Vernacular vocabulary in the *Durham Account Rolls* (1278-1538): a philological approach

Amanda Dafne Roig Marín

Selwyn College

Faculty of English

University of Cambridge

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

July 2020

DECLARATION

This thesis is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any work that has already been submitted before for any degree or other qualification except as declared in the preface and specified in the text.

It exceeds the prescribed word limit for the Faculty of English Degree Committee, but approval to exceed such limit was obtained on 2 July 2020.

SUMMARY

The burgeoning interest in historical multilingual texts has modified our appreciation of written material traditionally deemed macaronic: the mixing of Medieval Latin with the vernaculars is now considered not the result of an imperfect grasp of Latin but understood as fundamentally instrumental in articulating specific communicative functions in texts such as the multilingual administrative documents which form the basis of this PhD dissertation: the *Durham Account Rolls* (*DAR*). Previous research into multilingual records produced in medieval England has pinpointed a series of central linguistic patterns, including the occurrence of the French definite article, non-existent in Latin, the use of lexical items that could be interpreted as simultaneously belonging to multiple languages and, in relation to this, abbreviations or suspension marks in lieu of full inflectional Latin suffixes. This dissertation goes one step further: not only does it examine the vernacular vocabulary in multilingual accounts in terms of attestations, etymology, and semantics, but it also explores whether, within this multilingual system, it is possible to trace features of Northern Middle English (NME). To the best of my knowledge, this question has not been tackled so far in the examination of multilingual sources. I draw on previous work on Middle English dialects, which has made use of English monolingual sources, and discuss to what extent they can be applied to texts whose matrix language is Medieval Latin (see Section 1.2), thereby offering a fresh perspective on a long-standing topic.

I collected all the lexis that could be recognised as 'English', but as this is a problematic assumption given the often blurry boundaries between Anglo-French and Middle English vocabulary, the term *vernacular* seemed more suited to describe the multilingual reality of these rolls. Section 1.3 describes the textual sources in question, giving some notes on editorial principles and the underlying manuscripts, and Section 2, the methodology employed. The analysis of my data, amounting to c. 1600 lexical items, is first organised by source language: Old English, Anglo-French, Old Norse, and Middle Dutch. Each individual section (3.1.1 - 3.1.4) provides an etymological survey of the *DAR* vocabulary coming from those source languages and pays attention to the lexicographical difficulties that arise in the study of each Germanic / Romance language in contact with the English vernacular and its interplay with Medieval Latin in the *DAR*. The main semantic fields to which each source language contributed in the vernacular lexical make-up of the *DAR* are also discussed. Because of the vast amount of French-origin lexical items, the section on Anglo-French is devoted to broader issues such as the Latin-Romance continuum, the teaching and learning of French at the time, and how pedagogical practices and historical milestones seem to be linked to the linguistic competence of the community involved in the production of these rolls. The aforementioned use of the French definite article is revisited in light of previously neglected evidence, further complemented by Section 4.3.2 in which the northern variant *ly* is addressed extensively for the first time in research into multilingual texts.

After a panoramic vision of the major source languages, Section 3.2 gives some insights into local and global socio-economic history by analysing lexemes named after place-names as testimonies to the historical interactions and commercial transactions between England and the Continent as well as within Britain and Ireland. Section 3.3 examines multi-word lexical units as part and parcel of the vernacular vocabulary in the *DAR*. The thorny concept of *compound* is addressed and compounding is historically tracked from Old English to Middle English through a multilingual lens. Finally, Section 4 on NME covers several linguistic levels—namely, orthography (vowels and consonants), morphology, and lexis—in synergy with Medieval Latin. It also proposes a new taxonomy for the study of northern vernacular vocabulary, highlighting the role of dictionaries in constructing our understanding of what is meant by 'northern' and emphasising how often it is essential to revise impressionistic views on the dialectal status of this vocabulary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Richard Dance, for his wise advice and generosity throughout these years, even before he started supervising me. I wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr Sarah Meer, our former Director of Graduate Studies at the Faculty of English, whose help at a difficult time at the beginning of my PhD was crucial. I am likewise grateful to my advisor, Dr Orietta Da Rold, for her encouragement and for kindly allowing to attend her TRS seminars. I have learnt much from all the lectures, seminars, and reading groups, among the many academic activities in which I have taken part during my MPhil and PhD at Cambridge, as well as from the enriching experience of teaching over these two academic years.

From the University of Alicante, Dr Jordi Sánchez Martí deserves special mention and thanks for believing in me and supporting me ever since we first met when I was an undergraduate. I have presented my ongoing research in Cambridge, London, Seville, Morella, Valladolid, and Alicante, where I have received very useful feedback, so thank you very much to the organisers and the participants who expressed their interest in my work in those memorable events.

More formally, I want to thank the Archivists at the Durham Cathedral Archives who allowed me to navigate their very extensive collection of manuscripts, which gave me a sense of the full dimensions of the account rolls with which I had spent so much time working (although mostly in their edited versions) during this PhD, and the Cambridge AHRC DTP for its financial support.

What started as a one-year MPhil ended up being four years away from home, with its ups and downs, and this dissertation is dedicated to my parents, whose everyday support has played an essential part in this PhD and all my studies, and to my brother for his encouragement too. I am extremely thankful for having them in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

Languages and varieties
e = early
l = late
M = Middle
O = Old
Mod = Modern
PD = Present-Day

AF = Anglo-French
CF = Central French
CL = Classical Latin
MDut = Middle Dutch
ML = Medieval Latin
MLG = Middle Low German
NME = Northern Middle English
OIcel = Old Icelandic
ON = Old Norse
ONF = Old Northern French
PGmc = Proto-Germanic

Lexicographical resources [full references to be found at the end of the dissertation]
AND = Anglo-Norman Dictionary
DEAF = Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français
DLDEE = Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary
DMF = Dictionnaire du moyen français 1330-1500
DMLBS = Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources
DOE = Dictionary of Old English
DOST = Dictionary of the Older Scots Tongue
DSL = Dictionary of the Scots Language. Dictionar o the Scots Leid [encompassing both the *DOST* and the *SND*]
EDD = English Dialect Dictionary
FEW = Französisches Etymologisches Wörtebuch. Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes
Gdf = [Godefroy's] *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du 9e au 15e siècle*
HTOED = Historical Thesaurus of the OED
MED = Middle English Dictionary
OED = Oxford English Dictionary
TL = [Tobler and Lommatzsch's] *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*
TLF(i): = *Trésor de la langue française informatisé*
YHD = Yorkshire Historical Dictionary

Areas of Britain and Ireland referred to in *EDD* entries follow *EDD* conventions.
Short titles in *DSL*/*MED*/*OED* quotations normally follow those in the *DSL*/*MED*/*OED*.

Introduction

This dissertation is the first comprehensive study of the vernacular vocabulary in the *Durham Account Rolls* (*DAR*). It draws on a database of 1,598 lexical items (not counting orthographic variants of the same item) which were manually culled from the *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham from the Original MSS* [1278-1538], edited by Fowler in three volumes (1898-1901) and which I collated with the original manuscripts held at Durham Cathedral Library Archives (see 1.3 for a description of my textual sources). I set up an initial database in which I included the following information for each lexical item:[1] its spelling variants in the source texts and the pages in which they occurred[2] and its lexicographical treatment in the *MED*, the *OED*, the *DMLBS*, the *DOST*, and the *AND*,[3] including its recorded forms, definitions, etymology, attestations, and indications of its dialectal status, if any (more on the underlying methodological and procedural principles in Section 2). The inspection of this first database laid the ground for a series of in-depth analyses that the reader will find in Sections 3 and 4. Section 3.1 is organised by language input (Old English, Anglo-French, Old Norse, and Middle Dutch). This section fleshes out the taxonomical difficulties involved in the etymological analysis and classification of lexical material coming from each of those languages and how the interplay between Medieval Latin and the vernaculars can only be understood if placed along a continuum. Section 3.2 illustrates the kinds of contributions that my PhD can make not only to English lexicography but also to our understanding of medieval economic history, by analysing commodities named after place-names or associated with particular locations both in

[1] A simplified version of the database can be found at <shorturl.at/ADFQS>. The main purpose of this database is to provide the reader with basic lexicographical information about each *DAR* vernacular lexical item (in bold in the thesis itself). Except for a few individual cases, most searches were performed in early 2019, which means that the current records in the *MED* or the *OED* may not exactly match the ones included there. Dates and short titles of other texts cited follow those in the *MED* and *OED*.

[2] The page number is only indicated if there is just one attestation or its occurrence is relevant to my main argument. This also applies to any comments on spelling variants, which are kept to a minimum in order not to obstruct the reading of the discussion. NB. Not all the attestations in the *DAR* are included in the online database (see Footnote 1), only the first occurrence in the edition.

[3] The rationale behind my selection of historical dictionaries is justified, from a theoretical and methodological perspective, in Section 2.

Britain and Ireland and on the Continent. Section 3.3 concentrates on the concept of *compound*, its significance as a word-formation mechanism in the medieval history of the English language, and whether this label can accommodate the large number of multi-word lexical items in the *DAR*. Some notes on the semantic domains which contributed the most to the vernacular lexical make-up of the *DAR* are also given throughout the dissertation.

Previous work on the lexis of *The Inventory and Account Rolls of the Benedictine House or Cell of Jarrow* [1303-1537] (some of which was published in Roig-Marín 2018a; 2019a) led me to pursue research into the influx of dialectally marked lexical items in Medieval Latin texts informed by the vernaculars. Section 4 is guided by the scholarly literature on Middle English dialects and word geography in English monolingual sources, since no previous studies of this kind have been carried out upon multilingual material. In the two following sub-sections of this opening chapter, I overview the scholarly tradition, first situating my research within the study of 'English' vernacular vocabulary in Medieval Latin documentary evidence.

1.1 The study of English words in Latin documents

In 1906 Hone already drew attention to the use of English in Latin manorial records (court rolls and, especially account rolls (*compoti*)). He accounted for the presence of such vernacular material by simply claiming that 'the accountant's stock of Latin [had] failed him' (Hone 1906: 203). As a historian, his scope and limited philological skills could in part justify that reductionist explanation; language use, historians such as Hone would argue, falls outside their area of expertise, and any striking linguistic peculiarities in their material might be noted only in passing. Naturally, the presence of English in Latin documents did not go unnoticed by philologists either. Hulbert (1936) published an article with an extensive glossary of English words in the University of Chicago's collection of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century manorial records, which he had scrutinised in their original manuscript form. Taking the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1884–1933) as his reference, Hulbert's glossary encompasses those words which were

either unrecorded in the *OED* or were given later dates of attestation. As he puts it (Hulbert 1936: 38):

> Many of them would never be used in the kinds of literature we have from medieval times, and hence the *Oxford dictionary* has been able to find no instances of them before the eighteenth or nineteenth century.

He was aware that the *OED* was by then incorporating some published records into its sources, a painstaking process which is on-going as part of *OED3*.[4] Beyond Hulbert's indubitable contributions to the study and appreciation of long-forgotten words, his more general observations still hold true and bear direct relevance to the present investigation: (a) the co-texts[5] in which most lexemes occur do not generally shed light on their meanings, because of the intrinsically laconic nature of the records; yet, even if those contexts *per se* are not illuminating, there is nowadays a wider range of textual evidence (both in print and online) that can help the lexicographer to elucidate the semantic value of those words; (b) the presence of 'slips of the pen' may obfuscate the form of what he calls the 'intended word' (Hulbert 1936: 39); the subsequent advancements in the study of Middle English may have clarified that what was perceived as erroneous realisations of a given lexeme were in fact just spelling variants; and (c) the notable advantage of these kinds of documents, which are rather precisely dated, over manuscript evidence whose dating can only be hypothesised. It is important to note that, despite the clear internal evidence for the dating of administrative documents, as Hulbert specified (1936: 39), the making of account rolls was a two-stage process which did not have to be strictly simultaneous:

> First notes were made by the reeves and their inferior officers. These the reeves collected and kept until the clerks who wrote the accounts in final form came to the manors. Just when they arrived we have no means of knowing.

---

[4] *OED3* (Simpson and Proffitt 1990–in progress), <http://www.oed.com/>.

[5] Understood as the *linguistic* environment in which a word is employed vis-à-vis its *non-verbal* environment (i.e. its context). Little *contextual* information can be deduced from these administrative texts, so this dichotomy is less meaningful and will only be brought to the fore in ambiguous cases. Otherwise, *co-text* and *context* may be used interchangeably.

Nevertheless, the rudimentary system employed, as Hulbert also highlighted, seems to suggest that the interval between these two stages could not have been very long: the rolls were written either at the end of the regnal year which is given or at the beginning of the following one. Hulbert's ground-breaking investigation set the stage for the research that would follow a few decades later: the value of English words in Latin documents as testimonies to medieval English life was, for the first time, foregrounded. However, these findings did not dispel the long-standing conviction that clerks' command of Latin was, overall, defective or not more than a stock of set phrases. Rothwell's 'pyramid of Latinity' (1994: 46), where clerks would be at the lower end whilst erudite scholars and high officials would be at the top, echoes this view.

Rothwell clearly divorced scholarly Latin from the Latin employed by medieval clerks in England; the latter would be a 'dead construct' (1994: 46), in contrast to the English and French vernaculars. In his claims, Rothwell seemed to misapprehend the nature of Medieval Latin, exposing his own preconceptions. He asserted that 'the business life of the nation [does] not come from Classical Rome, *as might be assumed* [my italics], but are largely copies of French phrases', further adding that 'not only are virtually all the lexemes in reality French terms dressed up as Latin, but the word-order is Romance rather than Latin' (Rothwell 1994: 47). He then acknowledged that English lexemes also make up the 'non-Latinate' vocabulary present in these accounts, terms which 'have never existed in genuine Latin' (1994: 48). The use of *genuine* reinforces his biased attitude towards Medieval Latin, which, by definition, was not Classical Latin—a highly standardised variety—and, therefore, its syntax and morphology did not have to parallel the morpho-syntactic system at work in previous stages of the language. Latin was evolving as any other language.

While it is true that Classical Latin remained influential in the Middle Ages—and still today—the pressure of the standard classical forms was not equally acute in all the registers and contexts in which it was employed.[6] In such prosaic documents as inventories or account rolls, writers appropriated Latin to meet their immediate needs

[6] See 'Latin in the Middle Ages' in *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* < http://www.dmlbs.ox.ac.uk/british-medieval-latin/language/latin-in-the-middle-ages> [accessed 27 April 2018].

rather than to create highly stylised pieces of writing. Vocabulary, the primary concern of *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (*DMLBS*, 1975–2013) and of this dissertation, is one of the areas that most neatly attests to the dynamism of Medieval Latin. Users would creatively use classical forms with new meanings, coin new lexemes through the internal mechanisms of the language, and appropriate others through borrowing.

The inclusion of a large number of vernacular lexis with Latin-inflected endings into the *DMLBS* epitomises the vigour of the language as well as the elusive nature of any contemporary, rigid taxonomic divisions based on the vernacular/non-vernacular divide. *Variation* is a keyword in understanding Medieval Latin, particularly so when it had to accommodate newly absorbed vernacular material with its own history, which often resulted in gender and/or spelling variants (e.g. *DMLBS*, s.v. *shafa*, *shafum*, *shefa*, *shefum* [ME *shaf, shef* < OE *scēaf*] 'bundle', 'sheaf'). The question, then, arises: what is the status of the vernacular material found in Latin texts? The general lexicographical policy adopted in the *DMLBS* seems to suggest that only vernacular vocabulary containing a Latin inflectional morpheme is lemmatised and, therefore, these words could be tentatively deemed integrated *borrowings*; the reverse strategy applies to the *OED*, which only includes words which are not inflected in Latin as *bona fide* attestations of vernacular material. Would the latter, non-integrated vernacular lexemes, in Latin texts instantiate episodes of code-switching?

Research into present-day multilingual communities has widely debated the boundaries between code-switching and borrowing. One of the most compelling approaches precisely uses morphological and phonological criteria as markers of integration: code-switching would involve the alternation between two (more rarely, three) linguistic codes without any kind of integration of the items involved whereas a borrowing would presuppose a complete assimilation of the material from the donor language into the recipient language (see, e.g., Poplack and Meechan 1998). In historical written texts, the *oral* phonological parameter—as put forward in contemporary research—is rendered inoperative, and so the morphological criterion, as exemplified in the *DMLBS*, would, in principle, be justified. Nevertheless, this would imply examining medieval morphological units through the lens of present-day data, overlooking, amongst other things, the thin line between flourishes and abbreviation

marks indicating Latin declensional morphemes, and the great variability encountered even within the same text, where the Latinate and non-Latinate variants of the same vernacular lexical item may repeatedly coexist close to each other.

Even the concept of *mixed-language*,[7] which is often used to describe the material that is the object of this dissertation, may seem somewhat anachronistic; in its strictest sense, a *mixed-language* would presuppose the existence of clearly distinguishable, unmixed, monolingual linguistic varieties, but neither medieval Latin nor Middle English/Anglo-Norman seem to fulfil this requirement.[8] On the one hand, Medieval Latin was in a synergetic relationship with the vernaculars rather than in one of opposition, as documentary evidence shows; and, on the other, as Rothwell aptly put it, 'the relationship of Anglo-French with Middle English was one of merger not of borrowing' (1991: 174). Durkin, in his discussion of vernacular lexis in Latin texts (see also Durkin 2014: 290-297), also observed that:

> whether the vernacular language in question is French or English can be very difficult to tell, or in many cases plain impossible. In fact, many scholars who have spent time working on such documents take the view that the writers themselves probably did not always distinguish very clearly between one clearly defined vocabulary as 'English' and another as 'French'.[9]

I recently discussed the pitfalls of applying modern code-switching frameworks, such as Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Framework (1993; 1997; 2001), to historical data (Roig-Marín 2019c). Similarly, Gardner-Chloros (2017: 24-26) exposes the inefficacy of drawing boundaries between matrix and embedded languages not only when describing historical data but also modern material. The presence of cognates and 'bare forms' (Halmar 1997: 89-90) conspicuously signals the need for a more flexible and dynamic approach. Being aware of such ambiguous material, Myers-

[7] On some of the problems of using the conceptual category of *mixed-language*, see one of the most recent discussions, Versloot (2017).

[8] It is widely assumed that medieval scribes were indeed able to discriminate between texts produced in Anglo-Norman or Middle English, but this does not presuppose that they were cognisant of the etymological origins of smaller units, lexemes, or their etymons.

[9] Durkin 'Middle English–an overview' in *OED* <https://public.oed.com/aspects-of-english/english-in-time/middle-english-an-overview/> [accessed 27 April 2018].

Scotton (2002: 22) suggested the notion of a 'composite' code, in her words, 'an abstract frame composed of grammatical projections from more than one variety'. Yet, as Gardner-Chloros (2017) also discusses, the morpho-syntactic variability encountered in multilingual texts (either written or spoken) is much greater than the variability which may occur in a standard language. Matras's (2009: 4) repertoire model highlights the availability of a large multilingual repertoire, 'not organised in the form of "languages" or "language systems"', since the latter constitutes a meta-linguistic formulation learnt through a process of 'linguistic socialization'. The use of certain elements of repertoires instead of others would be conditioned by factors such as the interlocutors and settings involved and the topics discussed. The use of inverted commas when referring to languages resonates powerfully with authors such Jørgensen, Karrebæk, Madsen, and Møller (2011), who define languages as 'sociocultural abstractions which match real-life use of language poorly' (23). This may perhaps be too extreme a stance, disputing the very notion of a *language*, which is nowadays more distinctly conceptualised than in the Middle Ages, but the broader implications of Matras's claim, championing a large repertory drawing from several languages, would resound powerfully among multilingual speakers.

It is not my aim here to reject the existing terminology in the field, but I believe that at least it is worth problematising it because, in so doing, our own contemporary assumptions are exposed. The widely used label *mixed-language* may serve its purpose of capturing the multilingual nature of Latin texts informed by the vernaculars. Still, I contend that the more general term *multilingual* may be equally fitting. The *degree* of multilingualism in these texts is indeed more significant than in their allegedly *monolingual* counterparts, although I would not go as far as to claim that they constitute a mixed-language. Such an assertion would require explicating rigorous methodological procedures that would enable researchers to determine at what point a medieval text containing lexical material from languages which have not undergone a process of standardisation, but are in very close contact, can be said to be written in a mixed-language. Features such as the presence of *le/les* or the use of 'visual diamorphs' (Wright 2011: 203) or emblems occur recurrently in documents produced in medieval England but cannot be the sole determinants. More recently, the term *translingual*, moving away from the monolingual/multilingual dichotomy, has gained

currency in fields such as applied linguistics and literacy studies. *Translingualism* precisely recognises the fluid nature of languages and examines competence across languages as not being restricted to predefined sets of languages, which is why this concept could be incorporated into our formulations of medieval societies' communicative practices.

I concur with Rothwell's statement that one of the reasons why studying lexical borrowings in the Middle Ages is particularly challenging is that 'the linguistic conditions […] have long since disappeared and are often only imperfectly understood by our present age' (1980: 119). Apart from the lack of information we have about 'what was meant, for example, by the separatedness [sic] of languages, which we take for granted' (Trotter 2009: 155), Trotter adds another caveat, namely, the complex Latin-Romance continuum existing between Medieval Latin and Anglo-Norman. That is why speculations about medieval metalinguistic awareness, that is, about the status of vernacular lexical items in the scribe's mind, are rather challenging.

1.2 Medieval multilingual accounts and English dialectology

When I surveyed the previous scholarship on English multilingual accounts whose base language is Medieval Latin, it transpired that no published work had attempted to propose a methodological framework for the tracing of dialectal features in the scribe's vernacular. Nor has, to date, any investigation touched upon that question save for a footnote in Hulbert's 1936 work signposting such an avenue for future research. It is, thus, worth reproducing Hulbert's (1936: 40) note:

> It may be possible eventually, when someone has studied all extant manorial records, to obtain from the English words in them evidence as to the dialect of the places where the rolls were written. If in general the scribes who wrote them, however, were not residents of the manors, the value of this evidence would be limited. In any event, the data which I have been able to collect are not sufficient to be of value for that purpose.

Hulbert (1936) raised two interrelated issues germane to the enterprise he puts forward: if the dialect of manorial records is to be examined, a comprehensive study of

all the existing evidence, including the scribes involved in their production, is required. Certainly, not all the extant manorial records have been examined yet. Practical limitations here come into play: large repositories of untapped medieval documents still await transcription, but their general state of preservation often makes such a mammoth task particularly arduous. Unlike highly elaborate manuscripts, these functional textual objects were, for a long time, largely neglected and stored in less optimum environments. As has been previously highlighted (Prescott 2012: 174; Mooney 2008: 184), the number of illuminated manuscripts or vernacular literary texts gives a false impression of the full dimensions of scribal activity in medieval England, but if we consider the whole spectrum of extant manuscript books and documents, 'the productivity of medieval English scribes seems astonishing, arguably unparalleled in western Europe' (Prescott 2012: 174).

Another serious scholarly gap that Hulbert noted involved the uncertain identity of the scribes who produced administrative documents. It has been generally assumed that these documents were produced by local scribes, and this seems to be a general tendency judging by the scarce information available in records. However, the possibility of scribal mobility should not be fully discarded. Nor should one confine these scribes to the exclusive production of administrative records. A professional scribe performed a large number of activities, ranging from producing administrative texts to books.[10] Mooney and Stubbs (2013) shed light on the scribal activity of those civil servants who were working at the London Guildhall and were also responsible for the copying of famous and authoritative literary manuscripts, such as the works of Geoffrey Chaucer, John Gower, William Langland, and John Trevisa.

In religious or monastic contexts, which occupy a prominent position in this dissertation, clerics rather than professional scribes might have produced such documents. In his examination of northern books, Friedman (1995: 31) suggests that friars could have 'dominated' the writing of both service books *and* some secular productions. This serves to illustrate the difficulties in examining documentary material from a philological viewpoint.

[10] On professional vs commercial scribes, see Mooney (2000; 2011), Edwards (2010), and Pouzet (2011).

Faced with similar problems, albeit in the context of Middle English scribal production, one of the main developers of the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (*LALME*, 1986), McIntosh, drew heavily on his previous experience in the creation of an atlas of contemporary Scots, the *Linguistic Survey of Scotland*.[11] Along with Samuels and Benskin, McIntosh established rigorous protocols which would endow English medieval dialectology with systematic methodological principles and a more solid theoretical basis. For its ample coverage, *LALME* is indeed the closest example to Hulbert's ideal, a comprehensive survey of, in this case, Late Middle English material that could also be utilised in localising written material and tracing isoglosses.

McIntosh (1963) substantiated his dissatisfaction with previous research into Middle English dialects by pinpointing some of the weaknesses in the studies of some of his predecessors, Oakden (1930)[12] and Moore, Meech, and Whitehall (1935). McIntosh's remarks are predicated on several parameters which would also become crucial for the creation of *LALME*: the number of items selected to demonstrate diatopic variation (dialect markers), the role of frequency of use, the (mis)use of linguistic evidence—which, he argues, was often simplified and mishandled in previous studies—and the choice of texts. I will here concentrate on the selection of texts by previous authors, as this partially links with and is relevant to Hulbert's aforementioned proposal. Three main problems, McIntosh contends, can be identified in the choice of texts in Moore, Meech and Whitehall (1935): the neglect of a significant number of documents and the use of some which did not have much value; the exclusive use of localised texts, mostly documents (in detriment to literary manuscripts), and 'too wide a chronological spread' (McIntosh 1963: 5). From his point of view, the ideal window to work with vernacular documents would be from 1350 to 1450—before that period Middle English vernacular texts are scarce, and afterwards they are too standardised. This temporal delimitation proves effective if the data is to be depicted unidimensionally (i.e. on a static map), but this representation does not reflect diachronic variation across the one-hundred-year period covered by *LALME*.

---

[11] See McIntosh (1952) for a description of the foundation of *The Linguistic Survey of Scotland*.

[12] As McIntosh (1963) also underlines, Oakden's dialectal survey is a series of prefatory notes (in McIntosh's words, 'a prelude') to the study of alliterative poetry rather than a fully-fledged dialectal project, which is why I shall concentrate on his critique of Moore, Meech, and Whitehall's (1935) work.

As for the use of localised sources, the most straightforward option is to begin with texts whose provenance is known. Black (2000: 456) rightly states that 'the ideal text is the authorial holograph', which is so rare in the Middle Ages. In an overwhelming majority of cases, the 'informants' from the past either remain anonymous or rarely reveal any information about their background. That is why McIntosh advocates the use of the fit-technique. The fit-technique would first involve establishing a map of fixed points (already localised texts). Then the text to be localised is *asked* a questionnaire of dialectal items, which generates a linguistic profile; each response is plotted against the existing evidence that corresponds to the item in question on the matrix map; the more items that are employed, the narrower the mapping can be. As a result, new fixed points are created which, at the same time, make the localisation of further texts easier. This approach could have potentially erased Hulbert's concern, that is, the drawback of having scribes not belonging to the same place of production. Scribal profiles were delineated and available for consultation in *LALME*. Nevertheless, the types of items that can be utilised in Latin texts containing English material do not fully correspond to those in fully vernacular texts and, therefore, the dialectal parameters would have to be tailor-made.

A further issue that has kept troubling researchers both in the past and in the present is the large number of Middle English texts translated from one dialect to another. Peters (1988: 399) completely rejected the value of manuscript copies written in a different dialect from the original, stating that the only way to arrive 'at valid conclusions' involves making use of either 'manuscripts which are identical with the original text' or 'copies written in and representing the same dialect area as the original' (1988: 399). Accordingly, are we to disregard a considerable amount of textual evidence just because it happens to be in a different dialect from the original? McIntosh (1963: 8) pointed out that if the translation seems to have been thoroughly done, it should not hamper the analysis of the text as a specimen from another dialect. Further research into dialectal reliability has highlighted the complex and wide range of strategies that a scribe could possibly apply, which could vary not only according to text type or genre but also within a string of texts and a single text.

Conventionally, three types of copying have been identified (see McIntosh 1973; McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin 1986; Benskin and Laing 1981): the very rare scenario

in which (1) a text is copied fairly consistently from the original with no alterations; (2) the exemplar may be transformed into the copyist's dialect, the changes being reflected at different linguistic levels (orthography, morphology, and lexis)—this was a usual strategy; and, finally, (3) the scribe may adopt a hybrid, somewhere-in-between, procedure, creating a *Mischsprache*, which also occurs quite frequently. Gradience is clearly noticeable among these taxonomical categories, as consistency was not always the norm; and even if a scribe is consistently translating the text into his own dialect, he may preserve—or at least hesitate—when confronted with those words which are essential to the alliterative pattern or rhythm of a poem. Those instances should, in principle, be salient and relatively easily detectable.

The appearance of relict forms, broadly defined in dialectology as 'earlier form[s] not yet ousted by the spread of new forms from surrounding areas' (McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin 1986: 13), which can also apply to forms not originally belonging to the scribe's own dialectal repertoire but 'perpetuated' from an exemplar in a different dialect, as McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin suggest (1986), may also initially obscure the difference between a case of *Mischsprache* from texts containing a large number of relicts; but a comparison of the productions made by the same scribe could signal the presence of such earlier forms, which may occur in just a single text. Aware of such complex issues, McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin (1986: 12–23) detailed every single scribal possibility in their exhaustive introduction to their work, in which they also discussed, amongst many other issues, the complex textual history of widely disseminated manuscripts—unlike most local administrative documents—and how to recover 'archetypal spellings'.

Following the principles designed for *LALME*, a 'sister' project, *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* (*LAEME*, 2013), was launched to provide coverage for the earlier period of Middle English (i.e. ca. 1150-1325). *LAEME* departs from *LALME* in its corpus-based approach: the texts in *LAEME* are tagged, and the interface allows the researcher to perform searches for specific lexical and grammatical features and to make concordances. One of the main drawbacks of this tool is that its corpus is more limited than the one underlying *LALME*. The differing amounts of extant sources for each period are evident when one examines the survey points, whose numbers differ dramatically between the two *Atlases*.

Technological advances have certainly facilitated the development of such searchable corpora, databases, and other lexicographical resources for the diachronic study of English dialects: the *English Dialect Dictionary* (Wright 1896-1906) and the *Middle English Dictionary* (*MED*, 1952-2001) were digitised, the latter dictionary also incorporating complementary resources such as the HyperBibliography.[13] The Internet has also opened the door for interconnection among the dictionaries that represent the languages employed in late medieval England: the *AND* refers to the *MED*, the *DMLBS*, and the *OED* (as well as Old French dictionaries); and the *MED* links to the *OED* and the *Dictionary of Old English* (*DOE*, 2009–). In addition, the *OED* includes links to its online *Historical Thesaurus* (*HTOED*, 2009), which is particularly useful in historical semantic research.

Among the online dialect projects currently underway is the *Corpus of Middle English Local Documents* (*MELD*).[14] The total number of English local texts which has been compiled for this corpus amounts to 2,017, both administrative texts and letters from 1399-1525.[15] From 31st May 2017, the East Midlands part, containing 571 texts, has been available online. *MELD* presents four versions for each text: a base version (the transcription *per se*), a readable (edited) version, a diplomatic version, which preserves the original manuscript letter shapes, marks and features of layout, and the concordancer versions, meant to be used with a concordancer programme.

As can be inferred from these categories, greater prominence is given to the original scribal output and its visual presentation. The aim and approach of that project shaped the selection of texts and the decisions made from the outset: rather than attempting to 'reconstruct' dialectal features, they sought to draw attention to 'geographical variation in relation to actual provenance', asking 'who wrote what where - and for whom?'.[16] That explains why, in contrast to *LAEME* and *LALME*, the

---

[13] The HyperBibliography encompasses all the materials which are quoted in the *MED*, which makes it the most comprehensive list of sources in Middle English that is presently available electronically.

[14] Stenroos, Thengs, and Bergstrøm (2017.1) <http://www.uis.no/meld> [accessed 27 April 2018].

[15] *A Corpus of Middle English Local Documents - version 2017.1: Manual* (2017) <http://www.uis.no/getfile.php/13348618/Forskning/Kultur/MEG/MELD%20Manual%202017_1.pdf> [accessed 27 April 2018] (para. 1).

[16] Merja Stenroos, Kjetil V. Thengs, and Geir Bergstrøm, 'MELD Introduction' (2017) <http://www.uis.no/research/history-languages-and-literature/the-mest-programme/a-

range of text types covered is much narrower, but the level of detail is greater. More importantly, the fragments in Latin in the original sources—introduced by [Latin:]—have been preserved, which may give room for further investigation into language choice once the full corpus has been released.

For specific geographical areas, two pioneering examples for Northern English are worth mentioning, namely the *Seville Electronic Corpus of Northern English*[17] and the *Salamanca Corpus*.[18] *SCONE* consists of 70 Northern English texts, including runic and non-runic inscriptions, from as early as the seventh century to the sixteenth century,[19] which were lexically annotated and edited to create electronic editions,[20] whereas the *Salamanca Corpus* covers the ensuing period (i.e. from c. 1500 to c. 1950) and comprises literary representations of the Northern dialect and, to a lesser extent, glossaries. These two projects fill an important lacuna for lexical research into Northern English from the early medieval period to the twentieth century, and complement the dialectal evidence found in classic lexicographical works.

More generally, the uninterrupted editing of medieval texts for the London Record Society, the Canterbury and York Society, or the Surtees Society, keeps enlarging the existing wealth of local materials. Not only are administrative documents the object of study but also miscellanies, letters, and other medieval texts which give insights into the breadth of medieval England and past societies at large. More will be said on work by the Surtees Society, since the northern documents underlying this dissertation are editions published by this text publication society.

---

corpus-of-middle-english-local-documents-meld/meld-introduction/?s=21401> [accessed 27 April 2018] (para. 1).

[17] *Seville Corpus of Northern English* (*SCONE*) (2008) <ingles3.us.es/> [accessed 27 April 2018].

[18] *The Salamanca Corpus: Digital Archive of English Dialect Texts* (*SC*) (2011) <http://www.salamancacorpus.usal.es/DL_N_1500-1700_LAN_Robin_ans_Gonny.html> [accessed 27 April 2018]. Unfortunately, the *Salamanca Corpus* does not seem to be open access unlike *SCONE*.

[19] The majority of specimens come from the Early Northumbrian period, although there are a few from the other four chronological sub-divisions represented in *SCONE* (Late Northumbrian, Early Middle English, Late Middle English, and Early Modern English).

[20] See Fernández Cuesta, García García, and Amores Carredano (2012: 39–41) for more details on the linguistic annotation process and the diagnostic features selected.

1.2.1 Northern English in historical perspective

The previous sketch of recent digital corpora developments in Northern English dialects evinces part of a general trend—especially noticeable since the mid 2000s—which has been characterised by a reinvigoration of the study of varieties of English spoken in the historical and present-day North of England.[21] Yet, metalinguistic awareness of the North/South divide can be traced back to medieval times. Well-known are the references to Northernisms in Chaucer's *The Reeve's Tale*[22] or the remarks made by the author of *Cursor Mundi* in translating the southern version into the northern dialect (lines 20059–64). The fact that translated texts from 'northrin englis' abound, whereas the inverse procedure is more rarely encountered,[23] is somewhat indicative of the general—linguistic and otherwise—move southward.

In the Early Modern period, Southern English was already being explicitly favoured, but this did not prevent later authors from appreciating the value of Northern speech. Hickey (2015) underscores how the interest in dialect was sparked in the eighteenth century when the North of England came to be associated with 'older forms of English' in comparison to the South (see Wales 2002; Hickey 2015: 13). Ever since, northern phonological and, to a lesser degree, morphological features have received a significant deal of critical attention; considerably fewer works have been devoted exclusively to lexis (Hudson 1983: 74), Kaiser's (1937) being one of the most notable exceptions (see also Kristensson 1976; McIntosh 1973; Hudson 1983; Black 2000; Carrillo-Linares and Garrido-Anes 2012). With his lists of 'Nordwörter' and 'Sudwörter' and initial theoretical formulations, he marked an important milestone in Northern Middle English research, an area which has remained largely fragmentary until a few decades ago.

Recent efforts have concentrated precisely on redressing the nature of former studies, which tended to have a very limited temporal and textual coverage.

---

[21] The definition of the *North of England* adopted corresponds to the traditional 'seven-county North' (Northumberland, Yorkshire, Durham, Cumberland, Westmorland, Lancashire, and Yorkshire). For a more detailed discussion of the geography of the North, see Hickey (2015).

[22] See, *inter alia,* Tolkien (1934), Horobin (2001), and Taylor (2010).

[23] On the phenomenon of Southern > Northern ME translation, see McIntosh (1963: 8) and Hudson (1983: 75).

Continuities throughout the history of Northern English were, thus, established between early and late Northumbrian (Fernández Cuesta, Rodríguez Ledesma, and Senra Silva 2008), Old Northumbrian and Northern Middle English (Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma 2007), and between Middle, Modern, and Contemporary English (Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma 2009), which, together with more synchronic descriptions of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Northern documents by the same authors (Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma 2004; Fernández Cuesta 2014), have contributed 'towards telling the full story' of historical Northern English (Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma 2008). They aimed to complicate the simplistic narrative of Northern English as lists of occurring features (e.g. the *-s* inflectional suffix for the third singular person present indicative, the use of *thir* and *tha(s)* as plural demonstrative forms, or the Northern Subject Rule, to name but a few); and their results, based not just on grammar but also on spelling and lexis, proved that 'in some cases the form which is cited as characteristic of the North is not even the dominant one (i.e., plural of *that* and *this*)', and that a certain degree of homogeneity in Northern dialects cannot be adduced to dismiss significant variation dependent on geographical area (e.g. between the West Riding of Yorkshire and the other northern counties) and text type (e.g. Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma (2008: 107) note how *-ing* occurs more frequently in legal texts, whereas dialectally-marked *-and* is preferred in literary sources).

As far as Middle English is concerned, notwithstanding the copious amounts of extant textual evidence that overall typify the period, the researcher of Northern varieties may still face more limited data sources in monolingual English for some sub-sets of periods. As discussed in the General Introduction to *LALME*, northern *and* north Midland English pre-1350 are scant, which means that the *Atlas* did not cover that period.[24] Nevertheless, McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin made use of northern texts that were from later than 1450 and even Scots texts (for Ayr, Selkirk, and Wigtown) from the early sixteenth century; omitting such documents, in their view, 'would have constituted a serious impoverishment'.[25] For this purpose, the slow process of

[24] *LAEME* exhibits even greater limitations in the number of northern survey points.

[25] McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin 'A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English, Volume One: General Introduction, Index of Sources, Dot Maps', p. 3; in 2008 the beta version (1.1) of the

standardisation in the north is in advantageous counterpoint to the speed at which it was taking place in the south, where such late texts could not have been considered.

The inclusion of Scots texts as evidence for Northern English in *LALME* leads to the discussion of the relationship between medieval Scots—conventionally known as Older Scots—and Northern Middle English. It has been generally assumed that up to the fifteenth century 'the two language labels are used to distinguish geopolitically what is perceived to have been a common speech area' (Williamson 2002: 253). Along these lines, James Murray (1873: 29) described the fourteenth and early fifteenth-century Scots language as 'simply the northern English, which was spoken from the Trent and Humber to the Moray Firth'. Older Scots and Northern Middle English were seen as a common linguistic entity which was in sharp contrast with the dialects spoken in Midland and Southern dialects of English. However, this assumption has been refined by Maguire (2015). To better contextualise the complex historical interplay between the two, he goes back to the Anglo-Saxon period.

In the early sixth century, Anglian reached the southeast of Scotland as far as the Firth of Forth, and there was no border dividing Lowland Scotland and England. The only geographical—as well as linguistic—boundary was the River Humber, which served to separate the Northumbrian from the Mercian dialects. The Anglian dialect spoken in Scotland was later superseded by early Northern Middle English coming from further south, which prompted a process of koineisation (Siegel 1985; Trudgill 2004; Maguire 2015: 439). This marked the beginning of *Inglis*, later called *Scots*, which would progressively become more and more detached from the broader linguistic category to which it had initially belonged (i.e. Northern Middle English). The formation of the Scottish-English border, which started to take shape during the reign of Duncan I of Scotland (1034-1040) and culminated in 1482, would contribute to this process that was already underway.[26] Because of the Border and the two developing distinct standards, as Williamson highlights, 'the fifteenth century [was] a period of

---

Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots [*LAOS*], Phase 1, 1380 to 1500, was released online (http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laos1/laos1.html). *LAOS* furnishes further evidence on Older Scots, completing the rather patchy picture in *LALME*. The current accessible version is 1.2 (2013–), but there is a new version currently being prepared.

[26] See also Meurman-Solin (1997: 12), who dates this divergence to the period spanning the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth century.

linguistic divergence with the Northumbrian *Sprachgebiet*, both between Lowland Scotland and Northern England and within these respective areas' (Williamson 2002: 253). In spite of all of this, the significant number of Scots vocabulary in Northern English sources cannot be neglected (cf. Aitken 1984: 112), which is why due attention will be devoted to their identification and description in the documentary evidence from the broader period considered in this dissertation (i.e. from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century).

1.3 Textual sources

In this section I describe the general principles underlying the initial selection of texts and why I decided to narrow down my corpus to the *DAR.* The seven administrative texts that formed the preliminary basis for this dissertation (listed on page 21) were selected following three main criteria: linguistic, geographical, and temporal. All of the texts had to be categorised as being produced—mostly, if not entirely—in Medieval Latin. Interspersed with them might be illustrative excerpts, sentences, or lexemes translated into English and texts that were originally produced in the vernacular.[27] As my focus is on lexis rather than on morpho-syntax, the latter category of English passages could potentially be of interest in tracing the evolution of some of the lexis previously encountered in the Latin texts. Straightforward as this distinction might seem, in practice the boundaries between the modern editor's translations and actual English passages are not always so clear.

A problematic case in point is the *Jarrow Accounts*, in which from the year 1437 the editor starts to present summaries of the main items for each account in English. According to the editor (Raine 1854: 105), the original, untranslated words are indicated in brackets or inverted commas, but after a series of translated accounts, an oscillation between English and Latin starts to become noticeable.[28] Not only are

[27] Among the Correspondence of the Priory of Coldingham (Raine 1841) are letters produced in French as well. These include messages between the King of England and the King of Scotland (generally, concerning the King of Scotland's attempt to attach the Priory of Coldingham to the Monastery of Dunfermline), and letters by the Priory of Durham.

[28] The same applies to some *DAR* rolls where an initial short summary in PDE is provided (see, e.g., Rott. Elemos. 1522-3, 254). Those sections have naturally been excluded.

prepositional phrases, numerals, and past participles which had been previously exclusively used in Latin now in English, but also English alternates with Medieval Latin back and forth (e.g. Raine 1841: 115 [Item CXXI]). The editor gives no explicit indications as to whether some of those later accounts are de facto hybrid beyond the realm of noun phrases, or whether they continue to be an editorial byproduct; the language is definitely not coetaneous (it is not in ME, which would be expected in the fifteenth century), which forced me to exclude this kind of material from my analysis. The fact that these changes only seem to occur in this sub-set of accounts—the *Monkwearmouth Accounts* are, in their entirety, in Medieval Latin—, out of a total of eight sets which have been selected, suggests that it might be the mere corollary of a somewhat loose application of editorial principles.

Even if those language fluctuations were present in the original manuscripts, there is not a mere '*sporadic* [emphasis is mine] return to Latin phrases and formulae', as postulated by Wright (2017: 343). Proof of this is the final outcome, which is not a complete shift to monolingual English but quite the opposite.[29] Therefore, this would constitute a transitional phenomenon different from the vacillating process of the Anglicisation of accounts, whereby the disruption of the so-called 'mixed-language system' would have started in the 1370s and would have ended c. 1480, coinciding with the emergence of Standard English.[30] The base language of the other accounts examined consistently continues to be Medieval Latin well into the sixteenth century. In this respect, it may be argued that the secular and religious institutions engaged in this textual production were more conservative than those which have been diachronically surveyed in the literature: notably, *The London Bridge Accounts* (Wright 1994; 1996; 1998; 2002) and *The Wardens' Accounts of the Mercers' Company of London* (Alcolado Carnicero 2013; 2015; 2017; 2018; 2019). That is why, in a way, the

[29] Among many others, the very last entry (from the year 1536, the dissolution of the Monastery) is revealingly in Medieval Latin (cf. Raine 1841: 135–136 [Item CLVII]), as well as those from the *DAR*.

[30] Compare Wright (2017: 339) and an earlier paper by the same author (Wright 2013), in which she gives a slightly different time span, c. 1380-1430, but approximately her archive-dependent dates range from the late fourteenth to the early fifteenth century. Alcolado Carnicero (2019) concurs with Wright (2012) in her three-stage model and its chronology, although he notes a transition from both 'Romance monolingualism to code switching and from code switching to English monolingualism' (Alcolado Carnicero 2019: 408).

linguistic distinctiveness of my textual material interrelates with the temporal and geographical delimitations of this study.

Because of the dialectal—Northern English—dimension that this dissertation is going to account for, naturally, the material had to come from the North, herein understood in a broader and more flexible sense and extending to the Priory of Coldingham in the Scottish borders. Despite being on Scottish soil, its monastery depended on an English Church, which 'exercised over it an absolute control, and appropriated to its own use a considerable portion of its revenues' (Raine 1841: viii). Its connection with England also pervaded the language of the accounts and their records indeed share a significant proportion of the vernacular vocabulary with the *DAR* and other texts.

The long-standing editorial tradition of the Surtees Society allowed me to fulfil the geographical requirement. The Surtees Society was established in 1834 to edit manuscripts which were illustrative of 'the intellectual, the moral, the religious, and the social condition' of those territories in England and Scotland corresponding to the former Kingdom of Northumbria, comprising those 'on the East between the Humber and the Frith [sic] of Forth, and on the West between the Mersey and the Clyde' (Thompson 1939: 2). Their publications cover the whole history of this area, so only medieval—and, exceptionally, early modern—accounts and inventories produced in Latin could be subject to this analysis. The steady use of Medieval Latin throughout those texts further blurs the contestable chronological boundaries between Middle English and Modern English, which is why the first accounts to be considered dates back to 1278 and the last one to 1538. These temporal delimitations emerged organically in the choice of medieval institutions which, inevitably, kept their records beyond the Middle Ages. Nonetheless, I excluded those texts which, despite being written in Latin, were too chronologically narrow and late (e.g. *The Durham Household Book or the Accounts of the Bursar of the Monastery of Durham*: *From Pentecost, 1530 to Pentecost, 1534* (Raine 1844)).

My previous work on the *Jarrow Accounts* (see Roig-Marín 2018a; 2019a) suggested that, from a diachronic viewpoint, there was no significant lexical variation throughout the whole set, but the nature of that preliminary case study hinders its representativeness. Now, with more data, I will examine if diachronic variation can be

effectively traced (e.g. in terms of dialectally marked spellings) and can be tentatively ascribed to the historical development of Northern English, noting any similarities and disparities among the sets of accounts.

Many of the Surtees Society's publications revolve around the counties of Durham and Northumberland.[31] Creating a thorough picture of the whole North East of England through administrative texts would be an ambitious goal in long-term research; as for now, the resources available, as well as the criteria deployed, shaped the configuration of my preliminary corpus, which comprised the following titles:

- *The York City Chamberlains' Account Rolls 1396-1500*;
- *The Customs Accounts of Newcastle upon Tyne 1454-1500*;
- *The Inventories and Account Rolls of the Benedictine Houses or Cells of Jarrow and Monkwearmouth in the County of Durham* [1303-1536];
- *Extracts from the Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, from the Original MSS. Volume I-III* [1278-1538] (*Durham Account Rolls* or *DAR* for short);
- *Correspondence, Inventories, Account Rolls and Law Proceedings of the Priory of Coldingham* [1261-1448];
- *Charters of Endowment, Inventories and Account Rolls of the Priory of Finchale in the County of Durham* [1311-1535],
- and *Durham Priory Manorial Accounts, 1277-1310*.

Within the more miscellaneous compendia (i.e. the multi-text books from Coldingham and Finchale), only accounts and inventories were considered in order to ensure consistency. Correspondence in one or more of the three languages of late medieval England (Medieval Latin, Anglo-Norman and Middle English) is sporadically included in appendices (e.g. in the Jarrow and Monkwearmouth multi-text books), but the great discrepancies in numbers between the different kinds of textual materials included in those editions signifies that they would be unequally represented in this study. Besides, as distinct genres with their own conventions, letters, as well as

[31] Cf. The Surtees Society <http://www.surteessociety.org.uk/> [accessed 27 April 2018].

charters of endowment (in the Priory of Finchale multi-text books), could only be analysed on their own terms.

