old English texts only. After 1066, these words were largely replaced by equivalents from the French superstrate. This leads to new questions with regard to the stratal role of the Norse loans surviving into Middle English. Did these words survive (1) as part of a mixed Germanic, i.e. Old English and Old Norse, substrate below the French superstrate? Or was the stratal role of Old Norse in Middle English more complicated than that, namely (2) with regard to the survival of Norse loans in the Middle English dialects and (3) with regard to the late Middle English usage expansion of some of them into the emerging standard language? This presentation proposes answers that are consistent both with regard to the Middle English data and to the principles of comparative contact linguistics.

References

Görlach, Manfred. 2009. "Borrowing as Language Conflict". In Marlis Hellinger and Anne Pauwels (eds.). *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 715-749.

Hansen, Bente Hyldegaard. 1984. "The Historical Implications of the Scandinavian Linguistic Element in English: A Theoretical Evaluation". *North-Western European Language Evolution* 4: 53-95.

Hug, Sibylle. 1987. *Scandinavian Loanwords and their Equivalents in Middle English*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Kastovsky, Dieter. 2006. "Vocabulary". In Richard Hogg and David Denison (eds.). *A History of the English Language*, Cambridge: University Press. 199-270.

Lutz, Angelica. 2012. "Language Contact in the Scandinavian Period" In Terttu Nevalainen and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of the History of English*. Oxford: University Press. 508-517.

Poussa, Patricia. 1982. "The Evolution of Early Standard English: The Creolization Hypothesis". *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 14: 69-85.

Rynell, Alarik. 1948. *The Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English, especially 'taken' and 'nimen'*, Lund: Gleerup.

Skaffari, Janne. 2009. *Studies in Early Middle English Loanwords: Norse and French Influences*. Turku: University of Turku.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 2010. "Contact and Sociolinguistic Typology". In Raymond Hickey (ed.). *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 299-319.

Winford, Donald. 2010. "Contact and Borrowing". In Raymond Hickey (ed.). *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 170-187.

Donka Minkova
University of California at Los Angeles (USA)

Did the Principles of Syllabification Change in Middle English?

A clear understanding of syllabification is central to the account of all phonological processes. Syllable structure determines segmental associations and syllable weight, which in turn drive qualitative and quantitative adjustments. A (C)VCV word such as *honey* can be syllabified onset-maximally as CV.CV, ambisyllabically as CV[C]V, and coda-maximally as CVC.V. In Present-Day English the status of intervocalic consonants and clusters can be debated, yet ambisyllabicity is considered the structural trigger of phenomena such as the lack of aspiration of [p] in e.g. *happy* vs. *appear* with [ph], or alveolar tapping, both pre-atonic (*atom, letter, inevitable, anxiety*) and phrasal (*at Ed's*).

For Old English, the principles of syllabification are also controversial. Suzuki (1994, 1995) proposed ambisyllabicity for V[C]V in all cases of a short vowel followed by a single consonant, irrespective of the nature of the vowel or the nature of the consonant. Fulk (1997) presented a vigorously 'contrary' view. Using arguments from high-vowel deletion, resolution in the meter, OE word division at line ends, and open-syllable lengthening, he concluded that none of the evidence for ambisyllabicity in OE is compelling, and some of it is philologically unsustainable. An entailment of this view is that ambisyllabicity arose sometime during Middle English, presumably after the completion of open-syllable lengthening and degemination.

My paper contributes to the debate on syllabification in the history of English by re-examining the evidence for open-syllable lengthening in Middle English in relation to the nature of the intervocalic consonant. Ritt (1994: 40-41) is an attempt to address that aspect of the change, but the only property he considers is sonority, leading to a rather puzzling, and unexplained, behavior of medial sonorants: out of 76 items of the type *gammon, moral, talent, tenant*, only a single item, *moment* (a1382) has been lengthened. Dealing with the same data, Bermúdez-Otero (1998) isolated the sonority of the second syllable codas in words resisting OSL, such as *copper* (c. 1000), *desert* (c.1225), *metal* (c. 1230), as the 'blocking' trigger. Unlike these earlier

studies, I focus both on sonority *and* manner of articulation of the intervocalic consonant. The working hypothesis, suggested by current experimental studies of syllabification (Content, Kearns, and Frauenfelder (2001)), is that obstruents are more likely to appear at onset than at coda position, and conversely, sonorants are more likely to appear at coda than at onset position. The results promise to throw light on a central debate in English historical phonology.

References

Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 1998. "Prosodic Optimization: The Middle English Length Adjustment". *English Language and Linguistics* 2: 169-197.

Content, Alain, Ruth Kearns and Uli Frauenfelder. 2001. "Boundaries versus Onsets in Syllabic Segmentation". *Journal of Memory and Language* 45: 177-199.

Fulk, Robert D. 1997. "Ambisyllabicity in Old English: A Contrary View". In Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr (eds.). *Insights in Germanic Linguistics II: Classic and Contemporary*. Berlin: Mouton. 29-45.

Minkova, D. 1982. "The Environment for Open Syllable Lengthening in Middle English". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 3.1: 29-58.

Ritt, Nikolaus. 1994. *Quantity Adjustment. Vowel Lengthening and Shortening in Early Middle English*. Cambridge: University Press.

Suzuki, Seiichi. 1994. "Breaking, Ambisyllabicity, and the Sonority Hierarchy in Old English". *Diachronica* 11: 65-93.

---. 1995. "Resolution and Mora-counting in Old English". *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures* 7.1: 1-29.

Rafal Molencki
University of Silesia, Katowice (Poland)

The Competition between *purvey* and *provide* in Late Middle English

The English verb *provide*, first attested c1420, comes from the Latin etymon *pro-videre* 'fore-see'. The Central French derivative of *providere* is *pourvoir*, while the regular Norman French counterpart is *pourveir*, used in both concrete senses of seeing and looking, and more abstract of examining, foreseeing, judging and

furnishing. The first French instances of *pourvoir/purveir* are attested in the *Psautier d'Oxford* and the *Voyage de Saint Brendan* in the early 12th century, thus in the Anglo-Norman dialect. The verb was adopted into Middle English as *purvey(en)*, but only in its abstract senses, e.g. 'foresee, foreknow, consider, get ready, prepare oneself, provide, supply, gather, ordain, seek, attend to'. The earliest attestations quoted in the *MED* come from c1300.