Certainly, accounts and inventories share many formal features (e.g. in terms of layout and formulaic language), although the ways in which they are presented to the reader vary significantly from edition to edition. Firstly, not all the texts give information about the editorial policies adopted: only the most recent editions, *The Newcastle Accounts*, *The York Accounts*, and *Durham Priory Accounts,* give explicit indications about the treatment of erasures and deletions, abbreviations, the use of capitals and numerals, and spelling conventions (e.g. the rendering of <v> as <u> for a vowel or as <v> in consonantal position, and the replacement of thorn and yogh as <th> and <y>, respectively); in earlier editions (which unfortunately have not been revised since their original publication), insertions—i.e. the editor's own comments or translations—are usually indicated in parentheses (as in the *DAR*), but how editorial intervention materialises in each set of texts usually has to be inferred. More erratic are the descriptions of hands and scribal idiosyncrasies: the *Coldingham* and the *Finchale Accounts* make occasional references to the scribal hands in footnotes, although they are not consistently given. Neither are more recent editions fully precise in their characterisation of hands and their participation in the production of the accounts: for instance, while Dobson makes some remarks on the hands involved in the production of the accounts, those commentaries often have an impressionistic tone (unclear / neater hand, etc.) and are not always present (wanting in items 10, 12, and 13).

Tentatively, these seven sets of account rolls and inventories were the object of study of this dissertation. However, once the number of lexical items per edited collection of accounts and/or inventories was retrieved, the prospect of offering an analysis of all the vernacular lexical items in all of those texts proved to be an unfeasible task for this thesis: the data obtained only from the three volumes of the *Account Rolls of the Cathedral of Durham* (Fowler 1898-1901) amounts to c. 1600 lexical items; data from other accounts or inventories is, therefore, only adduced for comparative purposes.

I decided to concentrate on the *DAR* material, which would enable me to factor in and assess variables more closely. I gathered the following information for each lexical

entry: lemmas, definitions (the closest sense to the occurrences of the word(s) in my texts), and attestations in the *OED*, *MED*, *DSL* (i.e. *DOST* and/or *SND*), and *DMLBS*, etymological information provided in those dictionaries (paying particular attention to the one provided in the *OED* and the *MED*), and any Northern specific features or likely dialectal markers, which will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 4. The three *DAR* volumes represent a selection of rolls from the vast material housed in the Durham Cathedral Archives. These archives consist of two main sections separated at 31 December 1539, the date of the dissolution of the Benedictine priory founded in 1083 by the bishop of Durham, William of St Calais. The medieval archive, one of the largest in the country, consists of 124 metres plus archive boxes. Most are records relating to the administration and exploitation of the Cathedral's privileges and possessions (e.g. court-rolls and books, inventories, deeds, rentals, and accounts),[32] and there are also fragments of manuscript books, miscellaneous charters, and cartularies, among its archival material. The *DAR* rolls correspond to several departments: volume 1 comprises excerpts from the Cellarer's, Hostiller's, Almoner's (*elemosinaria*), Chamberlain's, and Infirmarer's (*magistrorum infirmarie*) Rolls; volume 2, Commoners', Terrars', Stock-keepers', Sacrists', Feretrars', Bursars' Rolls, and *Marescalcia Prioris*; and volume 3, Bursars' and Miners' Rolls. There are also some extracts from Treasurers' books (1569-1580) and miscellanea (1293-1542), mostly in monolingual English, which are beyond the scope of this dissertation. The rolls, generated by the different departments and written on parchment, paper, and mixed media, are classified following a colour scheme and stored in boxes.[33] The immensity of the extant material, albeit in varying states of preservation, meant that no additional rolls were added to my analysis although the editions were checked against the manuscripts. As Fowler (1898: viii) indicates, the content becomes somewhat repetitive even if only a few rolls are given in *extenso* as specimens. Yet, 'no Roll [was] left without a mention of some kind' (Fowler 1898: viii).

---

[32] The Durham Cathedral Archive subdivides the accounts into broad categories: 30-43 (Durham office-holders), 44-59 (manors), 60-3 (livestock), 64-5 (coal-mining), 66-9 (proctors of churches), 70-9 (cells) (see 'Summary Guide to the Durham Cathedral Archives' at <www.dur.ac.uk/library/asc/> [accessed 1 March 2020].

[33] My archival visit to the Durham Cathedral Archives was funded by the AHRC (Award No AH/L503897/1), whose support is here gratefully acknowledged.

Vernacular suffixes (e.g. *-es, -ez*, and *-ys*) seem to have been faithfully rendered in the edition and we can safely assert that ambiguous suspension signs in the vernacular material are left unexpanded (e.g. **m'kyngiryns***,* **rod'**, **argent'**, and **yslandfyss'**). In CL-origin words, here rarely considered, the common abbreviation marks (e.g. for *-er, -orum, -is*) may have been expanded without further comment, and there are some unsignalled editorial choices when the MS has deteriorated (e.g. *peccis* for *pecc*[...]). Fowler does, however, acknowledge editorial intervention when confronted with dubious readings or possible scribal errors if the word is known: on 'pro j famulo vocato Trippyngknase', he writes 'we should expect Trippyngknafe, errand-boy, but the MS. certainly has Trippyngknase' (Rott. Instaur. 1416-7, 317, footnote 3). In terms of abbreviations, the lexis in the *Marescalcia Prioris* rolls is much more abbreviated than in any other part of the *DAR* material. These rolls are not connected to the *marescalcia* ('farriery') per se, but 'relate to an inspection of weights, measures, etc., which formed a part of the business of the various manor courts held by the authority of the Prior' (Fowler 1898: 326), an ideal textual scenario for the use of abbreviations. In discussing these texts, Fowler (1898: 326) underscores the ambiguity and opacity of these contractions, setting out his policy on them: 'it has been thought best to print them as nearly as possible as they stand, only expanding some contractions in italic type, and printing without any stops'. Only a few sample sentences with conjectural expansions and translations are given at the beginning of the section. Therefore, the underlying editorial principles followed seem to be consistent enough for one to be able to rely on the vernacular lexis as editorially rendered.

2. Methodological and procedural considerations

I will start by discussing the implications in the choice of the subtitle of this dissertation, *a philological approach*. For a long time, philology bridged realms of humanistic knowledge which are nowadays much more disconnected from each other. Throughout its history, philology has been identified with textual exegesis and the application of protocols for the reconstruction and editing of historical texts,[34] as well as with the study of language history and the use of the comparative method to describe historical languages. Its multiple ends can be discretely categorised and ascribed to what is now conceived as separate disciplines (i.e. *textual criticism* and, ostensibly, *linguistics*), but ultimately they share a fascination for language and/or textual artefacts *in context.* This approach brings my PhD closer to some of the fundamental premises in textual editing; such a pursuit requires, at least, an understanding of the workings of the language(s) in which the text is written (i.e. its structural components, functions, historical development and relations to other language(s)) and its context of production, knowledge of palaeography and codicology (the physical and scribal aspects of the text and the material object in which it has been preserved and disseminated), acquaintance with literary—or, more generally, textual—practices and conventions of the tradition to which this text belongs, and the textual history of the text.

As time went on, there were endeavours to dissociate philology from the more recent discipline of *historical linguistics*. Philological approaches to language would be deemed old-fashioned in comparison to the generalising theories in linguistics. In my view, this misconception arises out of differences in aims and methods: philological work does not endeavour to create theories that can explain language in the abstract, but it seeks to better understand the particular history of a given (or several) language(s). I concur with Smith in his appreciation of the direction of linguistic disciplines, which is 'to allow theory (or sometimes simply notation) to overwhelm the data – for the empirical study, which (in our view) the subject should be, to be smothered in a rationalist blend' (Smith 1994: 99). Fulk (2016: 102-103) also voiced his

[34] Miller (2010) correlates *textual exegesis* with *philology*, which, according to him, would be a 'subbranch of linguistics' (2010: 14).

concern for the turn of twentieth-century linguistic research, which completely neglects the 'contextualising and particularising aims' which have enabled philologists to find nuanced and more holistic explanations beyond purely linguistic considerations. The role of *probability* is central to the philological enterprise, but it is a kind of probability that does not require the application of complex mathematical models or statistical tests but it is 'usually plain enough to be intuited' (Fulk 2003: 2), since it builds on empirical evidence.

Being aware of the pitfalls in applying current theoretical models to historical texts and, more specifically, to the data that I will be discussing, I decided to adopt a more traditional, philological approach and consider my textual sources within their broader contexts of production. Projects such as *LALME* have proved the advantages of drawing on disciplines which, from the point of view of a philologist, are clearly interlinked: palaeography, for instance, provides the scholar with crucial skills for accessing the manuscript sources without having to rely slavishly on texts mediated by modern scholars in the form of editions. As I discuss in 1.3, editorial policies vary significantly from text to text, especially in nineteenth- or early twentieth-century editions, and sometimes only the manuscript itself may help to disambiguate what was actually written from what the editor estimated it said, particularly so in the case of abbreviations or flourishes—whose status is not always clear-cut—or the transcription of ambiguous letter forms.

A different issue is *physical* accessibility to original manuscripts, which cannot be taken for granted at the present time. Two typical scenarios are that either the manuscript may no longer survive or it may have deteriorated to such an extent that it is in a very poor and illegible condition. As far as documentary evidence for this dissertation is concerned, the latter seems to apply for at least a few fragments in the editions; even at the time of the editing of the texts, the editors acknowledged this situation. Exclusions are, nevertheless, also the result of the editor's awareness of the repetitive (almost *verbatim*) content of some of the accounts / inventories, which they considered of little value for the primary readership of those editions (i.e. historians). Naturally, such passages shall not be analysed for this dissertation, but I believe that that is not detrimental to the process of data compilation *per se*, which preceded the examination of the original manuscripts.

Generally, that should be the first step and would take place prior to the data compilation. Nevertheless, the idiosyncrasies of the texts I have selected and the general aim of this thesis, I would argue, can justify a slightly different procedure. Unlike the sources included for the *Atlases*, which were primarily composed in English, the substantial amount of Latin in these accounts signifies that the variables to account for are fewer. A priori, no pronouns, conjunctions, or prepositions are in English, and only some adjectives and a handful of verbs (e.g. *warantizo* < *warant*) come from one of the two vernaculars, so there is less scope for variation. Only in dubious spelling choices, the original manuscript can assist in clarifying what was in the unedited text. Otherwise, the edited texts may suffice as first points of reference for compiling the vernacular material.

Likewise, my purpose is considerably different from McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin's, since I am more interested in examining the presence of English in these Latinate accounts; my texts are localised and no further manuscript localisation is required. It would be unrealistic to attempt to explain why every single vernacular lexeme is used or preferred over Latinate equivalents, if any, but I will individuate noteworthy words in any (one or more) of the following aspects: (un)attestations, geographical distribution, and etymology.

In order to do so, I pulled out all the vernacular lexical items from the administrative texts whose matrix language is Medieval Latin listed in 1.3. Excluded from the count were toponyms, personal names, and personal titles. As has been discussed, the vernacular/medieval Latin distinction is problematic; more so if Anglo-Norman is added to the picture. That is why a sine qua non is clarifying what I mean by *vernacular* in this dissertation. I shall consider the lexical evidence which fulfils the following requisite: the word in the *DAR* does not come directly from earlier periods of Latin (Late or Classical Latin) and, if it does, it exhibits a vernacular-specific morphological or semantic development (see 3.1). In that way, I do not exclude potentially relevant Latin/French-origin words which may also have an idiosyncratic meaning and/or exhibit a Northern distribution.

The evidence for Middle English in widely unexamined, multilingual, administrative sources may help to re-evaluate our understanding of some forgotten English words which, as Hulbert also underlined, may not be included in historical dictionaries or

attested poorly, including examples of their use in much later periods (see, e.g., Roig-Marín 2018b on *Spanysyren'*). For this I will refer to the *MED* and the *OED*,[35] and I will reassess their etymology. I will also gauge the level of integration of vernacular words (which may be *camouflaged* as Latin), by checking their inclusion in the *DMLBS.* In connection with this point, the suffix *-is* deserves careful scrutiny: in Latin it is used as the plural ablative case marker (for the first and second declensions in Classical Latin) but, in Northern Middle English, *-is* (and its variant *-ys*) are general plural allomorphs. The items listed in accounts and inventories tend to be in an oblique case (generally, the ablative), so the recurrent presence of *-is* further complicates any attempt at taxonomy. In this regard, I will endeavour to describe the multifaceted—and sometimes subtle— interaction between the Latinate record-keeping tradition and the English vernacular, which will be placed along the Northern Middle English/Old Scots linguistic continuum.[36]

This comprehensive approach poses several challenges which shall be tackled by referring to the more general principles underpinning *LALME*. In devising the questionnaire, McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin (1986: 7) established four kinds of evidence which would be collected for their dialect survey: purely graphological, phonological, morphological, and lexical. The two first categories hinge on the degree to which written historical data can be interpreted to correlate with speech. McIntosh (1956) discussed this topic and underscored the danger in unequivocally assigning different phonetic values to spelling variants. Firstly, from a phonological viewpoint, certain spellings are intrinsically imprecise (e.g. *þam* which may have represented /þæm/ or /þam/).[37] Similarly, the phonological information could be decoded differently according to the reader, so that a spelling variant with a particular phonological resonance for a scribe and his milieu could have a different value for the reader 'because of some local usage' (McIntosh 1956: 29); or, more generally, the

[35] It is worth stressing that the *OED* is, in Durkin's words (2016: 392), a 'dynamically changing resource', which means that I will be citing the precise edition (and its date of publication/revision) utilised in my analysis.
[36] In this enterprise, the *Dictionary of the Older Scots Tongue* (*DOST*, 1937-2002), which is embedded in the *Dictionary of the Scots Language* (project date 2001–) <http://www.dsl.ac.uk/>, becomes a primary resource.
[37] See McIntosh (1956: 28–29) for more examples.

spelling system in Middle English may simply have been ineffective in conveying meaningful phonological contrasts.[38]

Whatever the case might be, even orthographic variation with no apparent contrastive phonemic value (e.g. <ȝ>/<gh>, <þ>/<th>, <i>/<y>, or <u>/<v>) does not render the analysis of such variances futile. Nor is it productive to adopt a purely dichotomic approach, oversimplifying evidence which is in fact much richer; for instance, McIntosh (1963) quotes Moore, Meech, and Whitehall's (1935) simplistic approach to the third person plural pronoun acting as an object, *them*, which is treated as h- and not-h forms (i.e. *h-/th-* forms) where in fact there were least twelve variants (McIntosh 1963: 3). Indeed, there might be more variants and underlying distributional patterns worth uncovering for the insights they can give into the spelling systems employed in the Middle English period. McIntosh (1956: 49) takes this argument further and puts the stress on the distinction between the *graphematic* and *graphetic* level, that is, between variation in orthography vis-à-vis variation in handwriting, advocating a 'much closer integration between the work of the paleographer and the linguist than is at present customary' (whether consciously or unconsciously, he seems to be conjuring up the figure of the philologist discussed above). In sum, the written system could—and should—be studied on its own.

Notwithstanding McIntosh's sceptical position towards the correlation between spelling and phonology and his vindication of the supremacy of the written sign in Middle English, the multivalent nature of spelling variants is sometimes subsumed under entries for broader items (e.g. 252 STAND pres. and 252-10 STAND inf., which encompass variants with both <o> and <a>), and little graphetic detail was incorporated into *LALME*.[39] I do not claim graphetic (as opposed to graphemic) contrasts are particularly revealing in my study, but I would not dismiss the value of diachronic phonology in accounting for data of potential dialectal significance. That is

[38] For more recent discussions about the representation of Middle English, formulated in terms of *litterae/potestas*, see Laing and Lass (2003; 2013).

[39] In the Introduction to *LALME*, such a mediated representation is acknowledged and parallelisms are drawn between the process of phonemic transcription and 'graphemic transcription' (cf. McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin 1986: 7).

why Jordan-Crook (1974) as well as the *Corpus of Narrative Etymologies*[40] will undergird my data analysis.

Probability of occurrence partly motivated the choice of the sixty items in the questionnaire of *LALME*, which signifies that what McIntosh deems 'a great number of interesting words' (1973: 57) are not present in the questionnaire of *LALME* because of their '*relatively* low' frequency of occurrence. The present dissertation will be exempt from such a constraint: some lexical items may occur just once in my whole corpus, whereas others may co-occur frequently across my set of texts, but only frequency *within* the set of accounts/inventories can be meaningful in tracing graphemic variation (e.g. the choice of *stone/stan(e)/stayn/*etc., which may have dialectal significance). The main problem with low-frequency items is inherent in its nature, that is, the insufficient amount of textual evidence attesting to their use or even their meaning, something which may be problematic from a semantic or dialectal viewpoint. On the one hand, poor contextual cues and wrong inferences may lead to erroneous semantic interpretations. Generally, far more words are now included in historical dictionaries than in the past, and even if they are not, their approximate sense may be obtained through their etymology or related cognate words from other languages.

On the other hand, a lexeme could potentially be misinterpreted as northern just because of the provenance of the (sometimes few) attestations compiled in dictionaries; the extent to which one can rely on dictionary evidence as representative of the medieval uses of a given word may be questionable, but it is worth going back to the philological method aforementioned. Certainly, there would be debatable cases in which any statement can only be tentative; however, if phonological/spelling and lexical evidence from a number of lexicographical works seem to point to a particular distribution, the likelihood of a word being a northern form cannot be dismissed. I will, therefore, assess all the existing evidence in as much detail as necessary.

A cautionary note is here worth stating: no scribal identification or profiling has ever been made for my corpus, the main reason being the overall lack of information about the scribes involved in these texts' production. We may learn about the scribes'

---

[40] *A Corpus of Narrative Etymologies from Proto-Old English to Early Middle English and Accompanying Corpus of Changes*, comp. by Lass, Laing, Alcorn, and Williamson (2003–) <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/CoNE/CoNE.html>.

salaries, but they usually remain unnamed (e.g. 'scriptori compoti et alia necessaria, 3s.' 'the writing of accounts and other necessary things, 3s.' (*DAR*, Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 170);[41] 'In pergameno cum salario scriptoris compoti iij s. iiij d.' 'In parchment along with the salary of the scribes writing the accounts, 3 s. 4 d.' (*Jarrow Accounts*, Item LVI, Raine 1854: 60)). Only in a few cases the commissioners seem to be mentioned in accounts,[42] assuming that the masters were summoned but did not necessarily act as scribes themselves. The historians who edited the texts were not primarily concerned with *who* produced the accounts but *what* was in them; scribal continuity/discontinuity is very occasionally pointed out in some of the editions[43], which may help to elucidate the preference for particular dialectally marked forms. If more information can be gleaned from the extant documents, it may advance our knowledge of administrative scribal production in northern England.

The creation of scribal profiles in the fashion of *LALME* would be much more problematic—if not unfeasible—mainly because I can only draw on nouns, (a few) adjectives, verbs, and plural-noun markers (i.e. *-s/-es/-is/-ys/Ø*). No other *English* traces are left, in contrast to the sources for *LALME*. The other side of the coin is that, for the purposes of this dissertation, the kind of data subject to analysis is not so overarching and its occurrence across time and space can be monitored more closely. Thus, all the kinds of evidence discussed by McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin (graphological, phonological, morphological, and lexical) will be represented, in differing degrees, in this dissertation, and another dimension will be tangentially added: semantics. For taxonomical purposes, I will adopt the well-established concept of *semantic fields*, sometimes understood with the more encompassing and flexible category of 'associate fields' (Sylvester, Marcus, and Ingham 2017: 310), which may better capture the nature of medieval documents and their organising principles.

[41] This is the system that I will be using to cite the *DAR* material: roll reference + the page number in which it can be found in Fowler's (1898-1901) multi-volume edition. The page numbers across the three volumes are consecutive, which facilitates the finding of the reference. All English translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

[42] For instance, in those for the monastic cells of Jarrow we find 'Status domus de jarow per dominum johannem swain deliberatus domino willelmo ogill anno domini […] Nonogesimo primo' (Item CXLVI, Raine 1854: 128), and in the *DAR* 'Et solvit Will'mo Gybson, scrpitori, pro scriptura et notacione quir' quatuor cum pergameno pro capella B. M. Magd., 5s.' (Rott. Elemos. 1484-5, 249).

[43] I will discuss this point in greater depth in Section 3.1.

Sylvester, Marcus, and Ingham (2017: 310-312) exemplify how, in their *Bilingual Thesaurus of Everyday Life in Medieval England*,[44] their broader categories (e.g. 'farming' would include 'animals' and 'plants') do not fully match up with those in the *HTOED*, which are categorised into different separate entries (e.g. 'animals' and 'plants' are separate entries within 'the world' entry).

As for my corpus, the occasional arrangement into locative sub-headings—often introduced by paragraph marks—facilitates this approach. Some of the headings are *camera* ('chamber' ['bedroom']), *coquina* ('kitchen'), *panetria* ('pantry'), *pistrina* ('bakery'), *lardaria* ('a room used for storage of meat'), *stabulo* ('stable'), *bovaria* ('cow-shed'), *porcarius* ('swineherd'), *granario* ('granary'), *dayria* ('dairy'), *grangia* ('barn'), and *ecclesia* ('church'). However, there are many rolls with other structural principles, whose sections are based on expenses (*exp.*), items received (*recepta*), and other transactions which agglomerate lexis that is not semantically related. Even within 'associate fields', the *DAR* material tends to be miscellaneous and does not necessarily have to correspond to rigid taxonomies. The layout of the documents per se did not determine the application of different protocols. In other words, regardless of whether the surrounding textual environment is a list of unconnected lexical items or not, the procedure followed was the same. The co-text would be an issue central to the analysis of northern specific lexemes: do they occur in proximity to other northern-specific words? Is there variation between dialectally marked and unmarked forms within the space of a few lines? Section 4 on NME tackles these questions in greater detail. The next section (Section 3), devoted to the general analysis of the *DAR* vernacular vocabulary, opens with a discussion of taxonomical questions such as the boundary between code-switching and borrowing, evaluating productive ways of approaching lexis whose classification on different fronts (etymology, morphology, and more broadly typologically) is complex.

[44] This project, based at the University of Westminster and Birmingham City University, will allow researchers to examine Middle English and Anglo-Norman vocabulary in seven occupational domains (building, farming, domestic activities, food preparation/cooking, manufacture, trade, and travel by water).

3. Analysis of the vernacular vocabulary

At the very heart of the analysis that will unfold are a number of questions on which modern researchers have recurrently ruminated: how do we typologically classify the vernacular vocabulary in multilingual texts and, more specifically for the purposes of this thesis, in administrative documents? Is it in French, Middle English, or both? To what extent is it integrated/unintegrated into Medieval Latin? As has already been discussed in the Introduction, a popular way of conceptualising lexical material from several languages has been in terms of borrowings/code-switches from an embedded language(s) into a matrix language. On-going research over the last decades has proven the impossibility of establishing hard and fast boundaries between medieval languages (inter alia, Trotter 2000; 2011; Ingham 2010; Hunt 2011; Schendl and Wright 2011), which hinders the operability of this binary: conceptualising medieval languages as distinguished/distinguishable does not fully capture the intricate linguistic ecology of late medieval England and medieval Europe in general. Tangible proof of this is the large shared stock of vocabulary included in the *DMLBS,* the *MED,* and the *OED.* Even if integration has often been one of the main measuring factors in deciding whether a particular word is a borrowing or not, the presence of vernacular items in both their unintegrated (i.e. without Latin inflections) and integrated version in a Medieval Latin text adds an extra layer of complexity. Code-switching and borrowing can, thus, be better represented along a continuum (Myers-Scotton 2002: 153-63; Gardner-Chloros 2009: 30-3; Matras 2009: 110-14; Schendl 2013: 48), and many researchers such as Sylvester (2017) opt for a more flexible approach by not making any assumptions about the status of the vocabulary as code-switches. Picone (1994) puts forward a third alternative to 'borrowing' and 'code-switching': the creation of an intermediate, neutralised, 'buffer code' (1994: 271), whereby the borrowing/code-switch dichotomy is suspended. This non-binary conceptualisation epitomises the kind of theoretical basis that should underpin our understanding of multilingual material. The main question to be posed here, therefore, should not be whether we are dealing with

either borrowings or code-switches from the vernaculars into Medieval Latin,[45] but rather, what are the etymological narratives of the lexis which made its way into the *DAR*? According to Fischer's (2003) classification of 'typologies of lexical borrowing', this analysis would roughly fall into the 'morpho-etymological' or 'morphological' typologies which 'focus on the formal aspects of borrowings and take into account both their etymology and their morphology as lexemes of the borrowing language' (Fischer 2003: 98).[46] Fischer traces the development of these typologies to Betz (1974 [devised between 1936 and 1949]) and Haugen (1950). Betz (1936) first discussed Latin loanwords in Old High German and distinguished 'Lehnwörter' from 'Lehnprägungen', making a further distinction between 'Lehnbidungen' and 'Lehnbedeutungen' within the latter class, which is at the same time made up of several sub-categories. On the other hand, Haugen (1950) devised a three-fold taxonomy for his analysis of Norwegian loanwords in American English: loan-words (which correspond to Betz's 'Lehnwörter' and exhibit no morphological substitution), loan blends, an intermediate phenomenon characterised by the morphological substitution and importation of the material, and loan shifts, in which there is no importation but only substitution. Carstensen (1968) merged the two typologies and provided the terminological basis that would be later used and refined in the years to come. Similarly to Serjeantson's (1935) monograph, the subsequent sections will tackle what have been considered borrowings with importation (and not substitution).

---

[45]The vast majority of these lexemes came to be accepted as *borrowings* into English at some point in history, that is, even if *OED* editors, present and past, might have had their doubts when deciding whether an earlier attestation really exemplifies their use in English or in another language (typically, French), their later diachronic treatment and use in the language makes them 'English'. In Roig-Marín (forthcoming (2020)), I discuss the problem with the *OED* entries relying on just one attestation by problematising *OED3* (2009), s.v. †*achaque*.

[46] Fischer (2003: 98) details two other main classifications: lexicosemantic or semantic typologies (102-106) and socio-historical or sociolinguistic ones (106-110). Semantic approaches fundamentally conceptualise loanwords in terms of (1) lexical and semantic intake, (2) lexical replacement, (3) lexical import and subsequent semantic change (semantic differentiation) and (4) semantic change due to contact (semantic borrowing), whereas distinctions such as *language maintenance* vs. *language shift* (Thomason and Kaufman 1988) are very relevant to socio-linguistic orientations. In reality, these taxonomies interact with each other, and despite their relevance to much of the vocabulary that will be discussed in this etymology section, the present dissertation will not specifically follow any of these because of the very multilingual nature of the textual sources used and the difficulties they present.

In some cases, we can establish the directionality of well-established borrowings into the vernacular(s) with a certain degree of confidence: for example, on chronological grounds, a borrowing from Old Norse would occur in Middle English or be mediated through Middle English rather than having been directly borrowed from Old Norse into Anglo-French.[47] Yet, since that particular vernacular word could have been employed in Anglo-French as well (a scenario which may not be reflected in the *AND* in its present form) and their immediate source language in *DAR* is often unclear,[48] only the main underlying language(s) will be the primary object of this etymological enquiry: Anglo-French, Old Norse, and Middle Dutch. Deciding whether the etymology of a vernacular lexical item indeed coincides with its direct 'donor language'[49] in these particular texts seems to run against the permeable boundaries which characterised medieval languages, especially in the context of late medieval England, which is why no such speculative claims will be made. It is worth remembering that the lexicographical evidence that will be adduced in this thesis is somewhat partial: the most complete historical dictionary that exists and will be employed, the *OED*, traces the development of each word in English, which may not correlate with the route that word followed into a Medieval Latin text. That is why I will here pursue a probabilistic exercise based on etymology and not so much on the typological status of the material at the time, thereby leaving aside the thorny question of whether a lexeme can be deemed a code-switch or a borrowing in the *DAR*. The morphological cues which often serve to classify the lexical material in the *DAR* (e.g. the presence of Latin inflectional endings) will be problematised throughout this dissertation in an attempt to create a more comprehensive view of the range of morphemes available to the scribes involved in the production of these accounts.

---

[47] There might be borrowings from Norse into Old (Continental) French as well, but for the purposes of this dissertation, they will not be considered.

[48] The *OED*, especially in its third edition, often includes comments such as 'it is unclear whether the following shows the English or the Anglo-Norman word' when citing examples from this kind of multilingual material (e.g. *OED* (2008), s.v. † *sport*, n.2). The *AND* and *MED* are more inclusive as far as multilingual sources are concerned even if many manuscripts still remain unpublished.

[49] The labels 'donor/receiver language' and 'source/borrowing language' will be mainly used to discuss borrowings in the history of English.

The provisional list of c. 1600 words (including multiple-word units but not counting spelling variants)[50] was arranged into several spreadsheets by the main language of origin (Anglo-French, Old English, Old Norse, Middle Dutch, and a miscellaneous category for other languages whose contributions are uncertain and, hence, could not have fully-fledged sections like the aforementioned languages). I necessarily had to discard words which neither the present state of lexicographical scholarship nor my own enquiry had been able to trace: some of them are difficult to pin down because of the lack of contextual cues (e.g. **foraiwes** (Rott. Hostill. 1371, 130), and **Chiltons**[51] (Rott. Bursar. 1406-7, 606), while others are specific material objects (e.g. a **scowler** (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1422-3, 271), a name given to 'a window in the Infirmary hall', **Warde** (Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89) 'a kind of large pot' [*magna olla*], **Eden** (Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89) 'a kind of vessel', or **nole** (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1384-5 (verso), 264, 'a particular cup') or names denoting parts of a building (e.g. **Barry** (Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso) 148)*,* **Chapelhende** (preceded by 'vocata' in Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1447-8, 275),[52] **chinon** ('le Chinon', Rott. Hostill. 1370-9, 129) or **halieland** (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1442-3, 275) meaning different 'kinds of rooms'), as can be inferred from such constructions as 'in alia camera/-e voc.'

In the *DAR* and multilingual texts more generally, the marker *voc./vocat*., *-a*, *-e*, *-ur* 'called/is called' generally introduces vocabulary in the vernaculars and more rarely in ML (there is one example in the *DAR*, i.e., 'pro 6 acris prati vocati pratum Terrarii in Edmondens' (Rott. Terrar. 1507-8, 307)) or in a combination of vernacular and Latin elements ('pro facture Cinefactorii voc. le Barowe Coquine' (Rott. Celer. 1467-8, 92) or 'j claus. vocat. quarer. celerar.' (Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 67) and 'liber vocatus cartuarium' (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245)). *Vocat* usually precedes toponyms, including prates (e.g. 'prato voc. Hostillermedow' (Rott. Hostill. 1528-9, 162) 'pratorum vocat. Bownelez'

[50] A few words not explicitly included in the database because they do not exist as such in the vernaculars are ML derivations based on ME or AF like **tiketo** 'sort of material used to make pillow or quilt, 'ticking'' (*DMLBS*, s.v. *tiketum*), with only one attestation (from the *DAR*) in that dictionary, or **blodius** 'blue' or 'blue cloth' (*DMLBS*, s.v. *blodius* [OF *bleu*, *blou* v. et. *blavus*, *bludus*]).

[51] Capital letters are preserved as rendered in the editions unless the word is also attested in lower case, in which case the latter variant is preferred. The order of the lexemes within a particular series follows their attestations in the *DAR* editions.

[52] Unlike most of these elusive words, **chapelhende** is attested at least twice in the edited rolls (see also 'le chapelhende' in Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1450-1, 276).

(Rott. Bursar. 1536-7)), springs ('le Spreyng voc. Shynkleybanke' (Rott. Hostill. 1480-1, 157)), bridges ('reparac. unius pontis voc. Chapmanbrig' Rott. Terrar. [date gone, in modern hand 1429], 304), or enclosures ('unius claus. vocat. Westrydyng sive Powterclosse' (Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 669), 'j claus. vocat. Ferthyngcroft' (Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 67) 'unius claus. vocat. North Rauynsflatt' (Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 696)). Some references seem to have been particularly meaningful to the community of Durham Cathedral or, in other words, context-dependent: Durham-specific spatial references ('et domum latimarum (sic) voc. Westhous' Rott. Hostill. 1513-4, 161[53]), particular animals (e.g. 'cum quodam equo Regis vocato Morell de Cobham' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1336, 531)), or objects ('una crux nigra que vocatur Blak rode of Scotland […] Item una crux que vocatur Sancte Margarete regine Scocie' Liber de Reliquiis 1383, 426). These are invaluable sources of inside information, which can be exploited in historical research. Yet, since the primary interest of this dissertation is in common nouns, only those were systematically compiled, a task which resulted in a tentative list of 43 such lexical items. Three of them contain the word *chambr'* (**Clerkechaumbre**, **Knyghtchambr'**, and **Kyngeschaumbr'**), although the 'called'-constructions represent a wide range of semantic fields, ranging from taxes ('15 bond. in precio 37 quar. di. ordii vocat. Havermaltes' (Rott. Bursar. 1546-7, 676), 'cum decem boll avene que vocatur Scathaver de bondis de Heworth' (Rott. Camer. 1344-5, 172)), kinds of cloths ('2 pannis vulgo voc. pant^{a} bredcloth' (Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 659), 2 fuerunt de blodio mixto vocato Cogsale, '8 uln. panni vocat. Herdyng' (Rott. Celer. c. 1430, 60), 'v^{xx} xij uln. panni linei vocat. Holandecloth (Rott. Hostill. 1485-6, 157)), utensils (e.g. 'j pelvis cum foraminibus vocata j Syle' (Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89)), and animals ('una ove vocata a hog' (Rott. Camer. 1498-9, 194),[54] 'cum quodam equo Regis vocato Morell' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1336, 541)). This Latin participle functions as a textual marker to introduce mostly vernacular lexical material: the general structure is made up of a Latin lexeme, typically, the superordinate term (e.g. *morbo* 'disease' in 'quodam morbo voc. le redeyll' (Rott. Instaur. 1417, 318) or *libri* 'of the book' 'pro ligatura cujusdam libri vocati le landmalebok', Rott. Bursar. 1416-7, 614), followed by *voc.* or variants + the

[53] On the broader history of house-naming practices in Britain, particularly in London, see Wright (2020).
[54] Note the unusual insertion of the English indefinite article *a* after *vocata* in this construction.

vernacular lexeme in question. Only the French article—not this construction—has been addressed in previous research, described as a textual marker from the mid 15th century onwards, when it departed from its predicted usage as a definite marker. In Section 3.1.2.2, I argue that the definite function of *le* seems to be preserved within the ecosystem of ML despite the non-grammatical structures in which it is later found. Similar unexpected syntactic patterns occur in some constructions containing *voc.*: for instance, a numeral is inserted between *vocata* and the vernacular word in 'j pelvis cum foraminibus vocata j Syle' (Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89) and the indefinite article in 'vocata a hog' (see Note 48). The gender and number of *voc*. is often suspended through the use of the truncated forms *vocat*./*voc*., often indicated by a sign of abbreviation such as the punctus (e.g. 'j rod. di. vocat. Delf' or 'in quadam camera voc. Clerkechaumbre'). When it is written in full, it tends to agree with the immediate surrounding textual elements (e.g. '2 fuerunt de blodio mixto vocato Cogsale' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1419?, 616), '2 p^{c} salis vocati Courtceldres' (Rott. Bursar. 1432-3, 622), 'cum quodam equo Regis vocato Morell' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1336, 531), even if they do not agree in number with the referent, 'the head', given afterwards (see 'cujusdam libri vocati le landmalebok' (Rott. Bursar. 1416-7, 614), 'unius plumbi vocati le Burulede' (Rott. Bursar. 1476-7, 646)). Variation in gender in its use when referring to the same entity cannot be traced because the full gender-inflected forms, if attested, often alternate with the abbreviated ones across rolls (see 'voc. Hoglyng close' (Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 107) and 'vocata Hoglyngclouse' (Rott. Celer. 1534-35, 112)). In the nature of the French article, the same lexeme may be found with and without *voc.*,[55] although there is a tendency for *voc.* to co-occur in the same roll with different lexemes (see, e.g., 'vocat. Culyngleydez' and 'voc. Brewleddez' within the same paragraph (Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 656), or 'vocat. Havermaltes' and 'vocat. Colthaver' (Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 676)). Therefore, there are some parallel developments between the French article and *voc.*, even if *voc.* consistently preserves its function as a textual marker.

[55] See **langsedile** with 'voc.' in Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 148, and without it in Rott. Elemos. 1352-3, 208 (langsedil) or in Rott. Elemos. 1515-6, 253 (longsedle (le)); also 'voc Slawghtermanhowse' (Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 106), 'vocato slawghterman housse' (Rott. Celer. 1534-5, 109) vs. **Slaughtermanhous** (Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 88), Slawghtermanhows (Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 104), and Slaughtermanhouse (Rott. Celer. 1534-5, 112).

In addition, I created sub-groups and classified the vocabulary according to whether it was made up of several elements (e.g., N+N and Adj+N) or just one. It is worth pointing out that the boundaries between phrases and complex word formations are not as clear-cut as they may seem (more on this taxonomical difficulty in 3.3), so, a priori, I did not exclude any lexical combinations involving a vernacular word. In Section 3.3, I will examine multiple-element units in these rolls, placing the simplistic textbook narrative claiming that compounding in ME was superseded by borrowing (usually from French) under scrutiny. That section also considers the reliability of graphematic evidence for the study of complex lexical units.

After classifying all the vocabulary, I performed a semantic analysis: I made use of the *HTOED* categories (with a few adjustments), when available, and took into account the larger semantic networks offered in the *OED*, which usually encompass semantically related words from the OE period (if existent and if the word in question is included in the *OED*) onwards. The semantic component of the vocabulary present in these Latin texts is particularly relevant to our understanding of the main realms in which the vernacular was employed (in lieu of or at the same time as their Latin counterparts) and in which English borrowed lexemes from other languages as well. The present chapter, as well as Chapter 4 on NME, tangentially addresses semantics across its various sections (3-3.3). Most of the sections in 3 and 4 cross-refer to appendices at the end of this dissertation which list all the spelling variants of words found in the classifications discussed in the body of the text. These classifications, if any, may be based on semantics (Appendix 1 on OE-origin simplexes and Appendix 2 on AF simplexes) or on formal criteria in the case of ON-derived lexis (Appendix 3) or NME (Appendices 6). I have keyed the headwords in bold into the Appendices, although if more than one spelling variant occurs in the *DAR*, only the first attestation in the editions has been emboldened in both the appendices and the body of the text. The order of appearance of the occurrences mirrors the one in the editions unless otherwise stated.

3.1 Major source languages

French-origin lexemes are, by far, the most numerous in my database, 704 lexical units are or at least contain French-origin elements (44.06% of the total *DAR* vernacular vocabulary), conforming to the general trend in Middle English. Morphology is usually a reliable diagnostic parameter to establish whether a particular word comes from French and not from Latin. Yet, as Durkin (cf. 2014: 244) highlights, Latin borrowings into medieval English (particularly, early Middle English) could 'easily have occurred as learned borrowings in French as well, in forms corresponding to those found in English', which is why negative evidence—the fact that a word (or a sense) is not recorded in French or at least at a particular date—is usually invoked. The difficulties in deciding whether a lexeme comes directly from Latin or through French become particularly apparent in the *DAR*. There is a non-negligible number of words whose etymology and/or route(s) of entry into English is complex, and even more so in the context of multilingual texts.[56] These etymologies are often described in the *OED* as 'multiple', a label that encapsulates other possible scenarios involving genetically proximate languages: apart from Latin and the Romance languages, the Germanic languages in their northern branch (Old Norse) or the West Germanic varieties, Middle Dutch/Low German, might have contributed in several degrees and forms and at different points in history to the adoption of a particular word.

The individual inputs of each language to the *DAR* lexical make-up may give a somewhat fragmented view of the actual synergies between Medieval Latin and the vernaculars, which can be best apprehended in context. Even if attention is given to the main semantic fields susceptible to receiving influences from the vernaculars (OE, AF, ON, and MDut), I will here give some longer sample passages illustrating the interplay between languages in two rolls (see Roig-Marín 2018a for a similar analysis of the Jarrow Account Rolls and Inventories). The excerpts below are arranged, in the original manuscripts, into locative headings rather than the more usual structure which opens with *expens.* (expenses)*, recept.* (receipts), *reparaciones* (reparations)*, allocaciones* (allocations)*,* or other all-encompassing descriptors which provide series

[56] The etymology of a number of lexical items in the *DAR* still remains unknown (c. 40), uncertain/doubtful (31), or obscure (14).

of more loosely connected vocabulary often without any underlying semantic connections.[57] As has been pointed out in Section 1.3, a textual arrangement based on locatives facilitates a lexico-semantic study; limitations are, however, imposed by the different distributions of the rolls themselves since sections vary from roll to roll. The first two examples below are taken from Rott. Elemos. 1464-65, 243-244, and the third one from Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245-246. Because some of the lexical items are wanting on the former (paper) roll, I have selected two of the most complete sections, under the headings *aula* and *coquina*, and etymologically tagged their nouns and adjectives; the third example, from a different roll, presents a rarer heading in the *DAR*, *stabulum* (only found once in the whole edited collection, with the exception of *Stabulum Bursarii* in Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 636), which is why it is reproduced here as well.[58] Not all sections contain the same amount of vernacular vocabulary in the *DAR* rolls: for instance, the *Capella Infirmarie* heading contains significantly less. This is mainly because some religious-related objects are preserved in CL (see *calix argent*, *messale, stola,* etc.) even if the vernaculars also creep in, particularly in reference to textiles (see 'ij towelles pro altari', 'j coverlyde coram altare' (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 246)). This paragraph-based approach is, therefore, productive only to a certain extent, which is why it was not pursued further in the present study.

Excerpts from Rott. Elemos. 1464-65, 243-244:

> *Aula* [CL]. In primis [CL] j dorsale [LL] paylde [OF] de sago [CL: ML infl. by AF] blodeo [ML < OF *bleu, blou*] et rubeo [ML]. Item ij nova [CL] banquererez (sic) [OF]. Item alia [CL] ij banquerez [AF] vetustate [LL] consumpta [CL]. Item vj qwyshyns [AF] de opere [CL] Flandrensi [ML] cum scriptura [CL] de le Roy [OF] in eisdem. Item alia iiij qwyssyng' [AF] cooperta [CL] cum nigro [LL] sago [CL: ML infl. by AF]. Item iiij tabule [CL] mensales [LL]. Item iij paria [ML < CL *par*] de trysdelez [OF]. Item iij formule [CL]. Item j cathedra [CL]. Item j candelabrum [CL] ferreum [CL] fixum [ML] in pariete [CL]. Item j por [MDut] pro igne [CL]. Item ij pelves [CL] cum lavacris [CL].

[57] Some of these sections indicate the departmental locations of those receipts/expenses, hence, semantically forming a more cohesive group of lexical items (e.g. *expense sartrine*).
[58] The translations are my own.

Hall. Firstly, 1 striped dossal of blue and red say. And 2 new bankers. And 2 other bankers deteriorated by age. And 6 cushions of Flemish work with an inscription of the King in them. And other 4 cushions covered with black say. And 4 table napkins. And 3 pairs of trestles. And 3 benches. And 1 chair. And 1 iron candle fixed on a wall. And 1 fire poker for the fire. And 2 shallow basins for washing.

Coquina [CL]. In primis j olla [CL] erea [ML] fixa [ML] in fornace [CL]. Item iiij olle [CL] eree [ML] majores [CL]. Item iiij^{or} olle [CL] minores [CL]. Item j magna [CL] patella [CL]. Item iij ȝetlynges [ME: OE + suffix]. Item j schawfour [OF] pro cibis [CL] reparandis [CL]. Item ij rakkez [?OE] de ferro [CL]. Item ij veruta [CL] ferrea [CL]. Item j par [CL] de potclyps [OE + OE]. Item j brandreth [ON] cum iiij^{or} costis [CL] ferreis [CL]. Item j brandreth [ON] rotundum [CL]. Item j flechcrok [OE + OE]. Item j hausorium [ML] cupreum [ML]. Item j scomer [OF] de arecalco [ML].[59] Item j craticula [CL] ferrea [CL]. Item j mortariolum [LL] ereum [ML] cum pilo [CL]. Item ij mortariola [LL] lapidea [CL] cum j pilo [CL] ligneo [CL]. Item j dressyngknyff [OF + OE]. Item j swetstan [OE]. Item j miour [OF] de stanno [CL]. Item j tribula [CL] ferrea [CL]. Item j por [MDut] pro igne [CL]. Item j candelabrum [CL] ferreum [CL] fixum [ML] in pariete [CL]. Item j mell [OF]. Item j dressyngbourde [OF + OE]. Item j barell [OF] pro veriuto [AF]. Item j archa [CL; cf. OF *arche*] in camera [CL] inferiori [CL]. Item barow cloose [OE + OF]. Item iij scale [ON] majores [CL] et minores [CL]. Item j trow [OE].

Kitchen. Firstly, 1 copper pot fixed in a furnace. And 4 larger copper pots. And 4 minor pots. And 1 large pan. And 3 cooking vessels of cast metal. And 1 kettle for food which is to be repaired. And 2 iron racks [for kitchen use]. And 2 iron broaches. And 1 par of pot-clips. And 1 gridiron with 4 iron bars. And 1 round gridiron. And 1 flesh-crook. And 1 ladle made from copper. And 1 skimmer made from mountain copper. And 1 iron griddle/gridiron. And 1 little copper mortar with a pestle. And 2 little stone mortars with a wooden pestle. And 1 dressing knife. And 1 whetstone. And 1 grater made from tin. And 1 iron scoop. And 1 fire poker for the fire. And 1 iron candle fixed on a wall. And 1 great hammer. And 1 dressing-board. And 1 barrel for verjuice. And 1 casket in the lower chamber. And 1 covered barrow. And 3 larger and smaller scales. And 1 trough.

[59] As Fowler (1901: 892) clarifies, *auricalcum* seems to be a corruption of *orichalcum*, 'a kind of brass, gold-mestling'.

Excerpt from Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245:

> Stabulum. In primis ij equi [CL]. Item ij colle [ML inf. by OF],[60] et ij colle [ML inf. by OF] antique [CL]. Item j ladesadyll [OE + OE]. Item iiij gyrthez [ON]. Item iiij frena [CL]. Item ij cloþis [OE] to lay [OE] under þ^{e} sadlys [OE]. Item ij horscolers [OE + OF]. Item j hors came [OE compound]. Item j saccus [CL]. Item ij yrenfork' [OE + OE]. Item j barowe [OE]. Item j pyke pro feno [CL] extrahendo [CL]. Item j pype [ML/OF] pro prebenda [ML] equorum [CL].
>
> Stable. Firstly, two horses. And 2 horse-collars, and 2 old horse-collars. And 1 load-saddle. And 3 girths. And 4 horse's bridles. And 2 cloths to lay under the saddles. And 2 horse-collars. And 1 horse comb. And 1 sack. And 2 iron forks. And 1 barrow. And 1 pike to extract hay. And 1 pipe [part of horse harness] for food for horses.

The etymologies of the lexis above evince a number of CL/LL-origin lexemes or those formed in ML (e.g. **rubeus** < CL *ruber* + *-eus*). Since French and/or English appropriated some of these lexemes (**dorsale**, **formule**, **sack** (cf. *sacc* < Latin *saccus*), **pype** [ML] also in French (route of entry of the English word)), their reading as either ML or vernacular is often unproductive. Only the development of a specific sense or morphology in the vernacular departing from its Latin etymon can be of assistance in attempting to delineate their immediate source language. Examples include **sago**, meaning 'say'; the CL etymon, *sagus* refers to 'coarse woollen cloak', so the sense found here seems to be derived from AF *seie*, *saie*, *soie* (also in ME) 'say' (cf. *DMLBS*, s.v. 1 *sagum*, 1 *sagus*)). Another example is **fornace**, borrowed from French *fornais* into English (*OED* (1898), s.v. *furnace*, n.) but here present in the form of the Latin etymon *fornace*, or **formule**, meaning 'benches' in ML, a sense not found in English or French (see Section 3.1.2.3 for a lengthier discussion of these issues and their implications for the study of multilingual lexis). **Formule** also reveals another peculiarity of the *DAR* vocabulary, namely the absence of a plural marker morpheme[61]

---

[60] *DMLBS*, s.v. 2 *collare* [CL; cf. OF *coler*, *coliere*], *collium*, *collius*, *collia*.

[61] In this dissertation, this phenomenon is referred to as zero-plural marking, although *sensu stricto* the absence of the plural morpheme does not involve a zero or null morpheme and should be understood in the context of ML, characterised by scribal innovation in the usage of declensions.

across lexemes regardless of their vernacular/Latin origin (see **olle** (CL), **formule** (CL) and **scale** (ON), **colle** (CL/ML *collare,* ML *collia, -um, -us* influenced by OF *coler*)). The pattern in 'iij scale majores et minores' is paralleled in 'iiij olle eree majores', which might indicate a scribal convention of omitting the *-s/-z*, particularly but not exclusively, in NPs where Ns are postmodified by adjectives.[62]

The scribes' insightful and flexible command of the vernaculars and Latin is exemplified by the use of synonyms across languages, as in **brandreth** (ON) ('j brandreth rotundum') and **craticula** (CL) ('j craticula ferrea'), both meaning (according to our present understanding of these words) 'gridiron'. Below are phrases entirely made up of Latin-origin vocabulary (e.g. 'Item j candelabrum [CL] ferreum [CL] fixum [ML] in pariete [CL]') as well as composed of vernacular lexical items in tandem with Latin (e.g. 'Item vj qwyshyns [AF] de opere [CL] Flandrensi [ML]'). What is meant by 'Latin' is earlier periods of Latin (CL/LL) or Medieval Latin lexemes not found in the vernaculars. The vernacular/Latin distinction is greatly eroded by the vast amount of vernacular vocabulary that was incorporated into Medieval Latin (see, e.g., 'Item j barell [ML *barellus*, *barellum*, *barella* < OF *baril* 'barrell'] pro veriuto' [ML *verjutum* < AN *verjous*, OF *vergus*, ME *verjous* 'verjuice']). This permeability affects nouns and also some adjectives like names of colours (e.g. **blodeo** < OF *bleu, blou*; *DMLBS*, s.v. *blodius*). Not only is the French-origin vocabulary remarkable in these paragraphs but also that of OE origin (see Section 3.1.1 below): the vocabulary related to the 'stable' includes **ladesadyll** (OE + OE), **hors came** (a compound already in OE), **barowe** (OE), **horscolers** (OE + OF) (more on multi-word lexical units in 3.3). Whole syntactic units in French or in English also occur in 'cum scriptura de le Roy' (Rott. Elemos. 1464-65, 244) and 'ij cloþis to lay under þ^{e} sadlys' (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245). These would be classified as embedded-language islands in ML, the matrix language, according to the aforementioned Matrix Language Framework (Myers-Scotton 1993) and the latter in English would be symptomatic of a stage of 'moribund switching' according to Wright's (1998, 2012) study of multilingual writing. However, as has been cursorily explained in the Introduction, rather than part of a process of Anglicisation, this seems to be an

[62] The lack of the plural marker is also recorded in words occurring on their own. Its presence in two identical constructions might be simply due to the scribe's re-use of the same structure. Whole sentences are indeed copied verbatim under two different sections within the same roll: 'Item j por pro igne' and 'Item j candelabrum ferreum fixum in pariete'.

isolated case in the *DAR* corpus; there are no other such instances in the material examined by the editor or myself (see, e.g. the last roll of the Rott. Magistr. Inf. dated to 1526-7 (283-284), which has few unadapted vernacular lexical items or Rott. Bursar. 1536-37 (667-707) given in extenso).[63] Finally, the dialectal dimension of the scribes' vernacular surfaces even in these short excerpts: the northern words **ȝetlynges**, **potclyps**, and **mell** will be further discussed in Chapter 4.

3.1.1 Old English

Compared to the other major source languages in the *DAR*, Anglo-French, Old Norse, and Middle Dutch, Old English was a source of vocabulary historically native to the country for much longer; through the filter of Medieval Latin these languages are on more equal grounds, contributing with vernacular material to the lexis of the *DAR*. Despite the role of French as the default language of communication in the management of estates among the higher officers during this period,[64] English played an important part in conceptualising both basic, hyperonymic, vocabulary (e.g. **nallez** and **pan**) and, more often, technical lexis in the form of 'basic-level terms' (Croft and Cruse 2004; Sylvester 2018) or hyponyms (see also Section 3.1.2.4). Basic-level terms are further down the semantic hierarchy and, therefore, are semantically more specific than superordinates. However, a term may belong to a basic-level category for speakers with a good command of the subject matter but at the same time it may not be 'a satisfactory basic-level term for one who has limited experience of it' (Sylvester 2018: 255; see Cruse 2004: 96-7). Both basic-level terms and hyponyms tend to be multi-word lexical items in the *DAR* which can be fully made of OE-origin vocabulary, exclusively of borrowings or, more generally, be a combination of native material and

[63] In rolls like Rott. Sacrist. 1535-6, the editor has a more erratic policy of translating/summarising the original text into PDE and reproducing the original roll in quotation marks back and forth, so the boundaries between the editor's rendering of the text and the original MS are less defined. The language in the translation is, nevertheless, clearly not coetaneous with the rest of the text in monolingual ME as found in the extracts from Treasurers' Books 1569-1580, 714-717, or the Miscellanea 1293-1542. Future research should go beyond accounts and investigate this additional material for comparative purposes.

[64] See Ingham (2012) and well-known works such as Bibbesworth's *Le Tretiz*, a tool for teaching young aristocrats French terminology which would have been useful in an agricultural context.

borrowings from ON, AF, or MDut already integrated into ME. They would have functioned as collocations or conceptual lexical units in the scribes' ordinary speech, thus being often embedded in the accounts with varying degrees of integration into Medieval Latin through the use of case endings, suspension marks, or zero morphemes, and they could also be partly rendered in Latin, giving rise to hybrid creations, as illustrated in Section 3.3. The exploration of 263 simplex (one-element) OE-origin forms may also unveil another source of not only basic-level terms but also more specialised terminology. Some examples from the most representative semantic domains will be given and their relation to Classical/Late Latin and Medieval Latin adumbrated: how many of them are early OE borrowings from Latin? Do they coexist with the Latin stems that were the source of the Old English words? Are the OE-origin words widely found in Medieval Latin (see *DMLBS*)?

One of the most comprehensive and important earliest lists of Latin-origin borrowings in OE was Serjeantson's (1935), with more than 520 borrowings; as Durkin (2014: 100) rightly points out, some are rather dubious and there are some omissions in Serjeantson's Appendix, as also of material mentioned in the body of her text. Once the *DOE* comes to fruition, a more complete understanding of the OE word-stock will be acquired, including the c. 600 relatively secure borrowings from pre-conquest Latin (Durkin 2014: 100; see also Wollmann 1993 and Scheler 1997 for earlier estimations).[65] A recurring methodological pitfall from a monolingual lexicographical perspective is precisely how to approach Latin borrowings which preserve their inflection in OE and, therefore, are not always 'integrated' (see, e.g., the OE forms under *OED* (2001), s.v. *mat*, n.[1]). It is worth noting that out of the early Latin-origin borrowings into English in the *DAR*, *capon, psalter*, and *butter* preserve their ML declensional paradigm along with their abbreviated forms (ML rather than CL as their endings do not fully match up with the expected case endings of the original CL declensions): **boutiri**, *butir, butir', Butir., butiro, butir, butiri* (CL *būtȳrum*), **capon'**, *capone, caponibus, capon., caponum, capones* (CL *capō*), and **psalterium**, *psalterio, psalterii* (sing.), *psalteria* (CL *psaltērium*). The majority are unintegrated or exhibit a wide range of suffixes and/or suspension marks, signifying that their classification either as Medieval Latin lexemes or as

[65] Scheler (1977: 38) identifies 50 post-Conquest (i.e. 1066-1150) Latin borrowings into OE although his parameters are not clearly delineated and remain dubious.

reflexes of the same Latin words borrowed into OE is often problematic: wrethyn **candell** (OE *candel*, *çǫndel* < Latin *candēla*), **culter** (OE *culter* < L *culter*), **mattes**, *matte, mattis* (OE *matta, meatte, meatta* < L *matta*), **schewtells**, *scutellis, scotil, scuttyl, scoteles, scutell., scutell* (pl.), *scotlys, scuteles, scotellez* (cf. *scutella*, *scutello*; OE *scutel* < Latin *scutella*; *DMLBS*, s.v. *scutella, scutellus, scutellum*). If the vernacular appropriation of the Latin root evinces considerable morphological transformations unparalleled in the history of the Latin etymons, a more direct connection can be established between the words as adapted in OE and those in the *DAR*, as in **mylne**[66] (OE *mylen*, *myln* < L *molina*, *molinus*) or **lopisters**, *lopster', lopsters* (OE *lopustre*, *lopystre*, *loppestre* < Latin *locusta*). *Milne* is found in AL as *milnus* (see *DMLBS*, s.v. *milnus*), clearly betraying the influence of the English vernacular. However, instead of a Latinised vernacular lexical item of this kind, sometimes the *DMLBS* only includes etymons such as *cammarus*, *locusta*, *polypus*, and *saltulus*, which are the expected developments of words for *lobster* descending from earlier stages of Latin.

Many Latin-origin borrowings from the OE period would later come into contact with the French vernacular equivalents, resulting in a number of scenarios: the English lexeme was partly influenced or reinforced by the French lexeme deriving from the same root, such as **capon'** (ONF/AF *capun, capon*)), **Moskylles** (< post-classical Latin *muscula* (< CL *mūsculus*), reinforced by AF *moskle, muscle, muskele* (OF *moulle*)), **plastr'** OE < L *plastrum* (French *plaistre, plastre*), **pynes** (OE *pin* < L *pīnus* (reinf. by French *pin*),[67] or **pyone** OE < L *paeōnia* (reinforced by French *peoine*, *pïoine*); the French lexeme may also have superseded the early OE lexeme (e.g **Ostree** (pl.), oysters, Oystres (OE *oster* < CL *ostrea*; OF *uistre*, *oistre*)[68] or the English word might have been reborrowed from French (e.g. **morter** (in compounds); OE *mortere* < CL *mortārium* (also in the *DAR*), later cf. OF *mortier, morter*); the (Old) English *and* French descendants of these Latin-origin words could also coexist in Middle English: **lak** (OE

[66] Also in *milne irennys, milneles, milnestanes, Milnpikkes*, and *milnposte*.
[67] Nevertheless, the sense of **pynes** found in the *DAR*, 'edible seeds from the cones of various pines', seems to be first attested not earlier than the ME period, in 1327 (*OED* (2006), s.v. *pine*, n.[2]), and should be compared with CL *pīnea* and French *pyne*, OF *pin*). French cognates with these early Latin-origin borrowings into English may have undergone completely independent developments so that the existing ME reflex and the OF lexeme do not resemble to each other (for instance, *DAR* **culter**, cf. OE *culter* < L *culter*; OF *coutre*).
[68] The root *ostr-* is also present in ML (cf. *DMLBS*, s.v. *ostrea*, *ostreum*, *ostria*, 1 *ostrium*).

lacu < L *lacus*; OF *lac*), **tabule** (pl) (OE < CL *tabula*; OF *tabul*, *tabull*), **troutes**, *truttis, trout, Salmon Troutys, trutis, trut'* (cf. OE *truht* < LL (also ML) *tructus*, *tructa*, *truta*; OF *truite, troite, troute*), and **sekkes** (WS *sacc*, Merc. *sec* < Latin *saccus*) which in French had a different vowel (*sac*, *sach*) and shares the <e>-stem with ON (OIcel *sekkr*). Crucial to the multilingual matrix of the *DAR* is precisely a potential linguistic ambiguity (e.g. is *culter* Latin or English? Or are *trut'* or *mortar'* ML, AF, or ME?).

In total, 98 out of the 263 OE simplexes—that is, 37.26%, excluding derivatives on OE roots in ME—[69] are in the *DMLBS.* Apart from the Latin-origin borrowings into English which the *DMLBS* derives directly from their Latin etymons (e.g. *DMLBS*, s.v. *candela* [CL]) unless they reflect vernacular-specific morphological and/or semantic changes in ML (*DMLBS*, s.v. 4 *polus*, 3 *pola* [ME *pol* < AS *pal* < *palus*]), the nominative cases of other vernacular-origin lexical items are sometimes reconstructed in this dictionary as they are often only found in the oblique case in the extant texts (e.g. *ladelus* [ME *ladel* < AS *hlædel*] and *mattocus* [ME *mattok*], although also note the suspension sign in some lexical items like 1 *grot*' [ME pl. *grotes*]). The spelling variability found in medieval texts is also largely simplified in the lemmas and the number of attestations illustrating the lexeme's actual usage varies (compare *DMLBS*, s.v. *lempeta* [ME *lempet* < AS *lempedu*], with only one attestation '1313 in crevese, in ~is, wylkes Ac. Durh. 10', and s.v. 3 *hopa* [ME *hop*], which is more amply recorded in the *DMLBS*). Four Germanic, OE-origin lexemes appear to be declined following the ML paradigm (**fanna**, **creba**, only attested once, **clout**, *clitta, clouttis, clout.* (pl.), and **cove**, *cofe, coue, cova, cofe,* and *cova*) but most of them contain *-e*, *-es*, *-is* and, to a lesser extent, *-ez* (e.g. **barowe**, *barow, barows, barowes* (*le*), *barrowez* and **coclis**, *kocles, kokells, cokles, cokylles, cokelys,* and *kokyllez*); *-(e)z* should be, in principle, unexpected in lexical items other than French-origin loanwords, although it is found in 43 OE-origin lexemes, that is, 28,10% of the total of pluralised OE-origin nouns (153),[70] in lexemes

[69] 41 out of the total number of OE-origin words are in the *DMLBS* with the same sense as in the *DAR*, but others present different semantics (e.g. **credill** 'a hurdle' in the *DAR* and in the *DMLBS*, s.v. *cradellum* [ME *cradel, credel*], 'a cradle'). The many *-ing* forms are, generally speaking, not in this ML dictionary.

[70] These are the following: *bollez, bolstourz, bordez, cannez, crabbez, crokez, croppez, kokyllez, Deynez, fattez, flettez, futhrez, grotez, hakkez, heltrez, hopez, ladz, leippez, mossez, nallez, pykkez, Poundez, rakkez, ricez, rongez, ropez, rowmez, scotellez, sevez/Syffez, Shellez, sholez,*

which could have potentially been employed in AF as well (see Sections 3.1.2-3.1.4, on borrowings from other languages pluralised through this suffix and its use in NME vocabulary in Chapter 4). This non-negligible percentage stresses the permeability of language boundaries in the *DAR* and the multilingual vocabulary of English more generally.

By semantic field, the most numerous items are those denoting equipment (41), including fastenings (e.g. **hespes**, **henges**, **hopez**, **rapys**, and **stapels**), containers (e.g. **fatt**, **boll**, **troue**, and **ladels**), and tools (e.g. **betours**, **schaves**, **swetstan**, **sparrez**, and **stayff'**). Within the domain of farming (17), there are also 6 terms for tools and implements (**Byll**, **culter**, **hake**, **harows**, **mattok**, and **pykoys**), enclosed fields (e.g. **croftis** and **hope**) and animal husbandry (e.g. **busys**, **byre**, **stirropes**, **yokys**, and **yare**). Other OE-origin terms include those for animals in general (20),[71] and animals for food ((5) **herrings**, **troutes**, **Moskylles**, **Ostree**, and **Wilkes**), materials (18), raw (e.g. **balk**, **beem**, **Spone**, and **Wattylles**) or manufactured (e.g. **bras**, **lynynges**, **Schaffes**, and **seme**), food (15), plants (11), measurements (11), and textiles and clothing (11) (see Apendix 1 for a full list). *-Ing* forms (27) extend across the aforementioned semantic domains:[72] among others are **beyttyng**, **byndyng**, **byrtenyng**, **demmyng**, **drawyng**, **dyghtyng**, **ernyng**, **fellyng**, **floryng**, **heggeyng**, **layng**, **nalyng**, **qwhykkyng**, **stoppyng**, and **thirlyng**, and there are also two gerunds with Latin *-ando* (**sinkando** and **wyndanda**). Manual workers responsible for these everyday tasks in the different departments of Durham Cathedral would have communicated in English, which explains the high incidence of vocabulary already present in OE for names of tools, animals, plants, or measurements. The choice of the phrasing 'already present' is deliberate: apart from Germanic roots, the influx of Latin and French, particularly noticeable from the Middle English period, is at the centre of the vocabulary of the *DAR*. Beyond the stems *per se*, the suffixes also betray these nuanced and complex inputs. The Romance-Latin continuum will be placed under scrutiny in the following section devoted to Anglo-French in relation to Latin.

---

spyndillez, stapillez, steropez, stokkez, Stottez, stralez, sylez, Tyldez, trowez, wattillez, webbez, and *Weez*.

[71] This division corresponds to the *OED* Thesaurus taxonomy: 'the world » food and drink » food » animals for food' and 'the world » animals'.

[72] Note that many of them are not in the *OED Thesaurus*.

3.1.2 On the Latin-Romance continuum: Anglo-French and Latin in the *DAR*

The reason why Latin has been included in this section dealing with the input of vernacular languages in the *DAR* is the instrumentality of French in the appropriation of Latin-origin vocabulary: the unprecedented scale to which Middle English borrowed from French and Latin, often via French, would not have been possible if this Romance language had not been so extensively used in the British Isles for centuries. As Durkin (2014: 223) underscores, the pattern of Latin borrowings in Middle English would have probably followed the course of Latin borrowings in the pre-Norman Conquest period, in OE, had it not been for this crucial historical event. In contrast to ON-derived lexis, loanwords from French or Latin do not feature in the list of the 100 most frequent words in Present-Day English, but the picture changes dramatically if the number of high-frequency words is broadened from 100 to 1,000: then French and Latin constitute the two largest sources of vocabulary in English, which showcases the immense influx of French. By 1500 most of these words would already have been incorporated into English, even if the largest influx of Latin vocabulary was only just beginning then (Durkin 2014: 223). The focus of this chapter, based on the *DAR* data, is on this pre-1500 period. The Latin-Romance continuum (see also Trotter 2009: 155-156) means that discerning whether a borrowing comes from French, Latin, or potentially both languages is a complex exercise in the multilingual context of the *DAR* and in multilingual Britain more broadly. Another question is what varieties of French influenced English during this period: the conventional use of the term Anglo-Norman in the conceptualisation of the variety of French employed in Britain has been deemed a somewhat inadequate label, as it does not reflect its multiple continental sources (not just from Normandy), which is why nowadays Anglo-French is one of the preferred options even if Anglo-Norman seems to be equally suitable given the long historical trajectory of the term.[73] Traditionally, borrowings from French were somewhat artificially separated into a Norman (11th-13th c) and a Central or Parisian

[73] Another label is *Insular French*, which avoids the exclusive association of French with England and terminologically encompasses the whole of Britain and Ireland. Yet, as the materials analysed for this dissertation were produced in England, *Anglo-French* is the term that will be here employed.

period, the central variety making more substantial lexical contributions in the 14th century (Fisiak 1968: 40; Wełna 2011: 303).[74] This distinction is inaccurate in so far as Anglo-French did not conform to a set of stable or uniform dialectal features (Rothwell 1996, 1998; Miller 2012): if *ca-* came into English early from Norman French and *cha-* only later on, brought by Central French speakers, the presence of central forms in early texts like *Leis Willelme* breaks down any alleged dialectal boundaries based on chronology (Rothwell 1998: 154; Behrens 1886: 203; Miller 2012: 152). The *OED* raises an additional terminological conundrum: the unrevised entries only refer to Old/Middle French, while the new entries make use of Anglo-Norman. This terminological change was introduced over time once the *AND* started to take shape (*AND1* dates to 1977-1992).[75] The *AND* helpfully acknowledges recorded parallels of an Anglo-French form in continental medieval French by referring to its attestations in the *FEW, Gdf, TL, DEAF,* and *TLFi* and also gives insights into its inclusion in the *MED/OED* and in the *DMLBS*. The Anglo-French form and the Old or Middle French stem may have a common source and/or have undergone considerable phonological, morphological, or semantic changes in its insular usage, or there might be words in Anglo-French unparalleled in Continental French varieties, in particular, in the form of borrowings from English, as the relationship between Middle English and Anglo-French was profound and 'of merger' rather than of borrowing (Rothwell 1991: 174). In the present section, the OF etymon will be provided as the source of the Anglo-French word unless the lexeme in question is an AF variant or it is unrecorded in continental French. Influence from English on the phonological system of Anglo-French and its departure from continental Old French,[76] also noticeable in morphology, would have been symptomatic, according to authors like Pope (1934), of the 'decay' of Anglo-French by the mid 13th century (similarly, Kibbee (1996) speaks of an 'essential

[74] Among the phonological features added to English through the lexical borrowing of these two varieties of French are the diphthongs [oi] (from Central French) and [ui] (from Norman French)—only [oi] survives since [ui] was replaced by the Central French variant—and Central French [oi] and Northern French [ei] (see Pope 1934; Wełna 2011).

[75] The *AND* has subsequently been subject to revisions in the form of *AND2*. The latest section completed was in 2017 (N-P), and there is an ongoing revision of the letters R-S expected to run until 2021.

[76]The orthography of later Anglo-French texts has been invoked in challenging the presumed restricted use of French only in written domains or, in other words, the notion of 'code diglossia' (Ingham 2009: 81).

difference' between continental and Anglo-French on the basis of syntactic structures and alleged noun gender errors); it would have become corrupt or 'bad French' (Price 1984).

Until relatively recently, the textbook history of Anglo-French in England was largely simplistic and tended to minimise the competence of French users, pointing out its 'elite' nature and eventual demise around 1250 (Price 1984; Kibbee 1991). Specialists working on Anglo-French and multilingualism have proven these claims empirically unfounded, and have demonstrated how, rather than declining, it thrived and expanded its domains of use after that date (see, e.g., the contributions in Wogan-Browne et al. (2009) and Ingham and Marcus (2016)). It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the highest degree of French lexical influence on English came from the mid 13th century onwards (see Dekeyser 1986—who refined Jespersen's (1905) and Baugh's (1935) conclusions—Coleman 1995; Durkin 2014). In the following section, I will refer to the learning of French and Latin in medieval England as a way of contextualising the milieu in which the *DAR* accounts were produced. This will also explain the changes in the use of the French article (usually *le/les/lez*, although the presumably northern form *ly* is also found in the *DAR* (see Section 4.3.2)), prototypically preceding vernacular lexical items in multilingual accounts although not always. I will then discuss the parameters that can be employed in determining whether a particular lexical item comes from French, Latin, or both, paying particular attention to both the 'Frenchification' and 'Latinification' processes operating in the *DAR*. A number of lexical items in the *DAR* are mediated through French although they come from other (generally Romance) languages, so they will also be considered here in order to better understand medieval trading routes (Section 3.2). As can be expected, French is the largest source of vernacular lexical items in these account rolls, so the final section of this chapter will touch upon their semantics in greater detail. English native lexical items were replaced or semantically narrowed after the adoption of many French or French/Latin loanwords, but the impact of French and Latin on technical and more specialised domains also had an additional effect on, in Durkin's (2014) words, the 'layering' or stratification of the English lexis and produced a more noticeable 'dissociation' in the use of etymologically unrelated stems denoting the same concept (e.g. *manual* / *hand*).

3.1.2.1 The teaching and learning of French in medieval England

Views on the nature of contact between English and Anglo-French and how it survived in England polarised into the proponents of extensive bilingualism until the Late Middle Ages (e.g. Legge 1950, 1980 and Suggett 1946) and those of very limited bilingualism in the upper classes during the first half of the 13th century, whose outcome could have given rise to a Middle English creole (Bailey and Maroldt 1977; McWhorter 2002). Other scholars (Rothwell 1976, Berndt 1972, Kibbee 1991, 1996) have proposed that Anglo-French ceased to be a vernacular already by the end of the 12th century and that it would have been formally taught only in the 13th and 14th centuries. As noted by Trotter (2003) and Ingham (2012), this has been the prevalent narrative, partly resting on the dubious assumption that French could not have been adequately learnt by speakers to whom English became their first language. Accordingly, its maintenance beyond the aristocratic elite of the country in England and throughout the centuries seems unaccountable. The incongruities of this theory with the reality of the extant records (inter alia, Rothwell 1999; Trotter 2003; Ingham 2012) has long been exposed. Britnell (2009), Kowaleski (2009), and Ingham and Marcus (2016), among other scholars, situated the learning of French in occupational domains, that is, non-formal settings, and the long-standing influence of French on everyday occupations becomes even more patent in the *Bilingual Thesaurus of Everyday Life in Medieval England*. In manufacturing domains, in which a large proportion of English-origin vocabulary is maintained (see Section 3.1.2.5 below), bilingual workers seem to have passed on their technical understanding of French terminology to monolingual professionals (see Timofeeva and Ingham 2018 and the references therein). Rothwell (1999) stressed the communicative function of oral and written French in professions and trade during the 14th and 15th century in his contextualisation of its use in English ports (see also Kowaleski (2009) on Anglo-French as a maritime lingua franca), which mostly operated in this language (Rothwell 1999: 650). In the records that Rothwell (1999: 650) examined, 'the goods carried in [the

vessels] are set down in a French form, regardless of their point of origin'. Most of my data in this section are, in fact, names of goods.

The question I will now turn to is how scribes such as those responsible for the production of the *DAR* would have learnt French as well as Latin, drawing on Ingham's (2012) detailed overview. By the last quarter of the 14th century and beginning of the 15th century, there are teaching materials (*manières de langage,* vocabulary lists, and grammar books) proving that by that point French was instructed as a second language (L2) in England (see also Hunt 1991).[77] Unless the learner had an aristocratic or elite upbringing, a formal learning setting—outside the home environment—is usually assumed to have promoted the learning of the language; private schools linked to the University of Oxford would also have provided instruction in writing documents and letters in French as well as in Latin (see Richardson (1942) on the teaching of the conventions of letter writing in French and its purposes). Ingham (2012) draws attention to the different kinds of materials extant from the late 14th century in contrast to those from the 15th century: the earlier conversation manuals and books containing model letters would assume an audience of relatively advanced learners who already commanded essential grammar and vocabulary, while foundational grammar books of French 'ab initio', as it were, are only found after the 15th century (the first extant one by John Barton dates from c. 1415). This seems to be diagnostic of an on-going shift in the status of Anglo-French in the late 14th century, which historically coincides with other significant historical events such as the rise of private correspondence in English, the choice of Latin over French in drawing up the truce agreement of Leulinghem in 1393 (Lusignan 2008), and the abandonment of French in schools and parliament after the Black Death (cf. Ingham 2012: 31). The medium of school instruction had been French up to that point (see Orme 1973), but in the late 14th and early 15th centuries, there is contemporary evidence (see Trevisa's (c. 1385) translation of Higden's *Polychronicon* (Kaiser 1961)) that French was taught as a second language through English. According to Ingham (2012: 33-34), clerks, administrators, and school students more generally would have started their formal education at grammar schools from the age of seven, learning Latin grammar through

[77] Rothwell (1976) suggested an earlier date for the teaching of French as an L2, the mid 13th century, but this is an empirically unfounded claim (Ingham 2007; 2012).

French (Rothwell (1976) questioned this pedagogical practice of teaching a foreign language through a second language although there is no proof of the validity of this speculation). In any case, the process of learning and being exposed to French would have started much earlier, at around the age of five, at a Church-run song school, a *schola cantus* (see Orme 1973), where children would have picked up the rudiments of literacy. However, the effects of the Black Death on the population,[78] especially among the clergy, disrupted this system until the eventual disappearance of instruction in Anglo-French: the number of clergymen—who were also the teachers—with a good linguistic competence in French and Latin and who could hand down their knowledge of Anglo-French to their pupils had been substantially reduced. As Ingham (2012: 35) puts it, 'the consequence in many places was that the use of A-N [sic] as a vehicle language in school could hardly be sustained. The transmission system of Anglo-Norman had collapsed, and its disappearance from the scene in England (except in law) was not long delayed'. The production of the *DAR*, spanning centuries, would have witnessed this linguistic shift; however, the only means available in these multilingual texts of tracing any grammatical changes not conforming to the expected grammatical patterns in French is through the use of the definite article.[79]

3.1.2.2 The French definite article revisited

Drawing on research into the use of the French definite article in multilingual records across England (e.g. Trotter 2009; Ingham 2009; 2013; and Wright 2010; 2013; 2017), as well as on the data compiled from the *Building Accounts of King Henry III* and the *Jarrow Accounts*, Roig-Marín (2018a: 187-188) questioned Britnell's (2009: 88) observations on the use of the French article, which lacked linguistic acuity and were clearly flawed in assuming that it introduced words for which the scribe lacked Latin equivalents. In this section, I will refine some of the premises that surface from a

[78] Miller (2000) also singled out the Black Death (rather than the loss of Normandy in 1204) as a decisive factor in the interruption of the transmission of AF naturalistically in non-elite settings although, as Ingham (2012: 29) points out, 'its impact [was] on the psycholinguistic status, and not so much because it triggered reorganization in society generally'.

[79] The early use of the French article in Anglo-French corresponded with its usage in Continental French.

diachronic and sociolinguistic perspective. In the *DAR*, the functions of the French definite article closely align with those expected in monolingual French texts at least until the 15th century; expressions like 'construccionem de le ale' (Rott. Terrar. 1419-20, 302), 'super le appilhous' (Rott. Celer. 1484-5, 98), or 'salis del Bay' (Rott. Bursar. 1368-9, 575)[80] would, according to Ingham (2009: 84),

> represent chunks of bilingual discourse from the ambient language used by stewards managing the manor and by those who drew up the accounts. Function words such as articles and prepositions would have been in the matrix language, French, while content words would quite often have been English.

Reeves, reliant on clerks for keeping track of all transactions carried out, prepared the annual draft accounts then examined by auditors to agree on their final versions. All these involved parties would have known French to varying degrees, except for reeves of yeoman stock, who 'if they did not attend school, might well have been anglophone only' (Ingham 2009: 85). Agricultural labourers, however, would have communicated in English, so any communication with them would have probably taken place in this language, which would explain the wide range of lexical items embedded in the *DAR* and in other multilingual texts whose base language is Medieval Latin as well as the presence of larger syntactic units in this language (e.g. 'Item ij cloþis to lay under þ^{e} sadlys' (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245-246)).

The uses of the French article, also in combination with *de*, remained fairly systematic until the mid 15th century onwards when it seemed to have started to function as a textual marker to indicate a switch into the vernacular (the function described by Trotter 2007; see Ingham 2009) in syntactically unpredictable contexts: for instance, it is combined with the partitive despite the indefinite nature of the referent (e.g. 'purgacione del kirvyngknyffes', Rott. Bursar. 1492-3, 652) and with Latin premodifiers, adjectives, and numerals (e.g. '2^{bus} le hekkys', Rott. Feretrar. 1501-2,

[80] *La* is more rarely found in the *DAR* before common nouns (with the exception of a couple of instances like 'emendacione de la byre' (Rott. Sacrist. 1405-6, 401) or 'pro la louthir' (Rott. Camer. c. 1380, 181)). For a description of its equally sparse use in the London Bridge Accounts, see Wright (2010); on gender marking in AN more generally, see Ingham (2012: 89–99).

481). In addition, *de* is sometimes not found in constructions which would require it. These transformations, reported in other accounts apart from the *DAR*—from Finchale, Norfolk, and Jarrow—after the year 1450 seem to run in parallel to the collapse of French as the language of communication in manorial contexts (Ingham 2009: 93). Traditionally, it was assumed that the French article blocked the Latinisation of the following vernacular lexical items (Trotter 2007; Ingham 2009; 2013; Wright 2010; 2013); only weights and measures would function as a special category (see Wright (2013: 14) on *le virga* 'yard', *le vlna* 'ell', *le lb* [libra] 'pound') which could potentially have been perceived as vernacular material. According to Ingham (2009: 88), these vernacular lexical items were not Latinised or abbreviated. Yet, in the *DAR* not only do we find 'le petr.' (Rott. Bursar. 1492-3, 652) but also 'le buttriciam Infirmarii' (Rott. Bursar. 1493-4, 652)[81] or 'le fleshlardar.' (Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89)[82] as well as the linguistically ambiguous morpheme *-is*, which occurs more than once in the *DAR* (e.g. 'les bayngoxinstallis' Rott. Celer. 1512-3, 105), which clearly shows how the prediction about the lack of Latin declensional suffixes attached to vernacular items sometimes fails. Such pieces of evidence would challenge the view that these units mirror oral communication in the manorial setting. Vernacular lexical items, allegedly unmediated by ML, are likewise abbreviated after the definite article: 'futhrez del thykston" (Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158), and several *chamber*-compounds, 'le Clerkchambr" (Rott. Hostill. 1453-4, verso, 148), 'le Clerkchawmbr" (Rott. Hostill. 1454, 149), 'le Kyngeschambr" (Rott. Hostill. 1461-2, 153), 'le Knightchambr'' (Rott. Hostill. 1463-4, 153), and 'le Waterchambr" (Rott. Hostill. 1456-7, 151). Other examples from the *DMLBS* show how the French article was used before *Latinised* vernacular lexis: a c1135 'usque ad la brutasca' (v. *bretescha*); 1390 'la barella' (v. *barellus* 1 2); 1392 'le florenus' (v. *florenus* 2e); 1460 'le dosserum' (v. dorsarium 1b); *DCCant.* p. 127b; 1516 'pro iij quar. *les* auri' (v. *deauratio* 1a). This had not been observed in the previous literature, focusing on the unintegrated vernacular nature of the lexis, and it may be argued that abbreviated lexemes represent low-incidence cases adapted to match the written medium of the rolls. Against the background of the vast number of extant

[81] Cf. *DMLBS*, s.v. *butericius*, *butericia* [OF *boterez*] 'buttress'.
[82] Cf. *DMLBS*, s.v. *lardarium* (*larderium*) [ML], *lardaria*, *larderia* [cf. ME *larderie*] 'a room used for storage of fish'.

medieval records, the presence of the French article in the small corpus of the *DAR* leads us to think that it is perhaps not such an unusual phenomenon and that it should receive more attention in future research, further questioning the orthodox thinking on the subject. Similarly, *ly* is a hitherto unexplored manifestation of an independent post-15th century development of the French article in the north, only mentioned in the *DOST* (s.v. *Le*, *Lie*, art.). Yet, the multilingual attestations in this dictionary start already at the turn of the preceding century (1398-1400 (Aberd. B. Rec. (S.H.S.) 147.) and continue throughout the 15th and 16th centuries,[83] so the question is whether the French article in Scotland developed earlier idiosyncratic uses than in England or if at the very end of the 14th century the French article had already started to be creatively employed in multilingual administrative and business contexts regardless of their place of origin. Another northern variant that has not been considered so far is *lie*, not found in the *DAR*, although its use, as the *DOST* acknowledges, does seem to be rather late (the first attestation is from 1507-8 Rentale Dunkeld. MS. fol. 56.).

3.1.2.3 French, Latin, or both?

The findings previously discussed underscore the permeable boundaries between vernacular lexical items and Medieval Latin: previous descriptions of the use of the French article in multilingual accounts were rooted in the assumption that it had to introduce vernacular lexical items, first in its prototypical use to grammatically specify definiteness, as in French, and later on as a marker to signal a switch into the vernacular. Nevertheless, its use before Latinised vernacular or ML words (identified simply as 'Latin' in the *DMLBS*, s.v. *le, la* [OF *le, la* < CL *ille*, *illa*] '1 (as def. art. before Latin sb.)') would reflect the appropriation and productivity of the definite article in Medieval Latin beyond these prototypical scenarios. I will now concentrate on the lexis alone: Durkin (2012) discussed the main parameters for identifying words coming solely from French, Latin, or both. The status of these words in the *DAR* as already ME and/or just AF has been problematised in the *OED*, which acknowledges a potential

[83] *DOST* (s.v. *Le*, *Lie*, art.).: 1413 Chart. (Reg. H.) No. 233., 1440 Reg. Episc. Aberd. I. 241., 1448 Reg. Episc. Brechin I. 113.), 1547–8 Orkney & Sh. Rec. I. 117., 1556 Reg. Great S. 253/1., 1561 Reg. Episc. Aberd. I. 445.

ambiguity in many instances; because Durkin's criteria were devised for the study of loanwords in English, a pertinent query is, thus, whether they can be utilised in the context of the *DAR*. As will be illustrated below, naturally, the etymological narratives of the *OED* sometimes may point in different directions from those pertinent to the data we find in the multilingual *DAR*: for instance, while *palfrey* is a loanword from French in English (*OED* (2005) s.v. *palfrey*, n.), only the ML forms *palefrido*, *palefrid*., *palefridis* and the abbreviated—and linguistically multivalent—*palefr*. occur in the *DAR* as simplex nouns in surnames (e.g. *Palfreyman*) and in the compound *Palfraypageo* 'horse boy' we find its vernacular rendering.[84] The most common scenarios in the *DAR* are the coexistence of ML/vernacular forms (see, e.g., **capelle**, capella, capell. (cf. ONF *capele*), **cubibis**, Cubibb', Quybibbis, quibibis, cubibis, Whibibbes; **vestimenta**, vestimentis, vestimentorum, vestimento, vestment., vestimenti; **parure**, paruris, parur', and **pipa**, pypez, pype, pipes (for the particulars, see Appendix 2.1)) or the sole use of the vernacular stem (regardless of whether it has declensional endings or not), which is why Durkin's classification partially applies.[85] The most easily identifiable loanwords from French are those which do not exist as such in (Classical) Latin:[86] roots which are not documented in Latin, including borrowings ultimately deriving from Germanic languages (**Towell** < AN *tuaille*, OF *toaille* < Frk. *thwahlja*; cf. ME *touail*; ML *tualia*, *toalia*); **bleu**card < OF *bleu*, *blo* < Frk. *blao*, **mote** < OF *mote, moett, mot* < prob. Gmc **mutt(a)*) or new formations (e.g. derivatives on Latin-origin stems **palets** (*DMLBS*, s.v. 1 *paletta*, 1 *palettus* [ME, OF *palete* < CL 1 *pala*])). The possible direct etymon(s) of these lexemes, which became part of the English language, are likewise complex, especially because many of them (if not all) in the *DAR* are documented in ML texts produced in the British Isles, and the morphological/graphemic differences between the OF and ML forms are not great (e.g. *DAR* **stamyn**, stamyns 'cloths made

[84] For the ML attestations in British sources, see *DMLBS*, s.v. *palefredus* [ME, AN *palefrei* < LL *paraveredus*].

[85] This panorama concurs with the overall trend in Middle English (see also Durkin's overview of ME in the *OED*), where even in borrowings allegedly coming only from Latin, partial input from French cannot fully be ruled out. Apart from the material inherited from Latin, French also borrowed ('reborrowed') Latin words that already existed in French with a different form.

[86] Since the overwhelming majority of the forms here discussed were also integrated into ML (see the *DMLBS* and below), this parameter can only refer to stems not present as such in Classical Latin. Exceptionally there are Anglo-Latin variants influenced by AF (e.g. AL *sausistrum*, *-cistrum*, vars. of ML *salsucia* (*MED*, s.v. *sausister* (n.)).

of wool' (OF *estamine, stamine* and ML *stāmen, stāmina, -um*) and **paschali**, Paschalis 'a candle burned during the Easter season' (OF *pascal*, *paschal*, LL *paschalis*)).[87] Particularly noteworthy are also words like **amerciamentis**, *-orum*, *-o*, *-um*, 'discretionary penalties or fines', which look like Latin roots but are not recorded in early stages of Latin, only in French and Medieval Latin (see *DMLBS*, s.v. *admerciamentum* [OF *amerciement*]; *AND*, s.v. *amerciement*[1]; *DMF*, s.v. *amerciement*). An important observation to be remembered at this point is that only words that were integrated into English are part of the database even if the case endings are systematically present (e.g. **murras**, **stuffo**, **venello**, **warnestur**, and **wyndagium**) or are combined with their abbreviated forms (e.g. **lagenis**, lagen.).

Other borrowings exist in Latin (in Classical or Late Latin apart from ML), but the morphology of the word indicates that it is a borrowing from French: **amows** 'hoods' 'capes with hoods' (CL *almucia*), **cabils**, cabyll, cabyllys, cablys 'strong thick ropes' (AF *cable* (cf. CF *chäable*); ML *cabulus* (< LL *capulum*)),[88] **gathes** 'bowls' (OF *gate*, CL *gabata*),[89] **parure**, paruris, parures, parurae, parur' 'ornamental parts of an alb or other vestment' (OF *pareure,* LL *paratura*), **samyt** 'a piece of samite [silken cloth]' (OF *samit*, ML *samitum*, CL *hexamitum*, *hexamitus*), **sarpleris**, sarplar, sarplez 'woolsacks' (AF *sarpler, sarpeller* (var. of OF *sarpilliere*), ML *sarpellārium*, *sarpellaria*, *sarpellarius*, AL *sarplera, sarplārius,* LL *xērampelinus*), **Terbentyn** 'turpentine, oleoresin' (OF *terbentine, turbentin(e* CL/ML terebinthinus, terebenthinus), **tramale**, tramellez 'fishing nets' (OF *tramail, tramal*, Late (popular) Latin *tramaculum*), or **tunakyll'** 'a vestment (eccl.)' (OF *tunicle*, *tonicle*, *tenicle*, ONF *tunikiel*, CL *tunicula*).

Relatively straightforward loanwords from Latin on formal grounds include **bitumine** 'a kind of mineral pitch' (CL *bitumen*; cf. OF *beton*), **crate**, cratis 'hurdles' (CL *crātis*; not in French dictionaries),[90] **distring.** 'writ directing the sheriff to distrain a person' (abbrev. form of *distringas*, the 2nd person present subjunctive of

---

[87] It is worth nothing that the forms without <h> in *paschalis* are only found in the edited monolingual (ME) material (see **pascall** in both the Treasurers' Books, 1557-8, 715 and Miscellanea, 1545, 727).

[88] Note the different forms of *cable* in **cabill**raype and capillrapez, the latter containing the <p> possibly after LL *capulum*.

[89] The *DMLBS* includes the two vernacular languages, ME and AN, as possible sources for the ML word: **gata** [AN, ME *gate* < CL *gabata*].

[90] Crate in the sense of 'a hurdle' is not in the *OED* only in the *MED,* s.v. *crāte* n.

distringĕre,[91] not in French dictionaries)), **lagenis**, lagen., lagen (pl.), lagenas, lagene (pl), lagena, lagenas 'wine vessels' (CL *lagēna*; cf. *FEW* 5, 131a, lagēna), **nux** 'a nut, a cup made of coconut shell' (CL *nux*; cf. *noix* f.n. 'nut', inherited from *nux*), **pulvinares**, pulvinaria, pulvinaribus 'couches on which an image of a god is placed' (CL *pulvinar*; cf. MF *pulvinaire* < Latin *pulvinarius*, see *FEW* 9, 561a, pŭlvīnus 2), lang**sedile**, langsedil, sedile, sedilis 'something like a tool to sit on or rest' (CL *sedile*; cf. OF *sedil(e)* < Latin *sedile*, see *FEW* 11, 412b, sĕdīle II),[92] and **strigili** (sing.), strigilis 'strigils' (CL *strigilis*; AF *strile*, *estrille*, not in the *DAR*). **Toga**, togas, togis 'robes, gowns' (CL *toga*) and **croci,** crocus 'saffron' (CL *crocus*) more likely come from Latin, although they are attested in the *AND* as *toge*—only once in the *AND1* entry—and *croc*[1] and in other French dictionaries like the *TLFi* (s.v. *toge*)[93] and *DEAF* (s.v. *croc* 3) and *FEW* (s.v. *crocum*) (see the section on OE for early Latin borrowings). **Velueth** is not recorded in CL (cf. CL *villus*) but in ML as well as in French; it seems to have been borrowed from English *velvet*, probably a formation on the French stem *vel-* (see *veluau, velvel, velvot*) + the suffix *-et*, first found in ML as *velvetum* (*TLFi*, s.v. *VELVET*). Generally speaking, however, borrowings only from Latin into English are much more slippery since most of them could have been used as 'learned borrowings' in French (Durkin 2014: 244); negative evidence, that is, the absence of records of a particular word or sense in French, or if attested at all, the date in which the form or sense is first recorded in French, comes into play to assess the likelihood of a word's having been appropriated from Latin—and not French—into English (see Durkin 2014: 244–245 for three case studies: *produce/product*, *provide*, and *idea/ideal*). In reality, the lexicographer is often confronted with multiple possible partial inputs, that is, borrowing from French and/or Latin.

As Durkin (2014: 250) puts it, 'as often as not no single form or meaning points incontrovertibly to input exclusively from one language or the other, and even when such forms or meanings occur we may choose to attribute them to later influence on

[91] See *OED* (1896), s.v. *distringas*, n. and *MED*, s.v. *distringas* n.

[92] Introduced by *voc.* in "scamnum voc. langsedile" (Rott. Hostill. 1453–1454 verso, 148), it is one of the few examples in which allegedly Latin lexemes (in this case, preceded by the vernacular adjective *lang*) are introduced by this textual marker. This may be perhaps due to its perception as a vernacular lexical item even if *sedile* and *scamnum* are CL-origin synonyms.

[93] The first attestation of *toga* in 'English' dates, according to the *OED* ((1912), s.v. *toga*, n.) to 1600.

an already borrowed word'. This consideration, largely confirmed by the data in the *OED*, acquires a special significance in the context of the *DAR*: the morphological make-up of the stem could sometimes tip the scales in favour of a borrowing from French despite its integration into Latin by means of declensional endings (**amitis**, amita, amittarum (cf. amicta, amictis)). The stems may be exactly alike in the two languages (e.g. **argenti**, argent., argento, argentiis, although in this instance, the Latin-inflected form *argento* (preceded by *de*) outnumbers the abbreviated ones by far (see Appendix 2.1 for further details)). The presence of Latin suffixes formally allows researchers to create a dichotomy between integrated and unintegrated vocabulary, but the psycholinguistic status of those vernacular lexical items across the vernaculars and Medieval Latin remains unclear. In the *OED*, concerned with the English vernacular attestations of these words, Latin-inflected lexemes are often excluded (except for a few cases like *psalterium*) and many of the 'unintegrated' lexical occurrences in these multilingual sources indeed pose serious taxonomical problems for being possible manifestations of either the Middle English or the Anglo-French word. A word's morphological integration tends to fluctuate not just chronologically but also within the same rolls: we also find suspension marks as in **dim**., abbreviation of either Latin *dimidium* 'half' or French *demi*, also spelt with <i> (*AND*, s.v. *demi*[1]; *FEW*, s.v. *dimidus*), and the suffix *-is* which could either be taken as a variant of NME *-ys* or the Latin plural ablative (see Section 4) as in **togis** (see above). Therefore, I will not measure the degree of morphological integration of possible borrowings from French or Latin/French through their Latinate inflections, but it is worth pointing out that by the time the *DAR* were produced, some of them were fully integrated into English (**bataling**, **pendyng**). The more numerous lexical items in the *DAR* are those containing material only from French, not just in simplexes but also in multiple word lexical items (also, e.g., OF + OE among other combinations) (see Section 3.3). 24 of them are compounds or noun phrases formed in English with French-origin elements, and there is one example of a direct borrowing of a compound from French (despite the reanalysis of the word-boundaries), **flowr delys** (see Section 3.3 on French compounds). There are 33 stems which are classified as betraying possible multiple

inputs (ML and AF), according to the *OED* and the *MED*.[94] Even if both languages could have contributed to the adoption of those words in English, the multilingual vocabulary in the *DAR* seems to be governed by its own principles. The French influx predominates in a few of these words:[95] **alkenemy**, akamy 'alchemy gold' (OF *alkemye*, *alkenamye*, *alkenomye* (among other variants),[96] ML *alchymia*, *alkimia, alconomia*), **Bowges**, Boulgys, Bowgez (cf. Bulgis) 'wallets or bags made of hide' (OF *boulge*, LL *bulgium, bulgia, bulga*), **capstane** 'a capstan bar' (French *cabestan*, also in 16th cent. *capestan* (Littré)) L *capistrum* 'halter'), **grue** 'a crane' (OF *grue*, CL *grus*),[97] **mell**, quarell mell, qwharellmell 'a hammer' (OF *mail*, CL *malleus*),[98] **pylers** 'pillars' (OF *piler, pileir, piller*, ML *pillere, pilare*, CL pīla), **querentayn** 'an area of land equivalent in length to one square furlong' (OF *quarenteine*, ML *quarentena* < **quaranta* (cf. Italian *quarantina*, Old Occitan *carentena*, Spanish *cuarentena*), **Rollez** 'rolls' (AN *rolle*, *roule*, CL *rotula*).

There is also evidence for the multiple language inputs which contributed to the adoption of these words in English through the presence of both the Latin and French forms in the *DAR*: **Ginger**, Gynger, Gingiberis (LL and ML *gingiber*, AF *gingevere*, *gyngyver*, *gynger*),[99] and **resinis**, rosen, resina, rosyn, rosine (CL *rēsina*, OF/MF *resine*, AF *rousine*).[100] Many other stems are ambiguous (e.g. **mantell'** 'a sleeveless

---

[94] The MED may give the ML form but allegedly for comparative purposes (compare, e.g., *OED* (2005), s.v. *paper*, n. and adj., which gives a French direct etymon, and the *MED* (s.v. *papĭr(e* n.), 'OF *papier* & L *papyrus*').