Apart from the verb *purvey*, we find some 14th century instances of the noun *purveyance* meaning 'supply, abundance, foresight, prudence, providence' (first attested c1300 in *South English Legendary*), which had a more Latinate doublet synonym *providence* (first attested c1382 in Wycliffe's *Bible*). Both are found in earlier (mid-13th c.) Anglo-Norman texts. Another morphologically related noun was *provision*, used in both Anglo-Norman and Middle English, which also had a doublet *purview*:

In the 1420s the new verb *provide*, directly borrowed from Latin without any French intermediary, appears in English and begins to compete with *purvey* in most of its senses. In Early Modern English *provide* supplanted *purvey* altogether, for example, it is not found in Shakespeare any more. The process was parallel with the gradual elimination of the phrasal conjunction *purveyed that* in favour of *providing/provided that* (Molencki 2012). According to the *OED provide* "may have been promoted by the fact that *providence* was already in use for *purveyance*". Out of nine senses listed in the *OED* eight are marked as either obsolete or archaic (three already died out in late Middle English) and from the 17th century onward *purvey* is "used chiefly or only of supplying victuals" (hence the noun *purveyor*). The majority of *MED* quotations of *providen* come from John Lydgate's writings.

Both *purvey* and *provide* were often used in their participial forms; according to Cougil Álvarez and González Cruz (2003:35) nonfinite (especially participial) forms of *provide* prevail in the Helsinki Corpus. Their full anglicization is best evidenced by the fact that the past participle was occasionally preceded by the Middle English reflex of the Germanic perfective prefix *ge-*.

Interestingly, the *AND* attests the verb *provider/providre* meaning 'to appoint by papal provision' in ecclesiastical Anglo-Norman, which appears to have been absent

in Continental French, thus making it a possible example of the English influence on the medieval Anglo-French lexis.

References
Dictionaries
Anglo-Norman Dictionary Online – http://www.anglo-norman.net.
Middle English Dictionary Online – http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/med.
Oxford English Dictionary Online – http://www.oed.com.

Other references
Cougil Álvarez, Rosa María and Ana I. González Cruz. 2003. "On the Development of Deverbal Conjunctions. A Case-study on the Grammaticalisation of *provided (that)* in Early Modern English". *SEDERI* 13: 33-44.

Ingham, Richard. 2009. "Middle English and Anglo-Norman in Contact". Paper presented at English Literary Society of Japan Conference, Tokyo, May 2009, available at

http://www.elsj.org/meeting/81st/81s10ingham.pdf

Molencki, Rafał. 2012. *Providing/provided that*: Grammaticalization or Loan Translation? In Irén Hegedűs and Alexandra Fodor (eds.). *English Historical Linguistics 2010.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 196-214.

Rothwell, William. 2001. "English and French in England after 1362". *English Studies* 82: 539-559.

Minako Nakayasu
Hamamatsu University School of Medicine (Japan)

Spatio-Temporal Systems in *A Treatise on the Astrolabe*

In our world where numerous situations occur in a variety of modes, it is the speaker of language who takes responsibility in choosing which situation to put into language and where on the time axis to place it. Examine the following context, where the speaker starts explaining the Astrolabe to his son:

(i) <u>Now</u> <u>wol</u> I preie mekely every discret persone that <u>redith</u> or <u>herith</u> <u>this</u> litel tretys to have my rude enditing for excusid, and my superfluite of wordes, for two causes. The firste cause <u>is</u> for that curious enditing and hard sentence <u>is</u> ful hevy at onys for such a child to lerne. And the secunde cause <u>is</u> <u>this</u>, that sothly me <u>semith</u> better to writen unto a child twyes a god sentence, than he <u>forgete</u> it onys (Ast 41-9).

Note that the speaker successively employs tense forms (*redith*, *herith*, *is*, *semith*, *forgete*), a modal (*wol*), a demonstrative (*this*), and an adverb/discourse marker (*now*). From a deictic point of view (Diessel (1999), etc.), he judges how far the situations are from his 'here and now' (i.e. proximal or distal), and realises the relations of space and time by these deictic expressions. Although there are several attempts to explain the relations of both space and time in historical data (Fries (1994), Nagucka (2000), etc.), no studies have so far tried to analyse the spatio-temporal systems in history in an integrative way.

The purpose of this paper is to conduct a systematic analysis of the synchronic spatio-temporal systems in Chaucer's prose, *A Treatise on the Astrolabe*, along the lines of historical pragmatics and discourse analysis (Jucker and Taavitsainen (2010), etc.). The corpus of the present study is based on the Riverside edition (Benson 1987) and the concordance by Oizumi (1991-94). The direction of mapping assumed is both form-to-function and function-to-form (Jacobs and Jucker 1995).

After defining the spatio-temporal systems, quantitative analysis reveals how frequently the expressions of space and time are exploited by the speaker, i.e. pronouns, adverbials, demonstratives, tenses and modals. Further analyses are conducted regarding in what manner these expressions are interrelated in discourse: interaction among the expressions, and discourse factors such as metadiscourse and discourse markers.

This research clarifies how the speaker, who plays a significant role in choosing language expressions, interacts with the systems of space and time in discourse.

References
Benson, Larry Dean (ed.). 1987. *The Riverside Chaucer*. Third edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Coompany.

Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fries, Udo. 1994. "Text Deixis in Early Modern English". In Dieter Kastovsky (ed.). *Studies in Early Modern English*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jacobs, Andreas and Andreas H. Jucker. 1995. "The Historical Perspective in Pragmatics". In Andreas H. Jucker (ed.). *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jucker, Andreas H. and Irma Taavitsainen (eds.). *Historical Pragmatics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton.

Oizumi, Akio (ed.). 1991-1994. *A Complete Concordance to the Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. 12 volumes. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

Nagucka, Ruta. 2000. "The Spatial and Temporal Meanings of *Before* in Middle English". In Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Päivi Pahta and Matti Rissanen (eds.). *Placing Middle English in Context*. Berlin and New York: Mouton.

Terttu Nevalainen
University of Helsinki (Finland)

Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Variation in Late Middle English

Middle English is usually portrayed as a period in which regional dialects were freely represented in writing, and, quoting Corrie (2012: 106), "represented without the ideological issues which have underscored the writing of dialects in subsequent times". Extending the generalization of dialect writing to other sources of linguistic variation, we may wonder about the extent to which Middle Englishtexts could also represent variation related to the writers' regional mobility, age, social networks and status, and even gender. For Early Middle English such questions are largely irrelevant: just as there is not enough material to base a description of northern English on, there is little data to explore writer characteristics. But as we move on to the 15th century, the personal correspondence available in English provides just such a resource.