[95] The Latin forms given are either Classical or Late Latin, if available because the ML lexemes are often borrowings from French themselves (not *alchimia* < Ar. *al-kīmiyā'* < *χῡμεία*). Most of the listed lexical items are recorded in the *DMLBS* (s.v. *alchimia; bulga, bulgia, bulgium*; **grua** (v. *grus*), **mella** (v. *medlea*); 6 *pīlare, pīlarius; quarentena, quarentana, quarantena, quarantana, quarentela, quarantela; rolla, rollum*) except for *capstane* and *mell*.

[96] Given the great spelling variability, I will only give the closest forms in French and/or in Latin (max. three per language).

[97] The *MED* (s.v. *grue* (n.(2))) suggests both languages contributed while the *OED* ((1900), s.v. *grue*, n.[2]) attributes either a French (*grue*) or Latin etymon (*gru-em*, *grus*).

[98] *Mell* is a variant of *maul*, which is taken as a borrowing from CL *malleus* through French although it could be argued to reflect an unattested OE borrowing from Latin (see Section 3.1.1 on these borrowings).

[99] Note also the other forms which are lemmatised in the *DMLBS*, s.v. *zingiber* [CL *zingiberi*], *zinziber* [LL *zinziberi*]. The disyllabic French forms in *gynger* are not paralleled in other continental French varieties and only found in AF 'where it is earlier, but also much rarer' (*OED* (2017), s.v. *ginger*, n. and adj.[1]).

[100] The *OED* distinguishes two etymons: *rosin* (*OED* (2010), s.v. *rosin*, n.) and *resin* (*OED* (2010), s.v. *resin*, n. and adj.): the former is described as a variation of CL *rēsina*, whose forms with <o>

overgarment, a robe' (OF *mantel*, CL *mantellum*, ML *mantella, mantellus*),[101] **missale** 'a mass book' (AF *missal(e), messal(e), massal*, OF *messal, messel*, ML *missalis*), and **sim'l** 'a kind of bread or bun' (OF *simenel, siminel, simonel, seminel*, AL *simenellus, sim(i)nellus, seminellus*, CL *simila*), despite the use of various case endings. With the exception of *-a*, which was not found in ME, most of the forms in this section typically present a zero-morpheme plural, a suspension sign, *-es* (found in the nominative plural and in oblique cases in ME), and *-e*, used in the vernacular and, prototypically, in the CL ablative case of the 2nd declension. Yet, the flexibility of ML signifies that it can also be found across other declensions.

The following words exhibit a variety of morphemes: **gummis**, Gummi, gumme 'gums, resins' (CL *cummi*, ML *gumma*, *gummus*, *gummum*), **Kameka**, Camaka 'a fine fabric' (OF *camocas*, ML *camoca*, *camucum* < Ar. *kamkhā*),[102] **macez**, maces, mace 'aril used as a spice' (OF *macis*, ML *macis*), and **salis**, sal. 'salt' (OF *sal, salle, sau(l*, CL *sāl*), while others do not have any suffix attached to the end of the words (e.g. **brasill** 'a red dye-wood of the genus Caesalpinia' (OF *bresil*, ML *brasilium*), **Morell** 'a dusky-coloured horse' (OF *morel*, ML *morellus*), **pele** (OF *pele, pale* and ML *pāla, pela, pila*, CL *pāla*), and **sconse** 'a candlestick or lantern with a screen and a handle' (OF *esconse, esconce*, ML *sconsa*, CL *absconsus*)). Additional linguistically ambiguous (ML/AF) stems are ***multur*a** 'a fee for grinding grain' (French *molture*, L *molitura*, ML *moltura*), ***sport*is**, sporta 'basket' (OF *esporte*, *sporte*, CL *sporta*), and ***papir*o**, papiri, papirum, papyr 'paper' (OF *papier*, CL *papyrus*).

For comparative purposes, **ancer** 'a kind of hand-held balance or a weight used on that scale' is the only word out of the multiple-origin lexemes in English which presents only its Latin stem in the *DAR* (cf. ML *ancera*, *anser*, *auncer*, *aunser* and AF *aunselle, auncell(e)*). All in all, a word's range of occurrences in the *DAR* sometimes oscillates between the Latinate and French forms (see **granis**, grayn, granes), falling somewhere

---

in English are only found in ML, AF, and Middle French, 'although their relationship with each other and with the English word is unclear', and the latter as a word receiving inputs from French and Latin. *Resinis*, present throughout the accounts, could be simply interpreted as both the CL reflex and as the vernacular lexical item with the ambiguous *-is* (see Section 4).

[101] The borrowing of **mantell'** from the Latin stem is recorded in OE (*mentel*) with i-mutation as in other Germanic languages (see also MDut/MLG *mantel*, OFris *mentel*).

[102] The *AND* records a number of variants of *camaca* with and without final *-s*, unlike continental French which tend to give the <s>-variants (*Gdf*, s.v. *camocas*; *DMF*, s.v. *camocas*; *TLFi*, s.v. *camocas*).

in between the two languages, and may be varied as in **frontellorum**, frontell, frontali, frontalis, frontall', frontello 'an altar frontal' (OF *frontel*, CL *frontale*). Even if the word does not derive from earlier stages of Latin, it can be fully integrated into Medieval Latin in the *DAR* (e.g. **regardis**, regardo, regard., rewardo, (AN *reward*, *regard*), not found with other allegedly vernacular-only suffixes like *-ez*)), which proves how the morphological behaviour of these words is very variable as is their status as belonging to just one language. No meaningful distribution of a particular kind of morphological behaviour according to the type of roll or date of production can be traced on the basis of the data available, only within the same roll or with particular lexical items such as *argento*, *capella/-e*, and *papiro*, whose morphological make-up remains largely consistent throughout time and across the different rolls (see Appendix 2.1).[103] An overall lack of regular patterns applies to most of the data in the *DAR* with the exception of the presence of some northern features (see Section 4 and Appendix 6.1). That is why most of the subsequent appendices do not include the details of time and type of production unless this information is relevant to the arguments in the body of the text.

3.1.2.4 Languages underlying French

The crucial criterion for classifying loanwords according to language is the immediate donor, in this case, French, which overshadows indirect influences in general etymological surveys. However, assessing the etymons from which a given word was adopted can give us insights into the broader socio-cultural background against which its use can be placed. Underlying French are other Romance languages, such as Occitan (**papejaies** < OF *papegai*, *papingai* < Old Occitan *papagay*), Provençal (**Spigotes** < OF *espigeot* < Old Provençal *espiga*), Italian (**vernag.** (vernagio) 'a kind of strong, sweet, white wine from Italy', AF *vernage* < Italian *vernaccia*), and typologically more distant languages like Arabic (e.g. **bazan** 'sheepskin tanned in bark' < OF *bazen(n)e*, *basan(n)e*, ulterior etymon Arabic *biṭānah*, **cubibis** 'Java peppercorns' < OF *cubebe, quibibe, cucube* / ML *cubeba, cubiba, cucube*, ult. Arabic *kabābah*, and **galanga** 'galingale'

[103] *Papiri* is also found as part of the phrase 'quatern. papiri' in the *DAR* monolingual treasurers' book (1557-8, 716).

(OF/ML *galanga*, ult. Arabic *ḵalanjān*)), which gives a sense of the breadth of languages which came into contact with French in the context of the *DAR* often for commercial or business purposes. Conde Silvestre (1998) meticulously examined the Mozarabic words **cordewan** (also syncopated as **corvays** in the *DAR*), originally meaning, 'Spanish leather that was made at Cordova [Córdoba]' and *cork*, among a number of lexical items whose direct etymons in English are French, but French had previously adopted them from Spanish or Spanish Arabic (e.g. **cotun** < OF *coton* < Spanish Arabic *qoton*).[104]

Fowler (1901: 906) describes **cordele** in the *DAR* as 'some textile' and refers to Cotgrave's definition which mentions 'Cordillat d'Espagne', 'a kind of twisted stuffe made of fine wooll'. The *OED* ((1893), s.v. *cordillas*, n.) links the alleged closest word in English, *cordillas*, to *cordillats*, presumably deriving from **cordille* although the word is left undefined and undiscussed. Oudin's (1616) *Tesoro de las dos lenguas francesa y española* is a bilingual lexicographical resource which reinforces the hypothesis of this word coming from Catalan *cordillat* even if no specifics are provided: *cordellate*, m. 'du cordillat [sic], une sorte de drap delié, comme de l'estamine'. Diderot's *Encyclopédie*[105] locates it to Chabeuil, in France, although no supporting empirical evidence is provided.

The following words could have potentially been borrowed through different routes. According to the *OED* ((1888), s.v. *capstan*, n.), **capstane** could have been borrowed directly from French *cabestan*, also in the sixteenth century as *capestan*—which is the source form in this 16th century account roll—or directly from its source in French, that is, Provençal *cabestan*, earlier *cabestran* (see Catalan *cabestrant*, Spanish *cabestrante*, Portuguese *cabrestante*), but it is difficult to tell judging from the dates and the morphological make-up of its first attestations in English. There are some discrepancies between the *MED* and the *OED* as regards the etymology of two further words: **bukasyn** and **Pynyonade**. The entry for **bukasyn** in the *OED* has not been revised (*OED* (1887), s.v. *bocasin*, n.) and suggests a direct borrowing from Spanish *bocací* '(also of its French form *boccasin* (Cotgrave), now *boucassin*)' ultimately

[104] See Roig-Marín (2019b; forthcoming (2020)) for an overview of the Spanish and Spanish Arabic component in the *OED*.

[105] *Encyclopédie de Diderot* accessed at <encyclopédie.eu/index.php/arts-metiers/1931083269-manufacture-de-drap/954942500-CORDILLAT>.

coming from Turkish *bōḥāsī* or *bōghāsī* 'cotton cloth'; the *MED* (s.v. *bokasin* (n.)) only gives the OF form, *bo(u)cassin*, which could be the more likely development given the spelling adaptation of the word. The Corominas's *Etymological Dictionary* suggests that the word arrived in Spain via Arabic (s.v. *bocací*) and it is first documented in 1397. In continental French, it is attested earlier, 1305 (*TLFi*, s.v. *BOUCASSIN*)—compare it with ML *bocassinus* 1259—so we can rule out the possibility of Spanish acting as an intermediary language for the French borrowing. The ML attestation of the word in continental French sources is considerably earlier (*bocassinus* 1259 (*TLFi*, s.v. *BOUCASSIN*)), but in the *DMLBS* the first attestation in British sources is rather late, from 1436, so a direct borrowing of the lexeme from French to English seems the more probable option. In the case of **Pynyonade**, the *MED* suggestion does not account for the closer morphological correspondences between the English lexeme and either Catalan *pinyonada* or Old Occitan *pinhonat* than with OF *pignon* 'pine nut' (the latter being the *MED*'s (s.v. *pinionāde* n.) proposal). The *OED* ((2006), s.v. † *pinionade*, n.) clarifies that 'while the earliest attestation in any language is apparently in Latin from a British source, the assumption has been made that both the product and its name were imported from southern Europe, as pine nuts were not grown in the British Isles'; despite the lack of proof in English monolingual sources, the novelty of the concept in Britain, as well as its morphology (compare the later MF *pignolat* and ML *pinonada*) points towards the introduction of a 'need-based' Catalan or Occitan borrowing into English.

3.1.2.5 Semantic fields

Early 20th-century scholarship, among others Serjeantson (1935) and Prins (1941), identified a correlation between a considerable number of French-origin loanwords and their technical nature. This assumption was more recently reassessed by Sylvester (2018) in a study of the vocabulary belonging to the 'Instruments' semantic subdomain of 'Building' in Middle English, part of the *Bilingual Thesaurus of Everyday Life in Medieval England* project, data which was complemented by the *Historical*

Thesaurus.[106] While everyday occupations such as metal-/wood-working and building show a penetration of French-origin lexis in a quarter of the domain-specific vocabulary (Ingham, Sylvester, and Marcus 2019), in manufacturing sectors there seems to be a higher incidence of native English lexis. English-French bilingualism, rather than French monolingualism, would have been the norm in those sectors. In the context of late medieval multilingual England, synchronous synonyms from different language traditions are expected to arise, although they are liable to undergo semantic narrowing. Sylvester adopted a cross-genre approach: rather than starting with particular text types (see Wright 1995), she took the lexis itself and its semantic characterisation as her basis. She found that hyponyms, many of which are compounds, were for the most part created natively in Middle English, usually with native elements alone or, more rarely, in combination with borrowings from other languages like ON, MDut, and French; in other words, they would be more resistant to borrowing. This finding does not fully apply to the general data of the *DAR* across semantic domains: despite the significant percentage of compounds, 41.79% (224 out of a total of 536 compounds), the majority of them contain lexical material from other languages (see Section 3.3). According to Sylvester, however, at the higher semantic levels, where the meaning is more general, the proportion between the native and borrowed vocabulary was more balanced. French-origin lexical items in this domain seemed to have been borrowed in their general, non-technical senses, and only in ME would they develop more specialised senses, unlike native terms which would either fall out of use or keep their general meanings. These are two important considerations which seem to be confirmed by the *DAR* data.

Given the large number of French-origin lexemes in the *DAR*, 703, and the fact that not all the lexical items (in particular, complex formations although simplexes too) are in the *OED Thesaurus* or the *Bilingual Thesaurus*, such a micro-level analysis is not feasible. One of the problems with the *OED Thesaurus* is that it compartmentalises lexis which shares common features such as the ornamental or decorative character of the entities denoted: **bossez** 'bosses, studs, projecting ornaments', **byis** 'fur for trimming gowns' (under textiles and clothing » textiles » textile fabric or an article of

[106] See also Sylvester's (2016) project on dress and textile vocabulary.

textile fabric » ornamental textiles » ornamental trimmings » [noun] » fur),[107] **chapes** 'caps, metal plates' (the arts » visual arts » ornamental art and craft » artistic work in metal » [noun] » plate of metal (*OED* (1889), s.v. *chape*, n.)), **fanun** 'an embroidered band, the maniple', **frayns** 'fringes or ornamental cords' (not in the *OED*), **garnessed** 'decorated, adorned', **Nouch** (also owches) 'a buckle, clasp, bracelet' (attention and judgement » beautification » types of ornamentation » jewellery » brooch or pin » [noun] (*OED* (2004), s.v. *ouche*, n.)), **papejaies** 'ornamental representations of a parrot on a tapestry', **parchettyng** 'ornamental plastering', **parure** 'an ornamental part of an alb or other vestment', **peytrell** 'a piece of armour to protect the breast of a horse (often richly ornamented, and retained for ornamental purposes after its defensive use had passed away)' (*OED* (2005), s.v. *peytral*, n.), **trelez** 'decorative latticework covering for a door or window opening', **vernys** 'resinous matter dissolved in some liquid and used for spreading over a surface in order to give this a hard, shining, transparent coat, by which it is made more durable or ornamental' (*OED* (1916), s.v. *varnish*, n.[1]). Nevertheless, some estimations of the most frequent semantic domains can be made (the lexis under each category can be found in Appendix 2.2):

- food and drinks (79), among them, additives (15), animals for food (11), containers (4), drink (7), food manufacture > equipments (8), table utensils (7)
- textiles and clothing (49)
- occupation and work (48) > equipment (22), materials (26)
- animals > fish (16), birds (10), mammals (8)
- farming (17) > animal husbandry (14)[108]
- building > furniture > household linen (6), covers or hangings (4)
- measurement (15) > measures (12), equipment (3)
- military equipment (10)
- faith (14) > artefacts (12), mostly vestments (5) or cloths (3)

[107] I will only include their classification in the *Thesaurus* if the definition *per se* does not make reference to the referent's ornamental or decorative qualities.
[108] Utensils appear under many different sections in the *OED* Thesaurus including the one listed here: world » food and drink » farming » animal husbandry.

The most common semantic domains in the Anglo-French vocabulary of the *DAR* feature, to varying degrees, in analyses of all the language inputs surveyed in this dissertation: textiles and clothing (excluding those used in religious contexts, which are under 'faith'), followed by the semantic field of food, most notably 'additives' (e.g. **caffatyne**, **saffron**, and **veryous**). The lexis of textiles and clothing was the object of study of two projects which highlighted the multilingual nature of the vocabulary used in the British Isles during the Middle Ages: *The Lexis of Cloth and Clothing in Britain c. 700-1450*, an interdisciplinary project researching the vocabulary of the medieval languages of the British Isles (OE/ME, Celtic languages, Anglo-French, Medieval Latin, and Old Norse) and its links to material artefacts and their visual representations,[109] as well as its sister work, *the Medieval Dress and Textile Vocabulary in Unpublished Sources* Project, whose sources are medieval petitions to parliament and the Royal Wardrobe accounts (see Sylvester, Chambers and Owen-Crocker's 2014 book). The Anglo-French component in this semantic domain has been extensively addressed by Chambers and Sylvester (2010a; 2010b), Sylvester and Chambers (2012), and Sylvester (2016). Other semantic domains which have been investigated include Manufacture (> metal-working and wood-working) and Travel by Water (see Sylvester and Marcus 2017), and the sub-domain of instruments within the Building (Sylvester 2018), among the research based on *The Bilingual Thesaurus* (see Sylvester, Marcus, and Ingham (2017) on the principles underlying the process of data collection for this database).

The pervasiveness of French can also be apprehended in sub-sets of vocabulary denoting artificial lights (**vergez**, **tortesse**, **torchettes**, **torche**, and **sconse**), foreign coins (**blaunkys**, **gyans**, and **crownes**), fees or taxes (**amerciamentis**, **dyme**, **multura**, **rewardo**, and **viagio**), devices for heating (**chaufor'**, **laundyrens**, and **Tewell**), equipment for hunting (**hays**, **lese**, and **tramale**), architectural elements (**butteressez** and **scotchons**) or plants, including grains (**anis**, **ceteuall**, **granis**, **gummis**, and **pepyn** in 'Resyns sanz pepyn' (Rott. Bursar. 1348-9, 549)). The spheres of art and architecture, religion, social/cultural terms, culinary and dining, and the armed forces are among those in which the influence of French is still noticeable in PDE (Baugh and Cable 1993: 165-70).[110] Some of these terms belonging to finance, dining, or military were

[109] See <lexisproject.arts.manchester.ac.uk/index.html>
[110] Only 81 out of the 521 *DAR* lexical items in the *OED* are now obsolete.

‘superimposed by the Norman conquerors’ (Gary 2012: 167; see also Hughes 2000; Lutz 2002, 2008; Vennemann 2011), but effectively French pervaded all walks of everyday life, not just through hierarchical routes—instigated by the elite or the clergy—but also through ordinary activities. Arguably, there are more OF-origin names for deluxe or refined products (see e.g. **byrels** or **Omeraud**, which are precious stones, and the terms for ornamented objects given above) than in the OE-origin vocabulary. The privileged status of French in names for prepared animals at the table, in contrast to the Germanic words for animals in the farm, is a well-known example of lexical stratification still being visible in PDE.[111] Similarly, imported products, including cloths, furniture, and spices were rendered in Anglo-French. Yet, most loanwords in the *DAR* do not accord with this view of French as elitist vocabulary: see, e.g., the many everyday goods such as **Crell'** ‘a creel’, **caldrun** ‘a pot or caldron’ or materials like **bazan** ‘sheep-skin leather’, **gravell** ‘coarse sand and water-worn stones of various sizes’, among many others. From the semantics of these French-origin lexemes as described in dictionaries it can be inferred that some had near semantic equivalents in English (e.g. **gloy** ‘straw’ or **playnshorez**, defined in the *OED* ((2006) s.v. *plancher*, n.), as ‘a wooden plank, a board’, also ‘planking, boarding’)—although often the context does not provide further semantic cues—while most in the *DAR* had narrower senses not recorded in the extant OE lexis (e.g. **planche** ‘a large board, a plank’ or **sclat’** ‘slate’). Therefore, the majority could be deemed necessary or cultural borrowings except for the occasional use of terms for which there was an equivalent in English or Latin as in ‘le Roy’ (see Section 3.1), which would function as phraseological units like 'Resyns sanz pepyn', possibly written down as they were uttered and heard in the French spoken in manorial settings.

The use of French in the manor as well as the learning of Latin through this language thus seems to crystallise in the language of the *DAR* on different levels. Firstly, the usage of the French article in these multilingual texts, mirroring the profound changes that the learning of French underwent, particularly after the Black

[111] It is worth noting that the displacement of native terms and its replacement with French terms did not occur overnight: its use was not fully systematic until at least the 16th century and only in the 18th century they became well established. Up until then, terms like *mutton* and *sheep* could be used interchangeably (Dubois 1992; Burchfield 1985; Kornexl and Lenker 2011; Dance 2014: 170).

Death (Section 3.1.2.2 above). The competence in this language overall decreased, which would explain the later innovative uses of this definite marker, functioning autonomously and departing from its French model (see also the morphological variants *ly* and *lie* in Section 4.3.2). Likewise, it can be argued that the use of French as a medium of instruction for Latin also had an effect on the choice of stems: whenever the Latin and French stems were available, the scribe might have opted for the French stem alone (e.g. **chapes** (Rott. Bursar. 1356-7, 558 and Rott. Bursar. c. 1365-6, 569) (cf. OF *chape* and CL *cappa*), **Jambe** (Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9, 642) (cf. OF *gambe*, *jambe* and LL *camba*, *gamba*), and **pulcin'** (Rott. Celer. 1307-8, 3) (AF *pulcin*; LL *pullicenus*), **roll** [of cloth] (Rott. Camer. 1378-9, 181), Rollez (Rott. Bursar. 1440-1, 627) (cf. OF *rolle*, *roule* and CL *rotula*)), but this depends largely on the lexical item in question (see Appendix 2.1 for some ML/AF examples), and any larger trends cannot be properly apprehended given the notoriously difficult taxonomical nature of the data, a pitfall which is discussed in Section 3.1.2.3; co-existence of the Latin and French stems is, in fact, part and parcel of the *DAR*, as is the linguistic ambiguity of many of these lexical items, which hinders the classification of this lexis in binary terms (Section 3.1.2.3). Among the many lexemes adopted from French are those with etymons in other languages such as Arabic, Spanish, Occitan, Italian, and other Romance languages (Section 3.1.2.4). Interrogating the etymological routes of these words enables us to have a more grounded sense of the connections and exchanges among the different peoples across Europe and the Mediterranean. Finally, a semantic approach to the French vocabulary in the *DAR* aligns with the latest research into everyday vocabulary: vocabulary associated with the elite is only a small fraction in the *DAR*; most of it denotes objects, materials, tools, and other equipment.

3.1.3 Old Norse

Both this section on Old Norse[112] and the subsequent one on Middle Dutch represent a fundamental departure from the previous literature on loaned material by examining sources written in Medieval Latin rather than in monolingual English. The potential of this richer and more complex interplay between languages will be further discussed throughout this chapter of the thesis, but for now it is worth stressing that the taxonomical principles that underlie this examination are common to Middle-English based studies. I will, therefore, be drawing on classic reference works on Old-Norse derived loanwords in medieval English such as Björkman's (1900-1902) monograph and cutting-edge research such as that carried out by Dance and his team for the *Gersum Project*.[113]

The effects of the contact between speakers of English and Old Norse in early medieval England still continue to fascinate researchers and the general public alike. The nature of the bilingual environment and culture that arose out of the continuous exchanges (linguistic and otherwise) between the newcomers and the native population are of extraordinary singularity in the history of English: the genetic proximity between Old Norse and Old English means that these two languages shared a significant number of cognates apart from evincing formal similarities. That is why a certain degree of mutual intelligibility has often been assumed (see, among others, Townend (2002) and Dance (2012) and the references therein) and the absorption of a large number of loanwords was facilitated. The most prototypical scenario for lexical borrowing involves requiring a new word to express a newly 'imported' concept or extra-linguistic reality previously non-existent in the receiving community. In contrast to these 'need-based' loans, there was a transfer of material at a much deeper level:

---

[112] Durkin (2014: 175) makes use of the term 'early Scandinavian'—also found in *OED3*—and explains how 'Old Norse' is terminologically imprecise in the context of Anglo-Scandinavian contact in the British Isles since English came into contact with the linguistic ancestors of both West Norse (Norwegian and Icelandic) and East Norse (Danish and Swedish). The differences between the two varieties, however, were not sufficiently noticeable as to be able to further distinguish West from East Norse input in English, which is why I will use avail myself of the long-standing term of Old Norse.

[113] I wish to express my special gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Richard Dance, who very kindly allowed me to make use of the *Gersum* database prior to its public release.

some prepositions and the third person plural pronouns are argued to have been borrowed from Old Norse—see Cole (2018) for an alternative, language internal, explanation for some forms of them—and native word-forms took senses or meanings from Norse (e.g. *dream*). Only a situation of intense contact would have possibly catalysed the borrowing of such fundamental lexical units in a language, a phenomenon which would have derived, in Dance's words (2013: 43), from 'source-language-led "imposition"' in communities routinely code-switching from Old Norse into Old English'. Yet, the scarcity of firm evidence has often led some authors to reassess the role of contact-induced change in the explanation of linguistic change on a lexical and morphosyntactic level. Lass (1997: 209) would argue that 'in the absence of evidence, an endogenous explanation of a phenomenon is more parsimonious, because endogenous change *must* occur in any case, whereas borrowing is never necessary'. The *World Loanword Database* (Haspelmath and Tadmoor 2009a, 2009b), the largest compilation of cross-linguistic data available to explore lexical borrowing, has proven that the borrowing of core vocabulary is unexpectedly common, and that limitations on the kinds and degree of material subject to be borrowed between closely related languages are particularly elusive (cf. Haspelmath and Tadmoor 2009; Dance 2019: I.27). Regardless of our epistemological inclination, this finding should make us problematise Liberman's assertion that 'all other conditions being equal, tracing a word to a native root should be preferred to declaring it a borrowing' (2008: xxvi). Contact can also be invoked in conjunction with potential native developments, which might have been actualised or accelerated because of the influence of the other language, so a scholarly polarisation between the advocates of internal vs external explanations for language change is not particularly helpful when thinking about multilingual scenarios; nor is the preference for language-internal accounts tantamount to dismissing any form of Scandinavian influence: from a lexical viewpoint, there has been general consensus on some fairly secure borrowings from Norse. Yet, some aforementioned factors such as the typological proximity between the two languages and the paucity of textual witnesses means that 'it is often impossible to be sure whether borrowing or endogenous change is at work' (Dance 2019: I.29). Alluring as the Viking element has been (and continues to be) ever since the nineteenth century, as Dance (2019) points out, in etymological research few directions have been

given as to how to decide whether a particular lexeme exhibits Old Norse influence when the amount (or lack) of information available can be utilised to argue both ways. To what extent we should rely on negative evidence, that is, on unrecorded Old English cognates has divided scholars. Kolb (1965: 133) suggests not searching for such cognates too eagerly, whereas other authors embrace Norse input even if earlier native words (with the same meaning) are attested (see, e.g., Ringe 2004).

In order to examine the Norse element in the *DAR*, I shall briefly revisit some of the main criteria (not always explicitly stated) and kinds of evidence adduced in the literature; in particular, Dance's (2013; 2018; 2019) typology and underlying theoretical basis and discussion will be followed. Important early contributions cited in Björkman's seminal work include Coleridge (1859), Steenstrup (1882), Skeat (1882), Brate (1885), and Kluge (1901). Björkman (1900) assesses the reliability and scope of his predecessors,[114] while foregrounding their treatment of ON borrowings, primarily on phonological grounds (see, e.g., Brate 1885: 4–30; Knigge 1885: 71–2). Coleridge (1859: 26) made use of a word's distribution in the Germanic languages, and Björkman (1900) himself concentrated on phonological tests but also considered other (less reliable) criteria. Dance propounds a two-fold classification for the kinds of positive evidence susceptible to be used for assessing Scandinavian input: 'structural' and 'circumstantial' evidence. Under structural evidence would fall aspects relating to the formal structure of the language (e.g. phonology and morphology); and circumstantial evidence would 'derive from patterns of occurrence' (Dance 2019: I.36). He clarifies that chronology is not a reason *per se* for assigning ON influence; rather, the lateness of a word (900 is the *terminus post quem* for any visible lexical effect of Anglo-Scandinavian contact on written Old English) is a prerequisite for a loan; attestations of lexemes earlier than the tenth century are deemed cognates, not loans. I will now review Dance's classification of evidence in greater depth, which is primarily arranged into four main types (Types A, B, C, and D), and I will illustrate each type with examples from the database (a full list of the classified lexical items can be found in Appendix 3).

[114] Björkman (1900) also acknowledges the primary historical interest in Anglo-Scandinavian relationships that characterised Steenstrup's work in contrast to Brate's (1885) philological research.

The source material that is the focus of this dissertation—the *DAR*—comes from an area beyond Samuels's 'Great Scandinavian Belt'[115] (1985: 269), so, in theory, a relatively lower incidence of ON influence should surface. 160 lexical items (67 simplexes and 93 complex lexical units) stems have been tentatively classified as evincing ON influx (around 10% of the total number of vernacular items).[116] How representative this figure can be in the context of a text traditionally classified as 'Latin', in which there are few closed-class lexemes coming from the vernaculars (a few prepositions and the definite article from French), is a question that remains to be answered in future research. For the purposes of this dissertation, rather than analysing ON influence on the language of the *DAR* in purely numerical terms, I carried out a qualitative analysis. Many of these lexemes are classified under the ON-influenced headwords, so that any compounds/lexical units are not counted as distinct lemmas. Other tentative borrowings were not included on the list because the evidence was either too tenuous (e.g. in **cape**stonys, cf. the *OED* ((1893), s.v. *cope*, n.[1]) 'the Middle English forms might be from Old Norse *kápa*, but this is an unlikely source') or it was suggested in the past but was ruled out (e.g. in **stepe** lede, where the *OED* ((1916), s.v. *steep*, v.[1]) indicates that it is 'of difficult etymology' and discards the possibility of being a loanword from ON (OIcel *støypa*) on phonological grounds).[117] The direct etymon is the main focus of investigation and, therefore, words such as **til** and **wyndas** have been excluded from this list on the basis of their direct borrowing from French (even if they were ultimately borrowed from ON). So was **brusket'** (also bruskett'): the *OED* identifies formal and semantic resemblances between **brusket'** and French *brechet*, whereas the *MED* only consider its alleged NGmc parallels (OIcel *brjósk* 'cartilage', Dan. *brusk*). Palatalisation in the onset position is expected in Central French dialects (in contrast to the Insular variety), so it is more likely that **brusket'** comes from Anglo-French. The information provided by the *OED* and the *MED* has been collated with that included in Dance's volume 2 (2019) and the *Gersum* database,

[115] See Samuels (1985: 269) on the Great Scandinavian Belt, 'excluding the old kingdom of Bernicia in Durham and Northumberland'.
[116] Complex lexical units or compounds made up of a Scandinavian-derived element are not included in this count but will be discussed in 3.3.
[117] As per common practice, I will cite the OIcel reflexes as etyma of the ON loans.

which also gives the proposed ON etymon, the OE cognate (if any), and phonological and morphological markers (if relevant).

While there might be discrepancies between the main etymologies given in the *OED* and the *MED*, some items do not attract much controversy. The classification below, nevertheless, is provisional and subject to further refinements. A more thorough cross-linguistic examination of each individual item (especially those belonging to categories other than Type A) would be desirable, but it is beyond the scope of the present thesis, which attempts to delineate the several language inputs in the vernacular lexis of the *DAR* more generally. I have not made use of Dance's 'probability categories'—unless they are adopted from the *Gersum* project or Dance (2019)—but have indicated if the evidence for a tentative ON borrowing can be reinforced by the dialectal distribution of that particular word through the use of the letter 'c' (mainly confined to the North or East of England in the general ME lexis) or, just in one instance, 'b' (confined to the North or East in the toponymic record).

3.1.3.1 Type A

Systematic phonological and morphological parameters are well-established in the literature as regular and reliable.[118] Indeed, as Dance puts it, 'their consistency is what allows comparative philologists to argue for English and Norse as distinct developments on the Gmc family tree in the first place' (2019: 39). Dance further subdivides Type A borrowings into three sub-categories: A1 phonological criteria, A2 morphological criteria, and A3 phonological and morphological criteria. A paradigmatic example of these formal, phonological, correspondences is OE /ɑː/ (corresponding to ME /aː, ɔː/) and ON /ei/. If the English form happens to exhibit the corresponding OIcel sound instead of the expected OE-derived form, this would be indicative of a discontinuity between OE and ME generated by contact with ON. The OE cognate is, nevertheless, not needed to prove the influx of ON precisely because of the systematicity of these—in this case, phonological—features. The probability of a native variant developing independently so that it would eventually converge with the ON

[118] See Lass (1997: 123-39) on the need to establish correspondences which are ''lawful'', statable in principle as particular instantiations of general rules'.

form often seems unlikely; hence, we can speak of relatively 'secure' criteria within the philological paradigm.[119] Yet, if there are no attested cognates in other Germanic languages apart from ON, the distinctiveness of allegedly ON features may be at stake, and the possibility of independent convergence gains ground.[120] Unfortunately, there is only one instance of the A2 class in the *DAR*: the presence of the inflectional *-t* in **twhert**sawes; *-t* is the suffix attached to adjectives to form adverbs in ON but not in OE: OIcel *þvert* adverb 'across', originally neuter of the OIcel adjective *þver-r* = OE *þwerh* (cf. *OED* (1912) *thwart*, adv., prep., and adj.). There are none representing A3, which is why I shall concentrate on the A1 group.

Our understanding of certain phonological changes (A1) has been considerably refined since the nineteenth century, so that not all of them are regarded as equally reliable—at least, under all circumstances—in present-day scholarship. It had been long assumed that palatalisation had not been fully operative in Northumbrian, or that in initial position /k/ did not assibilate.[121] This belief, implying northern-exclusive developments, has been progressively invalidated ever since Gevenich (1918) proved prevalent /k/ > /ʃ/ in native northern toponyms. Yet, its absence in non-initial position is much more problematic and is often seen as a possible native development, which is why in this chapter more secure—initial-position—environments will be considered. The reflex of PGmc */k/ is /tʃ/ in Old English but not in Old Norse, as can be seen in **castyng** (OIcel *kasta*), replacing the native OE *weorpan* in ME (*Gersum*, s.v. *kest*), **kerr** (*Gersum,* s.v. *ker* [A1bc]; not in OE), **keruyng**knyves (OIcel *kyrfa,* OE *cyrf*), **kyd**sape (OIcel *kið*), and **kirn**, a northern variant of OE *cyrne*, probably influenced by contact with ON (OIcel *kirna*). The other contexts in which we can perform a palatalisation test are PGmc */g/ > ON /g/, OE /j/ and PGmc */sk/ which also remains /sk/ in ON but palatalises in OE, resulting in ME /ʃ/. **Gersuma** (< OE *gærsama* < OIcel *gørsimi*) and the *garth*-compounds (OIcel *garð-r*): berne**garth**, connyn**garth** (x2), ymp**garth**,

[119] See my comments in the methodology section for a more detailed explanation of the philological nature of the present dissertation.

[120] Dance (2019: 42) cites *mynne, rake,* and *rasse,* among other examples of vocabulary which did not make the cut in this sense and are, therefore, classified as Type D.

[121] For a general description of palatalisation, see, inter alia, Campbell (1959: §§426–41), Hogg (1992: §§7.15–43), and Jordan-Crook (1974: §§177–94), and on its outcomes, Luick (1935), West (1936), Penzl (1947), Watson (1947), Kristensson (1976), Hogg (1979), Cercignani (1983), Krygier (2000), Minkova (2003; 2014; 2016), Dance (2003: 141–2; 2012; 2013; 2018; 2019: I.§8), and Liberman (2007).

swynhous**garth**, stak**garth** (x3), and Wode**garth** exhibit ON /g/. It is worth noting that the native variant, with *yard*, is also present in three compounds, ymppe**yard** (x2), Wod**yard** (x5) and Hemp**yard**. Both the native and the ON-influenced variants mostly occur in the 14th century, so there does not seem to be a diachronic motivation for the use of one form over another, especially in the cases of ymppe**yard** and Wod**yard**; rather, it is lexically conditioned (see Section 4). Spone**garn** (pronounced with /g/) also seems to exhibit partial input from ON (cf. OE *gearn*), and there is further evidence for the absence of palatalisation in the following lexemes starting with <sc/sk>: e.g., **skelez** 'vessels' (OIcel *skjōla*) (x7; x1 with <sc>—see Appendix 6.1 for details)),[122] **scale** (pl.) 'scales', also in merow**scales**, Wey**scill** (all of them always spelt with <sc>),[123] **skepe** (OIcel *skeppa*) (x7), **skers**, and may **skynnes**. *Scales, skeles*, and *skepes* are also in the *DMLBS* (cf. *DMLBS*, s.v. *2 scala, skela,* and *skeppa*). Regarding the last two, *skeles* and *skepes*, they are written with <sc> and <sk>, the former spelling allegedly representing an adapted Latinised version (nonetheless present in ME as well) and the latter being a reflex of the source etymon, directly adopted. These two graphemic versions are in ML as well as in ME.[124] *Skeles* is also spelt with <sch> (the spelling variant that the *MED* cites as northern '(N) *schele*' only because it is in the *DAR*, s.v. *skḗle* (n.)) in the records of the *DMLBS* (*schalis* and *schelis* with vowel alternation too), which evidences the flexibility of ML. It might be contended that the early instances of these words were 'unadapted' and, therefore, contain <sk> and, as time progressed, <sc> replaced <sk> in Medieval Latin texts. Wright (1998; 2012) suggests the reverse phenomenon in the context of multilingual business writing which would show a progressive 'Anglicisation' of the lexis before there was a complete shift to monolingual English. The scarce <sk> data in the *DAR* prevents me from reaching any generalising conclusions, but the *DMLBS* shows considerable variation across space,

---

[122] The total number of occurrences of a lexical unit is given here in parentheses, while Appendix 3, like most of the appendices, only lists the distinct spelling variants of a given lexeme.

[123] The <sk> in *scales* is not favoured despite the possible confusion with the word *scalis* (coming from CL) 'ladders' although the plural-forming suffix *-ez* (and less often, *-es*) is employed instead of *-is*, so this was perhaps the strategy to distinguish the two words in case it was used.

[124] *MED*, s.v. *scōle* n.(1): 'Also *skole*, (N) *schole* & (early) *skale*, (early SWM) *scale*, (early SW) *scoale* & (error) *stole*; s.v. *skep(pe* (n.) Also *skepe, scep(pe, schep(pe, szepe & skip(pe, skipe, scippe*; s.v. *skḗle* n. Also (N) *schele* & (error) *skliyee*'.

time, and possibly genre, rather than a steady trend (e.g. see *skippis* ((*Ac. Milton*) *DCCant*) as early as 1299 and *skepcis* (*Househ. Bk. Durh.* 133) from 1532).

Other consonant features evincing ON influence are the following: PGmc */ð/ > ON /ð/ in **girthys** (x20), **girth**bukyls (x7), **Girth**webbs (x9), and **Girthe**tres (x1, A1c in *Gersum*, s.v. *gerrethis*), cp. OIcel *gjǫrð* < PGmc **gerđō*, and there are no attested forms containing a fricative in West Germanic languages (cf. e.g. MDu *gherde*); ON consonant assimilation in **broddis** (ON *brodd-r* = OE *brord*), also in **brod**nales, lat**brodes**, lat**broddes**, Spon**brod** (C3),[125] stan**brod** (x5), and Stra**brod**, and in **gonnys** (x5), cp. OIcel *gunnr,* with loss of the nasal consonant and compensatory lengthening (*Gersum*, s.v. *gunnes*); and PGmc */jj/ and */ww/ > ON /ggj/ and /ggw/ by sharpening or Holtzmann's Law, a regular (albeit obscure) change in Gothic and ON, yielding ME /g/ in **byg**bern (OE *bēow* 'barley'), and *eggs* in Rent **Egges** (x3) (OE *ǽg*). This change is not found in OE, which is why the equivalent OE and ME forms have vowels, semi-vowels, or diphthongs. Likewise, **littyng**leyde (x2) can be accounted for by referring to PGmc */w/, which was lost before /l/ in ON but remained in OE *wlite* 'beauty, splendour, appearance' (*OED* (1928), s.v. † *wlite*, n.).

Two other consonantal changes which may be more problematic in etymological descriptions are ON /hl/ > /l/, noticeable in *male* in land**mall** (x3), land**male**bok (le), and medow**male**, and ON assimilation of /nk/ > /kk/ in **drawkyng**. There is a cognate of *male* in Old English, *mæðel* 'discussion, meeting', although the sense of the English words seems to derive from OIcel *máli* 'contract, stipulated pay'. As the *OED* ((2000) s.v. *mail*, n.1) indicates, the word survived only in Scots and Northern English dialects (see Section 4.3). Concerning **drawkyng**, according to the *OED* ((1897), s.v. *drawk*, v.), it should in theory be ascribed to Type D1 since its etymology is 'obscure', only 'possibly' related to ON (OIcel. *drekkja* < PGmc **drankian* 'to drawn') 'drench, drown, swamp, submerge'; yet, given the Northern English / Scottish distribution of the word (cf. *DOST*, s.v. *Drawk*, v. too; lemma not in the *MED*), the lack of a native source and/or closer Germanic etymon with this sense and phonological make-up, we can place it within this group.

[125] *Spon* 'spoon' is also an ON-derived lexeme but of a different class, Class 'C' (see below and Dance (2019: §263) s.v. *sponez* (CCC3a)).

A number of vocalic features can also be used as diagnostic tests in the *DAR* material: ON /ɛi/ vs. OE /ɑː/, visible in plough**swayn**landes (OIcel *sveinn* = OE *swán*), and PGmc */au/ > ON /ɑu/, /ɔu/, in **wyndow**clath and **stopez** (x4), also as stowpys (x3) (ON *staup* = OE *stéap)*. Influence of the ON vowel is patent in **stra**brod (OIcel *strá* = OE *stréaw* (PGmc. **strawo*-)).

3.1.3.2 Types B, C, and D

The following types of evidence can be classified as less secure because they do not rely on formal criteria like Type A. The ultimate lexical source for these items is here the determining factor: the form-source may not be attested in early OE but recorded in ON (in which case, the word would belong to Type B); it may also be found in early OE (Type C); or the form-source may be obscure, not unequivocally identifiable (Type D). Generally speaking, the scale of probability ranges from the more secure Type B words to the unclear Type D items, but within these major groupings, there is also scope for a spectrum of individual cases, which may be equally placed on a continuum of likelihood as far as ON input is concerned (hence, the numeric sub-classification).

3.1.3.2.1 Type B

An underlying premise with Type B words is that if a particular Germanic root is not recorded in early written OE, it may signify that it did not survive long enough to explain its use post Anglo-Norse contact. Frequency of use might play a part in a word's attestation, meaning that very specialised or low-frequency items might be absent in extant OE writings, but this should be carefully assessed on a case-by-case basis. A further distinction can be made between Type B1 (when no forms deriving from the same root have been identified in Germanic) and Type B2 items (when these lexemes are indeed present in Gothic and/or the continental West Germanic languages). The information has been mostly gleaned from both the *OED* and *MED*, but the classification below is not exclusively reliant on the *MED* or the *OED* entries, some of which are still in the process of being revised and do not give enough details or may wrongly assume that a given lexeme unproblematically comes from ON.

Some examples of Type B1 are **eldyng**pan 'fuelling' (cf. OIcel *eldíng*, Danish *ilding*), **hale** 'handles of a plough' (OIcel *hali*, Danish *hale* 'tail'), **rove** 'a small metal plate' (OIcel *ró*, Norwegian *ro*, Faroese *rógv*), whose further etymology is unknown (possibly related to the Germanic stem *wro* 'crooked object' 'curvature' (*OED* (2011), s.v. *rove*, n.1)), **ryvyng** 'splitting or cleaving of wood' (OIce *rífa*, Norwegian *rive*, OSwe *riva,* ODan *rywæ*, cognate with Old Frisian *-rīva* (*OED* (2010), s.v. *riving*, n.1)), *muk* 'manure' in **muk**forkez (x2) and **muk**hak (x3) which, before ME, is only extant in late OE outside the North Germanic languages (cf. *Gersum,* s.v. *mokke* (B1)), and **toft** 'the land on which a house stands' (cf. Old Swedish *tompt*, Norwegian *tomt*, and Danish *tomt*). The etymologies of **brakennez** and **Kelinges** (x4) are more challenging although they certainly seem to be B1: there is no surviving form for **brakennez** 'ferns' in ON although it is reconstructed as **brakni* on the basis of Scandinavian equivalents in Danish, Swedish, Icelandic, and Norwegian; no OE **bræcen* is recorded either (cf. *Gersum,* s.v. *braken,* n. (B1c));[126] on the other hand, the origin of **Kelinges** is likewise uncertain: the *OED* ((1901) s.v. *keeling*, n.1) suggests that the name 'like *cod* n.3, seems to be confined to English, but may be ultimately related to Icelandic *keila* 'gadus longus', or to Danish *kolle, kuller*, Swedish *kolja* haddock' and the *MED* agrees on the possibility of representing a borrowing from ON (OIcel *keila*).[127]

Lexical items belonging to Type B2 are, among others, **dam** 'a dam' a common Germanic root in OFris *dam*, *dom*, MDut and MLG *dam(m)*, MHG *tam*, and OIcel *dammr* (14–15th cent.),[128] **flakes** (x4)[129] 'a hurdle' (OIcel *flake*, *fleke*, MDut *vlāke*, MLG *flake*), **gabelorum** (x8) 'a gable (also a façade) of a building', the closest comparanda are OIcel *gafl*, OSwe *gafl*, ODan *-gawel* although there is an ablaut variant of the stem in MDut. *gevel*, OHG *gibili* (also with a different suffix OHG *gebal*), and MHG *gibel*.

[126] It is classified as 'c' in *Gersum* because the *MED* attestations are mostly from the north and the East Midlands (*MED*, s.v. *brāke(n* (n.)).

[127] Irish *ceilliuin* and Gaelic *cílean* seem to be borrowings of the ME word themselves (cf. *OED* (1901), s.v. *keeling*, n.1). The word was certainly northern during the ME period (see Section 4).

[128] In the *Gersum* database (s.v. *dam*), it is labelled as BBB2abc. Dance's letter-based taxonomy and the sub-classification into 'probability categories' attempts to further clarify the degree to which researchers can ascribe ON influence to a particular lexeme. In the case of Type B, B represents fairly general consensus on the status of the word as deriving from ON; BB involves some disagreement, since other alternatives to ON input may be likely; and BBB words may be explained more satisfactorily through other explanations.

[129] Also in scaffalde **flakes**, chese**fleke**, and Cart**fleykke**.

Anglo-French possibly reinforced the spellings with <b> (given under the β forms in the *OED*), so *gable* received multiple partial inputs (*OED* (2018), s.v. *gable*, n.[1]); **crokez** (x9)[130] is in ON (OIcel *krókr*) and seems to be part of the same ablaut series (*krak-*, *krôk*) as OHG *kracko*, *krahho* 'hook'; it is commonly derived from the ON etymon rather than OE **crōk* (here departing from the *MED*, s.v. *crǭk* n.) or OE *crycc* 'crutch, staff', which might also be related to the aforementioned ablaut-series (also see *Gersum*, s.v. *crokeȝ* n. (pl.) (BB2b));[131] and **tedyr** < ON *tjóðr* 'tether', which corresponds to WFris *tyader, tieder* (15th cent.), and MLG/MDut *tûder, tudder,* and LG *tüder, tüdder, töder, tider, tier, tir*.