Questions to do with linguistic variation have of course occupied Middle English scholars long before the emergence of historical sociolinguistics as a field of study. For example, H.C. Wyld (1936) was puzzled by the failure of the northern third-person verbal suffix -*s* to spread to East Anglia before reaching London in the 15th century and Davis (1954) describedhow the language of the Paston brothers diverged as they were exposed to different social environments. Since these early studies, a good deal historical sociolinguistic research has been carried out on 15th century correspondence, notably the Paston family, showing how social status and networks, for example, correlate with linguistic variation (e.g. Bergs 2005, Conde Silvestre and Hernández Campoy 2004). Recent studies also question any simple notion of Middle English regional variation. Stenroos and Thengs (2012) argue that real "geographical space" and reconstructed "linguistic space" reveal partly different trends, thus providing complementary evidence on regional variation.

Largely based on the 15th century data included in the Corpus of Early English Correspondence (CEEC), my talk will make use of a new tool, Text Variation Explorer, to assess linguistic variability in this period when writing was considered work and thus an occupation for servants and others professionally trained to do it. I will focus on evidence (1) for dialect mixing and levellingin official contexts and (2) for the role of scribes in introducing or retaining linguistic variabilityas witnessed in personal correspondence.The latter is of particular relevance when approaching the topic of gender variation in Late Middle English.

References

Bergs, Alexander. 2005. *Social Networks and Historical Sociolinguistics: Studies in Morphosyntactic Variation in the Paston Letters (1421–1503)*. Berlin and New York: Mouton.

Conde Silvestre, Juan Camilo and Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy. 2004. "A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Diffusion of Chancery Written Practices in Late Fifteenth Century Private Correspondence". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 105.2:133-152.

Corrie, Marilyn. 2012. "Middle English: Dialects and Diversity". In L. Mugglestone (ed.). *The Oxford History of English*. Oxford: University Press. 106-146.

Davis, Norman. 1954. "The Language of the Pastons". *Proceedings of the British Academy* 40: 119-144.

Stenroos, Merja and Kjetil V. Thengs. 2012. "Two Staffordshires: Real and Linguistic Space in the Study of Late Middle English Dialects". *Outposts of Historical Corpus Linguistics.* In J. Tyrkkö, M. Kilpiö, T. Nevalainen and M. Rissanen. Available at http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/10/stenroos_thengs/.

Wyld, Henry Cecil 1936. *A History of Modern Colloquial English.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Mª Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma
University of Seville (Spain)

The Northern Subject Rule in First Person Singular Contexts in 14th-15th-Century Scots Texts

One of the most distinctive features of Scots and northern English is the so called Northern Subject Rule (NSR), which governs the selection of inflections (Þ vs. -*s*) in the present indicative depending on the type and the position of the subject. The present article focuses on the operation of the NSR in first person singular in early Scots, since this context is not so well documented as the present indicative plural and therefore has normally received less attention. The results of the present study show that the first person singular comes under the scope of the NSR in 14th- and 15thc.-Scots, with a near-categorical operation of the Proximity to Subject Constraint, and reveal the strength of this constraint, which in recent literature (Cole 2012, de Haas 2011, Fernández Cuesta 2011) is generally assumed to be less robust than the Type of Subject Constraint. Comparison of these findings with those obtained from Northern English seems to suggest that Scots is more advanced than Northern English in the operation of the NSR.

References
Cole, Marcelle. 2012. *Old Northumbrian Verbal Morphology in the Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels.* Dissertation. University of Seville.

De Haas, Nynke. 2011. *Morphosyntactic Variation in Northern English: the Northern Subject Rule, Its Origins and Early History*. Dissertation. Radboud University Nijmegen.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia. 2011. "The Northern Subject Rule in First-Person-Singular Contexts in Early Modern English". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 32: 89-114.

Hanna Rutkowska
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan (Poland)

Late Medieval Dialectal Spellings in the Early Sixteenth-Century Editions of the *Kalender of Shepherdes*

The aim of this presentation is to discuss my corpus-based study concerning the remnants of late medieval dialectal spellings in early printed books. In most late fifteenth-century and early sixteenth-century documents, due to "the growth of standardization and displacement of local usage" (Samuels 1981: 43; see also [1963] 1969: 415), dialectal spellings are rare. However, in the corpus under consideration it has been possible to identify several spellings which are either associated with the focused varieties of written English which emerged in Late Middle English, listed by Samuels ([1963] 1969: 404–18) and labelled as Types I–IV, or otherwise localisable dialectally. The lexemes represented by such spellings recorded in the documents subject to analysis include ANY, ASK, MANY, MUCH, NOT, and SHOULD. Dialectal spellings covered by this discussion also comprise the graphemic forms of verbal and nominal inflectional endings.

The corpus of this study comprises four sixteenth-century editions of the *Kalender of Shepherdes*, a comprehensive compendium of prose and verse texts on a variety of subjects, including those printed by Richard Pynson (1506), Julian Notary (*c*. 1518), Wynkyn de Worde (1528), and William Powell (1556). The corpus contains 267,100 words, and is an electronic database of my transcriptions of the relevant editions based on the facsimiles available at *Early English Books Online* (at http://wwwlib.umi.com/eebo/).

The study discussed in this paper is a part of a larger post-doctoral project that aims at analysing the orthographic systems of the early printers of books in English. This research is funded by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (project no. N N104 055438).

References

Samuels, Michael Louis. [1963] 1969. "Some Applications of Middle English dialectology". *English Studies* 44: 81–94.

Samuels, Michael Louis. 1981. "Spelling and Dialect in the Late and Post-Middle English Periods". In Michael Benskin and Michael Louis Samuels (eds.). *So Meny People Longages and Tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English Presented to Angus McIntosh*. Edinburgh: Middle English Dialect Project. 43–54.

Herbert Schendl
University of Vienna (Austria)

Multilingualism, Multilingual Texts and Language Shift in Late Medieval England

In multilingual societies, speakers often face the question which language to choose in a specific communicative act, both in speech and writing. That this also applied to the literate multilingual speakers in medieval England is supported both by secondary sources and the surviving texts. A range of monolingual texts in Latin, French and English, the main written languages of the period, mirrors a di- or triglossic situation, at least in for the early part of the period. Linguistically even more interesting evidence for medieval multilingualism is provided by the numerous mixed-language texts, which, as now widely agreed, represent instances of written code-switching. In spite of these linguistically relevant data, historical English linguistics has tended to adopt a predominantly 'monolingual' perspective in the linguistic and sociolinguistic study of the ME period, both in its theoretical outlook and its choice of data. However, as lexicographers of Anglo-French such as W. Rothwell and D. Trotter have repeatedly emphasized, the (socio)linguistic study of

Middle English should be based on all types of textual evidence, both monolingual and multilingual.