Less straightforward B2 lexical items (nevertheless, probably ON-derived) are **kagges**, **Ripp's**, and **snypys**. The semantics of **kagges** (OIcel *kaggi*) complicate a linear etymological narrative: in the *DAR* it has to be read as 'kegs', 'small casks or barrels', but in the sense of 'fishing-boats' it is identified with Dutch *kaag,* Low German *kag*. The word was also borrowed into French (*cague* 'fishing-boat' and *caque* 'a herring-barrel') so the theory that 'ships, or boats, and casks, or tubs, often go by the same name' is echoed in the *OED* etymology of the word ((1888), s.v. † *cag*, n.[1]), which is relatively uncertain (the *MED* just limits its etymology to give the ON etymon but does not mention any possible cognates in other Germanic languages), so the word is provisionally included here. **Ripp's** is 'probably' cognate, according to the *OED* ((2010), s.v. *rip*, n.[1]), with German regional (Low German) *rep*, OHG *href*, *ref* 'basket' (MHG *ref*, German (now regional) *Reff* 'pannier'). The *OED* also draws attention to the lack of additional supporting evidence by means of the word's regional distribution, since 'the (post-medieval) currency of the word in south-eastern counties outside the Danelaw area is surprising in a word of Scandinavian origin'. As exemplified in Section 4, the development of lexemes throughout time can be varied and complex, so this can only be taken as a lexicographical curiosity. **Snypys** 'snipes' has an even more complicated origin: the *OED* links it to ON, but the lexeme seems only to be attested as part of compounds (Icelandic *mýrisnípa*, Norwegian *myr-, strandsnipa*) and the connections

[130] *Crook* with the <u> spelling variant (x5), also in brer**croke** (BB2b), dore**crokez,** flesh**cruk** (x2), and Shepe**croke** (x2). See Appendix 6.1 for details of the <o> and <u> occurrences.

[131] Note the *OED* claims that it 'unknown elsewhere in Germanic' although it does cite the possible connection to the ablaut series to which OHG *kracko* belongs (cf. *OED* (1893), s.v. *crook*, n. and adj.).

with MLG and LG (also older Danish) *snippe/sneppe*, German dialect *schnippe*, and MDut *sneppe* (Dutch *snep*), OHG *snepha* (*snepfa*) and *snepho* are not clear. Yet, because the word is not found in OE and the localised attestations in the *MED* suggest a northern/east midland distribution, we have included it here rather than along with the etymologically obscure Type D words.

3.1.3.2.2 Type C

Type C items vary greatly in so far as an early OE source-form has been identified; the revealing feature is a sense, usage, or word-form which might be rare or unparalleled in earlier OE. Type C items are, therefore, classified according to that defining characteristic, which can fall under the following linguistic levels or parameters: derivational morphology (C1), phonology (C2), semantics (C3), complex word-formation processes (C4), and frequency (C5), arranged by category below. Within Type C are also those lexical items whose (direct or indirect) source-forms come from another language (e.g. Latin or French). The question is, again, whether the feature under consideration could be tentatively explained through an unattested (endogenous) descent or through a direct borrowing from that third language rather than from Old Norse, a probability that may vary widely from item to item.

Bonesilver, croce**loft**, **flyttyng**, the deverbal noun **hyngynges**, **slawters** (x2) (also in **Slawghter**house (x6), **Slaughter**manhous (x4)) and **wandes** (also in **Wande**penys and Sayl**wandis**) are Type C1 and shall also be discussed in greater detail:

- OIcel *bón* 'boon' and OE *bēn* 'request, prayer' represent the only known Germanic reflexes of **bōn*-. The OIcel non-mutated form may be an alternative *ō*-stem, rather than *i*-stem, development (cf. *Gersum*, s.v. *bone*, which also mentions its widespread use in ME).
- Similarly, the OE *i*-mutated form *lyft* contrasts with OIcel *loft* (*lopt*) (< PGmc **luft-a-n*); the only possibility for explaining the closer alignment of the ME (and late OE) form with the Scandinavian paradigm other than through derivation—which is to date the most authoritative account—is to assume that there was an unrecorded/now lost OE variant which had the *o*-stem (see Pons-Sanz 2013: 72–3 and Dance 2019: II.123, who classifies *lofte* as C1b (CC3ab));

- **flyttyng** ‘removing’ is a weak verb deriving from the root **flut-* which is only recorded in North Germanic (*Gersum,* s.v. *flitt*, gives the source for **flut-,* the Gmc strong verb **fleutan-*, with a different sense, ‘float, stream’, whose reflexes are OIcel *fljóta*, OE *flēotan*, OFris *flīata*, OHG *fliozan*, and OS *fliotan*);
- ME *hengen* in **hyngynges** (‘an ornamental hanging for a room, hall, etc.’) was formed on PGmc **xang-*. OE had the strong (VII) verb *hōn* (trans.) and the weak 2 *hangian* (intrans.), both meaning 'to hang', and nominal formations on the *i*-mutated stem, *heng-*, are also recorded. There are also weak 1 verbs in West Germanic languages (MDu *hengen*, OHG *ir-henken*, OFris *hingia*), so OE **hengan*, as suggested in *Gersum* (s.v. *henge*), would be within the realms of possibility. However, the absence of recorded usage in OE and its northern distribution in ME has led scholars to believe it is a loanword from ON (cp. ON *hęngja* (weak 1 verb (trans.)), being entered in *Gersum* as CC1ac;
- for **slawters** (OIcel *slátr*) there are no corresponding stems with *r* in other Germanic languages, only OE *slieht, slæht, sleaht, sleht, sliht, slyht* < PGmc **slaxt-* (see also *Gersum*, s.v. *slaʒtir*);
- lastly, **wandes** ‘rods or laths’ is cross-linguistically represented in other Germanic languages (e.g. both OIcel *vǫndr* ‘wand, switch’ and Go *wandus* ‘rod’) which descend from a common root, PGmc **wanðuz,* a formation on **wenðan* ‘to turn’ (see Dance (2019: II.138) and *Gersum*, s.v. *wandez*, a lexical item entered under C1c).

There are two Type C2 lexical items in the *DAR* which could be claimed to have arisen endogenously: *cart* and *stoth. Cart* (in **Cart**bod. (x2), **Cartfleykkes**, **Carth’**neys (x3), **cart**rapes (x5), **Carte**sadle, (x2), **cart**sadiltrees, **cart**silver, **Cart**strakes, Lang**cart’**, Stan**kart** (le)) with metathesis (< PGmc **kratt-*) is not present in OE (*cræt*) or other West Germanic cognates (e.g. OHG *kratto*). As stated in the *Gersum* database (*Gersum*, s.v. *kart* (labelled CC2)) and the *OED* ((1888), s.v. *cart*, n.), there is no overlap of the metathesised and unmetathesised variants, and the unmetathesised form is not attested in ME, which may be revealing in assessing the extent to which ON could have influenced (not necessarily replaced) the native form. On the other hand, in **stothes**—also in dore**stothez** (x3)—, there is final-position /ð/ rather than /d/. Nonetheless, unlike **girthys** (Type A1, discussed above), there is a cognate in OE, so the word could

have been a variant of the native *studu*, perhaps reinforced by ON, rather than a direct borrowing (OIcel *stoð*). The fact that most attestations of *stooth* are located to the north and East Midlands is, again, not sufficient proof.

Type C3 lexical items (**coddis**, **thyxtyll**, **mosse**, **fery**bote, and **spon** (in **spon**brod and **spon**yarn)), based on semantics, are sometimes more problematical: *spon* represents a relatively secure Type C3 item because OE *spón* only had the sense of 'chip', not the utensil; **coddis** 'bolsters or bearings of an axle' may have had an OE source *codd* 'bag' and/or OIcel near-cognate *koddi* 'pillow'. The *MED* identifies sense 4, both 'a metal "cushion", such as a bearing of an axle or a bell' (4b) and, more generally, 'a pillow' (4a) as only northern (*MED*, s.v. *cod* n.(1)), and the *OED* devotes a separate entry to this northern usage (*OED* (1891), s.v. *cod*, n.[2]), although it is noted that it shares its root with *cod*, n.[1] 'bag'. The connection between 'a bag' and a pillow—being a stuffed bag—becomes patent, but the fact that ON *koddi* (also Old Danish *kodde*) had the primary meaning of 'pillow' might have triggered semantic narrowing and the development of that particular sub-sense in the English lexeme; **thyxtyll** 'a kind of ax', in **thyxtyll** goug, probably comes from OIcel *þexla* (cf. Norw. *teksla*, Dan. *teksel*, with the same meaning in OHG *dehsala*), since it has a cognate in OE (OE *þīxl*) but with a different meaning 'beam or pole' (*MED*, s.v. *thixel* n.);[132] likewise, the double sense of **mosse** (x3) is linked to ON (OIcel *mosi* both 'moss' and 'bog, moorland') since it seems that OE *mos* only meant 'bog' (*Gersum*, s.v. *mosse* (CCC3ab); Dance 2019: II.§259). It has been claimed that both meanings might have already had currency in early OE, so a native-only historical trajectory is also possible; and *fery* in **fery**bote is another instance of partial multiple inputs: it is, in part, a borrowing from Scandinavian (OIcel *ferja* ferry boat, OSwed *færia,* ODan *færie*, all meaning 'ferry boat') as well as the outcome of the conversion of the verb *ferry* 'to transport or carry' (*ferian* in OE and OSax, and on the more specific sense of 'by boat', see OIcel *ferja*, Gothic farjan, and MLG *vēren*, MHG *vern*) into a noun.

Bollez was tentatively included as Class C3c although it is a more dubious case: **bollez** (x2) is used as a term for a dry measure in the north of England and Scotland (see Section 4), so it was hypothesised that this sense might derive from ON (OIcel

[132] Unlike the *MED*, the *OED* ((1912), s.v. *thixel* | *thixle*, n.) mentions that no cognate in OE is recorded: 'known c1300, not yet found in Old English'.

bolli) rather than OE *bolla* 'bowl', but the argumentation seems to rest on its northern distribution (*OED* (1887), s.v. *boll*, n.[2]). The closest sense recorded in the *Dictionary of Old Norse Prose* is 'liquid measure, measuring cup of specific size' (*ONP*, s.v. *bolli* sb. m., sense I.2) whereas in the *DOE* no measure-related meanings are attested. Because of the highly unspecific and broad nature of terms such as *bolle* 'cup' (also the content of the vessel, etc.), this sense could have been developed in parallel to ON, where its usage seems to be more limited to 'liquid measures'.

C4 and C5 are represented by only two lexical items and one respectively: (C4) **axil**tre (x6) and **bland**corne and (C5) **crosez**. For the Type C4 stems there is a ME compound or combining form which is not in early OE although it has parallels in Scandinavian languages: the native equivalent to **axil**tree 'an axletree' (only recorded from early ME onwards) is *axtree* (*OED* (1885), s.v. † *ax-tree*, n.). Because *axil* was also in OE (OE *eaxl*),[133] there might have lexical substitution through contact with ON (cf. the OIcel compound *öxul-trē*). **Bland**corne is attested in Scandinavian languages, both as a simplex and as a compound, OIcel *bland* 'mixture' and dialectally in Swedish, *blandkorn* (*MED*, s.v. *bland-corn* n. 'ON; cp. Swed. dial. *blandkorn* & E dial. (Yks.) *blend-corn*.'). There are also OE cognates *bland* and *gebland*, but, as Dance (2019: 230) acknowledges, these OE stems are 'rare and confined to poetry', so its use in **bland**corne could be tentatively derived from ON (also note this is consistent with circumstantial evidence of type 'c' for both **axil**tre and **bland**corne). **Crosez** is classified as 'FC5b' (Dance 2019: II.§292; *Gersum*, s.v. *cros*): both the late OE *cros* (exclusively attested in the toponymic records) and ME *cross* have Latin *crux* as their ultimate etymons, but the direct source forms are less well-established; there are two possible sources, OIr *cros* and OIcel *kross,* and there are other cognates in AF and ML (*crosce, crosse* and *cros*, respectively) which might also have contributed to the development of the ME word if they are not borrowings of the ME lexeme themselves. Apart from the hypothesis of multiple inputs, Dance (2003: 417–18; 2019: 246–247) and Durkin (2014: §4.1 n. 6), among others, are more inclined towards accepting the less complex explanation, which is to assume that there is just one source 'a Hiberno-Norse word

[133] *Axil* in **axil**nayl (also in **axillyng**) has been discarded because the root *axil* seems to descend from OE *eaxl* rather than the ON form (OIcel *öxl*).

borrowed from OIr *cros*' (Dance 2019: II.247, see also the extensive bibliography on this word listed under f.n. 955).

3.1.3.2.3 Type D

The etymologies of Type D items are the most difficult to track down of the four categories. They are often classified as 'obscure' or 'difficult' in two main respects: the etymology of the word has not been agreed upon, although its form and sense are relatively clear (Type D1), or even the interpretation of the word in context can be highly debatable (Type D2). Type D1 is represented in the *DAR* by **cloukis**, **sowmys**, and **steyned**clothes: **cloukis**, most likely, 'clutches', is a word with a complex history (*OED* (1891), s.v. *clutch*, n.1): the word is first attested in ME (*clōke*) and Scots (*clūke*), and only in the 17th century there seem to be records of a Southern palatalised version (*clooch*). The reconstructed OE stem would have been **clōc*, *clōce* or, alternatively, **clūc* or *clūce,* following the paradigm of ME *brōke* < OE *brūcan.* The ancestor Germanic root would then be **klûka-* or *klûkôn-* (whence OE *clycc(e)an*). Like the *MED* (s.v. *clǭke* n.(2)), the *OED* notes the possible influence of the verb *clicchen* (< OE *clyccan*) on the palatalised forms. If we apply Occam's razor again—as we did with **crosez**—it would not be far-fetched to presuppose that the ME word *clōke* might have been adopted from another Germanic, nominal, root rather than assuming multiple unrecorded native developments and a word-class change (verb > noun). Yet, an ON cognate does not seem to have been identified either, only a surviving form in Swedish (see *MED*, s.v. *clǭke* n.(2), '?ON; cp. Swed. *klyka* 'a clamp, fork''). **Sowmys** 'chains or ropes' has multiple possible sources: not only ON (OIcel *saumr* 'nail, seam') but also AF (OF *some, soume* denoting a 'pack-saddle'), even if there are semantic differences which are left unexplained;[134] an Anglo-Latin variant of LL *sagma* 'pack-saddle' (*DMLBS*, s.v. 2 *salma*, *sauma*, *somma*, *suma*, 1 *summa*) is also attested, which adds more complexity to the possible layers of influences that converged in the adoption of the ME word. The best semantic analogue, thus, seems to be the ON lexeme, and the supporting circumstantial evidence is here represented by the northern distribution of

[134] The *OED* ((1913), s.v. *soam*, n.) differs from the *MED* in hypothesising a borrowing from OF without mentioning ON.

the word (cf. *OED* (1913), s.v. *soam*, n.; *MED*, s.v. *soume*). As indicated in the *Gersum* database (s.v. *stayned*), **steyned**clothes 'worked in colours or embroidered'—to be distinguished from **stevynd**, which in the *DAR* interestingly only co-occurs with Latin *pannus/-i* 'clothes'—can be semantically traced to two forms: ME *stainen* < aphetic version OFr *desteindre* 'to remove colour' or OIcel *steina* 'to colour, stain' (on the same root as *steinn* (OE *stān*)), whose semantic development is complicated but seems to bear resemblance to other Germanic languages (cf. OHG *staimbort* ?'painted shield'), including OE *ā-stǣnan* 'to adorn (something) with precious stones' (*DOE*, s.v. *ā-stǣnan*).

As Dance (2013; 2018; 2019) argues, the focus of this taxonomy is on *etymological evidence* and not on the *outcome* of contact. These two different ways of conceptualising ON input may interact in fruitful ways, but Dance's categorisation offers a more dynamic approach: the different Types may encompass manifestations of language contact which would belong to different categories in traditional typologies (e.g. direct loanwords and loan shifts). Beyond structural evidence, other factors can come to play a role in assessing the etymology of a word. Dance brings to the fore two kinds of 'circumstantial' evidence, namely the Germanic distribution of a word in the form of cognates in closely related languages, represented by the West Germanic family (Middle Low German, Old and Middle High German, Middle Dutch, Old Frisian, and Old Saxon) and the word's geographical distribution. The geographical confinement of a word to the North and the Danelaw area has often been identified as a marker indicating ON influence: while Björkman (1900) does consider its use as an auxiliary criterion, Miller (2012: 99) seems to go too far when claiming that this is 'the safest way to recognise a Scandinavian loan', especially if this distribution endures through time and still applies to Modern English. A correlation between such an important area of Scandinavian settlement and a greater incidence of Old Norse input is not far-fetched and has indeed been demonstrated.[135] The labels that Dance proposes to distinguish the kind of documentary evidence coming from the North or

[135] See Kaiser (1937: 178–278), Xandry (1914), Thorson (1936), Kolb (1965) and Samuels (1985) on the 'Great Scandinavian Belt' and the more noticeable number of ON-origin grammatical words (Samuels 1985: 274–5; Dance 2003: 289–91). The results are dependent on the amount of the localised evidence surveyed, which was less accessible in the past than it is nowadays thanks to the online *MED, LALME, LAEME*, and corpora.

East of England are ‘b’ for toponymic recordings, and ‘c’ for the general lexis (see Dance 2019: I.62). Nevertheless, as Dance points out, the evidence adduced to claim ON influence based on geographical distribution is often contentious (2019: 56-7). The context of use (e.g. in a literary text) and the size of the corpus examined are just a few of the factors that may skew the representativeness of the material employed if these are not properly accounted for. The *Gersum* project contains a few of the items in the *DAR* database, but the context-dependent cues and semantic interpretation of them did not necessarily match that found in the *DAR*. This, for instance, applies to Type D2 **sloknyng** (B1 in the *DAR*)[136] and one Type CCC3 lexeme, **bord**, which cannot be among the ON-derived words because of its sense: rather than meaning ‘table’ (or derived meanings), senses which are rare in OE and may evince ON input (cf. ON *borð*), in the *DAR* it always occurs in complex lexical units (e.g. in **bord**nayles) and has its prototypical meaning, which can be traced to OE *bord*. Likewise, homographs within my database will also be kept distinct: *band* in hat**band** is *OED* (1885), s.v. *band* n.[2] (from French), not the ON loanword (**bandeȝ**, also in bely**bandes** and dore**bandez** (see below)). Arguably, a few more words than those classified into the different types show inputs from Scandinavian in various ways: for instance, **saez** (x3) (also in water**say**), another Scottish and northern term for ‘a wooden tub’ seems to derive from OE on the basis of the dating and contexts in which it is attested in early OE. Nevertheless, as the *OED* ((2015), s.v. *sae*, n.) remarks, the northern-eastern distribution of the lexeme and its ME variant *soe* possibly reflects ON-influx rather than an uninterrupted continuity with the native word. In the following section, I will overview the main semantic fields to which ON-derived lexis contributed within the multilingual lexical networks of the *DAR* by using the *OED Thesaurus*.

[136] **Sloknyng** is here considered Type B1 because 'le Sloknyng' (Rott. Bursar. 1488-9, 651) 'extinguishing' in the *DAR* can be derived directly from ON (cp. Icel weak verb *slokna* 'to be extinguished') whereas the meaning of *slokes* in *Gawain* is much more remote from its meaning in Scandinavian languages and, thus, more difficult to account for (see *Gersum*, s.v. *slokes*).

3.1.3.3 Semantic fields

The relatively few ON-derived borrowings attested in OE before 1150 (c. 150, according to Kastovsky (1992: 321), and 185 relatively secure loan-words/expressions following Pons-Sanz (2013)) are mostly connected to cultural innovation or technological advancements, including sea-related terminology, warfare, law, currency, measures, and more generally, terms reflecting social or commercial exchanges (Durkin 2014: 180–181). The significantly larger numbers of Scandinavian-origin lexemes in Middle English, extant in a much wider range of text-types and registers, better allow us to assess the realms of Anglo-Scandinavian contact: not only were Scandinavian-specific or technical terms adopted and/or adapted into English but also basic lexical units used in everyday situations, sometimes already having synonyms in OE.[137] The agents of lexical transfer would also have been substantially different pre- and post-1150: OE speakers would have been responsible for the early borrowings into OE, while possibly Old Norse speakers, having switched to English, would have carried over later ON loanwords (see, inter alia, Townend 2002; Dance 2019). Since the *DAR* are not like any other monolingual texts in Middle English and usually exhibit a certain degree of technicality, partly inherent to the nature of record-keeping itself, the vocabulary that surfaces in this material has an extra dimension of relevance in the multilingual context of late medieval and early modern England.[138] Apart from ON-origin simplexes, I have included complex lexical units—usually, OE+ON / ON+OE constructions—containing early Scandinavian lexemes (e.g. land**male**bok), some of which are quite recurrent in the *DAR* lexis (*(h)aver*,[139] *bag, cart*, *garth*, *girth, lyng, muk*, and *wand*. OE-origin words are also productively combined with ON elements (e.g. *door* in dore**bandez**, dore**crokez**, and dore**stothez**) and, more rarely,

[137] Apart from the borrowing of new lexical material, the form, phonology, or meaning of OE words was also sometimes remodelled to match the ON cognate (a well-known example of a process of phonological substitution in native material through contact is *sister* (cf. OE *sweoster*, *swuster* and OIcel *systir*) (see also in *Gersum* under *half-suster* and *sister-sunes*)).

[138] There is no observable diachronic variation in the use of ON-derived lexis in the *DAR.*

[139] **Aver**malts could also have been borrowed as a unit later on from another Germanic language, MLG *hāvermolt* (cf. earlier *oat-malt*). The *OED* ((2015), s.v. *haver-malt* n.) dates its first attestation to 1569, but it is attested two centuries earlier in the *DAR* (Rott. Bursar. 1388-9, 596).

complex lexical units are made up of ON morphemes in their entirety, either (arguably) original compounds in Scandinavian (**axiltre**, **blandcorne**, **stakgarth**, and **wadmale**) and, in two instances in my database, combined in ME (**Scathaver** and **Cartfleykkes**).

A significant proportion of the ON-derived vocabulary has to do with building,[140] cultivation, ploughing, farming, and animal husbandry. Equipment, either containers or tools represent 27 lexical items. I will now illustrate some of the most frequent categories under which these lexemes sit in the *HTOED*:[141]

- society » farming » animal husbandry » general equipment: bely**bandes** 'bands which passes round the belly of horses', lat**brodes** 'goads' **tedyr** 'a tether', and **sowmys** 'trace-ropes';
- equipment » building and constructing equipment » fastenings: **broddes** 'nails', **linkis** 'chains', **spekys** 'large nails', **Sponbrod** (pl.) 'nails for fastening shingles', and stane**brod** 'a nail for fixing stone slates';
- equipment » receptacle or container (8 lexical items, 3 of which contain *bag*): among others, **Bag**sadle 'packsaddle', kagges 'small casks', **ripp's** 'baskets for fish', **skepe** 'a basket', **skeles** 'containers for liquids (milk, beer, etc.)', and **stopez** 'jugs (also a measure for liquids)';
- farming » tools and implements » ploughing (or harvesting) equipment (3 containing *crook*): among others, Brer**croke** 'a hook for cutting brambles', Shepe**croke** 'a crook used in tending sheep', and **hale** 'a handle of a plough or wheelbarrow'. In addition, other terms (under different sections) are related to farming, namely, methods such as **Rakyng** and **castyng**, two instruments to prepare the soil, **muk**forkez, **muk**hak, plough**swayn**landes 'land cultivated by a plowman', and the measure unit **thrawez**.[142]

[140] Some materials also belong to this larger occupation domain of building (e.g. **gaddis** 'a metal bar or rod', **flaggez** 'flagstones', and **wandes** 'rods or sticks').
[141] Some labels in the *OED Thesaurus* seemed to be unnecessarily complex (e.g. the categorisation of *slaughter* under 'the world » life » death » killing » killing of animals'), so I have adapted and simplified the categories for the purposes of this chapter.
[142] No other measures are attested in the *DAR* as coming from ON, only the measurement instruments **scales**, merow**scales**, and Wey**scill**.

Parts of machines and, especially, carts (a borrowing from ON itself) are also formed on ON lexical material (14 lexical items): including *cart* (**cart**bod, **Cart**h'neys, **cart**rapes, **cart** sadyll, **cart**sadiltrees, **cart**silver, **cart**strakes, Lang**cart'**), **cod** 'a bearing of an axle', **cloukis** 'clutches', **axiltre** 'an axletree' and **axiltre** hopez 'bands or hoops about the axletree'.

Names for animals, specifically for food (food and drink » food » animals for food) and in general, amount to 11 lexemes: **Baghors** 'packhorse', fish (**Gedde**, **Kelinges**, and **scates**), a kind of bird (**snypys**), **kyd**sape 'lice of sheep', hence, 'soap to destroy such lice', and **brusket'** 'the brisket of an animal'. *Skin* is also present in **may skynnes**, possibly 'the skin of a sheep or lamb slaughtered in May' as is the term *slaughter*, itself as a simplex, **Slaughters**, and in compounds (**Slaughter**manhous and **Slawghter**house). Within the domain of food, there are cereals or grain (food and drink » food » corn, cereals, or grain) **blandcorne** 'a blend of rye and wheat', **Aver**garner and **haver**barne 'a storehouse for oats', and Colte**hauer**, 'oats for colts'. Instruments involved in the production of dairy products (food » food manufacture and preparation » preparation of dairy produce) are **Syle**, milk**syle** 'milk strainer', chese**fleke** possibly 'a flake for storing cheese' and for the sifting of cereals, **byg**bern 'barley sieve'.

Other representative semantic domains are the following: fees and taxes (trade and finance » fees and taxes » impost, due, or tax), land**male** 'a rent on land' (and the aforementioned land**male**bok), medow**male** 'a tax on meadowland', **gilde** 'payment as a tax or tribute', **Scathaver** 'a tributary rent of oats', payments for hires or rents (trade and finance » fees and taxes » hire or rent), **gersuma** 'a manorial rent', and **Wande**penys 'customary rents'; feudal services (authority » subjection » service » feudal service), **bondis**, **Bonesilver** 'boon work, an extra service required by a feudal lord of his tenant', and more generally, a tol**bothe** 'a custom house'; plants (plants » particular plants), **brakennez** 'a variety of ferns', **Scrabbez** 'crab apples' ('food plant'), **Lyng** 'heather', and the compounds **lyng**house and **lyng**thake; places to store materials, animals, or to cultivate plants, including berne**garth** 'a barn', **Impgarth** 'a garden where seedlings are cultivated', swynhous**garth**, and Wode**garth**. Terms denoting natural phenomena or features of the landscape (under 'the earth' section of the *Thesaurus*, although scattered under different categories), **dam**, **banke**, **kerr** 'a marsh', and **mosse**.

Other miscellaneous lexical items include ‘parts of a building’ (inhabiting and dwelling » inhabited place » a building » parts of building), **bandeȝ** ‘hinges of a door’, **dorestothez** ‘doorjambs’, **gabell** ‘gable or façade of a building’, **wadmale** ‘a kind of woollen cloth’ and other *-ing* forms (some related to building as well) such as **drawkyng** ‘saturating with moisture, as flour or quicklime with water’, **flyttyng** ‘removing’, **kyrvynge** ‘carving’, **ryvyng** ‘splitting of wood’, and **wyndyng** ‘wattling, enclosing with wattle-work’.

It is worth noting that not all the ON-derived words are classified in the *OED Thesaurus* (only, e.g., the separate units in **dorecrokez**, **eldyng**pan, **twhert**sawes, and **window**clathe), and a few others had been semantically tagged with a sense different from the one in the *DAR* (e.g., **flywinges** as either (a) the wing of a fly or (b) Bookbinding (see quot.), *OED* (1897), s.v. *fly-wing* n. rather than with the figurative sense of ‘some kind of small nail’ (*MED*, s.v. *flīe* n.(1), 3. (c) *fle-wing, fli-*)). Likewise, the two different kinds of borrowings pre- and post-12th century are present in the *DAR* (*gersuma*, *gilde*, and *male* were already borrowed into OE) although other than those, there are not many cultural concepts. Rather, vocabulary from everyday activities such as building, farming, ploughing, and animal husbandry, including some specialised terminology for pieces, tools, or instruments is the general trend of ON-derived lexical items in the *DAR*.

3.1.4 Middle Dutch

The *DAR* records Anglo-Dutch relationships on two fundamental levels: on a more superficial level, in the form of surnames ('Haukyno Flemyng pro brokagio' [a brokerage] Rott. Bursar. 1299, 496) or goods reported as coming from or going to the Netherlands (see Section 3.2.1) in the broadest sense of the term, which includes Flanders and Brabant (e.g. 'contr. nunciis per d'nm papam ad partes Flandr. destinatis j*d*.' (Rott. Camer. 1374-5, 180)) and on a deeper linguistic level, through borrowings; this is the focus of the present section. The influence of West Germanic languages (Dutch, Frisian, and Low German varieties) on English is substantially less researched in comparison to its northern Germanic relatives, despite the millennial (from c. 700 to 1700) history of Anglo-Dutch contact. By and large, Bense's monograph (1924) and his dictionary (Bense 1926-1935),[143] as well as Toll's (1926) work,[144] still remain the most comprehensive studies exploring the linguistic impact of exchanges between the Low Countries and Britain. Over the last decades, however, an increasing attention has been duly given to these exchanges, and very fruitful avenues have been opened up: Murison (1971) explored the Dutch component in the Scottish word-stock, Chamson (2014) discussed the impact of Low Germanic languages on dialectal vocabulary in English (see the *EDD*) and, more recently, the project *North Sea Crossings* precisely aims to promote the study of Anglo-Dutch relations.[145]

As will be shown in the ensuing analysis of some of the 56 MDut-derived words,[146] one of the intrinsic problems in the study of the mutual lexical influences between Germanic languages is of a typological nature: perhaps even more conspicuously than in the ON contact situation, the proximity between the two West Germanic languages,

---

[143] Some of the etymological discussions in this *Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary* (henceforth, *DLDEE*) are outdated and rely on *NED* (i.e. *OED1*) entries which were later on revised. However, the *DLDEE* often gives better insights into the historical context and social milieu in which a word was introduced and used than other dictionaries. Yet, not all the words in the present section of this dissertation are included, so references to this lexicographical resource will be sparse.

[144] Anglo-Dutch contact from a linguistic perspective had also been treated, more succinctly, by De Vries (1916), earlier than Bense's seminal works.

[145] <www.bristol.ac.uk/arts/research/north-sea-crossings/> [Last accessed 1 March 2020].

[146] NB that this number, as in the analysis of the other source languages, includes distinct lexical creations which may be based on the same MDut-origin word (e.g. **pakkis***,* **pak**nedel, and **pak**threde counted as three lexical items rather than as one, *pak*).

Dutch and English,[147] and the presence of cognates and morphological and phonological similarities, may obscure the etymology of lexemes which could have potentially been borrowed or, alternatively, developed independently in English out of common Germanic roots. An alleged borrowing from Dutch in Middle English could be argued to have its origins in an unrecorded native, OE, lexeme, or if the term is indeed attested in OE, it could have fallen out of use afterwards having been re-introduced through contact with Dutch. Some lexemes, however, are only recorded in the 14th century in both ME and MDut, which makes the dating criterion inoperable. In a sense, therefore, the methodological issues in the identification of Dutch/Low German loanwords share a great deal with those involved in the Anglo-Scandinavian scenario. Yet, the external history seems to have conditioned and played a part in the scholarly traditions of research into these two linguistic groups in relation to English: while the Scandinavian age was characterised by 'dramatic and conspicuous events' (Chamson 2014: 282), there was a long and 'gradual infiltration' (Baugh and Cable 2002: 187) of Dutch into English. In fact, the earlier the period, the more complex the identification of Dutch influence is; in Bense's words, it is a 'practically impossible' enterprise (Bense 1924: viii).[148] Migratory movements from the Low Countries to Britain were quite noticeable both before and after the Anglo-Saxon invasions, which would have fostered lexical transferability. The time span with which this dissertation is particularly concerned, however, starts in the Middle English period, which witnessed a shift in the nature of Anglo-Dutch relations: the early military and mercenary encounters during the Anglo-Saxon period progressively gave way to commercial transactions (this is connected to a larger shift in power from northern to southern Europe (see Bartlett 2000: 102; Chamson 2014: 289)). As examined in Section 3.2.1, the flourishing Flemish cloth industry, reliant on English wool, was a key economic sector in the Middle Ages. These transactions, however, were not exempt from

[147] Dutch is often paired with Low German since it is very difficult to make a distinction between the two. This chapter acknowledges this continuum although most of the lexemes considered are Dutch, in particular from the period comprising 1150-1500, known as Middle Dutch (MDut) and, to a lesser extent, from Low German (Middle Low German (MLG)).

[148] Bense (1926) and Toll (1926) classified the evidence as internal or external although no systematic formal criteria—as the ones discussed in the Section on ON—are established and a case-by-case approach is taken.

taxations, restrictions and later resentments on both sides, as the aforementioned Latinised *brokagio* evidences.

A few MDut-origin terms related to textiles and clothing are recorded in the *DAR*: **Curtebys** < MDut *korte pîe* 'short coat of coarse woollen stuff' (compare English *pea coat* or *pea jacket*), a now obsolete word meaning 'a short coat, cloak, or tabard of coarse material worn in the 14th and 15th centuries' (*OED* (1893), s.v. † *ˈcourtepy*, n.). The [p] in Dutch is not aspirated, so this could explain why it would have sounded like [b] to English speakers, hence, the different spelling variants in ME, particularly at the early stages of its borrowing (*MED*, s.v. *cŏurte-pī* n. Also *curte-, corte-, court(e)by, courby, courbe*). Another word from Dutch is **pak** 'a bundle of things' in general and more specifically, 'a bundle of a commodity (such as wool, cloth, fur, etc.)' (MDut/MLG *pak*); the *OED* speculates that 'it is not impossible that the Middle Dutch and Middle Low German words might instead reflect a borrowing from Middle English'. The earliest attestation of the word in Dutch comes from a Medieval Latin text produced in Ghent in 1199; the noun (and verb) in English is allegedly earlier (yet, no earlier quotes are provided; see also (*OED* (2005), s.v. *pack*, v.[1]), post-classical Latin *pakkare* (1290, 1341, 1440 in British sources)) and is connected to the wool trade, so I would argue that it is indeed a borrowing from Dutch despite its cognates in other Germanic languages (see also OIcel *pakki*, OSwed *pakke*, ODan *pakke*) and its appropriation in other languages (see AF *pakke* (1410), Middle French, French †*pacque* (1510) apart from its use in Medieval Latin). *Pak* is recorded as a verb in **pakkanda***,* 'to pack a (artefact, usu. wool)' inflected following the ML declensional paradigm of gerundives (*DMLBS*, s.v. 2 *paccare*),[149] and in the compounds **Pak**trede (MDut + OE) 'strong cord or twine used for sewing or tying up packs or bundles; a piece or length of this. Also figurative' (*OED* (2005), s.v. *packthread*, n. and adj., A), and the equipment for packing **Pak**nedel (MDut + OE) 'a large strong needle of a type originally used to sew up packs

[149] The morpheme *-and* could allegedly mark a present participial form in ME, *-and* being traditionally associated with the north (cf. *-end(e)* and *-ind(e)*). However, apart from the lateness of the *DAR* rolls in which *-anda* is recorded (the later form *-yng* is widely employed in both the *DAR* and in ME in general), Latin gerundives or future passive participles can be in agreement with the nouns they modify, a feature which is not shared by present participles in ME ('pro lana pakkanda' 'wool which is to be packed', and see also the more usual verbs meaning 'repair', 'ad emendanda hostia' 'for the door which is to repaired', 'in campana reparanda' 'the bell which is to be repaired', etc.); hence, its interpretation as a gerundive rather than as a present participle form.

made of tough material'. The three are present in the same line of a Bursary roll (Rott. Bursar. 1341, 542): 'In Paknedel et Paktrede emp. pro lana pakkanda, 8 d.'. *Nop* in **nop**sekez could, in principle, be a direct borrowing from Dutch (MDut *nop*) or an altered variant of OE *-hnoppa*, although it is natively attested only once, in the compound *wullhnoppa* (*OED* (2003), s.v. *nap*, n.[2]), so it seems more likely that it was borrowed. *Nop,* now obsolete, means *'*woolly material removed from the surface of cloth by shearing, esp. (usually in plural) considered as the stuffing of pillows, mattresses, etc.' (*OED* (2003), s.v. *nap*, n.[2]) and the compound as a whole it is attested in MDut *noppensac* and MLG *noppensack*, so this could have influenced the endogenous development of an analogous form.

At the very centre of any commercial activities was the transportation of goods, mostly by water (cf. **slede** below), a process known as **fraght** 'the transport of goods, usually by water, or the charge paid for this', also meaning the hire of a vessel for this purpose, most likely from MDut/MLG *vracht* (cf. French *fret* hire of a ship, Spanish *flete*, Portuguese *frete*, all with the voiceless fricative). In *La pratica della mercatura*, a guide to 14th-century trade on the Euroasiatic continent and parts of the north of Africa,[150] Pegolotti compiled names for ships in the vernaculars of Europe (sometimes common to several languages) 'barca in più linguaggi' and, among others, 'battello e batto in francesco' and 'feuto in fiammingo' (Evans 1936: 16–17) [*feuto* in Flemish], *feuto* being 'a small ship used for the transportation of goods'[151] (*Tesoro della lingua Italiana delle Origini*, s.v. *FEUTO* s.m.).[152] The vocalic variation between *vracht* and *vrecht* seems to suggest an adoption from Frisian (cf. *OED* (1898), s.v. *fraught*, n.), but the crucial piece of information is that the latter form, the <e> variant, was the one adopted in Romance languages, so it is highly likely that *feuto* is the Italian rendering of the original Middle Dutch word, which underwent a process of phonological simplification, especially in the final-position consonant cluster (<cht>), due to phonotactic constraints in Italian. This word would, therefore, be a cross-linguistic borrowing from MDut/MLG, differently adapted in Germanic and Romance languages and documented as being Flemish in Pegolotti's account.

[150] Special thanks are due to Dr Orietta Da Rold, who pointed out this resource to me.
[151] My own translation.
[152] The origin of *feuto* is, according to the *Tesoro della lingua Italiana delle Origini* (s.v. *FEUTO* s.m.), obscure, probably a corruption of *scuto*, unattested in their corpus.

Keyl (in **keyl**fulis) 'a boatload'[153] is another name for a vessel, in this case for loading ships ('a lighter'), widely employed on the Tyne and Wear, and it probably derives from MDut *kiel* (MED, s.v. *kḗle* n.(2)). The OE cognate, *céol*—like *beer* below—seems to be mostly found in poetry (see also OHG *chiol,* OIcel *kjǫl-r*) and cannot account for the non-palatalised forms in ME (*kele, keil*, etc.). A connection with the Scandinavian cognate is discarded in the *OED* ((1901), s.v. *keel*, n.2) on semantic grounds (see *OED* (1901), s.v. *keel*, n.1), although the *OED* does point to multiple influences 'from Scandinavian, English, or French, or of all combined' in the loss of the original sense of Dutch and German *kiel* 'ship' which underwent a process of semantic shift from the 16th century and came to signify 'a keel' (*OED* (1901), s.v. *keel*, n.2). Other Dutch-origin nautical terms are **bum**kyns and **trysyng** rapis: **bum**kyns 'the spars of a ship' is described as a derivative of *boom* (< Dutch *boom* 'beam, pole' (cf. OE *béam* with different senses) + the suffix *-kin*. *Boom* denoting 'spars on a ship' is attested later, so another possibility that has been put forward is that English *bumkin* was directly borrowed from Dutch (MDut *boomkijn*); the problem that arises here is that this diminutive does not occur in relation to spars on a ship in the source language (*OED* (2018), s.v. *bumkin*, n.1), which is why in this section only *bum* is taken as a relatively secure borrowing; the closest etymon to *trysyng* in **trysyng** rapis 'ropes for a pulley, windlass, or tackle' (*MED*, s.v. *trīcinge* (ger.)) is MDut *trîsen* (see also MLG *trîssen, trîtsen*), not found in OE.

Fishermen of the Low Countries and Zealand operated in English waters at least from the late 13th century and continued to do so until the mid-1500 (Bense 1926: 54–5), so Bense is inclined toward affirming, quite categorically, that **Stocfisse** (also with <k> in ME although in MDut it only appears with <c>) is a borrowing from MDut *stocvisch*, unlike the *OED* ((1917), s.v. *stock-fish* | *ˈstockfish*, n.), which is more reluctant). The earliest attestation in the *OED* is dated to 1290s, coinciding temporally with early maritime contacts with Dutch sailors, and it also occurs as part of larger lexical units in the *DAR*: **stokefisshe** hambers 'stockfish hammers', and **Stokfisshe** Leenges 'dried lings'. *Mud* in **mud**fis, 'a fish which lives in mud',[154] is not attested in

[153] The compound is attested once in the *MED* (s.v. *keilful* n.).
[154] In Scottish usage, 'fish, esp. codfish, which is preserved by being salted and then packed in brine' (*OED* (2003), s.v. *mudfish*, n.).

OE, so it has been argued that it could be a borrowing from MLG or MDut. Bense identifies its possible origin in MLG *mod(d)e, mudde*, which would have been first recorded in Scotland in 1373 (cf. the *DSL*, as it is only in the *SND*, s.v. *Mud*, n.1, v.1), although evidence from place-names, 'in names in areas that are far apart geographically', seems to disprove this scenario of lexical borrowing (*OED* (2003), s.v. *mudfish*, n.).

Measures, weights, and currencies are also involved in the transaction of commodities, although only the unit of weight **Wawes** and the coin *grot* in **grot**silver seem to have a Dutch origin in the *DAR*. The value of a *waw* (MDut / MLG *wage*) often varied 'between 160 and 190 lbs.' and was especially used in reference to lead and glass (*MED*, s.v. *wawe* (n.)). The corresponding OE cognate was *wǽg* although it followed a different phonological and semantic path (as well as geographical distribution, restricted to the north in the case of *waw*): a new diphthong was created before the palatal /g/ in ME (*wǽg* > *way* / *wey* (cf. *OED* (1926), s.v. *wey*, n.[1]; and also on the same root, *weigh n.1*), whereas the borrowing from Dutch did not exhibit it in any of its forms (*MED*, s.v. *wawe* n. Also *waghe*, (?error) *walbe*; pl. *wawes*, etc. & *wawe*, *waugh*, *wagh*). This is one of the few cases in which we can invoke a phonological criterion in the identification of these borrowings. Additionally, semantically, OE *wǽg* (and later developments) is narrower than its Dutch counterpart: the native lexeme is used with a large number of commodities (cheese, wool, salt, coal, corn, etc.), whereas the borrowing from Dutch came to be associated with weights in the context of lead and glass. *Grot* in **grot**silver as a coin was recognised in several European countries (ML *grossus*, French *gros*, Italian *grosso*) and also varied in value across countries and periods (*OED* (1900), s.v. *groat*, n.). The *OED* acknowledges that the appropriation of the Dutch stem for the adjective *great* (OE *grēat*) in elliptical constructions (cf. MHG *grôȥe pfenninge* 'thick pennies') indicates that the Dutch coin was in circulation in England before the equivalent English coin was issued (*OED* (1900), s.v. *groat*, n.). Yet, because **grot**silver 'a customary gratuity of a groat' as a compound is found in only two texts (one of them being the *DAR*; *MED* (*grōt* n.(3) 1.(c) ~ *silver*)), from 1394 - c. 1460, and the English *groat* seemed to have been introduced in 1351-2, it is not clear the value of *groat* in the *DAR* or if it varied

from 1394-5, the date of the first attestation, to the last one, 1440-1. In any case, the word owes its morphological make-up to Dutch, which is why it is here considered.

Another important craft imported from the Low countries in the 14th century is the brewing of beer. Beer was bitterer than the English ale, the latter brewed without hops, so it did not attract the attention of Englishmen—used to a sweeter taste—until the 15th century, when beer started to be produced and sold locally in England (Bennett 1996: 79). 'Flemish ale' and its brewing in England was linked to foreigners for a very long time; well-known are John Taylor's (1651) hostile and nationalistic remarks about beer, even when it had become a very popular beverage amongst English people:[155] 'Beer, is a Dutch boorish liquor, a thing not known in England, till of late days an alien to our nation, till such times as hops and heresies came amongst us, it is a saucy intruder into this land'. The distinction between English ale vs. Dutch beer would only become obsolete in the eighteenth century after a long process of naturalisation (see Bennett 1996: 80). In the *DAR*, *beer* is mentioned twice in rolls from the fifteenth century, when its popularity grew exponentially: barell de **ber** (Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 219) and (pl.) barell' de **bere** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404-5, 399). The word is originally found in Old English, although its use is not very frequent and is mostly restricted to poetry (*OED* (1887), s.v. *beer*, n.[1]; *DOE*, s.v. *bēor*); by the 15th century, it could be equated to the alcoholic liquor with hops. *Ale* is only present in the *DAR* in a monolingual ME account 'in ale' (Miscellanea 1544, 723, not part of my database); the most common term is the Latinate equivalent in any of its manifestations, **cervisia***/-ie* < CL *cervesa* (*DMLBS*, s.v. *cervisia* [CL *cervesa* < Gall.], *cervisa*, *cervisium*), also cervisie, cerv., cervise, all of which might potentially be French as well (see *AND*, s.v. *cerveise*; *TLFi*, s.v. *cervoise*; *DMF*, s.v. *cervoise*). It is also included in the *MED* with only three attestations (*MED*, s.v. *cervoise* n.; not in the *OED*) although the term was much more widely employed in multilingual records. In the *DAR*, the attestations span from the beginning of the fourteenth century up to the sixteenth century ('et in 5 tortis, cum cervisia' (Rott. Communiar. 1511-2, 291)).

More generally, the contact with the Dutch affected the vocabulary of other spheres of everyday life and extended well beyond England. In the analysis of **Wawes**

[155] For instance, in late sixteenth-century London it won out over ale (Bennett 1996: 80).

and **keylfulis** (see Section 4), I briefly sketched the northern distribution of these words, a pattern which is found in other MDut words: for example, **slott**, **Spultes**, and **morterstanez** (a possible calque on MDut *mortiersteen*) are Northern English and Scottish terms. This is not coincidental: despite the overall scarcity of records from early Scotland, the Low Countries and their people are recurrently mentioned as early as the year 1138 as part of the army of David I (Murison 1971: 160). Place-names and other proper names are also indicative of this influx (Bense 1926: 10). Bense's remarks on *spult* 'spout' elaborate on this connection:

> The fact that this sb. appears in Sc. and north. England during the latter half of the 15th c., the time when there was a large influx of Brabanters into Scotland (Bense, *A.-Du. Rel*. 70), induces us to suggest the existence, though unrecorded, of a M. Flem. form of WFlem. *spulten* – the verb with which N. E. D. compares the word under discussion – introduced into Scotland and the north of England, where it, though unrecorded itself, gave rise to the 15th and 16th c. *Spult sb.* (*DLDEE* (1926), s.v. *spane*).

The *OED* entry to which Bense refers has not been revised yet (*OED* (1915), s.v. † *spult*, n.) and the *MED* etymological information is not conclusive either: '?Alteration of *spŏute* n.; ?from MDu.: cp. WFlem. *spulten* to spout' (*MED*, s.v. *spult* n.), so the *DLDEE* provides the most detailed record of the possible origin of this word. Apart from **Spultes**, other likely MDut-origin names for containers include the following: **kittez** 'wooden tubs or buckets', possibly from MDut *kitte* (Dutch *kit*), whose ulterior etymology is not clear (*OED* (1901), s.v. *kit*, n.1); **tubbez** 'large wooden vessels formed of staves and hoops' (also in flesh**tubbez**, 'tubs for the preparation and storage of salted meat' (*MED*, s.v. *tub(be* (n.) *flesh* ~), and stepyng**tubbez** (not in the *MED*/*OED*)). In relation to *tub*, Bense (s.v. *Tub* sb.) adduces a clear connection between its first attestation in the *NED* (*OED*), in the works of Chaucer (the *Miller's Tale*, c. 1390) and Chaucer the man, who would have entered into contact with Flemish immigrants in London and also visited Flanders himself. The later quotations, he claims, also show other MDut borrowings. The earliest attestations of the Flemish word date to 1252 and 1312 (Bruges), so he concludes that it is a secure loanword. This circumstantial evidence is not enough proof to claim that it is indeed a borrowing, although certainly

the word is not in OE or in northern Germanic languages, so it would constitute a 'Type B' lexical item if we follow the taxonomy employed in the analysis of ON-derived words. **Stande** 'a tub, barrel', in all probability, comes from MDut *stande* (see also MLG *stande*, OHG *stanta*, *standa*); and **scope** 'scoop' is a more difficult MDut loanword, as it seems to have had two possible sources (the *OED* identifies a third one within MDut/MLG): two in West Germanic, MDut *schōpe* (also MLG *schōpe* prob. > MSwed *skōpa*; not in OE) and MDut *schoppe* (MLG *schuppe*) and, according to the *MED* (s.v. *scǭpe* (n.(2))), allegedly another one in French, OF *escope, escoppe* (not in the *AND*) but which seems to have been a borrowing itself from Dutch. On **tankardorum** '[of the] large hooped vessels for carrying liquids', the *MED* (s.v. *tankard(e* (n.)) notes just an AL rendering of the word (AL *tancardus*, *tank-*), while ignoring the closest vernacular etymon, MDut *tanckaert*, having the same sense; in contrast, the *DMLBS* (s.v. *tancardus*) refers to ME *tankard*, AN *tankart* (see also *AND*, s.v. *tankart* s. '(M.E.)') and hesitantly connects it to CL *cantharus*, which was probably also the source for French *tanquart,* with a possible transposition of the Latin stem; the ulterior etymology is unknown and is not in OE or other Germanic languages. The sense of 'drinking vessel' is much later (15th century) than the general meaning of 'vessel' (1310) found in accounts and inventories akin to the *DAR*, so it is possible that this word is part of the larger network of lexical items from MDut denoting containers. Lastly, within the category of containers for food[156] is **toppes** (also as the diminutive **toppettis**) 'baskets', also 'measures of grapes or figs' (in the *DAR*, '8 toppes racemorum magnorum' (Rott. Celer. 1440-1, 78); the context is ambiguous). MDut and MLG have *toppe, top* with the same meaning (see also OF *toppe*), so its borrowing into English is generally agreed on.