The present paper will concentrate on late medieval code-switching as a reflection of medieval multilingualism and of a specific type of language choice, especially in non-literary texts. This multilingual practice is closely linked to the multilingual literacy of scribes and authors as well as to the pragmatic setting of their work. The particularly high incidence of such texts from the decades immediately before and after 1400 and the fact that code-switching is more frequent in texts whose matrix language is French or Latin can be linked to the text-type specific shift from French and Latin to English, i.e., code-switching seems to act as an indicator of ongoing language shift. This as well as the varying switching patterns raises interesting questions about the sociolinguistic functions of switching in these mostly non-interactive texts, about the validity of the concept of code-switching for all multilingual text-types and about the differentiation between code-switching and borrowing.

References

Schendl, Herbert and Laura Wright (eds.). 2011. *Code-Switching in Early English* (Topics in English Linguistics 76). Berlin/New York: Mouton.

Sebba, Mark, Shahrzad Mahootian and Carla Jonsson (eds.) 2012. *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing. Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse.* New York/London: Routledge.

Merja Stenroos and Kjetil V. Thengs
University of Stavanger, Norway

Middle English Legal Documents and the Geography of Written Dialects

The current tradition in Middle English dialectology builds on the idea of a written dialect continuum. This means that texts of unknown provenance may be localized on linguistic grounds, using the 'fit-technique' developed by McIntosh (1956, 1963) and based on the assumption that written language changes gradually along a

geographical continuum. In this framework, texts that cannot be 'fitted' are seen to represent a non-local type of language: standardized, colourless or mixed.

An alternative approach to geographical variation in Middle English is to study texts with a known provenance and ask what kind of language was produced in a particular locality or area. Such an approach might be expected to produce much 'noise' in the form of various kinds of non-local language: scribes travelled, and increased mobility and text production lead to various processes of supralocalization. Recent studies of West Midland and Northern local documents (Stenroos and Thengs 2012; Thengs (under preparation) suggest, however, that a provenance-based study of Middle English dialectal variation does not necessarily present a chaotic picture at all. While it generally corroborates the traditional patterns of geographical variation, as shown in LALME (McIntosh *et al.* 1986) and earlier dialect studies, it also makes it possible to uncover breaks in the geographical continuum, such as text communities focussed on cities and institutions, and domain-specific features shared over geographical distance.

A new project ongoing at Stavanger aims at compiling a corpus of fifteenth-century documentary texts of known provenance, in order to carry out such a large-scale, provenance-based study of variation in written Middle English. The texts include legal and business documents as well as various ordinances, statutes and both official and private letters. The proposed paper will present some preliminary findings and discuss their implications for the traditional view of Middle English written variation.

References

McIntosh, A. 1956. 'The Analysis of Written Middle English". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 26-55.

McIntosh, A. 1963. "A New Approach to Middle English Dialectology". *English Studies* 44: 1-11.

McIntosh, A., M.L. Samuels and M. Benskin. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English.* 4 vols. Aberdeen: University Press.

Stenroos, M. and K. V. Thengs. 2012. "Two Staffordshires: Real and Linguistic Space in the Study of Late Middle English Dialects". In Jukka Tyrkkö, Terttu

Nevalainen, Matti Rissanen and Matti Kilpiö (eds). *Outposts of Historical Corpus Linguistics: From the Helsinki Corpus to a Proliferation of Resources.* Helsinki: Varieng.

Thengs, K. (under preparation). *English Medieval Documents of the North-West Midlands: a Study in the Language of a Real Space Text Corpus.* PhD thesis.

Nicole Studer-Joho
University of Zurich (Switzerland)

ȝinc and *gunker*: On Middle English Oblique Forms of the 2nd Person Dual Pronoun with Initial /j/

The dual forms of the personal pronoun are an archaic feature that is still attested in Early Middle English texts such as the *Ormulum,* Laȝamon's *Brut,* or *Genesis and Exodus.* A search query with the *Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* (Laing and Lass 2008-) reveals a total of 114 dual forms, out of which 31 are 2nd person oblique forms (Studer-Joho 2012: 173). While the most common forms acc./dat. *inc* (14x) and gen./poss. *in(c)ker(e)* (8x) reflect the corresponding OE forms *inċ* and *inċer* (Campbell 1959: §703), there are forms like ◻*ing,* ◻*ung,* ◻*inc,* ◻*inker,* ◻*ūker* in *Vices and Virtues* (text file #64) or *gunker* in *Genesis and Exodus* (text file #155), which seem to be Middle English innovations. The forms attest an unexpected initial consonant /j/ and, moreover, some of the forms have <u> rather than <i>.

The origin of the forms is still disputed. Kennedy (1915: 42) mentions "the tendency as the oblique cases of the plur. to acquire an initial consonant ȝ (g, y)" without going into detail. Howe (1996: 137–138) also comments on the parallel development of the plural forms with initial /j/, but finds it more likely that the dual forms have developed by analogy to the 2nd person dual nominative forms with initial /j/; however, this explanation does not account for the forms with /u/.

In this paper I reassess the possible origin of the Middle English oblique forms of the 2nd person dual pronoun with initial /j/. The data for the study is taken from *LAEME* and complemented by the forms recorded in Diehn (1901) and Kennedy (1915). I argue that analogy to the 2nd person plural personal pronouns with initial

/j/ should not be dismissed completely, as in addition to the initial consonant it would also explain the unexpected occurrence of /u/ in these forms. In order to support this view, I also present a comparison of the spatial distribution of the dual forms with initial /j/ and of plural forms with initial /j/ as recorded in *LAEME*.

References

Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Diehn, Otto. 1901. *Die Pronomina im Frühmittelenglischen: Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

Howe, Stephen. 1994. *The Personal Pronouns in the Germanic Languages: A Study of Personal Pronoun Morphology and Change in the Germanic Languages from the First Records to the Present Day*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kennedy, Arthur G. 1915. *The Pronouns of Address in English Literature of the Thirteenth Century*. Stanford: University Publications.

Laing, Margaret and Roger Lass. 2008-. *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325*. Version 2.1. University of Edinburgh. Available at <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html>

Studer-Joho, Nicole. 2012. "Diffusion and Change in Early Middle English: Methodological and Theoretical Implications from the *LAEME* Corpus of Tagged Texts." Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Zurich.