In the large semantic domain of 'building', we find elements possibly deriving from MDut in the following names for fastenings (equipment > building > fastenings),[157] **clampez**, **tyngil**naill, and **shot**naill. **Clampez** 'clamps or braces', is not known in OE or early ME (only after the 14th or 15th century) and is morphologically identical with MDut *klamp* 'heap', so it is a relatively secure loanword. *Tyngil* in **tyngil**naill, 'a very

[156] *OED* ((1913), s.v. † *top*, n.[3]) 'the world » food and drink » food » container for food » [noun] » basket » for fruit or vegetables'.
[157] See the *OED* Thesaurus, although not all the words listed here are categorised.

small type of nail', has been identified in the *MED* (s.v. *tingel* (n.)) as probably being an adaptation of MDu. *tengeliser, tinghel-* (or *tengelspiker*, *tinghel-*); in contrast, the *OED* ((1912), s.v. *tingle*, n.1) points to a cognate in MHG *zingel* 'little tack' without tracing any changes that the MHG cognate would have undergone had it been appropriated into English. The much closer morphological and phonological proximity to the MDut forms leads us to suggest a borrowing from that etymon or even a calque on the compound *tengelspiker*. **Shot**nayll 'a kind of nail', may be another calque on *schotspīker* (< *schot* 'movable partition' (cf. MLG *schot*) + *spīker* 'nail') or a native formation combining the MDut borrowing *schot* (same stem as in **wainscot** below), which might also have had the added sense of 'something that can be put rapidly into place' (*OED* (2011), s.v. † *scotnail*, n.) and the English *naill.* **Qwyp**cord,[158] 'a thin tough kind of hempen cord, of which whip-lashes or the ends of them are made; in allusive use, the material of whip-lashes' (*OED* (1923), s.v. *whipcord*, n.), is another type of 'fastening' element—categorised separately in the *OED Thesaurus*—[159] although its etymological origin is more disputed: the *OED* doubtfully ascribed it to *whip* v. III., with later association of *whip* n. I (*OED* (1923), s.v. *whipcord*, n.) and the *MED* to MDu. *wippe*, *wip*, MLG *wippe*, giving the verb *whippen* (prob. from MDut too) as a comparandum, so *qwyp* is here categorised as a MDut loanword. More generally, there is a gerund relating to working with tools, **pegyng** 'fixing or fastening with pegs', whose occurrences as a verb postdate those of the noun *peg*, so it seems to have been formed by conversion (*peg* (n) > *peg* (v)), after the noun *peg* < MDut *pegge* 'peg, small wooden pin', not recorded in OE, only in Dutch and German (*OED* (2005), s.v. *peg*, v.).

Miscellaneous lexical items which are not known in OE or early ME and are likely to come from MDut/MLG include **hamis** 'pieces of wood or metal forming the collar of a draught horse', < likely, MDut *hame, haem* (also MHG (dialectal) *hame*)*;* kip in **kip**stryng 'a part of the harness of a draught horse' 'a kip-line' < MDut *kip* 'a beam supporting the body of a cart' (*MED*, s.v. *kippe-līne* n.); *mod* in **mod**hylles is a variant with <d> of MDut/MLG *mol* and OFris *moll* influenced by *mouldwarp* (*OED* (2002), s.v.

[158] Note the northern replacement of <wh> with <qw> in some occurrences of **Qwyp**cord (see Section 4.2.2.3).

[159] *OED* ((1923), s.v. *whipcord*, n.): 'the world » relative properties » wholeness » mutual relation of parts to whole » fastening » binding or tying » bind or tie » bind » bind round or about » with cord or thread'.

mole, n.[3] (and adj.[1])); **por** 'fire poker' < MDu. *por* 'poke, push, act of piercing';[160] **rynd** (also in **rynd**spindellis), 'an iron in the centre of the millstone supporting it' < MDut *rijn*, MLG *rine*; **scowrynge** 'scouring, polishing', possibly MDut/MLG *schûren* (whence, MSwed *skura*), at the same time probably deriving from OF *escurer* (also in other Romance languages, e.g. Provençal and Catalan *escurar*); **slede**, 'a sledge', < MDut / MLG *slede* (also in OIcel *sleði* and OHG *slito, slita*); **slott**—also in yren**slottes**—'a bolt for securing a door, window, etc.' < MDut/MLG *slot* (also OHG *sloz*); **Soddez**, 'sods, pieces of turf', < MDut/MLG *sode* (also in OFris *sâtha*, *sâda*, 'of doubtful origin') (*OED* (1913), s.v. *sod*, n.[1]); **spanyng** lambes < MDut *spanen* and MLG *spānen*, *spōnen*;[161] **wainscot** 'oak imported into England from Russia, Germany, and Holland' < MDut/MLG *wagenschot*; and **wrak** 'rubbish, waste' < MDut/MLG *wrak*.

There is also a term denoting military equipment, **splentes**, 'one of the metal plates reinforcing the armour', which may come from MDut *splinte* or MLG *splinte, splente* (also borrowed into Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian, *splint*), two etymons that Bense (*DLDEE*, s.v. *Splint*, sb.) keeps distinct: he supports a MLG (rather than MDut) origin because the form with the <e> spelling is more frequent for the first four centuries of its usage in English; *splente* would allegedly not have been found in MDut, only *splinte*, which would become the preferred form only in the 19th century. In the *MED* (s.v. *splent(e* n.), the <e> spelling forms outnumber the <i> ones and the *splint* variant can be mostly found in sense (e) 'a chip, fragment, or splinter', which would reinforce another possibility, which is that *splinter*—or *splint* as a verb—could have influenced the adoption of the vowel in ME (the *MED* also gives the etymons in AL *splenta*, *splinta,* and AF *e)splente*). This vowel alternation does not seem to be a strong enough argument for the word to be deemed a borrowing only from MLG, which is why it has been included among those which share exactly the same stem in MLG/MDut, despite the usual graphemic variation that can be expected, especially in the Middle Ages.

---

[160] The *OED* claims that is formed by conversion after *purr* (s.v. *purr* v.1) but that verb, whose origin is uncertain, is attested later, which seems a rather incongruent piece of information (*OED* (2007), s.v. *purr*, n.[1]).

[161] The *OED* unrevised entry suggested a possible OF etymon, which Bense (*DLDEE,* s.v. *spane*) disputed because OF *espanir* could not have yielded ME *spane, spone* but **spanish* like other contemporary analogous OF-derived verbs ending in *-ir* (e.g. *finish* and *punish*). He subsequently adds that 'if not introduced into the North of England and Scotland by Flemish immigrants in the 12th and 13th centuries, it must have been imported by L. G. traders, which would at the same time account for the variant form *spone*' (*DLDEE,* s.v. *spane*).

The origin of some lexical items can be better understood as having a multiple origin, MDut being just one of the inputs the word received: for example, **Spowte** 'a spout' 'a pipe for carrying water'—also in malt**spout** 'a spout for malt (in a brewhouse)' and in the altered form **Spultes**—has cognates in MDut (*spoyte*, *speite*, *spuyte* ('tools for discharging liquid, pipes')), MLG (*spoite* 'spray'), and OSwed (*sputa*, with various meanings), all of which seem to be ultimately linked to the verb *spout*. This verb is probably a borrowing from either MDut or ON (OIcel *spýta*, with i-mutation) although it can also be the reflex of an OE unattested cognate, so it can only be classified as a lexeme of multiple origin. **Sparryng** 'the installation of timber' seems to be linked to both the verb *sparren* and the noun *sparre* (*MED*, s.v. *sparring* ger.); *sparren* is represented in OE by *gesparrian* 'to close or lock' (which, at the same time, might have been a borrowing from ON)[162] and *sparre* by OE (only in place names) *spear-*, *spær-*. The *OED* ((1913), s.v. *spar*, v.[1]) attributes an OE origin to just the β. forms with <a>, not to the α. variants with <e> which would derive from MDut *sperren* (cf. OHG *sperran*, Danish *spærre*); the β. forms are said to be 'a normal alternation' of the stem *spar*, not found in OE. In the case of the noun, it is etymologised as 'a word of Continental origin' (MDut/MLG *sparre*, OHG *sparro*, OIcel *sparri*, among other variants) without mentioning any traces of it in OE. The most likely possibility seems, thus, to assume a multifold influence on the development of the native reflex which would have shifted semantically throughout time and in contact with other Germanic languages.

More controversial cases are **Drevill**, **gloy**, **wymbillez**, and **spikyng** (also in gret**spikyngez** and middil**spikyng**). **Drevill** is, according to the *MED*, a form deriving from the OE verb *drīven*—although the noun *per se* in this sense is not recorded in OE—while the *OED* and *DLDEE* entertain the possibility of it being a direct borrowing from the LG/MDut reflex *drevel* 'scullion, turnspit', lit. 'driver, tool for driving' (OHG *tribil*, MHG *tribel*) (*OED* (1897), s.v. † *ˈdrivel*, n.[1]). **Gloy** was supposedly adopted into Dutch as *gloy* from French *glui* (not in the *AND*); the ultimate etymology is obscure, and it is not clear whether it represents a Germanic or Romance root. The *DLDEE* says

[162] On *gesparrian* as a possible loanword (< ON *sparra* 'to close, lock'), see Holthausen (1934: s.v. *gesparrian*) and Serjeantson (1935: 68). Peters (1981: 110-111) sees it as a native lexical item whose use might have been reinforced by the ON cognate (see also Pons-Sanz (2004: 183) and *Gersum*, s.v. *sparred*).

that if the word is not of Celtic origin, as was hypothesised, 'we consider Eng. *Gloy* a borrowing from M.Dut., in connexion with the M.Dut. form *gloy* and its variant *gly*'. All the attestations in the *MED* (the *OED* entry only covers three, all having *gloy*) are spelt with <oy> or <oi>, so it is indeed difficult to trace a connection with OF *glui* in English. In **wymbillez**, the MED suggests an AF/Old Northern French (ONF) etymon although it is only attested in ONF *wimbelkin, wembelkin* and in OF, with a different morphological make-up (*guimbelet*), not in AF. Here the *OED* also suggests the reconstructed AF form **wimble*, which it traces to MLG *wiemel*, Flemish *wemel* (whence, OSwed *wimla*, Danish *vimmel*) and MDut *wimpel* (form that Bense would not have included because it is not recorded in the *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek*). The *DLDEE* is more categorical:

> this leaves little doubt about the M.L.G origin of the word, which passed, possibly through the Low Countries, into A.Fr. and M.E., where the *m(m)* before *l* may easily have developed the *-b-*. The form *wimpel*, recorded only by Kil.,[163] may be an error on his part (*DLDEE*, s.v. *wimble*).

Two parallel borrowings into AF and ME, respectively, are therefore proposed, a possibility that cannot be neglected. Finally, **spikyng** exhibits the prototypical scenario in which a dictionary (in this case, the *MED* in contrast to the *OED* (1914), *spiking*, n.[1]) refers to a reconstructed OE form **spīcing* '(attested by erron. pl. *swicyngas*, transl. of L *clavos*)' MDu. *spikinc* (as well as ME *spīk(e* n.(1)) are only given for comparative purposes. There is also a last group of lexical items which might have been modelled on or influenced by MDut analogous compound formations (see Section 3.3.3 on them): the ones that have not been mentioned yet are **morterstanez**, **plogheuedez**, **poleax**, and **Weyscill**. On **Weyscill**, Bense (*DLDEE*, s.v. *Weigh-scale* sb.) remarks that since it is attested in English in the 14th century, it is too early to claim that it is related to Dutch *waagschaal*, appearing only in the expression *in de waagschaal stellen* 'to risk'. Therefore, the word must have been 'a revival' of OE *wǽgscalu* (only attested once) under the influx of MDut *waeschschale* (13th century), or a more likely

[163] *Kil* is the abbreviation that Bense uses to refer to van Kiel [Kilian]'s (1599) *Etymologicum Teutonicæ Linguæ*.

possibility, according to Bense, is that the OE word was obsolete and that *weigh-scale* represents a 13th- or 14th- century borrowing. The rest are not recorded in OE, so they were probably formed and reinforced through contact—or calqued—during the Middle English period.

From a taxonomical viewpoint, if we apply a classification of the kind devised for ON-derived lexis, the bulk of MDut borrowings falls under Type B (B1 or B2). Their morphological behaviour is in line with the other vernacular material in the *DAR*: a range of morphemes (*-is/-ys, -es, -ez,* and/or the zero-plural form) are sometimes attached to the same forms (see, e.g., **kittez**, kyttes) if they are attested more than once. The conspicuousness of the plural morpheme *-ez* among the attested forms of MDut borrowings—as well as in ON derived lexis (see Section 3.1.3)—could strike one as unusual as all these lexemes do not come from French. A survey of the MDut borrowings in the *AND* reveals that most are not listed in this dictionary[164] except for **clampez** (see *AND*, s.v. *crampe*, *clampe*)[165] and **tubbez** (see AND, s.v. *tubbe*); this state of affairs is not fully representative and may change in the future as work for the new edition of the *AND* makes progress. Nevertheless, the use of *-ez* provides further evidence for the permeability of language boundaries and the impossibility of ascribing the material unequivocally to just one language.

[164] The forms not present in the current state of the *AND* are *spikyngez* in gret**spikyngez**, **kittez**, **wymbillez**, **morterstanez**, **nopsekez**, **plogheuedez**, **soddez**, and **Waynscottez**.
[165] While the AND lists the variants with <r> and <l>, other French dictionaries (*FEW*, *Gdf*, *TLF*, and *DMF*) only record the <r> form.

3.2 The *DAR* vernacular vocabulary and trade in the late Middle Ages: place-name evidence from names of commodities

The discussion of just direct etymons often obscures the convoluted narratives of many words which were adopted and adapted via several languages before they made their way into English. Words are testimonies to the kinds of historical interactions that took place between the speakers of English and many other languages spoken far beyond France and Britain's continental neighbours. This section will adopt a different approach from the etymological survey offered in 3.1 and will consider the process of lexical conversion from proper names (more specifically, place-names) to common names as well as the use of descriptive adjectives or nouns denoting the geographical area from which commodities were exported, which did not necessarily have to coincide with the place of production. These words may not be borrowings *sensu stricto* but give some insights into the trading relations (direct or otherwise) between regions beyond Europe. An example from another multilingual set of accounts, the *York City Chamberlains' Account Rolls*, is *Spanysyren'* (see Roig-Marín (2018b) for an account of this lexical item, neglected in the *MED* and the *OED*):[166] Spanish iron was considered of a very high quality, second only to that produced in Sweden. These terms tend to occur in the vernaculars, as they would have been known at the time, and more rarely in Latin (in the *DAR*, e.g., *Spanish iron* is rendered as 'ferri Hispan.', 'Ferr. Hisp.', or, more rarely, 'ferri de Spayne' in Rott. Bursar. 1360-1, 562). The distinctive features of these commodities which would make medieval and early modern speakers readily associate a particular set of extralinguistic traits with a given commodity from a named region or country are sometimes irrecoverable from the extant records: efforts have been made to attempt to reconstruct them as well as to endow them with a diachronic and diatopic dimension (e.g., did a Flemish chest mean the same in the fourteenth and in the fifteenth centuries and in different regions of England?). Naturally, the vocabulary in this Section only represents a rather small

[166] An addendum to that note published in 2018 would be the inclusion of the word in the more recent *YHD* (s.v. *Spanish iron*). The first *YHD* attestation in English (in Latin/hybrid constructions there are antedatings) is from the same text discussed in that note (produced in York in the years 1453-4).

fraction of the overall lexical make-up of the *DAR* and of the goods purchased and/or consumed (sometimes internally produced) at Durham Cathedral; yet, many specialised terms, often borrowings, would not provide such geographical references, so in this section we can better explore the underlying connections of certain goods with particular regions within the British Isles, with Europe, and beyond.

3.2.1 The Netherlands

The main commodity imported from the Netherlands (including Flanders and Brabant, now belonging to Belgium)[167] in the Middle Ages is cloth, so the presence of **Holandcloth** (x5) and **Flemyshcloth** are not surprising.[168] In Threlfall-Holmes's (2005) study of Durham Priory obedientiary accounts to trace the region's commercial activity, the bursar's purchase of Flemish and Holland cloths for the year 1468-9 took place in London, so it can be ascertained that they were sold in English territory. From the 14th century, Flemish cities focused on the production of luxuries, while 'the absence of a powerful noble elite in Holland and the strength of the urban middle classes there led to a focus on products for the latter, which also found markets elsewhere in north-west Europe' (van Bavel 2010: 348). During the 14th and early 15th centuries, the production of cloth in Holland diversified, producing cloths of different qualities, and increased exponentially: van Bavel (2010: 348) gives the figure of c. 10,000 pieces of cloth produced in 1400 just in Leiden. There are also references in the *DAR* to typically Flemish crafts such as weaving or embroidery, present in Latin: 'Item vj qwyshyns de opere Flandrensi cum scriptura de le Roy in eisdem' ((x2, 243-244, 246), 'cushions of Flemish work with the writing of the King in them').

[167] See also Pegolotti's distinction between 'e che tucti i panni di fiandra e di brabante…' (cloths from Flanders and Brabant and those from France and 'other places' bought by the merchants from Florence 'e che tutti altri panni di Francia o d'oltre i monti che per li mercatanti di Firenze si comperassono'. According to Evans (1936: xxxii), this is against the law of 1342, which precisely attempted to abolish this separation, thus proving that Pegolotti's work aligns closer with the rule of 1338 than with the later one.

[168] The *MED* (s.v. *Holand* n. (c) ~ *tile*) also records *Holand tyle* 'a kind of tile made in or originating in Holland', which unlike the very frequent *Holland cloth*, is only found in a text from the 15th century ((1449) Will Brugco in Nichols Illust).

More generally, there are also chests, coffers, or boxes from Flanders (see 'cista flaundrenensis (sic)' (243, Rott. Elemos. 1465), 'j cista Flandrensis' (Rott. Elemos. 1515-6, 253), or 'ciste del Flawnders' (Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635)).[169] Chests were widely imported in the Middle Ages although their function is not entirely clear: they could have been used either as chests or as containers in the same way as barrels, which often also contained imported goods (Pickvance 2012: 111). Pickvance (2012) puts together several pieces of evidence suggesting that the term *chest* covered the two senses; in the Hull customs records (1453-90) *cistas* (in that text, 'chests') seem to be distinguished from coffers since the contents of the former were usually described while coffers were mentioned without any details. The fact that 'by far the greatest number of references to imported chests refer to those from Flanders' (Eames 1977: 137) suggests that *cista* is in the *DAR* meant to be read as 'a chest' from Flanders, which would be 'instantly recognizable' (Eames 1977: 137) and would therefore require no further explanation (cf. its various meanings in the *DMLBS*, s.v. 1 *cista*). Eames (1977) assesses the different types of chests they could have represented, namely, light panelled chests (Macquoid and Edwards (1927)), iron bound, and carved chests (see Eames 1977: 136–142 and the references therein). If Flemish chests were identified with just one type, Eames discards the light panelled kind because most references to them come from the fourteenth century and it is 'too early for chests of this form' (Eames 1977: 137). As Pickvance (2012) underscores, the origin of the chests is not necessarily Flanders but *imported* from Flanders, even if a native production of domed chests would be compatible with the extant records.

3.2.2 France

The larger-scale and incipiently (semi-)industrialised production in the tapestry industry established in the Netherlands during the fourteenth century had parallels in

[169] As in most of the sections of this dissertation except for 4.2, I will only include the reference to the manuscript and edition where the date of occurrence of those words is contextually relevant or when a whole phrase is cited from a particular roll.

France:[170] Paris was one of the first production nuclei until 1384, when Philip the Bold came to possess the territories of Artois and Flanders, and Arras would start to establish itself as a powerful centre of the tapestry industry and was put on the map internationally. In the *DAR* we find references to **aras** ('2 banquers de aras' Rott. Hostill. 1394-5, 135) 'a rich tapestry fabric, in which figures and scenes are woven in colours' (*OED* (1887), s.v. *arras,* n.) and **arreswerk** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397) 'tapestry, Arras, or something resembling Arras' (*MED*, s.v. *arrăs* n. 2. (b) ~ *werk*).[171] Similarly, Chalons-sur-Marne also enjoyed a certain popularity for its tapestries: j **Schalonne** in the *DAR* (Rott. Hostill. c. 1380, 132) is an adaptation of Chalons[-sur-Marne], the final <s> being mute in French and not being incorporated into the loanword in its singular form (compare **Reynes** below). As in the case of *aras* and many other lexemes in this chapter, there was a metonymic process and **Schalonne** started to be used as 'a figured woolen material named for Chalons-sur-Marne, a kind of tapestry; hence, a bedspread or hanging made of this material' (*MED*, s.v. *chalŏun* (n.) (a)). A third and last term connected to the refined French textile industry is **Reynes** (also **reynes**) 'a kind of fine linen cloth made in Rennes'. Among the French manufactured cloth—which bore strong resemblance to that of Holland—Bretagne was particularly prestigious in the Middle Ages.

England also imported salt from France: **salis grossi de Paytouse** (also patters, pattow, Patews) and in its version following the ME syntactic pattern, *Pattowsalt*, is 'imported salt from Poitou'. Poitou was a west-central French province whose capital was Poitiers (hence, the odd Anglicised spelling *patters* and variants) in which there were salt marshes but no defining characteristics of the salt found there transpire in the literature; in contrast, **bay salt** (sale de Bayon) refers to 'a coarse grade of sea-salt, orig. salt from the Bay of Bourgneuf (Novum Castrum) south of the mouth of the Loire'. The salt from the Bay of Bourgneuf was, therefore, composed of large crystals, which is why it is generally known as *sal grossus* in Latin (see, e.g., '4 celdr. grossi salis' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 519)). Bay of Bourgneuf was an abundant source of salt which

[170] The production of tapestry in Europe, by no means, started at this point, but earlier production was characterised by being more itinerant and artisanal. On the connection between France and the Netherlands in the tapestry industry, see, e.g., Weigert (1962).
[171] Remarkably, all except for one of the *MED* attestations (*MED*, s.v. *arrăs* n. 2. (b) ~ *werk*) are taken from northern records (from Coldingham, Yorkshire, and Durham).

was also exploited by towns from Zeeland (the Netherlands) once the nearby salt beds started to be depleted (Munro 1994: 160). No other places are mentioned as suppliers of salt for England, so salt from France, along with the supply of autochthonous salt pans in British territory, might have met the existing demands in Durham.

3.2.3 The Ottoman Empire

From the former Ottoman Empire, apart from spices, other products became fashionable in England: **baudekyn** 'oriental cloth woven of silk, shot through with gold (or silver) thread, or brocaded' from Babylon (*MED*, s.v. *baudekin* (n.(1)) (OF *baudekin, -quin* < ML *baldakinus, -ekinus* < Italian *Baldacco* 'Bagdad')) and **crete** 'a sweet wine, Cretan wine' exemplify a couple of them.[172] **Jordan** (pl.) 'vessels used by physicians and alchemists', presumably comes from *Jordan bottles,* a recipient containing water from the Jordan by pilgrims or crusaders. This word would broaden its meaning to encompass both the vessel and 'a chamber-pot' *sensu stricto*, and it was no longer identified as coming from that area at the time it was employed in the *DAR*. Similarly, **cowrans** (Razynges) (also curawns and variants (see Appendix 5); in Latin 'acemi corenc.') 'raisins of Corinth', would be imported from the Levant and other Mediterranean regions more generally, not just from the port of Corinth. The currant variety is one of the oldest ones—in the year 75 A.D. Pliny already wrote about this small berry-size grape—and from the early fourteenth century, *reysyns de Corauntz* were already recorded in English markets, becoming *raisins of Corinth* from the 16th century (Christensen 2000: 40). The morphological transformations from *Corinth* to *currant* evidence the progressive dissociation of the origin of these raisins. In general, the provenance of these materials was probably not transparent to an English audience (unlike *Holland cloth* or *Iceland fish* below) although the extra-linguistic referents should have been clear. All these words reflect the influx of French: as Rothwell (1999) emphasises, French was the language used not only in English ports at least well into the second quarter of the fifteenth century but also on ships from far

[172] **Alisaunder** 'black lovage, horse parsley', native to southern Europe is apparently named after Alexander the Great (French *Alisander*), but since it is a proper name of a person, it has been excluded from this section.

and wide in continental Europe. *La pratica della mercatura* gives insights into the multilingual milieu of trading beyond French, 'nolo in più lingue latine' ('freight in several Romance languages'), adding that 'freto in fiammingo e inghilese e ispagnuolo' (Evans 1936: 16), signalling the use of Flemish, English, and Spanish along other Romance languages.[173]

In the Middle Ages, wine-making would become a leading sector of farming after cereals.[174] The fourteenth century would also witness the rise of Cretan wine as an international landmark (Rackham and Moody 1996: 78). Among the main importers (also in the Mediterranean and the Balkans), the English custom of drinking a sweet dessert wine stewed in cooking-pots (cf. Rackham and Moody 1996: 78) would explain the popularity of **crete** in the *DAR* material.

3.2.4 Other regions in central, northern, and eastern Europe

Another popular wine, which was at least twice as expensive as the competing French *claret* or wine from Gascony, is **ryniswyne** 'wine produced in the Rhine region', the main export commodity in the region of Cologne.[175] The chief export markets of Cologne were the Netherlands (mostly, Holland, Flanders, and Brabant), England, and the Baltic. Other products which evince the strong commercial connections between England and the Continent include **Westwale**, a kind of cloth, 'probably coarse linen or canvas' of Westphalian origin (see *OED* (2011), s.v. *westvale*, n.; *MED*, s.v. *West-văl(e* n.) and 'ferro de Sprois' and '**sprwys** fisc.' (also with inverted word order), iron and fish originated in or associated with Prussia, which used to be German territory. These spellings suggest influence from Latin (AL *Sprucia*) and from French (*Prusse*, *Pruisse* > *sprois*). Like in the case of **ryniswyne**, a wider range of products are recorded in the *MED* under *spruce*: fish, iron, leather, plate, shield, and wax (*MED*, s.v. *Sprūce* n., 1, not to be confused with sense 2, 'spruce wood'). According to Postan

[173] The existence of an alleged European (French-Spanish-Italian) trade pidgin functioning as a lingua franca across the Mediterranean from the late Middle Ages to the mid-19th century has also been widely debated (see, e.g., Cifoletti 1989; Minervini 1996; Dakhlia 2008; Selbach 2017).

[174] On the wine trade in Medieval Europe, see Rose's (2011) monograph.

[175] From this area near the Rhine river were also *fats, gilders* (a coin), *pipes* (for wine), not mentioned in the *DAR* (cf. *MED*, s.v. *Rīnish* adj.).

(2002: 290), 'Hungarian copper, the high quality iron (osmund) of Sweden and local varieties of ordinary iron formed also quite an important category among Prussian imports', so it might have been the case that the 'ferro de **Sprois**' had been re-exported from Prussia.

In the Middle Ages, the consumption of fish was substantial, so it also plays an important role in the *DAR:* to '**sprwys** fisc.' we should add **Iselandfish**. The Scandinavian and Icelandic fishing industry operated on an international scale (in contrast to the English herring fisheries, see below), particularly that of stock-fish and the white herring (Postan 2002: 95). The prosperous fisheries of Iceland attracted foreign fleets, including from England, Ireland, and mainland Scandinavia which had already started 'since times immemorial' (Postan 2002: 120), but intensified in the Late Middle Ages, partly because of new direct routes: for instance, seamen from Zealand (Denmark) probably opened up a new route to the Baltic c. the mid-14th century. Another representative product indicated as coming from 'Eastland', **Estlandbordes**, 'Baltic timber' (made of yew, pine, or fir) became one of the main attractions in the western markets and 'one of the chief magnets which drew English merchants to the Baltic regions' (Postan 2002: 98). It is worth restating that the boards shipped from the Baltic might have come from farther away (e.g. the Carpathian Mountains) and sometimes went through intermediary countries such as Hungary and Prussia (Hirsch 1858). Lastly in this list of commodities associated with particular regions on the Continent is **caffatyne** (also Skaffatyne, where the insertion of the <s> in the former (as in *sprwys*) may be due to its association with other *(s)caff-* words (e.g. *scaffalde*)). **Caffatyne** derives from French *cafetin*,[176] whose ultimate etymon is probably Arabic, and denotes 'a type of sugar, orig. from Caffa [modern-day Ukraine] in the Crimea' (*MED*, s.v. *caffatīn* (n. & adj.)). Already in the second half of the 13th century, the pre-eminence of the Genoese in European trade with the Levant was unquestionable, reaching its climax at the end of the century (for more details, see Ashtor 1983: 10–11). The Genoese had regular trading routes with Egypt and Syria, which had 'sizeable quantities of various kinds of sugar' (Ashtor 1983: 206). At the end of the 14th and beginning of the 15th century, however, many sugar factories halted

[176] The *DMLBS* (s.v. † *caffatinus*) suggests a possible Italian etymon instead 'It. *caffettino* (?)'.

their production although it was not completely discontinued. The Genoese ship line connected Caffa with both Syria and Egypt, which in fact 'became a major axis of international trade' (Ashtor 1983: 11). This may explain why Caffa was also an important source of products like sugar.

At least from the thirteenth century, Italian merchants had kept regular trade with England. The main purpose of the journeys to England and Flanders (where Venice had galleys) was the acquisition of English wool, a key raw material for the growing textile industry in Italy (also in Catalonia), but the Mediterranean traders would also supply Oriental spices among other goods, which gives a sense of the reciprocal arrangements made in the Middle Ages. In this context, we find a reference to **powderlomberd** 'spice imported from or associated with Lombardy' (*MED*, s.v. *pŏudre* n.(1), 5b). This spice was traded in that Italian northern region although it most likely came from further afield (Logan (2002: 122), e.g., suggests Syria). In the following section, I will delve into the connections between both Britain and Continental Europe and, on a micro-level, between Durham, other parts of England and, to a lesser extent, Ireland (see **irislams**) and Scotland (**Skotisadell**).

3.2.5 Britain and Ireland

> The English imports, chiefly cloth, were compact and valuable, while the Prussian exports, corn and sylvan products, were bulky and cheap. Thus the English merchants required larger shipping space for the westward than for the eastward journeys (Postan 2002: 290).

The exports of Prussia—applicable to other areas as well—seemed to be in counterpoint to the English imports. Keen (1973: 148) correlates the decline of what had been an extremely buoyant industry, the export of wool,[177] with a rise in the

[177] See Lloyd's (1977) monograph on the topic. On the interrelations between the Flemish and English industries and the wider European connections in this realm, it is worth stating that there is a Flemish list of wool prices from monasteries in England from the middle of the 13th century (Varenbergh 1874: 214-217) which resembles Pegolotti's lengthier record, so Cunningham (1910: 628) proposes that Pegolotti could have drawn on a similar Flemish document (see also Whitwell's (1904)). The possibility that these lists circulated more widely is highly likely. Formal linguistic similarities in the adaptation of English names between the Flemish renderings and Pegolotti's lists might also be adduced to suggest a common source,

native English cloth industry which had started to be reinvigorated in the first half of the 14th century. After an initial boom (1420-1440), the English cloth trade faced difficulties prompted by the final phase of the Hundred Years War and demographic and commercial setbacks, but all the *DAR* terms relating to English production predate that date;[178] the bulk of them, in fact, comes from the 14th century, when it had gained a great impetus, propelled by Edward III's campaign to boost domestic production and reduce the English exportations to Flanders in light of the richness amassed out of English wool in the Low Countries (Chamson 2014: 290).[179] We find mentions of several kinds of cloth which indicate their geographical origins (all of them lemmatised in the *MED* but not in the *OED*): **Aylsam** 'Cloth of Aylsham, in Norfolk', **bermegheham** (also 'panni de Berm'/Berm'hᵃm'), 'cloth made in Birmingham', **Totenays** 'Some sort of cloth, perh. serge', probably from Totenais, the French version of the town Totnes (*MED*, s.v. *totenais* (n.)), and **worset'** (also in its Latinised version, *worseto/-i*) 'woolen cloth of some kind used for making clothing, furnishings, etc., worsted', from Worstead in Norfolk (*MED*, s.v. *worsted* (n.)). Other English-origin textiles in the *DAR* are **Cogsale**—the only one which is not in the *MED*—which the editor defines as 'a textile so named from Coggeshall in Essex', preceded in the text by 'vocato' in 'blodio mixto vocato Cogsale' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1419?, 616) and **Lyncolnesaye**, 'a fine fabric made at Lincoln, a kind of say' (*MED*, s.v. *Lincoln* (n.)). Along with **worset**, **Lyncolnesaye** is the sole term for which we have some associated quality characteristics in lexicographical resources, namely, that it is of a fine quality. The scribes of these Durham rolls would have been amply familiarised with these concepts, expect perhaps for **Cogsale**, on which the scribe elaborates (it is 'blodio mixto' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1419?, 616)). It is not clear whether these fabrics would have been renowned internationally under the names of the specific English toponyms in which they were produced. Based on the existing evidence, it is more likely that they

---

although as Evans (1936: xxviii) points out, they may simply represent an Italian speaker's attempts to represent sounds which did not belong to his original phonological repertoire (see Evans (1936) for an assessment of the likelihood of Pegolotti's use of different preexisting sources).

[178] On the history of this trade in relation to the Flemish and Brabantine draperies, see Munro (1994: 163-168).

[179] Edward recruited 'malcontent' textile craftsmen from the Low countries who headed to and settled in England, particularly in the east, as well as in Scotland (Chamson 2014: 290). They were granted privileges, which produced some resentment in local textile workers.

were known under the more general label ‘English’ cloths/textiles (compare **Holandcloth** and **Flemyshcloth** above), unless they had specific traits that could stand out against textiles from other regions.

Apart from **hakenay** ('a small saddle-horse'), an English-based creation (< *Hackney*, formerly a village in Middlesex, now in London) also found in Anglo-Norman (see *OED* (2016), s.v. *hackney*, n. and adj. and Roig-Marín (2019a: 248)), another important source of terms derived from English place-names is the fish industry. The herring fishing grounds off the coastal areas of South Lincolnshire and Norfolk—especially, Yarmouth—were famed centres for local consumption, although it is not clear whether they also featured in international trading routes (Postan 2002: 95), unlike the large-scale cloth and wool industry. The two fish-related terms in the *DAR* are, nevertheless, from a location closer to Durham, Beadnell on the coast of Northumberland: **bednale fiss’** and **bidnelcodlynge** (*MED*, s.v. *Bed(e)nal, -el* (n.)).

Non-English-centred terms are **irislams**, most likely, ‘Irish lambs’. Fowler (1901: 926) is doubtful about this correspondence, possibly because of the assimilation of the <b>, but it follows the pattern of **Antonlam**, ‘a St. Anthony lamb’, also in the *DAR*; and **Skotisadell** ‘a Scottish saddle’ (not in the *MED*/*OED*). The previous literature does not seem to have considered the importance or popularity of either Irish lambs or Scottish saddles in the Middle Ages, so we can only speculate that either their distinctiveness for a medieval audience has not been researched yet—or at least the evidence available does not afford it—or simply that the scribe just indicated that the lambs/saddles were coming from Ireland and Scotland without any particular semantic resonance. In the multilingual background of the accounts, where most terms are partly or totally rendered in Latin (see the examples above and the full list of occurrences in Appendix 5), the most likely explanation for their occurrence in the vernacular (both in terms of word-order and the choice of lexis) would be that *Irish lambs* and *Scottish saddles* would have functioned as common collocations in the scribes’ discourse, hence their occurrence without any adaptation or integration into Medieval Latin.

3.3 Compounds in the *DAR*

3.3.1 On the status of multi-word sequences

A definition of a compound as 'the formation of a new lexeme by adjoining two or more lexemes' (Bauer 2003: 40) would give the impression that it represents an easily identifiable word-formation; the term *lexeme* in that definition effectively excludes (derivational) affixes while including stems and free words. Even though this seemingly safe premise poses problems in languages typologically distinct from English, it could be a good starting point for the study of compounds in this Germanic language. However, the first part of the definition, alluding to a *new* lexeme, raises more questions: how can we recognise new compound formations? Criteria based on phonological, orthographic, morphological, and semantic features have partially addressed this issue, but they tend to be language-dependent and do not usually account for all types of compounds. In particular, the limits between N+N phrases and N+N compounds are rather blurred, which provokes mixed reactions: for Olsen (2000) any noun+noun collocation is a compound; and, at the other end of the spectrum, Spencer (2003) radically posits the non-existence of compounds in English. Bauer concluded that 'any distinction drawn on the basis of just one of these criteria is simply a random division of noun + noun constructions, not a strongly motivated borderline between syntax and the lexicon' (Bauer 1998: 78). On the basis of several language groups and languages (Germanic, Romance, Slavic, Finno-Ugric, and Modern Greek), Donalies (2004: 76), formulated ten criteria: compounds are complex, conceptual units, are formed without word-formation affixes, spelled together, have a specific stress pattern, include linking elements, are right-headed, are inflected as a whole, are syntactically inseparable, and are syntactic-semantic islands. While most criteria can be disproved cross-linguistically or are empirically unsustainable, three seem to be relatively reliable (Lieber and Štekauer 2009): stress, syntactic inseparability, and a compound's behaviour as a complex lexical unit in relation to inflection.

Some of these present-day debates can frame the study of compounds in medieval English (both Old and Middle English), whilst they necessarily have to be

accommodated to the historical data that is presently available as well as to the largely multilingual context that characterised England in the Middle Ages. This section takes a historical perspective on the study of this long-standing word-formation mechanism in English. Previous scholarship has lengthily considered compounding as a crucial device in Old English, especially in poetic diction (for an overview, see Burnley 1992; Davis-Secord 2016). The textbook account of the history of English states that Middle English favoured borrowing and native compounding declined. This has been widely confirmed by the number of compounds which were coined in Old English as opposed to Middle English. Still, some of the types of compounds carried on being productive and new types were developed in ME. The Noun + Noun structure was prominently employed in ME (see, e.g., Sauer's (1985) study of Laȝamon's *Brut*, in which out of 268 compounds, 138 were new ME formations) whereas in OE genitive noun-noun combinations were amply preferred. In fact, in OE both N-N and Adj-N compounds were less common, possibly because their morphological transparency would have prevented them from lexicalising into compounds (Fischer 2006: 255).[180] Fischer (2006: 262) argues that 'compound-like phrases' (of the *stone wall* type) were developed in Middle English out of variants of genitive constructions without the declensional ending *-s*; these NPs, functioning like compounds de facto and being semantically close to OE weak-adj + N phrases, would have fostered Adj-N compounds and N-N phrases, filling in the gap of the aforementioned OE construction after the loss of inflectional suffixes. Fischer (2006) uses the concepts of *phrases* and *compounds* interchangeably, which proves the permeability of these conceptual boundaries in the ME period too.

The non-negligible presence of complex lexical units—which encompass both compounds and other multi-word expressions (see Schlücker 2019)—in late medieval texts whose base language is (Medieval) Latin is worth tracing: What kinds of 'compounds' (for the time being, a provisional label) are in the *DAR* and why are they employed instead of French or even Latin equivalents (if any)? I will, therefore, give a

[180] Among the examples that Fischer (2006) gives of types of 'noun-noun compounds'—which were less common in OE—*ladybird, stonewall,* and *sunlight* (see also Rosenbach 2004), *ladybird* and *blackbird* are proof of how the modern compounds cannot be compared to the original OE weak-adj. + N pattern. Such OE constructions would become lexical units and their meaning would be considerably altered, narrowed, and fixed (compare the temporal and context-dependent combinations of Adj. + N constructions in *a black bird*, also marked with a change in the stress pattern).

sketch of the background to the historical development of compounding putting it alongside (rather than in isolation from) the languages and textual traditions with which English had contact, and I will give some examples of the compounds in the *DAR*.

3.3.2 From Old English to Middle English compounds through a multilingual lens

The influence of French on English word-formation processes did not materialise only in derivational morphology (see, inter alia, Dalton-Puffer 1996; Palmer 2009; Lloyd 2011) but also in compounding. The productivity of V+N exocentric compounds in Middle English (albeit limited) seems to have been partly favoured by French (Miller 2014: 53; Durkin 2009: 107); the use of exocentric compounds in general was very restricted in early Germanic, and the V+N type (e.g. *pickpocket*) was virtually non-existent except for a potential case in Gothic (*grinda-fraþjis** (see Miller 2019: 305)). There are some V+N synthetic compounds attested in late Old English (Wilmanns 1896: 536ff; Miller 2019: 305) though they did not become productive until Middle English and only to a limited extent. Another group of compounds whose presence is due to external (in this case, Celtic) influence is represented by inversion compounds, in which the determinatum is placed before than the determinant (although, unlike V+N exocentric compounds, they did not become part of the English word-formation system). Their order is 'un-English' (Sauer 1985: 500) and are not productive beyond place-names of Celtic origin (e.g. *Kaer Liun, Kaer Lud,* and *Port Lud*) in the areas of Cumberland and Westmorland (also attested, in their English renderings, in Laȝamon's *Brut*, see, e.g., *Leirchestre* (PDE *Leicester*) for *Kaer Leir*). Ekwall (1918) proposes that Scandinavians had coined them following the Celtic word-order. More recently, Grant (2002) has readdressed this topic in an extensive essay and concluded that, rather than being creations of native ON-speakers influenced by Celtic syntax, they would 'instead be the product of native Gaelic speakers utilizing the culturally-dominant Scandinavian language into which they transferred some features of their native speech' (Grant 2002: 82).

The adoption of calques or loan translations (Haugen 1950) such as *knight errant* 'chevalier errant' and *falcon gentle* 'faucon gentil' is also sometimes mentioned as an instantiation of the influence of French on Middle English compounds (see Faiss 1992: 74),[181] although the process itself, whereby each element of the source compound is reproduced in the recipient language by semantically analogous elements, is limited to a number of borrowed lexical items.[182] Earlier on, calquing from Latin also generated compounds previously non-existent in Old English (without being productive as a word-formation mechanism): two well-known examples are *liber evangelii* and *liber benedictionum* rendered as *godspellboc* 'gospel book' and *bletsungboc* 'book of blessings' (note also the alteration in the syntactic structure from Latin to the English compound).[183] In fact, after the christianisation of the Germanic tribes, more calques than direct loanwords—what Miller (2012: 52) calls 'actual loanwords'—were introduced into literary OE. A collation of the original version of a text and its translation may allow us to detect possible calques, but their identification as secure calques is far more complex: there might be fortuitous correspondences between the languages and/or the extant sources may be so limited that a cross-linguistic

[181] For some examples of calqued expressions or phrases from French, see Sykes (1899), Orr (1962), and Miller (2012).

[182] There are many classifications of calques, among which Betz (1949) and Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) are particularly relevant. The former relies on formalist criteria and involves three structural kinds, 'literal calques' (*Lehnübersetzung*), 'approximate calques' (*Lehnübertragung*) and 'conceptual calques' (*Lehnschöpfung*). The latter involves *lexical calques*, which comply with the syntactic structure of the RL (*cornerstone* < *pierre angulaire*) and *structural calques*, those introducing structures from the SL into the RL language. Arguably, the examples cited in the text fall under this type of *structural calques*, although the two word-orders co-exist in ME; the postponed position started to decline and was only more prominent in the early stages of incorporation of these borrowings into the RL (compare Gower's *Confessio Amantis* (1393) 'as a gentil faucon soreth' and *Mandeville's Travels* (c. 1400) 'Gerfacouns, sparehaukes, faukons gentyls' (*OED* (1894), s.v. *falcon-gentle*, n.)). The progressive fixing of word order in the transition into ME and the larger frequency of preposed adjectives meant that that position became the default option (variation is still permitted in PDE in a few adjectives which can be used in their attributive or predicative functions (*visible stars/stars visible*; see Hauman (2003: 59) for an explanation of the semantic (individual- vs. stage- level) distinctions between the two). Because of the syntactic component involved in calques, they are often classified as 'syntactic borrowings'.

[183] Latin compounds were also sometimes rendered prepositionally in OE: Hendrickson (1948) analysed OE prepositional compounds against the Latin originals in Alfred's translation of the *Historiarum Libri VII adversus Paganos* and discussed how Latin compounds were either paraphrased (e.g. *occīderet* '*beswac to deaðe*') or translated, acknowledging 'borderline examples' somewhere in between paraphrased and translated words. These, however, are *ad hoc* solutions which were not necessarily incorporated into the language.

comparison may not be feasible; the dating of the textual records also plays an important part in so far as the supposed calque, naturally, cannot predate the tentative source form. Durkin (2009: 135) pinpoints the most reliable scenario: 'when we encounter a highly lexicalized (possibly encyclopedic) meaning which is very unlikely to be coincidental'. He gives the example of *New Christian* modelled on Spanish *cristiano nuevo*.

In the multilingual context of the *DAR*, where scribes are navigating between languages and, in part, 'translating' (in the etymological sense of 'carrying over' words from their vernacular into Medieval Latin) material, calques should be expected (e.g. pan*is* de **tret**, probably a calque on AF *pain de trayte*). In this section, I will consider a few instances of calques and hybrid creations (Haugen 1950, 1953) as well as vernacular compounds more broadly.[184] Scholars like Fischer (2013: 34) include forms like *liðsmann* as 'hybrid compounds' (ON *lið* 'fleet' and OE *mann*; cf. OIcel *liðsmaðr*) and she points out that they are 'a more common form of mixing', also attested in Middle English in contact with French (Fischer 2013: 330). Yet, because of the genetic proximity of Germanic languages (not only with ON but also with MDut/LG) and the process of 'merger' between the vocabulary of English and French (Rothwell 1991: 174), it is often rather problematic to ascertain to what extent some compounds are native creations or perhaps variants of the SL which do not survive in the extant evidence; even more so within texts which are 'hybrid' or multilingual themselves such as the *DAR*.

The third category of Haugen's classification which was refined by Winford (2005), creations entirely made up of foreign elements (also known as 'pseudo-borrowings'), is often illustrated with Japanese *wan-man-ka* 'bus with no conductor', in which the morphemes taken from the SL are still recognisable despite the phonological and morphological adaptation. Many of the complex lexical units in the *DAR* exclusively combine 'borrowed' material in ME (e.g. AF + AF combinations) although they differ substantially from pseudo-borrowings in so far as they are not combined in ME in ways that would be impermissible (semantically or morphologically) in the SL. Rather, they

[184] Classifications of borrowings started in the late nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries (see Paul 1886; Seiler 1907; Betz 1949). Building on these classifications, Haugen (1950, 1953) first distinguished loanwords, loan meanings, and creations.

form larger units which have not undergone any semantic shifts in comparison to their usages in the SL. In the following section, I will describe these multi-word lexical units in the *DAR* in relation to the general characteristics of compounds discussed in Section 3.3.1 and will analyse their treatment in the *OED* and *MED*.