Theo Vennemann
University of Munich (Germany)

On the Rise of VO and SV Order in Middle English

Word order in Old English shows the typical features of the West Germanic TVX syntax, many of which have been preserved in Contemporary German and Dutch: verb-first in interrogative and imperative sentences; verb-second in declarative sentences, independently of the category or syntactic role of the constituent in first position; verb-final (or at least verb-late, i.e. verb-later than-second if possible) in subordinate clauses; head-final arrangement among the constituents following the finite verb in sentences, bringing about the sentence brace between the finite verb

and its immediate specifier. All these features are lost, and a consistent SVO syntax is developed in the course of Middle English, a system in which subject and verb form a fixed SV nexus and in which sentences and dependent structures have the same head-initial constituent order. In short, English underwent a major type change from OV to VO and from verb-second to SV order essentially within the Middle English period, and the question is why. The answer that will be proposed follows from the thesis that radical word-order change, i.e. rapid change of the headedness of fundamental constructions including the order of the verb and its objects into its opposite, occurs only as a result of language contact, preferably language shifting from a language of the opposite type. This is supported with a number of known cases of radical word order change that have found exactly this kind of explanation in the literature. Applying the thesis to the word order changes of English in the light of the developing theory that English owes much of its development to contact influence of the Insular Celtic VSO substrate of Anglo-Saxon, I propose that English developed its SVO syntax by approximation to the Insular Celtic type, whereas German developed without such contact influence.

References

Filppula, Markku, Juhani Klemola and Heli Paulasto. 2008. *English and Celtic in Contact*. New York: Routledge.

Fischer, Olga and Wim van der Wurff. 2006. "Syntax". In Richard Hogg and David Denison (eds). *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press. 109-198.

Fischer, Olga. Forthcoming. "The Role of Contact in English Syntactic Change in the Old and Middle English Periods". In Daniel Schreier and Marianne Hundt (eds.). *English as a Contact Language*. Cambridge: University Press.

Kroch, Anthony and Ann Taylor. 2000. "Verb-Object Order in Early Middle English". In Susan Pintzuk, George Tsoulas and Anthony Warner (eds.). *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: University Press. 132-163.

Kroch, Anthony, Ann Taylor and Donald Ringe. 2001. "The Middle English Verb-Second Constraint: A Case Study in Language Contact and Language Change". In Susan C. Herring, Pieter van Reenen and Lene Schøsler (eds.). *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 353-391.

Vennemann, Theo. 2003. "Syntax und Sprachkontakt". In Alfred Bammersberger and Theo Vennemann (eds.). *Languages in Prehistoric Europe*. Heidelberg: Winter. 333-364.

Vennemann, Theo. 2011. "English as a Contact Language: Typology and Comparison". *Anglia* 129: 217-257.

Vennemann, Theo. 2012. "Radical Word Order Change by Substratal Causation: English versus German". Paper presented at the ICEHL 17, Zurich.

Maria Volkonskaya
Lomonosov Moscow State University (Russia)

On the Origins and Functions of Synonyms in Middle English Alliterative Poetry

This paper examines a remarkable group of Middle English synonyms – words for 'man, warrior' that are almost exclusively found in the alliterative poetry of the fourteenth century, the so-called alliterative revival. It includes such words as *burn(ᵭ)*, *freke*, *gome*, *haþel*, *lede*, *renk*, *schalk*, *segge*, *wy3(e)*, corresponding to Old English *beorn*, *freca*, *guma*, *hæleð*, *lēod*, *rinc*, *scealc*, *secg*, *wiga*, existing mostly in alliterative works, and adds to them *tulk* (from Old Norse), and also far more frequent *kny3t* (from OE *cniht* 'boy', 'servant') and *prynce* (from Old French). The preservation and enlargement of this group are generally attributed to the fact that the technique of alliterative verse demanded a wide stock of synonyms for important concepts and have long been regarded as proof of the continuity of an oral tradition from Old English alliterative verse.

However, I argue that the way these words are used in Middle English alliterative poetry points not to the continuity, but rather to a creation of a new tradition that was deliberately made to look and sound archaic. I will present the results of the research concerning the functions of Middle English synonyms in the text as compared to classic alliterative verse. The differences observed are the following: the absence of nominal compounds with synonyms as their element, the rare use of the synonyms with adjectives, and their peculiar metrical positions. These traits indicate that the gap between Old and Middle English traditions is indeed rather wide, and

the possibility of the preservation of an unbroken alliterative tradition is quite remote. Furthermore, these differences, I suppose, add to the discussion on the possible ways these poetic words were preserved in Middle English texts. If alliterative revival was in fact an innovation, evidence that poets were collecting these words from different sources should be of utmost importance. Finally, as a new system, the synonyms were free to acquire new aesthetic functions and serve the individual stylistic purposes of the poet.

The study is based on the data on the synonyms for 'man, warrior' collected from *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. To put them into historical perspective examples from *Beowulf*, *The Oxford English Dictionary*, and *The Middle English Dictionary* have been taken into consideration.

References

Benson, Larry Dean. 1965. *Art and Tradition in "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight"*. Rutgers University Press.

Borroff, Marie. 1962. *"Sir Gawain and the Green Knight". A Stylistic and Metrical Study*. New Haven–London: Yale University Press.

Brink, August. 1920. *Stab und Wort im "Gawain": eine stilistische Untersuchung*. Studien zur englischen Philologie, 59. Halle.

Chism, Christine. 2002. *Alliterative Revivals*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Oakden, James Parker. 1968. *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English. The Dialectal and Metrical Survey*. Vol. I–II. Archon Books.

Turville-Petre, Thorlac. 1977. *The Alliterative Revival*. Cambridge: University Press.

Gyöngyi Werthmüller
Eötvos Loránd University, Budapest (Hungary)

Final *-e* in Gower and Chaucer's Monosyllabic Premodifiers – A Grammatical/Metrical Analysis

This paper attempts to provide some further contribution towards the results revealed by, for instance, Samuels (1972), Burnley (1982) or Pearsall (1999). It

intends to examine and compare the metrical and grammatical behaviour of monosyllabic premodifying adjectives ending in (inflectional or etymological) -e in Chaucer and Gower's English (iambic) verse. With regard to -e, the following cases can be observed:

(1) Definitions

Apocope: (optional). The final unstressed vowel (= -e) of a word can be dropped.
    (Example: *this blynde[0] Britoun*)

Elision: (obligatory). If the final unstressed vowel (= -e) is followed by (an optional *h* and) another vowel in the next word, this final vowel must be dropped.
    (Example: *the thridde[0]_ office*)

Retention: (obligatory). If the final unstressed vowel (= -e) is required by the metre as a syllable, it is retained.
    (Example: *smalë foules*)

The metrical scansion of 5000 tetrameter lines from Gower's CONFESSIO AMANTIS and 4000 pentameter lines from Chaucer's CANTERBURY TALES (from the Hengwrt Manuscript) presents the following data:

(2) Distribution of -e in monosyllabic premodifiers

a. **Gower:**

	Number of instances	Percent of Total
Total	268	100%
Retention	234	87.3%
Elision	33	12.3%
Apocope	**1**	**0.4%**
Silent (elision + apocope)	33	12.7%

b. **Chaucer:**

Total	319	100%
Retention	267	83.7%
Elision	27	8.5%
Apocope	**25**	**7.8%**
Silent (elision + apocope)	52	16.3%

The following features will be pointed out or examined in detail:

1) As Bihl (1916:2) notes in general terms, Gower was a "skilled versifier". This is confirmed by the fact that in Gower's verse, in the structures under scrutiny, apocope is systematically absent (see **(2a)**).