3.3.3 The DAR compound formations

533 lexical items combine at least two or, less often, three elements: from this count compounds already recorded in OE and, more rarely, other languages like Old French were not included, as well as phrasal combinations of adjectives and nouns which do not function as lexical units (e.g. **Dubelsols**, **gretspikyngez**, **Grenginger**, **Grenemellid**, **gretechargeour**, **hautboutavant**, **Longstalke**, **middilspikyng**, **Newchambr'**, **suger blanch**, **small cordes**, **smalrape**, and **Violet Ray**).[185] Regular past participles and nouns constructions (**cathedra turnyd**, **powdretfish, sawes irined**, and **tryetging'**), gerunds (also phrasal verbs **takyng downe**), phrases (**lake et waste**) were generally excluded; so were other NPs (**nyght chares**, **Skotisadell**, **Flemishcloth**, **Hollandcloth**), more noticeably those which specify the material of which the referent is made, usually in the left-hand element in the vernacular (**Brasynmorter**, **irinbokelles**, **lathroddes**[186], **lynghouse**,[187] **stanetrogh**, **Stankart**, **trechargeours**, **whiteledirskynnes**, **yrenforkez**, **yrenhake**, and **yrenslottes**) and more rarely in ML in post-nominal position (e.g. **girthes querculini**). Regarding this last group, some inclusions in the *OED* seem somewhat arbitrary: for instance, **lyngthake** is included under the general attributive compounds category in the *OED* ((1903), s.v. *ling*, n.2, C1. *ling-thatch* n.)—a definition is not provided—, whereas **lynghouse** is not in the *OED*. Similarly, the same lexeme can be the basis for fully-fledged compounds in some cases (**Stanbat'** 'a boat for transporting stone', **stanelatts** 'a strip of wood to which roofing slates are nailed', **stanhokes** 'hooks for attaching a hinge to stonework', **Stankart** ' a cart for carrying

[185] Langcart', also occurring as longa carecta, 'the long cart in which the Prior's impedimenta were carried' (Fowler 1901: 929).
[186] **Lathrod** is not in the *OED* under the special combination sections unlike *lath-brick*, *lath-brod*, or *lath-coop*. It is not clear why this is so.
[187] **Lynghouse** could have been a house made of or covered with ling but it is not clear from the context (cf. **lyngthake**, lemmatised in the *OED*).

stone and possibly other building materials') and simply indicate the material of which something consists in others (e.g. **stanetrogh**). The semantics of these words are key in trying to underline the syntactic relations between the two components.

The lack of a blank space between the two elements in written form might give the wrong impression that they constitute a unit. Nonetheless, if the criteria cited above are applied, it becomes quickly apparent that they are simple NPs containing adjectives, in postnominal position in the case of *suger blanch*. There are multiple combinations with *sugar* (also *sugre*, *zukur*, and variants) in the *DAR,* among others **Sugreroset** and **sucre in plate**, 'lb. de plate' (omitting sugar) (also sugre plate),[188] and **Sugyrlaffe** (also layf de suggir), which do seem to function like compounds, that is, they are syntactically inseparable and behave as complex lexical units, and are also classified as such in the *OED* (more on the treatment of these units below). They may exhibit different syntactic structures (NPs or nouns postmodified by a PP) in the *DAR* although they are onomasiologically equivalent. In his discussion of 'multiword lexical units',[189] Zgusta (1967) refers to Martinet's (1964: 35) functional principle, 'the subordination of form to function', in his comparison of synonyms (French *viellir - prendre de l'âge*) where their designative function is the same and 'the divergence in their form (one word :: more words) is less important' (Zgusta 1967: 579). The *DAR* data, thus, evidences different paraphrasing strategies across languages with a common semantic value: for instance, *layf de suggir* is a right-headed structure and a prepositional phrase modifies the noun *layf*, whereas **Sugyrlaffe** is a regular English left-headed compound. Bauer (2017: 76) observes how there are 'compound-like' genitive + N constructions which are sometimes equivalent to compounds (e.g. *robin's wheat* vs *robin wheat* 'a moss'). An alternative to this genitive construction is the use of prepositional phrases: these N + P + N phrases are deemed compounds in French (Lombard 1930), 'perhaps because of the degree of lexicalisation many of them show' (Bauer 2017: 76), as in *chemin de fer* 'railway' or *pomme de terre* 'potato'.[190] In OF

[188] **Sucre in plate** and *sugre de plate* are examples of 'synapsy variations' (Jacquemin 2001: 305), typical in French (*récolte de fruits - récolte en fruits*).

[189] Multiword lexical units include lexical collocations, idioms, and (semi)-fixed expressions.

[190] See also Van Goethem and Amiot (2019) on the difficulties of distinguishing compounds from syntactic expressions in present-day French owing to the inapplicability of formal criteria (e.g. there is no distinctive word stress, inconsistent spelling, and internal inflectional suffixes,

there were already N+N compounds—as in English—which seem to be 'relics of the OF nominative + genitives constructions where such relationships were originally marked by inflection, rather than with a preposition' (Wise 1997: 128). It is not my aim here to contend that these examples in the *DAR* were actually compounds in Anglo-French but to highlight parallel developments in the different ways of expressing the same concept in the multilingual context of the *DAR* (compare also **bordes de Estland** vs **Estlandbordes**).

Compounds are chiefly written together in the *DAR* although not always (see **hewyng knyffe** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397)) and there is also oscillation within the same unit (e.g. **lyn pynnys** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404-5, 399), **lynpinnes** (Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 518), and **Rent Egges** (Rott. Celer. 1366, 45) **renthegges**/rentegges (Rott. Celer. 1417, 55)) or in those sharing the first or the second element: compare **plogh pattyl** with **plogheuedez** and **ploghschoue**, **plowshon**, **plushone**, and **plushous**. It could be argued that each scribe had his own spelling preferences.[191] No intra-scribal variation has been noticed in the use of the blank space within the elements that make up the same compound in a given roll (for different compounds see **Rentheness** and **Rent Egges** in Rott. Celer. 1366, 45). The representativeness of this spelling incidence is, however, questionable: a particular compound (unlike semantically broader simplexes) usually occurs once or twice in the *DAR* rolls,[192] and the spaces between words in manuscript sources are sometimes not as straightforward as in printed sources.

The general distribution of Latin simplexes (usually hyperonyms, e.g. *cultellis* 'knives') and the hyponymic multi-word lexical units rendered in the vernaculars (e.g. *chopping knyfys*) in medieval multilingual texts has now been discussed in some detail (see Wright 1995; Sylvester 2018; Roig-Marín 2019a). Yet, hyponyms may also be rendered into ML (compare **tabilstonys** and **tabulares lapides**, both in the *DAR*) or one

---

generally attributed to syntactic formations, can also be found). Consequently, the concept of 'compounding' in French is much looser in the literature on French word-formation process (on the multiple uses of the term, see Van Goethem (2009) and Villoing (2012)).

[191] Variation is still very much noticeable in PDE with compounds being written together, with a hyphen, or separately. Institutionalised compounds tend to be rendered as one word or are written hyphenated although this a not fixed rule.

[192] In a few rolls, the verso and recto were probably written by two different scribes, so the presence of **spanyng lambes** on the recto (Rott. Instaur. 1416-7, 317, 'Compotus Joh'is Schepard, Bercarii apud le Holme') and **spanynglamez** and on the verso (Rott. Instaur. 1416-7, 319, 'Comp. Will'i Dycon, bercarii apud le Heggecote') is not revealing.

of their constituent elements may be replaced by a CL-origin word, potentially used in French or English even if the lexeme is not in vernacular dictionaries. For instance, *pan* in the regular compound, **fryingpanne** (e.g. in Rott. Celer. 1493-4, 100)—French-origin *frying*, fully integrated into the English verbal system by then, + OE-origin *pan*—is replaced by CL *patella* in **friyng patyls** (Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97), equally meaning 'a frying pan' (*DMLBS*, s.v. *patella* [CL], 1 *patellus*, *patellum*).[193] As it is spelt with a <y> and pluralised by means of the vernacular *-s* morpheme, it looks like a vernacular lexical item despite the lack of records of the word in the *OED, MED, AND*, and *TLFi*.[194] Alternatively, it might also be a 'vernacularised' or vernacular-mediated Latin lexeme without having been integrated into the vernaculars.

It is worth pointing out that a few compounds could have been created in Middle English with native or borrowed material (e.g. **Stocfisse** (OE + OE) and **shotnaill** (MDut + OE)) and/or perhaps modelled, 'calqued', on existing compounds in other languages: **Weyscill** (OE + ON) might have been modelled on MDu. *waechschale* (*MED*, s.v. *wei-scāle* (n.)), **Avermalts** (ON + OE) on MLG *hāvermolt* (*OED* (2015), s.v. *haver-malt* n.); and **nootmogez** might be a compound formation of OE *nut* and ME *muge* 'musk' (although it is a rare word), with semantic parallels in Anglo-Norman (*muge de bois* < OF *mugue* 'musk'). The compound in AN is *nois mugette*, and the Romance compound (see, e.g., Catalan *nou moscada*, Old Occitan *noz muscada*, and Spanish *nuez moscada*) seems to have been borrowed into Germanic languages like MDut *notemusscate*, MHG *muscātnuz*, Swedish *muskotnöt*, and Danish *muskatnød* (*OED* (2004), s.v. *nutmeg*, n.

[193] As a simplex, **patell**' in the *DAR* also means 'a long-handled instrument, spade, spoon, scoop, scraper' (*DMLBS*, s.v. *patella* [CL], 1 *patellus*, *patellum*, sense 6).

[194] In the *AND*, *patel* is listed as a variant of *pastel* (*AND*, s.v. *pastel, pasteal, pastelle, patel*), in the *TLFi*, *patelle* is defined as a 'petit vase sacré en forme de plat creux utilisé pour offrir des libations aux dieux' a ceremonial cup used in Ancient Rome (sense A) and as a kind of gastropod, 'mollusque gastéropode marin, à coquille conique univalve, sans opercule, qui vit fixé aux rochers, et dont certaines espèces sont comestibles. Synon. *arapède, haliotide*' (sense B) (*TLFi*, s.v. *PATELLE*, subst. fém.). These senses are also in the *OED* ((2005), s.v. *patella*, n. senses 3 and 4)). Out of these two, the closest sense is '4. Chiefly *Archaeology*. A small pan or shallow dish, *esp.* one of Roman origin', although the context does not seem to fully match with the one in the *DAR*. On the other hand, the *OED* also records *pattle*, although it is an etymologically unrelated word meaning 'a plough-staff' (*OED* (2005), s.v. *pattle*, n.), and the *MED* is currently preparing a new draft entry for the word *patella*, although there is only one attestation up to this point (i.e. a1425 *Chauliac(4) in Norri Dict.Med.), and it refers to a different sense, namely, 'kneecap, patella; bone at front of knee' (see also *OED* (2005), s.v. *patella*, n.). The simplest explanation would, therefore, be to assume that it was a general term for 'a pan' as in ML.

and adj.). **Forhamer** (OE + OE) should be compared with Dutch *voorhamer* and Danish *forhammer*, **morterstanez** (OE + OE), with MDut *mortiersteen*, MHG *morselstein*, **rokpen'** (OE + OE), with MLG *rōkpenninc*, **heuedshete** (OE + OE), with AN *hedeshete*, **plogheuedez** (OE + OE) with MDut *ploechhovet*, **poleax** (MDut + OE) with MDut *polaex*, **nopsekez**, either MDut + OE or MDut (cf. MDut *noppensac*, MLG *noppensack*), **Stocfisse** (MDut + OE) with MDu. *stocvisch, stock-*, MLG *stokvisch*, and **shotnaill**, probably, *scotnail* < MDut *schot* + OE *nail*, modelled on MDut *schotspīker*. In all the aforementioned cases, the possibility of Germanic languages having independently produced the same outcome remains, although to different degrees.[195]

From an etymological viewpoint, the two largest groups of 'compounds' are OE + OE (237 lexical items), OE + AF (29) and AF + AF (26). Within the OE + OE group, there is also a sub-group (21) formed by a left-headed *-ing* form which functions as a gerund-participle attributively: **Betynghamyrs**, **burningwod**, **burnyngyrynnys**, **culyng leyd**, **choppyngknyvez**, **fellyng ax**, **flayngknyfe**, **Hemmyngyar**, **hewyng knyffe**, **sarkyngnale**, **Sethynghwose**, **Sewynnge hayr**, **shavyngirnes**, **Shavynghous**, **stekyngknyff**, **stepyngfattez, stondyng cope**, **Wakyngsilvyr**, **Wechingbalk**, and **Wellynglede**;[196] *-ing* is also attached to borrowings, mostly from Anglo-French combined with native-origin second elements (**bayngoxinstallis**, **boutyng clathe**, **brochyngaxez**, **dressingknyf**, **drissyngborde**, **frygnpane**, **lavyng bollez**, **lechingknyf**, **soudynghyrnes**), but also from ON, **keruyngknyves** (ON [poss. reinforcing an OE lexeme]), **lyttynglede**, and from an uncertain/unknown origin, **mesyngpenys** and **Reyng syff**. There are also other *-ing* combinations of compounds: OE + suffix + MDut. (**steppyngtubbez**), OE + OF (**schavyngbasynnys**, **stepyngbarellez**, **wessyngtowellez**), AF + ON (**dalbyngstowres**), and **rostyngrange** (AF + French). The *-ing* form is also sometimes the head of the compound as in **guttersettyng**. Apart from these gerund-participle + N combinations, the line between the most frequent combination, N + N, and regular N+N phrases may

[195] See also the *OED* entries for these words: (1897), s.v. *fore-hammer*, n., (2002), s.v. *mortar stone*, n., (2009), s.v. *reek penny* n., (2013), s.v. *head sheet*, n.1, (2006), s.v. *plough-head* | *plow-head*, n., (2006), s.v. *poleaxe* | *poleax*, n., (2003), s.v. † *nap sack* n., (1917), s.v. *stock-fish* | *ˈstockfish*, n., and (2011), s.v. † *scotnail*, n.

[196] I have excluded nouns which are not deverbal (e.g **Hoglingclousse**) and the difficult word **connyngarth** (also **cunyngarth**), which seems to be an alternation of *cunnigar* (AF, cf. OF *conniniere*) remodelled under the influence of *coney* (OF/AF) and *garth* (ON) rather than a compound (see *OED* (2014), s.v. *coney*, n.[1] and *coneygarth*, n. and cf. **Wodegarth** below).

be very thin (e.g., what is the status of **Wynterhalle** and **kydsape**?). From a syntactic viewpoint, there is a certain systematicity since they usually enter into a subordinate relation of complementation (e.g. **Avergarner** 'a storehouse for oats').

As can be expected, the tentative 533 compounds do not receive the same treatment in the *OED* and/or the *MED*: in the *OED*, a number of compounds are directly lemmatised (e.g. *OED* (1887), *bay window*, n., (1972) *board-nail*, n., (2006) s.v. *mouldbred*, n., (2003) *ploughswain*, n., (1917) *stone-cart*, n., and (2016) *wame-tow*, n.), and 186 have subentries as compounds, usually being classified under the 'attributive' uses of the lemma (e.g. *OED* (1903), s.v. *ling*, n.2 (*ling-thatch* n.)) or, more rarely, in 'special combinations' (e.g. *OED* (1921), s.v. *wain*, n.1 († *wain-clout* n.)). According to the *OED3* guide,[197]

> A compound occurs when simple words are joined and function as a single grammatical unit (e.g. sea chest, sea-gull, seafood). Compounds are frequently collected together in a section or group of sections at or near the end of an entry. They are followed by a quotation block in which examples of each compound are presented in alphabetical order of the compound. Some major compounds are entered as headwords in their own right. 'Special uses' of an adjective are not grammatically compounds, but share a similar organizational structure within the dictionary.

The *OED3* only seems to consider 'special uses of an adjective', but does not draw any distinctions between 'special' N+N combinations and compounds (for instance, **Wodegarth** is classified as a 'C2.a. Special combinations. † wood-garth n. Obsolete = wood-yard n.', thereby cross-referring to *wood-yard*, in which *yard* is the native equivalent for *garth*). Such discussion is not fundamentally at odds with my purpose here although formal taxonomies are not particularly productive in the study of the multilingual vernacular vocabulary in the *DAR*.

The number of *OED* pre-modern/modern attestations demonstrating its continuity of usage throughout time varies, and a few of them are illustrated but not defined (e.g. *OED* (2000), s.v. *mail*, n.2, 'C1. † *mail-saddle* n. Obsolete' or (1893), s.v. *counting*, n. 'C1. General attributive. † *counting-board* n. Obsolete'). 90 out of the total number of

[197] Guide to the Third Edition of the *OED*: <www.oed.com/public/oed3guide/guide-to-the-third-edition-of> [last accessed 1 February 2020].

compounds are not in the *OED*: 22 are, however, labelled as 'in cpds. and combs.' in the MED, the regular *MED* classification which encompasses both regular compounds and special combinations (cp. with the *OED*, which makes a distinction between the two), 6 more are lemmatised (*brod nail* (n.), *eg(ge)-silver* (n.), *hĕng-lok* (n.), *keilful* (n.), *stok-fish* (n.), and *walk-stoke* (n.)),[198] and 61 are included as (semi-)fixed combinations although they are not explicitly put under categories (e.g. **cartsadiltrees**, *MED*, s.v. *cart* (n.) 5. (b) ~ *sadel tre*, 'the wooden framework of a cart saddle').

For the purposes of this section, the more problematic cases in this survey are the 30 lexical items which are not in either the *MED* or the *OED* and may be regular noun phrases without being semantic units: some are kinds of nails (**bukketnall'**, **sylynnall'**), knives (**stekyngknyff**), or pans (**friyng patyls**, see above), which, unlike other terms with similar characteristics, are not present in the *OED* or the *MED*. There are also names for locations or rooms, which it could be argued were not lexicalised (**caponhous** (compare **Horsehous'** (cf. *OED* (1899), s.v. † *'horse-house*, n.2)), **dynerhous**, **Clerkchambr'**, **Chapelhende**, and **guttersettyng**) and three-word lexical items, which are rarely included in dictionaries (**fothyr brynnyng wod** and **candylwykesylver**). In order to understand the semantic and syntactic characteristics of these lexical combinations, an appreciation of their semantics is needed. However, for some of these lexical items the only definition we have comes from the editor of the *DAR*, and others are simply not defined. Fowler's explanations—sometimes tentative—(see Table 1) seem to corroborate the impression that these lexical combinations were 'syntactic-semantic islands' or, to put it differently, inseparable conceptual units (see also Section 3.1.2). **Wyn seake** (OE + AF?) seems to be a hybrid loanword calqued on *vinum siccum* (Spanish *vino seco*, which seems to be the intended meaning here),[199] while the rest exhibit the expected syntactic pattern in ME.

Table 1. *DAR* complex lexical items along with Fowler's (1901) tentative definitions

[198] The practice of lemmatising compounds is, nevertheless, less frequent in the *OED* than in the *MED*.

[199] This kind of wine is one of the few not included in the extensive list in the *MED* (s.v. *wīn(e* n.(2), sense 1): '~ *agrest*, ?sour wine; ?verjuice ~ *clare*, *clare* ~, spicy sweetened wine, clary; ~ *grek*, ~ of gascoine (lepe, paris, etc.), etc.; ~ *red* (*whit*), *red* (*whit*) ~ *heigh* (*mighti*, *strong*) ~, wine high in alcoholic content; ~ *lep*, ?= ~ of lepe; *quiked* ~, ?boiled, concentrated wine; *smal* ~, weak, thin, or light wine; *swete* ~; *temperate* ~ moderately alcoholic wine'.

DAR attestations	Fowler's definitions
boytstede	The place where the boat was moored (Fowler 1901: 897).
candylwykesylver	A customary payment made by six cottagers in Cowpon, probably in lieu of candlewick originally made by them (Fowler 1901: 900).
faltrowe	Probably the trough that received the ground corn, according to the Finchale Glossary […] and in our text it occurs in connexion with a water wheel and inner wheel, which contexts seem to suggest the trough from which the water falls on to an overshot or breast wheel (Fowler 1901: 913).
har threde	Thread for sewing hair-cloth, itself made of hair (Fowler 1901: 922).
godeshous	Perhaps a 'goods-house' or receptacle for anything of value. (Fowler 1901: 919).
mydiltrace, mydletraces	Finchale has medylsomes and mydylsomys, and Jamieson explains Sowme to be 'the rope or chain that passes between the horses or oxen by which the plough is drawn'. Middle traces were doubtless the same as middle somes, but the precise way in which they were used is not very evident (Fowler 1901: 936).
Sheretreyss'	The lateral grooved posts between which the "bridge-tree" rises and falls as the upper millstone is adjusted (Fowler 1901: 964).
Wyn seake	A Spanish wine probably like dry sherry (Fowler 1901: 988).

Further attention shall now be paid to a few other lexical items: **chauffourpannez** (OF + OE) seems to be a tautological lexical combination; *chauffour* on its own already means 'a cooking vessel, such as a pot, skillet, or frying pan' (*MED*, s.v. *chaufŏur*) which probably replicates the structure of other kinds of *pans* used for specific purposes; and **croceloft** (AF[200] + OE) is defined as a 'rood loft' (Fowler 1901: 908). **Saltfish** was probably read as a particular kind of fish (compare *salt fish* nowadays which is used for 'bacalao' in the Caribbean), so it is probably a compound. Others like **dalbyng-warke** or **tranishone** (or, more likely, **trauishone**) are more dubious and one can only speculate about their meaning in the context of the *DAR* (see Fowler 1901: 978 on the latter word).

There are recurrent left-handed elements: *bag* (in **Baghorse**, **bagsadiltres**, and **Bagsadle**), *cheese* (**Cheseclathe**, **cheseclutes**, and **chesefleke**), *coal* (**colepickes**, **colhouse**, **Collerak**), *court* (**courtceldr.**, **courtladez**, and **courtsyngyls**), *door* (**dorebandez**, **dorechekez**, and **dorecrokez**), *girth* (**girthbokyls** and **Girthetres**), *land* (**Landleve**, **landmale**, and **landmalebok**), *malt* (**maltbagges**, **Maltgarner**, and **maltspout**), or *mill* (**milne irennys**, **milneles**, **Milnpikkes**, **milnposte**, **mylne flym**,

[200] Croce seems to be the Anglo-French word for *cross* (see e.g. Dance 2019: II.246–7 on variants such as AF *crosce*, *crosse*).

mylnerasse, and **mylnstep**), *plough* (**plogh pattyl**, **plogheuedez**, **ploghschoue**, **ploughswaynlandes**, and **plowghclowtes**), *rent* (**Rent Egges**, **rentehennes**, and **rentsalt**), *rig* (**Rigbandis**, **Rigtoues**, and **rygwythi**) and *salt* (**Saltarke**, **saltcatt**, **Saltfish**, and **saltsaler**). The entities denoted may be very disparate despite the common first element: payments, equipment (utensils, tools, etc.), materials, containers, and means of travel, among others, all having in common their hyponymic nature, very much like most of the vernacular vocabulary in the *DAR*.

In conclusion, the focus of this section has been on the role of multiword elements in the make-up of the *DAR* vocabulary. From this overview it transpires that there is not a simple divide between complex, multi-word, lexical items as only occurring in the vernacular, and simplexes, in Latin: in both the vernacular and in Latin, words may be intertwined to form larger lexical units, with multiple morphological inputs and syntactic structures. The position of the head in compounds cannot be invoked as a parameter cross-linguistically or in the *DAR*, and adjectives are found in both postnominal or prenominal positions. Unlike Latin and Romance languages, English only allows postpositive adjectives under certain circumstances and in fixed constructions, the default syntactic structure being Adj+N; the multilingual nature of these accounts affords greater flexibility.

The treatment of these words in dictionaries give us some important cues about the perception of these words from a formal viewpoint. The most usual combination is N+N, among which the presence of *-ing* forms cannot be neglected. Compounding as a word-formation strategy continued to be robust in ME rather than being debilitated by borrowing, although the range of lexical material available grew exponentially thanks to the input of other languages. Many of the compounds in this section may not necessarily be regarded as such by other scholars, but perhaps just 'special combinations', as the *OED* puts it. Such theoretical discussions are not unduly disabling of our purposes. The main aim here has been to show how these lexical items would often have functioned as collocations in the language employed by the *DAR* scribes. Further research should address the rendering of these structures into Medieval Latin in greater detail, including the issue of calquing, that is, ML structures calqued on vernacular languages in multilingual texts, an issue which has received little attention beyond the analysis of translation strategies, always from a clearly distinct source

language into a target language. It has been my purpose here to situate the *DAR* multi-word lexical units within the broader multilingual history of English, as well as to reflect critically on how we can approach these lexemes from a taxonomical perspective. Dictionaries can shape our perspective on such words, being classified as 'combining forms', 'special combinations', or 'compounds', but the data, particularly if it is multilingual, should make us rethink the applicability of these labels and encourage us to reassess the usefulness of the underlying criteria for discriminating between these kinds of lexical formations. The next section tackles another cornerstone of the *DAR* vocabulary: its northern dimension.

4. Northern Middle English in the *DAR*

Stenroos (2019: 40) addresses the concept of 'Northern Middle English' in a two-fold way, distinguishing its purely dialectal signification—i.e. the ME varieties whose features are marked as characteristic of the north—from its broader sociolinguistic sense, the production of texts in the north (implying those by non-northern writers as well) and by northerners. Research into Northern ME texts from a dialectal perspective has, naturally, tended to concentrate on business or administrative production (inventories, accounts, etc.), wills, and letters, because these texts tend to be dated and localised.[201] Durham and York were important centres of manuscript production and compilation beyond these text-types, so it is certainly simplistic to reduce our philological understanding of this area to such a small fraction of the overall textual culture. Similarly simplistic is our view of the 'north' as a large and all-encompassing label covering a vast area spreading from the north of England to Scotland. It is, therefore, a seemingly unsatisfactory label to conceptualise provenance of manuscripts, especially after the consolidation of *LALME* and *LAEME* as research tools (see also Putter 2018). In this dissertation, the localisation of the texts seems unproblematic: they were produced in Durham Cathedral or its vicinity based on external evidence present in the locative headings of the documents and the place-names and people referred to. To what extent we can correlate place of production with the scribe's dialect is another matter. It is worth remembering the two-stage process involved in the writing of accounts and inventories: the language, contents, and scripts of the drafts (some of which are still extant) *vis-à-vis* the final documents suggest either scribal intervention between the two processes or at least some changes from one version to another which might have been the product of the same person or not. Do these texts reflect a feasible degree of dialectal hybridity in light of the findings in the previous literature? Or does the presence of non-northern forms invalidate the possibility of a scribal community made up of only northerners? This chapter innovatively investigates these questions within the multilingual milieu specific

[201] Since these accounts run until the early modern period, this PhD also considers a small proportion of data from the first half of the sixteenth century. The bulk of lexical items comes, however, from the late Middle English period, hence, the title of this chapter.

to the *DAR*, by probing into the interactions between the vernaculars (including Anglo-French) and Medieval Latin on different linguistic levels: orthography (vowels (Section 1) and consonants (2)), morphology and lexis (Section 3). Interlinked as these topics may be, they deserve separate treatment in order to understand the organisation of the database which serves as the basis for this chapter.

4.1 Northern English and Scottish features

The *OED* and the *EDD*, key lexicographical resources in the data analysis of this PhD, often suggest that a given form, or even sense in my database, is, or has been at some point, Scottish. As has been discussed in the Introduction, the autonomous pace and direction of the diachronic developments that can be found in Scots, especially from the fifteenth century onwards, is undeniable; but so is the origin of Scots in Northern English. Murray (1873) correctly pointed out this premise,[202] while mistakenly assuming that the written discrepancies in Scots hinged on idiosyncratic sound developments (cf. Kniezsa 1997: 33). Matching up written variation in medieval languages with reflections of speech patterns has been a recurrent crux in dialectal studies. In fact, most accounts of northern features allege a phonological explanation for certain region-specific spellings. While acknowledging this tradition, in my own discussion of the data, I will concentrate on northern features as *graphs* or *allographs* in order to avoid an over-reliance on phonological reconstructions, one of the basic assumptions of *LALME* (see Section 1.2.1). Even dictionaries, such as the *DSL*, do not capture the frequency and connections between the many spellings listed under a particular lemma and the fact that some of those forms can be found within the same texts, which underscores the need for corpus-based analyses.

The development of *LAOS* and the *Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots* puts us in a much better position than nineteenth and early twentieth-century philologists in their description of orthographic conventions in Scots. Yet, as Kniezsa (1997: 24) points out, Older Scots is often associated with the Middle Scots period, a terminological merger

[202] Murray (1873: 29) also asserted how early (14th and 15th century) Scots was 'simply the northern English, which was spoken from the Trent and Humber to the Moray Forth'.

which is unhelpful in trying to delineate the history of Scots orthography.[203] In her account of the Early Scots period (1350-1440),[204] Kniezsa (1997) classifies Scottish graphemes into four categories: (1) notational traditions deriving from Old English; (2) Middle English conventions introduced by scribes with a Continental French ('Norman') background; (3) northern forms attested in the first thirty years of Scottish writing, some of which are shared with most of Northern English. Others are more restricted geographically, being only found in 'the region from northern Lancashire to Northumbria' (Kniezsa 1997: 34); and (4) special Scots conventions, either developed independently or, perhaps more revealingly in the context of the overall paucity of texts characteristic of the north of England, spellings which were northern more generally but, in Kniezsa's (1997: 34) words, 'had disappeared from the orthographic systems of the neighbouring northern English areas'.[205] Both monolingual and multilingual texts (such as the *DAR*) may provide hitherto unknown evidence, so it would be premature to claim that these features 'disappeared' simply because they do not happen to be recorded in the texts surveyed so far. Naturally, the focus of this section on NME will be on the third group, those features common to Northern English and Scots. Some spellings which are attested in the *DAR* and labelled in the *OED* as 'Scottish' or 'northern' have not been systematised in the literature, so they will be kept in a separate section.

Because scholars working on Northern Middle English tend to cover all the linguistic levels, technical and minute examinations of specific aspects of Northern Middle English notational conventions are few, which is why work on shared features with Scots may shed more light on the features in question. Computational advances have disrupted or, at least, challenged well-established assumptions about some of these traditionally northern, diagnostic features such as l-vocalisation. From both a diachronic and a synchronic viewpoint, l-vocalisation (LV) (e.g. OSc *bouster* vs. OE *bolster*) has been considered characteristically Scottish (see McClure 1994: 48). The

[203] *LAOS* even covers a broader chronological span (1380-1700).

[204] It is worth stressing that the first example of Scots, the *Scone Lease* (1350), can be found in a text in Latin whose terminology for geographical and personal terms and titles is glossed in Scots.

[205] Features traditionally associated with Scots such as <w> spelling in word-initial vowels (<wp>), *-ill* for words such as *litill* or <lʒ> and <nʒ> for l-mouillé and n-mouillé are not found in the *DAR*.

problem, as Molineaux et al. (2019) emphasise, resides in the perpetuation of unrevised, allegedly supporting, examples which create a false sense of systematicity. Molineaux et al.'s contribution, guided by a quantitative approach, is the first one to use a corpus (drawing on the *FITS* Project)[206] to study words containing a short back vowel followed by an /l/, the environment which would yield a diphthong or vowel lengthening if LV is in operation. <l> would, thus, be a marker to indicate vowel length and/or quality. The temporal placement of the origin of this Scots-based phenomenon varies from the fourteenth century to the fifteenth century onwards.[207] Molineaux et al. (2019) report no growth during the fifteenth century and it is only attested at a very low frequency (the spellings without <l> represent less than one per cent of the tentative contexts for its occurrence). The fact that it is advanced in Romance vocabulary can be better accounted for by referring to an independent process which had already taken place in the Old French period. The findings of this investigation are limited to the genres examined (legal and administrative documents) but leave the door open for further corpus-based studies which may confirm or debunk other claims such as the purported higher incidence of vocalised forms in comic poetry.

The combined use of the *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*, *LAEME*, *LALME*, the *MED*, and *LAOS* allowed Laing and Lass to assess the number of spelling variants available for OE <hw-> (a total of 57) and to prove how the wide range of scribal choices is not necessarily symptomatic of different phonetic realisations.[208] Laing and Lass depart from McIntosh's suggestion of the 'wide phonic solutions' (McIntosh 1969: 213) of the <q-> spellings and their own research[209] to propose that the pronunciation of the grapheme ran in parallel to the gradual process of lenition and debuccalisation; [kw] would have 'existed variably' (Laing and Lass 2019: 105) along with surviving [xw], its lenited versions [hw]/[w], and [h] after [w] was deleted.[210] More generally, their research discusses how <qu-> spellings are not exclusively characteristic of the north

[206] *From Inglish to Scots: Mapping Sounds to Spelling*, an on-going project based at the Angus McIntosh Centre for Historical Linguistics at the University of Edinburgh (<www.amc.lel.ed.ac.uk/fits/>).
[207] Girvan (1939: lxiv) exemplifies the former view (14th c.) and Murray (1873: 53), the latter.
[208] Laing and Lass (2019: 93) refer back to the Latin concepts *littera* (the superordinate term for 'letter'), *figura* (its graphematic aspect) and *potestas* (its phonological value).
[209] See also Lass and Laing (2016).
[210] According to Laing and Lass (2019: 105), the <h> spellings would suggest a fricative pronunciation [xw] rather than [kw].

of England and Scotland, but also of the North-East Midlands and some areas of the North-West Midlands (Laing and Lass 2019: 100-101). <Wh>-spellings are not very common in Older Scots (in *LAOS*)[211] and seem to be lexically conditioned—almost all of these spellings are related to *whitsunday*, probably because it was reanalysed after its etymology became opaque in early Middle English (Laing and Lass 2019: 100). Despite the low incidence of <wh>-spellings in Scotland, it is also worth exploring their occurrence in areas of the north of England. The transitional nature of the city of York (and Yorkshire more generally) would explain why <wh> occurs alongside more typically northern <qu(h)> or <qw(h)> (Kniezsa 1997: 32), although *LALME*[212] clearly depicts the widespread use of <wh> across the country. Concerning such unmarked regional variants as *which* and *s(c)hall*, Stenroos (2019: 51) postulates they 'were becoming supralocal' very early on, entering into competition with many, 'if not nearly all', of the northern forms.[213]

Another prototypically northern feature recently revisited is palatalisation, a parameter also invoked in my section on Old Norse-derived lexis. Kocel (2009; 2010; 2012; 2013) has extensively published on the non-uniformity of palatalisation in high-frequency grammatical words such as *each, much, such,* and *which*. In her 2013 paper, her data is taken from the *Innsbruck corpus of Middle English prose,* the *MED,* and *LALME* and exemplifies texts from the north, the East Midlands, London, and dialectally unidentified specimens. Overall, palatalised and non-palatalised variants seem to occur in even numbers in both the north and the south, the main conditioning process being attributed to lexical diffusion, which operates regardless of alleged

[211] Van Eyndhoven and Clark's (2020) statistic and corpus-based analysis of the clusters <quh-> and <wh-> in relative and interrogative clause markers suggests a categorical shift from the <quh-> to the <wh-> variant during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Among the conditioning factors, the variable 'audience' rather than 'text type' (as had been previously claimed), seems to have played a central role in this transition during the process of anglicisation of Scots (Van Eyndhoven and Clark 2020: 15).

[212] *LALME* Dot Map Item 44 (<wh-> spellings).

[213] The choice of 'supralocalisation' (Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003: 13) over *standardisation* seems to be more fitting for the Middle English context, avoiding the notion of an alleged acceptance of forms external to the scribe's repertoire—which is in Samuels's (1981[1988]: 90) dichotomy, associated with 'standardised' uses—and also any political overtones (see Nevalainen 2006: 117; Stenroos 2016: 162-3).

dialectal boundaries (Kocel 2013: 5).[214] No patterns were found in unclassified texts; overall, each text (or rather, the scribe(s) involved in its production) seems to exhibit certain preferences for palatalised or non-palatalised forms of given lexemes, but the presence of the two variants in the same text, even in close proximity, is not unusual.

All of this on-going research puts the stress on problematising clearly delimited dialectal features; the application of corpus-based protocols to collect large-scale data enables us to detect the varying 'mixed' nature of many texts, features which, in the past, would be neglected for not conforming to the philologist's expectations about a given Middle English dialect. Albeit more limited, my corpus, the *DAR*, displays variants traditionally connected to the north as well as their more widely spread, supralocal, counterparts. Since several scribes were involved in the production process of these rolls, which lasted for several centuries, and some of them are fragmentary and/or do not provide enough material susceptible to be analysed from a dialectal viewpoint, the data analysis will attempt to gauge the overall degree of northern marking, especially in vocabulary, which is the most readily identifiable aspect in the multilingual medium of the *DAR*, and I will also pay attention to how the plural morphemes are realised. Few 'northern' features are exclusively attested in their northern variant (unless they only occur once or twice in the corpus), which is why, in the following sections on vowels and consonants, I will give all the variants attested for each word and the year to which the roll is dated. A few substantial differences set this analysis apart from its predecessors, Vikar's (1922) 'orthographical investigation' of the Durham dialects and Orton's (1936) description of a South Durham dialect (both of which cite evidence from the *DAR*): firstly, as important as their pioneering contributions are to the study of northern textual material, their all-encompassing nature signifies that they do not attempt to draw systematic distinctions between diagnostic features and those more widely spread across England; only in a few places do they refer to the northern or Scottish character of the spellings. In other words, they often classify the material according to the source vowel or consonant—usually OE—subsuming many spelling variants (e.g. <ai>, <a>, <e>, <ey>, and <aw>) under the same category (e.g. Vikar 1922: 3) with no discussion as to whether the forms listed are specific to the area or

[214] See also Kocel's (2016) monograph which considers a wider range of textual evidence, including the West Midlands.

not; this is particularly noticeable in Orton.[215] Likewise, they devalue what seem to them 'corrupted forms' (Vikar 1922: 8) and do not mention recurring forms such as **dressing knyves** (Rott. Celer. 1366, 45),[216] **choppyngknyvez** (Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89), or **lechyngknyves** (Rott. Celer. 1471-72, 93) but only those containing <ff>, hence failing to capture the range of spellings employed by the scribes. These flaws led me to reassess the material in the *DAR* (excluding onomastics and (sur)names of occupation)[217] from a more comprehensive and updated dialectally specific perspective, covering not just spellings typically associated with (or which happened to be attested in) the north, but also morphology and vocabulary.

4.2 Northern vowels and consonants

4.2.1 Vowels

Written innovations would spread through a number of routes, particularly in educational settings in the Middle Ages: Stenroos (2016: 105) makes use of the concepts of 'school-hopping', 'manor-hopping' or 'abbey-hopping' to indicate the most frequent environments of linguistic diffusion in writing. Middle English orthographical innovations are indeed the most variable regionally, particularly long vowels, which were rarely explicitly marked in Old English; rather, vowel length was determined by context. In Middle English, there were three main options: the vowel could be doubled (e.g. <ee> or <oo> for high mid vowels), there could be digraphs (e.g. <ie> or <ea>, <a> marking a low/open mid vowel), or length could be marked by a final mute <e>. Within this repertoire, <i>-digraphs representing long vowels (e.g. <ai> for /aː/, <ei> for /eː/, and <ui> for /yː/) are perceived to be diagnostic of Scots and, more generally,

[215] For example, *hyngyng* is discussed under the section devoted to the raising of ME /e/ to /i/ before nasals (Orton 1936: §415), but Orton does not comment upon the distribution of *hing* in the north and the Midlands (which probably rests on ON influence), unlike Vikar (1922: 149) which does provide this information in parentheses.

[216] In this section on spelling, I will include the year(s) in which the accounts were produced to allow for any diachronic considerations. If the word is repeated several times in the *DAR*, I will indicate the number of times preceded by the symbol 'x' and will provide the time span of occurrences. Full details about the rolls and their dating can be found in the Appendix to this chapter.

[217] The principles of inclusion are explained more fully in the Introduction chapter.

Northern English. Allegedly, the <i>-diphthongs (/ai, ei, oi, ui/) monophthongised in the North in the second half of the 14th century (this date was first proposed by Luick (1914)), thereby merging with their corresponding long vowels; this phonological phenomenon would have led to the use of <i> (also <y>) as a vowel length marker. According to Kniezsa (1984), this merger is empirically unfounded and has been a long-standing myth, first initiated by Murray (1873) and thereon perpetuated (Morsbach 1896; Jordan 1925; Emerson 1923; Dobson 1968 §98; Jordan-Crook 1974: §19); what was originally a spelling innovation in Scots would have come to be perceived as a reflection of a sound change even if the rhyme evidence for the merger was either non-existent or diffusely found in the northernmost part of the country. Problematic or weak evidence was systematically misquoted to confirm the alleged merger of /aː/ and /ai/, when, in fact, it seemed to be a sporadic phenomenon which was 'restricted to individual words and [varied] from place to place' (Kniezsa 1984: 93). Kniezsa puts forward the possibility that this orthographic convention was introduced from 'outside sources' (Anglo-Norman) and that 'it has nothing to do with northern English sound changes' (1984: 94). On the other hand, Smith (1996: 99–101) identifies a 'Northern Shift', first involving the raising and fronting of /aː/ to /ɛː/, which would later on diphthongise to [ej][218] (see also Minkova (2014: 202-3) and Cole (2018: 197–200), arguing for underlying phonological changes in the development of OE /ɑː/ and their digraphic representation in Northern Middle English). The variable realisation of long vowels in Middle English (both as monographs and as digraphs) would partly explain why *LALME* includes two i/y-digraphs in its questionnaire (352 'ey', 'ei' for ME *ē* as in FEET, HERE, TEETH and 375 'oy', 'oi' for ME *ō* as in STOOD) although the *LALME* attestations, coming from the south of England, are extremely scarce, so no frequency can be given. Regardless of whether we want to consider the <i>-digraphs as a purely orthographic convention or as a specific phonological realisation, their higher frequency in the North cannot be neglected.

[218] As this diphthong is found in ON, influence from Scandinavian has been deemed to be likely (see, e.g., Minkova 2014: 203 and Dance 2019: I.84).

4.2.1.1 <y>/<i> digraphs

In the *DAR,* there are a few examples of <y>/<i>-digraphs rendering long vowels:[219] **beyttyng** (x2, Rott. Elemos. 1506-7, 252), **boyth** (Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 674), **boyt**stede (Rott. Communiar. 1511-12, 292), **breyst** (Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9, 641), **Coil**hors (Rott. Bursar. 1384-5, 594), char**coyll** (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1420, 270), brod**geys** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398), **Deynez** (Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 65), **goys**hous (Rott. Celer. 1474-5, 95), **hoyrs** (x2, 1358-1361; also **huyrs** (Rott. Bursar. c. 1360, 563)), **infanketheyff** (Rott. Camer. 1509-10, 195),[220] **layf** (Rott. Celer. c. 1440, 78), **layndmayle** (Rott. Celer. 1429, 60), brew**leyd(e)** (x17, 1494-1517), culyng(e) **leyd(es)** (x4, 1498-1517), lyttyng**leyde** (Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158), step(e)**leyd** (x5, 1517), **payll**bordes (Rott. Celer. 1483-4, 98), **payllyng** (Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 105), **payns** (Rott. Elemos. 1479-80, 248), cabill**raype** (Rott. Feretrar. 1448-9, 473), water**say** (Rott. Bursar. 1487-8, 651), **seylle** (Rott. Celer. c. 1420, 57), and **sheyll** (Rott. Hostill. 1528-9, 163). The great variability in the realisation of long vowels in Middle English signifies that most of the aforementioned forms are not taken as northern/Scots in the *MED* and/or the *OED*: only **breyst** and **raypes** are specifically labelled as northern in the *MED* ('(N) *breist*' and '(N) *raipes*')—also in the *OED* ('ME–15 northern *breist*' and ME **raypes** (plural, *northern*))—, and **boyth** and **boyt**stede as Scots in the *OED* (Sc. *boithe* and Sc. pre-17 *boite*, respectively).[221] However, some *OED* entries contain all the forms attested in Scottish texts regardless of whether they are specifically Scots or not, so their inclusion is not entirely reliable.[222] This complicates the classification of any forms as 'Scots', which is why this information was checked against the *DSL* and only those instances in which there was strong supplementary evidence from the

[219] I will only list the variants exemplifying the digraphic form. All the spellings can be found in Table 2. The digraphic renderings of etymological /ɑː/ are also included.

[220] *Infanketheyff* is part of a series of anaphoric constructions (*nec de …*), and it is preceded by *strayff* (sic, which should be *stray*) and *wayff*, so one may wonder whether in this particular scenario the previous rhyme with <ayff> might have had an effect on the choice of the graph in <eyff>. No similar contexts have been found in the *DAR*—and no other accounts are associated with 'd'ni Joh. Wrayk'—, so this claim remains purely speculative.

[221] Note that the *DOST* (s.v. *Bote, Boit, Bot(t*, n.2)) lists a non-negligible number of *bot*-stem attestations under 1(a) and 1(b).

[222] See e.g. *pale* (*OED* (2005), n. 1): *Scottish* pre-17 *paal*, pre-17 *paale*, pre-17 *pail*, pre-17 *paile*, pre-17 *paill*, pre-17 *pal*, pre-17 *palle*, pre-17 *paull*, pre-17 17– *pale*.

dictionaries consulted (*MED*, *OED*, *DSL*, and *EDD*) can be deemed 'northern'. It goes without saying that the <y>-forms are not the only ones encountered in lexical items which occur multiple times, even if they seem to be consistently employed within the same accounts. Table 2 lists all the variants encountered by lexical item and year, the latter being a variable which does not seem to have a correlation with the scribal treatment of the word; the occurrence of the digraph does not seem to be lexically conditioned either:[223] for instance, lyttyng**lede** (Rott. Hostill. 1485-6, 157) can be contrasted with lyttyng**leyde** (Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158), from an account produced just a year later and within the same monastic department (the Hostiller's). In the Rott. Communiar. 1517, we find many of the *leyd*-compounds (brew**leyd**(es) (x14), step(e)**leyd**(es) (x5), culyng(e) **leyd**(es) x3), which are predominantly rendered as digraphs except for the single occurrence of brew**led**. -*Stone* (rather than *stan(e)*) is also present (x14) throughout this account, a choice which would not conform with the expected preference for <a>-forms in other compounds (see Section 4.2.1.3.2). However, this compound is only found in this account and in the Rott. Hostill. 1456-7, 151, where, according to the editor, *tapstane* was misprinted for *capstane.* If this lexical unit is as rare as the printed sources seem to suggest (there is only one attestation in *OED* (1910), dated to 1522, from J. Raine's *Wills and Inventories N. Counties Eng.* (1835), only containing <o> and it labels the word as 'obsolete (?)'; the *MED* does not include it at all) and it is only attested from the mid-fifteenth century onwards, it may be the case that the word was used (or travelled northward) once the supralocal <o> form became widespread. Likewise, Brew**leddez** occurs along with Culyng**leydez** in Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 656. Despite the variation, the writing of <y>/<i> digraphs for etymological long vowels is usually a late feature in the north of England. Benskin (1989: 16) claimed that 'it is common enough in texts from towards the end of the fifteenth century, most of which are semi-standardised', and that it only 'characterises texts mainly from Scotland and from Lincolnshire' for 'the earlier period'. Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma (2004: 291) confirmed this trend

[223] Likewise, *sīle* (< OE *sȳl*) meaning 'one of a pair of timbers rising from ground level and curving to meet at the top to form a roof ridge' (*MED*, s.v. *sīle* n.(3)) is not attested in its digraphic rendering (cf. **Syles** (Rott. Hostill. 1379, 131), **syles** (x2, Rott. Sacrist. 1338 (verso), 377), **Sylez** (Rott. Bursar. 1453-4, 634), **sylez** (Rott. Bursar. 1457-8, 637), and **sylez** (Rott. Bursar. 1458-9, 638).

with their analysis of 15th- and 16th-century legal documents—two of their tokens date to the fifteenth century but most are from the first half of the sixteenth century. The data in Table 2 equally shows an increase in <y>/<i> digraphs toward the second half of the fifteenth century (6 tokens from the first half vs. 9 tokens from the second half) and especially in the first half of the sixteenth century (9 lexical items, 25 tokens), although this feature is also present in the second half of the fourteenth century in **hoyrs** (x3, 1358-1361). The Buru**leid** and culyng**ledes** attestations epitomise the variable use of the digraph and single graph in the late fifteenth century (see also, e.g., cabill**raype**) and a digraph-only practice in the sixteenth century. Yet, as Kohler (1967:56) discusses, the influence of the metropolis prevented the North from reaching the same frequency levels of <ai> (for historical <a>)—also applicable to other digraphs—as Scotland, which explains the overall spread of the single graph spelling and the more reduced number of digraphic renderings of historical long vowels in the *DAR*.

Table 2. Long vowels rendered as digraphs (and monographs, if available) in the *DAR*.