2) While in Gower's case there is hardly any doubt (if at all) about the scansion of these structures, Chaucer often allows alternative readings:

    /   x   x   / x /   x   / x   /
(3) a. |God of |his gre|të good|nesse[0] sey|de than| (CT IV. 1327)
        /   x x   /   x   /   x /   x /
     b. |God of |his grete[0] |goodne|ssë sey|de than| (CT IV. 1327)

4) By the expansion of the corpus, more light can be shed on whether the category of the *-e* (etymological ending, plural ending, weak declension – or more of these at the same time) has anything to do with the frequency of elision or apocope. Such an analysis (and the corollary that in Gower apocope virtually does not exist) may show whether Smithers' (1983:213) hypothesis that apocope "is simply an analogical use of an elided form" can be maintained.

5) According to Minkova (1991:173), there are unexpected cases of retention in Gower in the frame Prep. + Adj. + Noun, for which she brings the following examples from CONFESSIO, book VI: *of pure dette* (1502), *for pure dredde* (4976), *under guile faith* (2049), *in strange place* (4791). I suggest that the presence of this frame is accidental: the adjectives concerned all end in *-e* etymologically. An etymological *-e*, if there is no elision deleting it, is always pronounced in Gower:

      x   / x /   x / x /   x
(4) |He schol|dë seme[0] | a pu|rë Mai|de| (CONFESSIO, V. 3009)

References

Bihl, Josef. 1916. *Die Wirkungen des Rhythmus in der Sprache von Chaucer und Gower. Anglistische Forschungen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Verlag.

Burnley, David J. 1982. "Inflexion in Chaucer's Adjectives". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 83: 169-77.

Furnivall, Frederick J. (ed.). 2006. *The Hengwrt MS of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan. Available online: http://name.umdl.umich.edu/AGZ8233.0001.001.

Minkova, Donka. 1991. *The History of Final Vowels in English: The Sound of Muting*. Berlin and New York: Mouton.

Pearsall, Derek. 1999. "The Weak Declension of the Adjective and its Importance in Chaucerian Metre". In Geoffrey Lester (ed.). *Chaucer in Perspective: Middle English Essays in Honour of Norman Blake*. Sheffield: Academic Press. 178-93.

Peck, Russell A. (ed.). 2000. *John Gower: Confessio Amantis*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications.

Robinson, Fred Norris (ed.). 1957. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer: Canterbury Tales*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Available online: 1993. In Corpus of Middle English Prose and Verse. University of Michigan. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/CT.

Samuels, Michael Louis. 1972. "Chaucerian Final −e". *Notes and Queries* 217: 445-48.

Smithers, Geoffrey Victor. 1983. "The Scansion of Havelok and the Use of ME *-en* and *-e* in Havelok and by Chaucer". In Douglas Gray and E. G. Stanley (eds.). *Middle English Studies Presented to Norman Davis in Honour of his Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 195-235.

Keith Williamson
University of Edinburgh (UK)

Historical Dialectological Remarks on the Scottish Legends of the Saints in Cambridge University Library MS Gg.II.6.

Cambridge University Library MS Gg.II.6 contains the *Legends of the Saints* (*LOTS*), a rendering into Scots in verse of Jacques Voragines' *Legenda Aurea*, augmented by other sources. The CUL manuscript is 15th-century, but the original is presumed to have been composed in the last quarter of the 14th century, perhaps contemporaneous with John Barbour's *Bruce* or a little later. *LOTS* was attributed to Barbour's pen by Carl Horstmann (1875, 1881–2), George Neilson (1900) and R.L. Graeme Ritchie (1921–9). However, the linguistic analyses of *LOTS* by Paul Buss (1886) and Ritchie Girvan (1939) discount convincingly Barbour as its author. The rhymes, especially, in *LOTS* imply developments in phonology not inferrable from Barbour's rhyming practice.

John Barbour is associated with the North-east of Scotland through his office of archdeacon of Aberdeen. However, Mathew McDiarmid, in the Scottish Text Society's edition of *Bruce* (McDiarmid and Stevenson1985), has proposed that Barbour's family roots were in the South-west of Scotland. He accepts that Barbour was not the author of *LOTS*. But McDiarmid does claim North-east origins for the author of *LOTS* (McDiarmid 1985: 24–6). He argues this from internal mention of places, people and events and concludes 'These scanty facts … happen to agree with what is known of a colleague of Barbour at Aberdeen, William of Spyny (which is beside Elgin) who was finally bishop of Elgin' (McDiarmid 1985: 25). McDiarmid further asserts that the *LOTS* author's '… linguistic differences from the author of *Bruce* require a regional, not a temporal, explanation. The Legends almost certainly represent the speech of the north-east' (McDiarmid 1985: 26).

The language of the *LOTS* manuscript is intriguing in many respects and reveals traces of its copying history. The spellings of many rhymes contradict what must have been the original rhyming form. Some copyist (or more than one?) has overlaid his form on one member of a rhyming pair to manifest a different underlying phonology from that of the originator, e.g. <flesch> ~ <was>, <hing> 'hang' ~ <likyne> 'liking', <blame> 'same' ~ <sa*mmyn*ne> 'same', <bryne> 'burn' ~ <sone> 'sin', <fyrst> 'first' ~ <liste> "hem, edge". The orthography shows conventional long-vowel spellings for words in which an historical short vowel would be expected. Some cases suggest long versus short variants, e.g. <ʒeit>, <yheit> v. <yhet> 'yet', <had> v. <hade> 'had'. The text frequently renders Early Scots /y:/ with spellings implying ESc /u:/ and *vice versa*, including in rhymes. Early Scots features appear alongside Middle Scots ones.

Having in mind McDiarmid's claims of North-east authorial origins, this paper investigates possible temporal and diatopic provenances for some linguistic features in *LOTS* by calibrating them against the dated and localized corpus of a Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots, 1380–1500.

References

Buss, Paul. 1886. "Sind die von Horstmann herausgegebenen schottischen legenden ein Werk Barber's?" *Anglia* 9: 493-594.

Girvan, Ritchie (ed.). 1939. *Ratis Raving and other Early Scots Poems on Morals.* Scottish Text Society, Third Ser. 11.

Horstmann, Carl (ed.). 1875. *Altenglische Legenden.* Paderborn: F. Schöningh.

Horstmann, Carl (ed.). 1881–82. *Barbour's Legendensammlung nebst den Fragmenten seines Trojankrieges.* 2 vols. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henniger.

Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots, Phase 1: 1380-1500. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh. Available at: http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laos1/laos1.html.

McDiarmid, Matthew P. and James A.C. Stevenson (eds.). 1981–85. *Barbour's Bruce.* Scottish Text Society, Fourth Ser. 12, 13, 15. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society.

Metcalfe, William M. (ed.). 1887–95. *Legends of the Saints.* Scottish Text Society, First Ser. 13, 18, 23, 25, 35, 37. Edinburgh: Blackwood.

Neilson, George. 1901. *John Barbour: Poet and Translator.* London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner.

Ritchie, R.L. Graeme (ed.). 1921–29. *The Buik of Alexander.* Scottish Text Society, Second Ser. 12, 17, 21, 25. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood.

Laura Wright
University of Cambridge (UK)

Middle English Wills – Whose Language?

I have been asked by a group of historians to help prepare a grant bid for a project to build a corpus of Middle English London wills. It is estimated that there are about 5,000 (mostly unpublished) London wills that contain an amount of Middle English. Until the fourteenth century testaments had been written in Medieval Latin. There are isolated examples of Anglo-Norman texts during the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries, but the majority of surviving Anglo-Norman wills date from the mid-fourteenth century. They cease around the mid-fifteenth century. These texts are personal documents, but the surviving versions are generally probate copies. My task is to find a way of distinguishing between the language of the testator on the one hand, and the language of the scribe or scribes on the other.

Historians want to know this because when looking at consumer goods, and their proliferation over the fifteenth century, we don't know whether changes in the descriptors reflect the language of their owners, or legal style. If someone refers to his 'best standing cup', we don't know whether that is the lawyer's description, or the testator's own view of that item.

Two possibilities are suggested: 1) to investigate orthographical variation in the ME portions, and 2) to investigate ME word choice.

1) I hypothesise that from 1387 onwards, professional English writing began to lose its spelling variation. Therefore, we might expect any professional scribes writing wills in ME to use no more than two or three variants for a given feature (Wright 1998, 2001). If, on the other hand, we find a text that contains more variation than this, then we might posit that we have a non-professional writer. There are a small number of autograph wills (internally declaring that they were composed by the testator) and this hypothesis can usefully be tested against this group. However, the majority of wills were written either written by professional scribes when the testators were in health, or dictated to a professional scribe when the testator was on his or her deathbed. The language could be that of the scribe rather than that of the testator.

2) Occasionally, non-London dialect words are included, as in the wills of Richard Roos, 1406, originally from Beverley in Yorkshire (*kirk*; *ylk man* and *woman*), Sir Ralph Rochefort, 1439, with land in Lincoln and Warwickshire (*that most algates be born*), Richard Flore, 1424-5, with land in Rutland, Leicester and Lincolnshire (*kyrke, til ilk childe*; *for als mykyll*), Sir Roger Salwayn of York, 1420 (*I wi☐☐ þat ilkon off þe other thre*). Inclusion of such terms might indicate that we have the language of the testator at this point, and we could make the working assumption that the rest of the text is in their language too – not their hand, not their morphology, but their lexis (so long as we have reason to believe that the will was written in London, of course, as otherwise we could posit a regional lawyer). Further, there are occasionally first-person references, e.g. 'the bed on which I lie', giving a text that seems pragmatically immediate rather than more distant from the testator.

References

Furnivall, Frederick J. (ed). 1882. *Fifty Earliest English Wills in the Court of Probate, London : A. D. 1387-1439*. EETS O. S. 78. London: Oxford University Press.

Wright, Laura. 1998. "Middle English Variation: the London English Guild Certificates of 1388/9". In Ernst Håkon Jahr (ed.). *Language Change: Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics*. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 114. Berlin: Mouton. 169-196.

Wright, Laura. 2001. "Some Morphological Features of the Norfolk Guild Certificates of 1388/9: An Exercise in Variation". In Peter Trudgill and Jacek Fisiak (eds.). *East Anglian English*. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer. 79-162.

Takahiro Yamasaki
Chuo University (Japan)

The Survival of /n/ in *min*(*e*) and *þin*(*e*) in the Language of Hand 1 of the Auchinleck Manuscript

This study is concerned with the *n*-survival in the possessive adjectives *min*(*e*) "my" and *þin*(*e*) "thy/thine" in the language of Hand 1 of the Auchinleck Manuscript.

In the history of the English language, /n/ in these two words has completely disappeared before words beginning with a consonant other than /h/. In OE, the two words invariably had /n/ and required inflectional endings agreeing in gender, case, and number. In ME, the segment began to drop in sandhi before consonant-initial words, and the gradual implementation of *n*-dropping resulted in two variants: the *n*-less forms *mi*, *thi* before consonants vs. the original forms *min*, *thin* before vowels. This did not, however, behave strictly as a rule until the MnE period: according to Lass (2006: 75), "up through the sixteenth century both could appear in all environments."

Without a doubt the *n*-dropping had been implemented before consonant-initial words but the question of how the sound /n/ dropped in the transitional period remains unsolved as both *MED* and Lass (2006: 75) note, respectively, that "forms without -n- are commonly <u>but not invariably</u> used before a word beginning with a

consonant" and "[t]he *n*-less forms *my*, *thy* first appeared <u>variably</u> when the following word began with a consonant" (emphasis mine). In other words, the *n*-dropping was implemented randomly. However, I believe that to conclude the process was random would be premature, and I will present a rule-governed analysis concerning the *n*-dropping.

Since the process can be regarded as "dropping," researchers have mainly directed their attention to the *n*-less forms. Surely it is disappearance from a diachronic point of view, but it is also survival from a synchronic perspective. By turning our attention to the survival of /n/, we should be able to provide a clearer picture than ever.

As a starting point for the study of *n*-survival, I restrict myself to examining the language of Hand 1 of the Auchinleck Manuscript, inspired by the following lines from one of the works he copied, *Sir Orfeo*:

ll.105-8	ll.109-12
Þi bodi, þat was so white ycore,	& also <u>þine</u> fingres smale
Wiþ <u>þine</u> nailes is al totore.	Beþ al blodi & al pale.
Allas, <u>þi</u> rode þat was so red	Allas, <u>þi</u> louesome eyȝen to
Is al wan as þou were ded,	Lokeþ so man doþ on his fo.

<div align="right">(NSL Adv MS 19.2.1)   (emphasis mine.)</div>

Between l.105 and l.112, the second person singular possessive adjective is used five times, and all of them precede consonant-initial words. The proper use of the forms *þi* and *þine* in these lines was so systematic that I collected all the tokens of the first and second person singular possessive adjectives in all the works Hand 1 copied. As a result, I discovered that the sound /n/ behaves as if it were the scribe's plural inflectional ending when the following word begins with a consonant. In my presentation, I will discuss a causational factor of the metanalysis that contributed to the *n*-survival and will corroborate my findings with an investigation of *a*/*an*.

References

The Auchinleck Manuscript. Version 1.1. David Burnley and Alison Wiggins (eds.). National Library of Scotland. Available at http://auchinleck.nls.uk/.

Lass, Roger. 2006. "Phonology and Morphology". In Richard Hogg and David Denison (eds.). *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: University Press. 43-108.

Middle English Dictionary. Hans Kurath, Sherman Kuhn and Robert Lewis (eds.) University of Michigan Press. Available at http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/.

Eva Zehentner
University of Vienna (Austria)

-AND vs. -ING: An account of non-finite constructions in Middle Scots

The present paper investigates the history of the two non-finite constructions of present participle and verbal noun (gerund) in Scots, focussing on their morphological collapse as well as the syntactic/ functional relationship between them. The main aim here is to contribute to the discussion on the motivations behind the merger, as well as to the question of why both forms seem to have undergone a development from phrasal to more clausal behaviour. So has the participle become largely dissociated from its adjectival origins (cf. Swan 2003), while the originally purely nominal de-verbal noun in *-ing* gradually acquired verbal (i.e. more clausal) syntax (cf. de Smet 2008; Fanego 1996, 2004; Jack 1988). This can easily be seen in the differences between the following examples:

(1) At this horrible **murthering** of trew Christians (sdia2b)
(2) in **telling** ther jvdgments frielie (soff3).

These developments have repeatedly been linked to the formal merger of the infinites in Middle English (-*ing*-participles rapidly ousting the original -nd-forms from 1200 onwards, cf. Lass 1992), with Swan claiming that "the verbal characteristics of the participle [became] dominant [only] after the change *-ende* > -*ing* had taken place" (Swan 2003: 186), and various theories explaining the rise of the gerund as a result of the collapse (e.g. Langenhove 1925).

Seeing that in Scots the morphological coalescence was delayed some 200 years, first -*ing*-participles only appearing in the early 15th ct. (Gardela 2011; Dons/Moessner 1999), but a gradual clausalisation of the non-finites nevertheless

took place, Northern texts now appear to present a severe challenge to the above claims.

However, despite the fact that Scots evidence has been repeatedly drawn on to disprove these assumptions (cf. Fanego 1996, 2004; Jack 1988), a large-scale empirical study on the Scottish non-finite forms seems to be lacking (especially concerning the verbal noun, for studies on the present participle in Older Scots see Dons/Moessner 1999; Gardela 2011). This paper now attempts to fill that gap, by analysing all instances of verbal nouns/gerunds in addition to participles found in the *Helsinki Corpus of Middle Scots* (HCOS) in detail.

Not surprisingly, the data do indeed bear out an independent development of the non-finites from phrases to more clause-like constructions, and thus support the idea of primarily functional motivations behind the merger, seeing that when clause-types become more and more similar, and "clause-internal syntax and verbal morphology are insufficiently distinctive to keep different non-finite clause-types apart, mergers are to be expected" (de Smet 2010: 1184-1185).

Nevertheless, the time-span between the spread of verbal gerunds and the formal merger of the two non-finites is found to be shorter than often assumed (Jack 1988; Fanego 1996, 2004), suggesting that the (formal) collapse may well have played a significant role in furthering the constructions' functional convergence, as well as supporting the idea of mutual and continuous influence between present participle and (verbal) gerund.

References

De Smet, Hendrik. 2008. "Functional Motivations in the Development of Nominal and Verbal Gerunds in Middle and Early Modern English". *Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 12: 55-102.

De Smet, Hendrik. 2010. "English *-ing*-clauses and their Problems: the Structure of Grammatical Categories". *Linguistics* 48.6: 1153-1193.

Dons, Ute, Lilo Moessner. 1999. "The Present Participle in Middle Scots". *Scottish Language* 18: 17-33.

Fanego, Teresa. 1996. "The Gerund in Early Modern English: Evidence from the Helsinki Corpus". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 17: 97-152.

Fanego, Teresa. 2004. "On Reanalysis and Actualization in Syntactic Change: The Rise and Development of English Verbal Gerunds". *Diachronica* 21: 5–55.

Fischer, Olga. 1992. "Syntax". In Norman Blake (ed.). *The Cambridge history of the English language. Vol. 2. 1066-1476*. Cambridge: University Press. 207-398.

Gardela, Wojciech. 2011. "Spelling Variants of the Present Participle in a Selection of Northern English and Scots Texts of the Late 14th and the 15th Centuries". In Gregersen, Frans (ed.). *Language Variation - European Perspectives III: Selected Papers from the 5th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 5)*. Copenhagen, June 2009. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 201-214.

Houston, Ann. 1989. "The English Gerund: Syntactic Change and Discourse Function". In Ralph W. Fasold and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.). *Language Change and Variation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 173-196.

Jack, George. 1988. "The Origins of the English Gerund". *NOWELE* 12: 15–75.

Langenhove, George van. 1925. *On the Origin of the Gerund in English*. Brussels: Hayez.

Lass, Roger. 1992. "Phonology and Morphology". In Norman Blake (ed.). *The Cambridge history of the English language. Vol. 2. 1066-1476*. Cambridge: University Press. 23-155.

Macafee, Caroline. 2004. "A History of Scots to 1700". *Dictionary of the Scots language*. http://www.dsl.ac.uk/index.html

Miller, Garry D. 2002. *Nonfinite Structures in Theory and Change*. Oxford: University Press.

Swan, Toril. 2003. "Present Participles in the History of English and Norwegian". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 104: 179-195.

Tajima, Matsuji. 1985. *The Syntactic Development of the Gerund in Middle English*. Tokyo: Nan'un-do.

Visser, Frederikus. 1984. *An Historical Syntax of the English language*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Wright, Laura. 1995. "Middle English {-ende} and {-ing}: A Possible Route to Grammaticalisation". In Jacek Fisiak (ed.). *Linguistic Change under Contact Conditions*. Berlin and New York: Mouton. 365-382.