MED lemma	**Attestations in the *DAR***
bẹ̄ten (v.(2))	*beyttyng* (*le*) (x2, Rott. Elemos. 1506-7, 252)
bọ̄th (n.)	*bothe* (Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 66), *bothis* (Rott. Bursar. c. 1357?, 560), *boyth* (*unius le*) (Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 674)
bōt (n.(1)	*boytstede* (*lez*) (Rott. Communiar. 1511-12, 292)
brẹ̄st (n.(1)	*breyst* (*le*) (Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9, 641)
char-cōl (n.)	*charcoyll* (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1420, 270), *Charkol* (Rott. Bursar. c. 1357, 560)
cōl (n.(2))	*Coilhors* (*le*) (Rott. Bursar. 1384-5, 594)
dēne (n.)	*Deynez* (*lez*) (Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 65)
gọ̄s n.	*brodgeys* (Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398)
gọ̄s (n.)	*goyshous* (*le*) (Rott. Celer. 1474-5, 95), *gowsehouse* (*le*) (Rott. Celer. 1516-7, 106)
hūre (n.)	*hoyrs* (Rott. Bursar. c. 1358, 561), *hoyrs* (Rott. Bursar. 1360-1, 563), *huyrs* (Rott. Bursar. c. 1360, 563)
infangene-thẹ̄f (n.)	infanketheyff (Rott. Camer. 1509-10, 195)
lōf (n.(2))	*Sugyrlaffe* (Rott. Celer. 1422, 59), *sugerlafe* (Rott. Celer. 1430, 61), *layf (de suggir)* (Rott. Celer. c. 1440, 78) *laf* (Rott. Bursar. 1363-4, 566), *lafes (de Sugour)* (Rott. Bursar. 1373-4, 578)

lōnd (n.) + *mōl* n.(1)	*layndmayle* (Rott. Celer. 1429, 60) *landmale* (Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 73), *landmale* (Rott. Celer. 1439-40, 78) *landmall* (x2, Rott. Hostill. 1351-2, 120), *landmale* (Rott. Elemos 1402-3, 220) *landmale* (Rott. Elemos. 1522-23, 255) *landmale* (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1381-2, 263) *landmale* (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385, 265) *landmale* (Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 296) *landmale* (Rott. Sacrist. 1390-1, 392), *landmale* (Rott. Sacrist. 1401-2, 393), *landmale* (Rott. Sacrist. 1535-6, 417), *landmale* (*le*) (Rott. Bursar. 1432-3, 622), *landmale* (x7, Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 704-705)
lēd (n.)	*brewleyde* (*lez*) (Rott. Communiar. 1511-12, 292); *brewleyd* (x13, Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294) *Brewleydes* (ibid. 294), *Brewleyd* (Rott. Bursar. 1495-6, 654), *brewlede* (Rott. Hostill. 1456-7, 151) *brewledes* (Rott. Hostill. 1471-2, 156) *Burueleade* (*voc. le*) (Rott. Bursar. 1449-50, 633) *Burulede* (*le*) (Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9, 642), *Burulede* (*le*) (Rott. Bursar. 1473-4, 645), *Burulede* (*vocati le*) (Rott. Bursar. 1476-7, 646), *Burulede* (ibid. 646), *Buruleid* (*voc. le*) (Rott. Bursar. 1494-5, 653), *Brewleddez* (*voc.*) (Durham Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 656)
lēd (n.)	*culynge leyd* (Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294), *culyng leyd* (ibid 294), *culyng leydes* (ibid. 294), *culyngledes* (*voc.*) (Rott. Bursar. 1492-3, 652), *Culyngleydez* (*vocat.*) (Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 656), *Culynglede* (*lez*) (Rott. Bursar. 1506-7, 658)
lēd (n.)	*lyttynglede* (Rott. Hostill. 1485-6, 157), *lyttyngleyde* (Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158)
lēd (n.)	*stepleyd* (Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294) *stepeleyd* (x3, ibid. 294), *stepeleydes* (ibid. 294)
pāl(e (n.)	*payllbordes* (*lez*) (Rott. Celer. 1483-4, 98) *palebordes* (*lez*) (Rott. Celer. 1502-3, 102), *paylbordes* (*le*) (Rott. Celer. 1507-8, 105), *paylbordes* (*lez*) (Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 105)
pallen (v.(3))	*payllyng* (*le*) (Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 105)
pān(e (n.)	*payns* (Rott. Elemos. 1479-80, 248), *pane* (Rott. Bursar. 1333-4, 523)
rōp n.(2)	*cabillraype* (Rott. Feretrar. 1448-9, 473) *capillrapez* (Rott. Bursar. 1483-4, 649)
sō (n.)	*saez* (Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97), *sae* (ibid 97), *sa* (Rott. Hostill. 1387-8, 134), *saa* (Rott. Hostill. 1459-1500, 152), *saae* (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 247), *sae* (Rott. Sacrist. 1376-7 (verso), 387), *sa* (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397), *saa* (Rott. Bursar. 1383-4, 593), *watersay* (Rott. Bursar. 1487-8, 651)
sēl(e (n.(2))	*ceel* (Editor's note: "seal?") (Rott. Celer. 1309, 53) *zele* (Rott. Celer. 1416, 54), *sele* (Rott. Celer. 1417, 55) *seylle* (Rott. Celer. c. 1420, 57), *selefysch* (Rott. Celer. 1442-3, 81), *sely* (Liber de reliquiis 1383, 434), *Sealles* (Rott. Bursar. 1495-6, 654), *Sealles* (Rott. Bursar. 1511-2, 662), *porcis marinis* (Rott. Bursar. 1523-4, 665), *seall* (Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 698)
shḗle (n.)	*Sheele* (Rott. Hostill. 1415-6, 140), *sheyll* (Rott. Hostill. 1528-9, 163), *schele* (Rott. Elemos. 1338, 201), *schell* (Rott. Bursar. 1400-1, 603), *schelle* (Rott. Bursar. 1400-1, 603)

Some short vowels also seem to be spelt with the <y>-digraph: /u/ in **buyt** (Rott. Bursar. 1399-1400, 601) (cf. *FEW*, s.v. *bŭttis*; *MED*, s.v. *but(t(e* n.(1) cf. ML *butta* (*DMLBS*, s.v. 3 *butta*, *buttus*)), perhaps in an attempt to represent the quality of the source French vowel, the nasal vowel [ã]—of neutral length as it does not lie in final

position—[224] in **playnchour**nale (Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 96) and **playnshorez** (Rott. Elemos. 1447-8, 236), < French *plancher*; and short /a/ in **stayff**' (Rott. Sacrist. 1416-7, 406) (*MED*, s.v. *staf*).[225] The *OED* gives *staif* as Scottish (*OED* (1915), s.v. *staff*, n.1), but the *DOST* does not consider it to be a northern form (*DOST*, s.v. *Staf(f)*). The only *OED* attestation containing the <ai> spelling is from a Scottish text from 1561, so the possibility remains that it is indeed a northern form. Since many lexemes in my database are borrowings, mostly from French but also from Latin, their spelling behaviour, once they were adopted (and adapted) into English, may be either relatively unexpected (e.g. **loyt** (Rott. Hostill. 1361-2, 127) is only classified as northern in the *DOST* (s.v. *Lute*, n. 1) < OF *leut*, *lut* (see *MED lūt(e* (n.(1) and *OED* (1903) *lute*, n.1 for its spelling variants)) and even more dynamic than Germanic-origin lexis: whereas *payllbordes* (< partly from French *pal* and partly from Latin *pālus*), *payllyng* (by conversion < Latin *pallium*), and *payns* (< French *pan*) occur in their <y>- digraph versions allegedly to represent /aː/, others such as *mace* (also *Maces*)) (*MED*, s.v. *mācis* (n.sg. & pl.) French and ML *macis*) and *male* (*MED*, s.v. *māl(e* (n.(2)) < French *male*, *malle*), occurring once (as a simplex; as a compound, it is more widely attested (see *Malesadell* and variants)) do not present the digraph in the corpus. Vikar (1922: 93) notes that *loyt* is the first instance of <oy> in his corpus (followed by the personal names *Coik* and *Lightfoit*, occurring in two different rolls dated to the same year (Maresc. Prioris 1384, 336 and Rott. Bursar. 1384-85, 595, respectively)). There is afterwards a temporal gap of <oy>-spellings until 1462-6 (in the case of the *DAR*, 1474 with *goyshous*), when they become much more common (in Vikar's corpus (1922: 94) there is a total of 28 occurrences vs the two spellings from 1384). He treats <oi>-

[224] Vowels in French are 'long' in blocked final syllables (Fouché 1959: xxxvii-xlii; Tranel 1987: 49-51; Price 1991: 88-91; Sampson 1999: 91). Articulatorily, it is easier to nasalise low vowels, a fact which determined the sequence of nasalisation and its lowering influence on the nasalised vowel: the nasalisation of low vowels began in Early Old French (10th century) and first affected [ã] and [ãi], subsequently progressing in order of their height (Pope 1934: §434). Old French high- and mid- nasal vowels lowered—in a process starting in the late 11th century and culminating before the end of the 17th century (Pope 1934: §439)—, but there is no evidence for the lengthening of any nasal vowels. By the early Middle French period it is very likely that 'all vowels were nasalised audibly, though not all lowered' (Pope 1934: 169).

[225] *Staff* (< OE *stæf*) would undergo lengthening as part of the process involving short /a/ before a voiceless fricative /f, s, θ/ (also in the phonological environments of a nasal + /s t/ and syllable-final /r/ in the south) in the late 17th century, followed by retraction in the 19th. Therefore, it was not a long vowel at the time. *Stave*, already in Middle English, is a backformation of < *staves* (the plural of *staff*).

spellings separately from <ai>- and <ei>- forms and, within the <oi> group, he distinguishes the 14th c. attestations as purely sporadic (found in proper names and, according to him, hinting at an earlier similar pronunciation between /oi/ and /oː/, as <ei>-spellings do) from those post-14th c., when they become more recurrent. Vikar (1922) goes further when claiming that the later <oy>/<uy> spellings are coetaneous with Sc. <ui> and <oi> and represent 'mere imitations of standard Scotch orthography'; on what grounds he considers these spellings 'standard' is left unexplained. If we take just a couple of the examples he adduces (*boyrdnailles* and *croykks*), the *DOST* would show quite a different picture: among their headwords, both the <ui> and the <u> spellings are listed (cf. *DOST*, s.v. *Burd(e*, *Buird*, n. and *Cruke*, *Cruik*, *Crewk*, n.), the <u> spellings being represented in larger numbers (see the (a) section for *Burd(e*, *Buird*, n. in the *DOST*) or similar numbers to its <ui> counterparts (see (b) s.v. *Cruke*, *Cruik*, *Crewk*, n.). The first records given for the <ui> variants are somewhat later than the first <u> attestations—*buirdis* in the *DOST* dates to 1467 (cf. *burd* [1375]) and the first *cruikis* is from 1548 (cf. *cruk* [1375])—but the often more numerous <u> spellings run for a much longer period (*burd*: 1375-1600; *cruk:* 1375-1641). This illustrates the most common scenario rather than the exception, which reveals the pitfalls of assuming that certain Scottish and Northern English conventions differed substantially (viz. the alleged status of <oy>/<uy> as copies of 'standard' Scottish orthography and not part of a shared northern repertoire) when in reality both co-existed, often with alleged 'southern' spellings. Unlike <ai> and <ei>, to be discussed below, Vikar claims, <oy> and <uy> 'do not seem to have served any practical purpose in the Dur. dialect' (1922: 94). He justifies the scribes' use of this digraph (once with phonological value) by analogy with the use of the digraph for other long vowels (<ai> for /aː/, <ei> for /eː/, and <ou> for /uː/) but neglects the use of these two digraphs in etymologically short vowels, the co-existence of monographic and digraphic forms for those lexemes, and the sporadic presence of this digraph in other regions beyond the north (see *LALME* 352 and 375), discussed above. These counterexamples seem to be at odds with his conviction of a 'definite' adoption (Vikar 1922: 95) of the digraphic spellings by northern scribes.

Let us move on to <ei> and <ai>. On account of the lack of native <ey>-spellings rendering etymological /iː/, Vikar attributes their use from the 12th century onwards

to French influence (Vikar 1922: 59); he argues that there is no proof of <ey> representing /eː/ (except in Old Northumbrian), which makes him hypothesise that <ey> expressed quality, not quantity. He then adduces an array of etymologically diverse lexemes to prove how <ey> is also employed for short /i/: the very first example he gives is **redeyll** (Rott. Instaur. 1417, 318), but this is in fact a compound made of *rede* + *yll* (see *MED*, s.v. *rēd* adj., sense 10. ~ *ille* 'a disease affecting lambs, prob. a kind of red water') rather than a genuine instance of <ey> for short /i/. **Leinge** (Rott. Feretrar. 1501-2, 481 (cf. **lyng**, just a few lines above) seems to be a borrowing from Old Norse first attested in the North (*DOST*, s.v. *Ling*, *Lyng*, n.2; *OED* (1903), s.v. *ling*, n.2; *MED*, s.v. *ling* n.)). Even if it is not a native lexical item, the possibility that it may have been liable to vowel lengthening by analogy with other lexemes sharing the same phonological environment, in this case, before /ng/ (cf. also **leinge** (Rott. Feretrar. 1501-2, 481), 'the European ling', *MED*, s.v. *lĕng(e* n.(2), prob. < OE) is not far-fetched, but Vikar entertains neither the individual phonological contexts nor the etymologies of the lexis cited.[226] Another example of this neglect is **tweyld**, a Northern and Scots forms deriving from either OE *twilīc*, *twilī* (adj.) (*MED*, s.v. *twil(e* n.) or *twĭle* (*OED* (1916), s.v. *twill* | *tweel*, n.1), which may have undergone, according to the *OED,* lengthening of original *ĭ* to *ē* in the stem-syllable, typical of Scots. Apart from the low frequency of <ey>/<ei> spellings for *true* short vowels, Vikar's dubious claim that there is not a correspondence between <ey> and original /eː/ is unfounded if cases such as those listed in Table 2, *leyde*-compounds, **beyttyng**, and **sheyll***,* are considered. On the other hand, Vikar's examination of the <ai> digraph seems to be in line with the alleged merger between /ai/ and /aː/ discussed above, but he illustrates what he calls an almost 'free interchange between <ai> and <a>' (Vikar 1922: 3) from at least the second half of the 14th century, with some questionable examples such as the spellings for *nails* (cited repeatedly from the *DAR*), a word with an etymological short vowel. The dynamic and sometimes elusive nature of the digraphic rendering of vowels complicates any clear-cut distinctions between short and long vowels, although the relatively higher frequency of these <y>/<i> digraphic spellings in the north are, for the

[226] In his section on 'a / nd, ng', apart from *layndmayle*, he only discusses what he calls 'genuine' examples of /ɑŋ/ written <ang> (Vikar 1922: 19-20).

purposes of this dissertation, enough to deserve being re-examined from a less narrow—that is, allowing for multiple variants—dialectal perspective.

4.2.1.2 <o> - <u>

Another purportedly diatopic difference often singled out in association with the North is <u> for /oː/ and /o/ in certain phonological environments. It is generally assumed that, in northern varieties, the reflex of OE /oː/ fronted to [øː] in the 14th century (Stenbrenden (2015) argues for an earlier start in the northernmost part of England (Northumberland, the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire, and Durham), whence it would have spread in a southern direction in the succeeding 100-150 years) and raised to [yː] in the fifteenth century (Jordan 1925: §54; Wright and Wright 1928: §55; Luick 1914-40: §406);[227] the <u> spellings, as well as <ow> and <ou>, are, therefore, often taken as evidence for this sound change in the north (apart from rhyming evidence, unavailable in the type of texts herein considered). From a broader geographical and diachronic perspective, /oː/ (and its spelling representations) has a history of complex interactions: the Great Vowel Shift affected this vowel, whose regular outcome was /uː/, so <ou>, <ow>, or <u> could potentially reflect two different actualisations of phonological changes depending on the date and place of production of the records. The date of the beginning of the GVS raising of /oː/ in the south has been contested: alternative earlier dates to the traditional 1450 have been proposed, among others, by Jespersen (1909), Jordan-Crook (1974), Stockwell and Minkova (1988a, 1988b), and Stenbrenden (2015), who predicates that it started incipiently (in the mid-to-late 13th century) in the West and East Midlands, hence temporally coinciding with the northern fronting. In addition, it also interacted with the shortening of this vowel and the FOOT-STRUT split. The shortening process lasted several centuries and its effects are visible in different sets of lexical items at different points in time; in the sixteenth century, /oː/ underwent shortening in certain words (prototypically, followed by /d/ or /v/ as can be seen in words such as PDE *blood, love*, etc.); and there was a later shortening in

[227] Another not easily resolved question which is beyond the scope of this chapter is whether there was fronting without raising or simultaneous fronting and raising, a possibility which seems less likely (see Stenbrenden 2013; 2015).

the seventeenth century, which meant that such words (e.g. *book* and *foot*) were not subject to the FOOT-STRUT split (Wells 1982: 199). The study of words etymologically containing /oː/ and their graphemic representation becomes even more entangled once homorganic lengthening is brought into the picture. In late Old English, certain clusters of a liquid or nasal plus a voiced consonant (e.g. /nd/, /ld/, /rd/, /mb/, and /ŋg/) favoured lengthening of the preceding short stressed vowel, but in some cases, the vowel seems to have been shortened again, complicating its treatment as a long or short vowel in Middle English. This is signalled in the *MED* by the simultaneous use of a breve and a macron to indicate that the vowel length is unknown. Starting with *bord* (*MED*, s.v. *bŏ̄rd* n.), this chapter will show how some of these words exhibit the same vowel alternation (both <u> and <a>, the latter grapheme to be discussed in 4.2.1.3) as that found in unambiguous reflexes of /oː/. How we can, then, discriminate between what constitute 'northern' and 'non-northern <u> spellings (regardless of the vowel length of the lexeme in questions) in ME seems a pertinent question to ask; the procedure I preliminarily followed for all the data compiled for this chapter was to check the *MED,* the *OED* (and for further information, the *DOST*). Rarely do the three dictionaries agree on a particular label and the motivations behind the choice of labels even within the same dictionary do not always seem to be completely straightforward. For instance, the *MED* labels *cruk* as northern (s.v. *crǭk* (n.)) but not *huk* (s.v. *hǭk* (n.)) or *cluke* (s.v. *clǭke* n.(2)), despite them sharing the same phonological environment. It could be argued that the etymology of these words plays a part in their classification, but *hǭk* comes from OE, and both *crǭk* and *clǭke* might have derived from ON (see Section 3.1.3). Conversely, the *OED* does list *cluke* and *huke* under the Scottish forms (cf. *OED* (1891), s.v. *clutch*, n.1, β. Scottish ME– *cluke* and *OED* (1899) *hook*, n.1 ME–15 Scottish *huke*). Because of the aforementioned *OED* policy of including all the variants attested in Scottish texts and the unrevised nature of some of these entries, one may question their validity. In *OED3* entries such as *cool* (*OED* (2008), s.v. *cool*, *v.*1) the 'Scottish forms' section is maintained, giving the pre-17th-century <u>/<ui> spellings of the word; if we consider the *MED*, the entry only lists the <o> and the <oy> forms (*MED*, *cǭlen* v.(1)). Discrepancies between the *OED* and the *MED* can be noted in other lexemes such as *hupe* labelled as *northern* ME in the *OED* ((1899) *hoop*, n.1) in contrast to the *MED* (s.v. *hǭp* (n.)), so neither the *OED*'s section on 'Scottish' forms or its date of

publication seem to correlate with the way the *MED* deals with these words. Applying the 'northern' label can be particularly tricky when dealing with the <u> spellings, which is why in the two following sections, I will give all the instances of the <u> spellings (which may co-occur with such variants as <oo>, <ou>)[228] for etymological /oː/ or <ǒ>, regardless of their classification in the *MED* or the *OED.*[229]

4.2.1.2.1 *bord/burd*

Out of the four lexemes having <u> as a possible variant for <ǒ>, *bord, tofall*, *luge*, *stothes*, two of them are present in the multilingual material of the *DAR*, **Luge** (Rott. Sacrist. 1483-4, 415; also lewge (Rott. Bursar. 1514-5, 664)), from French (*loge*, *loige*, *loje*) and *burd*, the most frequent and variable; no other <y> digraphs are found for long vowels in the monolingual material.[230] In his *Description of a South Durham Dialect* (1936: 220-225), Orton claimed that the regular PDE development of OE and OF <or>, regardless of whether it was before <d and <n> or other consonants, was [ūə] — or an approximate, 'derivative' realisation — and that this [ūə] stage 'had been attained by c. 1450' (1936: 224). He attempts to prove his point by giving examples of *burd*-forms found in the DAR and other texts (1936: §376, 224), reusing Vikar's material (1922: 88). Interestingly, Orton's list excludes the selection of <o>-spellings given in Vikar which would disprove Orton's theory (e.g. **bordis**, **bordyng** and borddyng (Rott. Celer. 1512, 105-6); dressyng**borddes** (Rott. Celer. 1516, 106)) and, subsequently, fails to give an explanation for the presence of <o>-form in such late texts. Vikar proposes a correlation between the spelling of <u> for /oː/ and <ou> for /uː/, stating that 'the quality of modified old ǭ must have been strikingly peculiar' (1922: 92) in the 14th century, although earlier in the second half of the 13th century

[228] Only in the case of burd will the <uy> spelling also be mentioned. Other <oy>/<uy> spellings are given in the previous section.
[229] French loanwords such as *grosers* (also *grosier, groisour, gresur, croisour* (*MED*, s.v. *grōser* (n.))) and *storehouse* (also *stoer, storre, stour(e*, (16th cent.) *stower* & ? *stǭre* & (error) *scor* (*MED*, s.v. *stōr(e* n.(1))) which do not exhibit fronting are excluded.
[230] Note the spelling *dore stuythes* (Miscellanea 1541-c.1548, 721) in a monolingual Middle English roll and hence excluded from this analysis.

the change from /oː/ to /yː/ had already made inroads.[231] His rather linear narrative does not account for contemporary variants in such texts as the *DAR* and leaves out the 'secondary' spellings <oy>, <oi>, and <uy>. Johnston (1997) dates the northern fronting of /oː/ to /øː/ to the late thirteenth century (once the OSL was completed but before the GVS),[232] which would be rendered as <u> in spelling allegedly due to scribal conventions when dealing with French front rounded /y/.[233] He argues that this northern /oː/-fronting would 'soon become a defining characteristic of the whole northern English and Scots groups' (Johnston 1997: 69). Since both Vikar and Orton are far from being comprehensive in their early surveys, I have included all the spellings in the *DAR*—along with their reference and years of production—in Appendix 6.1. <u> and <ui> spellings of *bord* can be relatively safely deemed northern (*OED* (1887), s.v. *board*, n.: northern ME–17 *burd*, ME–16 *burde*, ME Scottish *buird*), but the Latinate *burdarum* or the linguistically ambiguous *burdes* (ME/AF/ML?) should make us reconsider language boundaries.

If we consider the simplex *bord*, <o>-spellings outnumber <u>-spellings: there are 16 instances (and 2 more in **bordyng**), the earliest recorded in 1278 (**bord'** (pl.) Rott. Bursar. 1278 (verso), 489) and the latest in 1524-5 (**bordarum** (x2, Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 297)). In contrast, the 2 <u>-spellings are much more chronologically limited and rather late (years 1505-6 and 1507-8). In compounds or complex lexical units (see more on them in Section 3.3), <o>-spellings seem to be favoured too: ten instances of Estland**bordes**[234] are spelled with <o> and three with <u> (all occurring pre-1500, 1300-1400); there are five <o> spellings for drissyng**borde**, one <ou> spelling (Rott. Elemos. 1465, 244) — which would have been pronounced with /uː/ pre-GVS — and one <u> spelling (dressyng**burdez** Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97); interestingly, in the same

[231] Aitken and Macafee (2002: 39) point out that this fronting of /oː/ took place in the late 13th century and merged with /yː/, mostly of OF origin. Orton only discusses the rendering of OE <ord> in final position (Orton 1936: 224).
[232] On the specificity of the Northern GVS, see Smith (2007: 138-153).
[233] After the fronting of /oː/ to [yː] before /r/ and /rd/, Aitken posits a velar glide from [y] to /r/, resulting in [yːr(d)] > [yːʷr(d)]> [yːur(d)], particularly in the northern area of Scotland, from Cai to Aberdeen (Aitken and Macafee 2002: 45). Even if the range of spellings reflecting what is called the Northern breaking of /yː/ before /r(d)/ (Aitken and Macafee 2002: 45) includes *bourd* (along with *bowrd(e)*, *bowird*), there is no evidence in the *DAR* to suggest the actualisation of this change in Durham.
[234] I will cite the first spelling recorded in the *DAR* to refer to the whole set.

account we find two <o> spellings of the same word (dressyng**bordez** (x2, Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97)). We also find five <o>-forms in the case of cuppe**bord** (1371-1353-4) but none with <u>; other lexemes lacking <u>-attestations in the *DAR* are payll**bordes** (x4 (1483-1513)), thak**bordes** (x2 (1447-1457)), mete**bord** (Rott. Celer. 1485-6, 99), sawne **bordes** (Rott. Communiar. 1517, 293) shil**bord**clogge (Rott. Elemos. 1451-2, 241), and fyrre**boordez** (Rott. Elemos. 1447-8, 236)[235]. Yet, other low frequency items in the *DAR* may exhibit a greater use of the <u>-variants—see **burd**clogges (3 <u>- vs. 1 <o>-spellings (1466-1472)), **burd**clath (2 <u> and 1 <o>-spellings (1404-1456-7), and cownting**burd** (Rott. Elemos. 1515-16, 253)—or be in relatively equal numbers with <o> instantiations: **boyrd**nailles is realised with this digraph in Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103, but it is also spelled with <o> three times (1509-1535) and another three with <u> (1528-1437). *Bord* has a complex history in English, being itself an agglomeration of two separate nouns in OE, which was later on reinforced by French and possibly ON in some uses (*OED* (1887), s.v. *board*). The time spans for each of the lexical item given below do not seem to point toward a correlation between chronology and spelling choice (most occur in the fifteenth century with the exception of *bordnail*): **burd**clogges and **borde** clogge are attested in the same year but in accounts coming from different departments (namely, Rott. Celer. 1466-7 and Rott. Elemos. 1466-7) and the aforementioned dressyng**burdez**/dressyng**bordez** are in the same roll. The overall choice of <o> spellings seems to be filtered through the multilingual milieu of the *DAR* accounts: both Latin and French (see **bordez** quarccuum (Rott. Hostill. 1453-1454, 150)) have <o> spellings; in particular, Latin conventions seem to overshadow the local graphematic preferences. Proof of this is the large number of Latinised simplex forms containing <o> (**bordarum** (x5) vs **burdarum** (x2)), with the abbreviation mark signalling linguistic ambiguity (**bord'** (x7) vs Ø u-forms) or with the equally ambiguous -*is* (**bordis** (x3) vs Ø u-forms). Only in compounds, which are not found in Latin or French, does <u> have a more significant presence. Within the textual ecosystem of particular accounts, there are consistencies too: **burd**cloges and (blank) **burd**es are both in Rott. Elemos. 1460-71, 245, shil**bord**clogge and **bordarum** (Rott. Elemos. 1451-

[235] Vikar (1922) cites it as '*fyrre-boordes*, 1447-8, 236', which again shows how Vikar's work is not completely reliable. It is also worth mentioning that <oo> would be pronounced /uː/ post-GVS, but it can be assumed that the shift had not taken place at the date of production of this account (1447-8).

2, 241), **bord**nale and **bord**nails (same account (Rott. Communiar. 1517) but different pages in the edition, 293 and 296), but dressyng**borde** and moldyng**borde**, mentioned close to each other (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 247), are in the same account as **burd**cloges (at the beginning of the roll (third entry), Rott. Elemos. 1472 (245 in the edited text)). The *MED* entry for this compound, **burd**cloges, only includes two recordings (from the *DAR*), and the word in question is not mentioned in either the *OED* or the *DSL,* so this term might have been only used in the North, the <u>-spelling possibly being the default (*clog* is still a 'thick piece of wood' in Scotland (*OED* (1891), s.v. *clog*)). The *Yorkshire Historical Dictionary* (*YHD*) does record this word as *bowrde clogg* (c. 1568)*, bourd clog* (c. 1495-1499)*,* and *board clogg* (Slaidburn, Lancashire, inventory of 1689) pinpointing its early uses in north Yorkshire wood accounts.[236] Local, low-frequency, terms would allegedly preserve the conservative spelling and better resist the adoption of what would become the standard spellings for those words, a tendency quite advanced in other lexical items such as Estland**bordes**, but not so much so in **burd**cloges. In any case, since most of the *board*-compounds date from the 15th century, the majority of <o> spellings are not surprising, especially within the scribe's aforementioned multilingual repertoire. In a similar vein, it would be wrong to assume that the first attestation of the <o> spelling in DAR (**bord'** from 1278) is actually meant to be read *only* as English but rather could potentially be in any of the three languages. Stenbrenden's investigation on texts from *LAEME, LALME*, and *SMED* equally proved that traditional <o> spellings are the most widely found—also alternating with <u> in the same text—in the North, even in late ME texts, which may be due to either the resistance of conventional spellings or the fact that northern fronting was completed later than has traditionally been postulated (Stenbrenden 2015: 10). In addition, if northern fronting was a realisational (rather than phonological) change, as Britton (2002) suggested, it does not necessarily have to be reflected orthographically.

[236] The sources used are the *Inventory of William Battersby* (1689) and Atkinson and Turton's (1894-7) *North Riding Records*.

4.2.1.2.2 Other <o>-<u> pairs

/oː/-fronting in Middle English **cruk** is likewise cited as a northern form (Aitken and Macafee 2002: §7.2.1, 42), arising out of an /oː/ before a voiceless velar (possibly, OE **crōk* or, less likely, ON *krōkr*).[237] Johnston (1997: 69) specifies that Northumbrian would not front in this position (that is, before a velar and after the uvular /r/), unlike Scots and 'other Northern dialects'. Along the same lines as *board*, *crook* is usually spelt with <o> although there are also <u>- attestations (<o> x 9 (c. 1320-1451) vs. <u> x5 (1404-1517)). Most of the records are rather late and the number of compounds containing this stem is very low (only four), which may explain the even lower frequency of <u>-spellings: flesh**cruk** only has <u> in two of its attestations (1404 and 1472) in contrast to its other three <o>-occurrences (1340?-1480); breer**crukez** only once (Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 55) as opposed to its two <o>-spellings (1459-60 and 1480-81); dore**crokez** does not have a <u> in any of its two mentions (1449-50; 1524-1525); neither does Shep**croke** (Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 98, in the same account as Brer**croke**; also Shepe**croke** in Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89).

More generally, the realisation of <u> for /oː/ is visible in **blud**hous, **busys**, **culyng(e)** le(y)d(e), **dur(e)-** (in compounds), **futhers**, **fut(e)-**, **-huk-**, **hupis**, **mur**kokes, nayl**tulle**, **spurres**, and **stud**mer (see Table 3 and Appendix 6.1 for the full details), amounting to 33.93% (19 of a total of 56 words including complex lexical units (the total number of stems which may undergo the change is 32).[238] Most of them are compounds —14 out of 20—and the <u> spelling (less common than its <o> counterpart) is not consistently attested within the group containing that stem: *stud* in **stud**mer (Rott. Sacrist. 1404-5, 399) is only present once and exclusively in that

[237] Based on Anderson (1987), Johnston (1997: 69) posits the possibility that the process could have also extended to the north-west Midlands and West Yorkshire if we assume that the outcomes [yː - ɪʊ - ɛʊ] and [ʊɪ] result from the same process.

[238] Vikar (1922: 92) gives only 12 reflexes of /oː/ from *DAR* (encompassing the *-burd* compounds, other lexemes like *cruk*, and the place-name *Rukehop*), although a few are misspelled (see *bludhus* (1385), which is, in fact, *bludhous*, 265, Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385 or *Hukschaue* (1350-1), given as *hukshaue*). Out of the 32 stems, the two single instances of the words *clǭke* and *rǭf* occur as *cloukis* (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396—NB. the MS is ambiguous, as indicated by the editor, and may also be *clonkis*) and *roofe* (Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239); which along with *gowsehouse* (also *goyshous*; see section 1.1.1), could presumably represent the /uː/ sound. As I am here considering just the graphematic component, I have excluded them from my list.

compound, but, generally, spelling variation can be noted in nayl**tulle** (8 <o> and 1 <u> forms), **Mor**kokes (2 <u> and 2 <o>; in Rott. Celer. 1329-30 both **Mor**kokes and **mur**kokes co-exist) and the **blud-**, **dure-**, **fute-**, and **huk-** compounds.[239] Both **blud** and **blod** are embedded in different compounds (**blud**hous (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385, 265) and **blod**eyrn (Rot. Feretrar. 1401, 451)); **dore** is found in **dore**chekez, **dore**stothez (x3), and **dore**crokez (x2) (cf. **dure**croks Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 296) and the other <u> forms occur in items present just once in the *DAR* (**dur**bandes Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 296, where it is next to *durecroks*; and trap**dure** (preceded by *hostio vocato*) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1423-4, 271); **fute**brace is temporarily close to its <o> spelling (**fute**brace Rott. Bursar. 1503-4, 657, **fott** Brassys Rott. Bursar. 1509-10, 661) and **fot**male only occurs once with <o> (549, Rott. Bursar. 1348-9); so does **fut**roppe (Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 659).[240] **Hokes** as a simplex is only recorded in Rott. Elemos. 1415-6, 225; wed**hoks** presents the two variants (2 <o> and 1 <u>) but both **huk**schaue (Rott. Bursar. 1350-1, 551) and tentur**hukis** (x2) only have <u>, which may be just a coincidental incidence of <u> in these two words rather than an underlying preference for this spelling. Only **culyng**leydez (x6) exhibits a clear predominance of <u>, as it is not attested in its <o> variant in the *DAR* (note **culyng** is not included as a variant in the *MED* and only as Scottish in the *OED* ((2008), s.v. *cool*, adj., adv., and int.)). No time/spelling correlation seems to emerge—let alone if we consider, from a phonological viewpoint, the interaction between the northern fronting and the GVS from the 15th century—, and it is difficult to pinpoint any lexical-based trends based on the overall high frequency of most of the stems in Middle English (*blood, tool, foot, door,* and *hook*) even if, as is often the case in the *DAR*, they do not occur as simplexes. Some <u> spellings pre-date the GVS (see **blud**hous (Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385, 265), f**u**thers (Rott. Bursar. 1375-76, 583), **huk**schaue (Rott. Bursar. 1350-1, 551), **stud**mer (Rott. Sacrist. 1404-5, 399), but so do some <o> spellings (see, e.g., **fot**male (Rott. Bursar. 1348-9, 549), Nayl**toll** (Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376), and stan**hokes** (Rott. Elemos. 1395-6, 214)). In addition to this, the simultaneous presence of <o> and <u> (also **cruk** and **croke** in Rott. Sacrist. 1404 and see the examples above) suggests (variable)

[239] Compare *blud-*, *dure-*, *fute-*, and *huk-* with *-wode-* (1356-1457), *flod-* (1334-1506), and *spone-* (c. 1310-1417), only appearing with <o>.
[240] Note the presence of *fot(e)* in proper names such as the place-name *Lightfotehous*.

spelling habits rather than the materialisation of phonological changes on a graphematic level. The inclusion of a few of these vernacular words in the *DMLBS* allows one to assess some spelling choices in other Medieval Latin texts: **spurres** is in two Durham sources, including the *DAR* (*DMLBS*, s.v. *spurrum* [ME *spore, spurre* < AS *spora, spura*]), but also in a 1292 text from Ambrosden [Oxon]; a systematic northern distribution is found for *cruk-* (v. 2 *crocus*), but not so much so for the only (and rather late) attestation of the <u>-variant of *futhers*, *fudr'*, in a non-localised text (*EEC* 628 (c 1488) 'xl fudr' calcis'; s.v. *fothera, fotherum* [ME *foþer*]); there are no <u-> spellings of *hook* in the *DMLBS* (*DMLBS*, s.v. *hokum* [ME *hok*]) and the other lexemes do not have an entry. Because the *DMLBS* objective was not to capture dialectal variation, it is not feasible to draw any conclusions—most of the data in this section is not even in the *DMLBS*—but overall variation seems to be the general trend.

Table 3. <o> / <u> spellings in the *DAR.*

	<o> spellings		**<u> spellings**	
<u> form (first attest.)	No. of times	Time span	No. of times	Time span
Blud-compounds	1	1401	1	1385
Culyng ledes	/		6	1492-1517
Dure-compounds	5	1449-1517	3	1423-1525
Fut-compounds	2	1348-1510	1	1503-4
futhers	23	1419-1477	9	1375-1487
huk as a simplex	1	1415-6	/	
huk- compounds	3	1391-1404	4	1350-1514
hupis	3	1349-1512	2	1417-1481
murkokes	2	1329-1417	2	1329-1340
nayltulle	8	1338-1351	1	1349-1350
spurres	/		1	1536-7
studmer	/		1	1404-5

4.2.1.3 <a> - <o>

The well-known reflex of OE (also ON) /ɑː/ is the other feature that I will be considering within this category of vowels. OE/ON /ɑː/ was common to all early ME dialects until the late 11th-12th centuries, when in the south it would become more back and probably rounded until it was raised, approximately to [ɔ̟ː] from the 13th c. onwards (see Aitken and Macafee (2002: 9-10) and Jordan-Crook (1974: §44));[241] in the north, it would remain unrounded (first as either [ɑː] or [aː]) and later on it was, to a certain degree, fronted (i.e. [aː]) if compared to the OE vowel.[242] Vikar (1922: 4) merges the short and the long version of <a> and gives a selection of spellings (including <ai> and <ay>) from several texts in section I,[243] but in section II he discusses the forms with <ā> which would be replaced with <ō> more extensively and makes greater use of the *DAR* spelling forms.[244] He notices that the <o> spelling is attested first occasionally in the later half of the 14th century and then increases during the 15th c., which would be expected within the broader context of the ongoing expansion of the supralocal variants. Interestingly, he maintains that out of 64 lexemes (both lexical and grammatical words), 19 'always exhibit vernacular forms, even when they belong to the last portion of the period examined' (Vikar 1922: 31). These include

[241] Wyld (1927: §156) believes that the change took place earlier than the 13th century (before the mid-12th century) although it did not start to be 'consistently nor universally expressed by the spelling' until the conventional date, the early 13th century. See Stenbrenden's (2016: 37-77) extensive chapter for an overview of the dating, loci, and spelling evidence for the development of OE /ɑː/.

[242] It could have fronted as far as [ɛː] before the 15th century (see Luick 1914-40: §§369–71; Dobson 1968: §98; Jordan-Crook 1974: §44; Stenbrenden 2016: 37). According to Dobson (1968: §98), by the time /ɑː/ had fronted to [ɛː], /ɑː/ was indistinguishable from the diphthong /ai/, [ɛː] not being reflected in spelling. Aitken and Macafee (2002: 9-10) discuss the multifaceted process whereby NME and what they call 'SME' achieved a close (if not identical) pair of phonemes (/o̟ː/ and /aː/). /o̟ː/ arose from the introduction of French loanwords such as *stor*, *cote*, etc., a sound which in the south would merge with [ɔ̟ː]. Since in Scottish and NME, OE/ON *ā* continued to be a low unrounded (yet more fronted) sound /aː/, the French-origin /o̟ː/ would remain separate in these varieties. /aː/ as a phoneme would, therefore, only merge with the new /aː/ (< French /aː/ (e.g. in *case* and *debate*) and AF/OE short /a/ by OSL (e.g. *name,* etc.).

[243] The *DAR* material is cited to refer to the developments of *meason* (coming from French), *weyscill* (from either ON or *OE), and *spekys.*

[244] Vikar (1922: 20-24) provides the lists of words with an <a>-spelling taken from the *DAR* and on page 29 he singles out those with <o> 'instead of the original *a*' (along with the date of first occurrence) and the words which are never spelled with <o> (with the date of the last appearance).

proper nouns and what he calls 'distinctly popular words, esp. such as denote household or agricultural implements'. Based on this claim, he questions the reliability of *crowe* (1370) but accepts the spellings *old* (1366) and *rowe* (1392) in place-names made up of multiple lexical units. Vikar's impressionistic judgement does not consider the overall frequency of the words both in the texts he surveyed and Middle English more generally, but it gives an indication of which words seemed to be more resistant to graphemic change. In the next section, I will try to shed further light on these issues starting with one of the most numerous groups exhibiting <a>-<o> alternation, those followed by a plosive. Since there are more instantiations of this northern convention, I have tried to classify them according to the surrounding environment: before plosives (the voiceless plosives <t,k,p> and the voiced plosive <d>), nasals (<n> and the consonant clusters <ng> and <mb>, which were lengthening environments even if the stems originally contained short vowels), and before <th>, <r>, and <ff>.

4.2.1.3.1 <a> - <o> before plosives

The words with <a> before voiceless plosives to be considered are *rap(e)*, *sap(e)*, *spak(e)*, and *bat(e)* and, within the category of voiced plosives, *wad* and *la(a)d(e).* Unlike the <u>/<o> pairs, the northern dialectal forms generally outnumber the supralocal ones: <a> is the only form attested for *soap* in kyd**sape** (Rott. Bursar. 1377-8, 587) as it is in **spak(e)s** (x4 (1334-1397), also **spekys** Rott. Hostill. 1454, 150), **wad**lede (Rott. Hostill. 1485-6, 157) and **lad**, both as a simplex, also adapted into Latin in the form of **lada** (Rott. Bursar. 1365-6, 568)—not in the *DMLBS*—and as a base form in compounds, notably in court**ladez** (x2, 1454-1457); **lad**sadell (pl.) (Rott. Hostill. 1397-8, 136) and **lade**silver (x2, 1425-1537). **Lade**silver (Rott. Bursar. 1536-37, 672) co-occurs with three **rop**-spellings (see below),[245] which allows us to see different levels of word-based dialectal marking well into the sixteenth century. *Rap(e)* (also *raype*, see section 4.2.1.1) is present as the only spelling in six lexical items, brydyl**rapes**,

[245] See also **Burd**nall' (698 Rott. Bursar. 1536-7) in the same account, although its spelling is particularly problematic.

cabill**raype** (x2), draght**rapes** (x4), **Rapys** (del unyons) (x4),[246] smal**rape**, and warde**rapes**.[247] Four lexemes present <o>/<a> variation: **Stiraps** (1 <a> and 4 <o>) and **Stirhap**lethirs (1 <a> and 6 <o>) showing a majority of <o> spellings, and Carte**rapis** (9 <a> and 1 <o>) and wayn**raps** (5 <a>; 1 <o>) of <a> spellings; and only fut**roppe** is written exclusively with <o> (659, Rott. Bursar. 1507-8). The multilingual nature of the *DAR* material means that sometimes a given concept is partially or fully rendered in both vernaculars and/or Latin (not just by means of morphological integration), as in carte**rapis**, 'rapys […] pro carecta' (Rott. Bursar. 1473-4, 645), 'corde pro carectis' (Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376) or 'uno hausour cum cariagio' (Rott. Sacrist. 1359-60, 384); the Latin equivalent for sti**raps**, **strepis** (Rott. Elemos. 1515-16, 253), entirely avoids the <o>/<a> division, proving how scribes were comfortable with—rather than constrained by—the three languages. **Steropez** and **sterop**leders are next to each other in Rott. Camer. 1498-9, 195, and **stirrop**leders, wayne**roppes**, and cart**ropez** appear in the same roll (Rott. Bursar. 1536-37), so a few clusters of systematic <o>-spellings are noticeable from the mid-fifteenth century onwards. The only <o>-compound of *ropes* (attested just once), fut**roppe**, is not in the *MED* and the *OED*'s ((2016), s.v. *foot rope*) first record—after an earlier quote in OE—is from 1592, so that it is impossible to pin down the dialectal distribution of this word before the early modern period.[248] Besides, the roll from the *DAR* dates to the years 1507-8, when the supralocal spelling of the word would not be unexpected regardless of the low incidence of the lexical item. The same applies to **bot**stede (Rott. Communiar. 1508-9, 290) and fery**bot(t)(e)** (x4, 1494-1537); comparatively, stan**bate** (note also the <a> in *stone*) (x4, c. 1336-1416) and Fisshe**bate** (Rott. Bursar. 1347-8, 546), with <a> in all cases, appear significantly earlier.

---

[246] *Rapa* as a simplex is lemmatised in the *DMLBS* (s.v. 2 *rapa* [ME *rape*, *rope* < AS *rap*]) although there is only one quotation, which is northern: '1470 et in una ~a pro campana in cancella Ac. Churchw. Glast. 282'.

[247] *Grape* is included in Vikar's (1922: 21) discussion of dialectal forms with /ɑː/ replaced by StE /oː/-forms, but he correctly points out that it is consistently spelt with <a>, which suggests that it goes back to OE *grap* rather than being derived from ON *greip* (the *MED* also considers the MDu/MLG cognate *grēpe*).

[248] The word in question is attested in none of the northern accounts I surveyed or the *EDD*.

4.2.1.3.2 <a> - <o> before nasals

The largest group of <a> before <n>/<m>, the *stone*-compounds, exhibits a preference for the northern <a> form: 14 of the compounds contain only <a> (in a total of 24 instances) from a period comprising c. 1357-1506; 9 out of 14 are from the 15th c., 4 from the 14th c. and one (**stan**brod) occurs both in the 14th and the 15th century. <O>-only spellings (6 in total; 7 occurrences)[249] mostly manifest themselves in the second half of the fifteenth century except for two lexemes (presumably the same lexical item, Tylde**stone** (pl.), thill**stone** (lez)) from the very beginning of the 16th century, Rott. Bursar. 1500-1501). Three further *stone*-compounds show an <o>/<a> alternation: gryndy**stan** (x4, 1404) vs gryndstone (1480-81 and 1523-4); sclat**stan** (x6, 1360-1428) and the only occurrence of sclat**stonys** occurs in the same folio as gryndy**stan** and gryndstan, **crukis**, **qwele** harow, **twynterys**, and **styrkis**, among other presumably northern lexis, Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398-399. We could assume that the verso of this roll is a continuation of the recto—where sclat**stanys**, gryndy**stan**, **crok**, and **qwele**tymber are present—as no new heading is provided. The commissioner, 'Dominum Thomam de Lyth', is mentioned five other times at the heads of the rolls of the Sacristy, but unfortunately no other northern features have been detected in any of those, so it is impossible to trace any larger patterns or variation in use. In addition, the editor's transcription seems accurate in light of the manuscript evidence: the letter forms <a> and <o> (as well as <o> and <u>) are clearly distinct in the scribe's Anglicana script, so we can safely discard any transcription errors. Rather, the co-existence of northern and non-northern forms is a sign of intra-scribal variation, a phenomenon which has already been reported in, inter alia, Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma (2004) and Stenroos (2016). No variation is, nevertheless, found in the *land*-compounds: note all <a> spellings in **land**mall (x20,

[249] One of them, **capstonys** (642, Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9)—in the same roll as **tabilstonys**—allegedly contains the northern <a>-form *cap.* On this word, the *OED* comments that derivation is made certain by the northern forms in *cape-*, *caip-*; but the sense appears to be influenced by association with *cop* n.2, or in the northern form perhaps with *cap*: see *cap* n.1 10b. (*OED* (1893), s.v. *cope-stone*, n.). Furthermore, the first attestation of this compound is in the *Records of the City of Norwich* (1382), so it will not be counted as a Class 1a lexical item but as Class 4 (see my discussion of these classes in 4.3.3.1).

1351-1537; see also **laynd**mayle Rott. Celer. 1429, 60, in Section 1.1.1), **lande**malebok (Rott. Bursar. 1416-7, 614) and **Land**leve (Rott. Busar. 1357, 560).

According to Vikar (1922: 19), 'the genuine instances of /ɑŋ/ are always written ang': **gang** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 398) and **tangs** (Rott. Magistr. 1384-5 (dorso), 265; **tangys** (Rott. Bursar. 1412-13, 610)) seem to confirm this statement, but the adjective *long*/*lang* renders it inoperative: we find **long** Roppe (Rott. Bursar. 1513-4, 663, in an embedded phrase in Middle English, 'long Roppe for the kyln') and **long**sedle (Rott. Elemos. 1515-16, 253). *Lang* is present in NPs such as **lang**rape (Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635), **lang**sedil(e) (x2, 1352-1454), and **Lang**cart' (Rott. Bursar. c. 1343?, 543). The use of Latin *longus* not only in postnominal position ('j pannus stevynd longus' Rott. Hostill. 1454, 149, 'j sedile longum' Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245) but also before the noun (see, e.g., longe carecte (x7, 1309-1382), 'longe cathedre' (Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 217), or 'iiij longe formule' (Rott. Bursar. 1464, 640) draws attention to the linguistic ambiguity of such adjectives as *longe*. In fact, **lang**cart' (also in **lang**cartsadill, in a different account hypothetically from the same year, Rott. Bursar. c. 1343?) is in the same paragraph as 'pro longa carecta', showing the lexical convergence of the vernaculars and Medieval Latin characteristic of this type of text. However, does *langcart'* reflect the influence of Northern Middle English while being an abbreviated phrase in Medieval Latin (see *DMLBS*, s.v. 1 † *carta* [ME *cart* < AS *cræt*, or (?) f.l. for *carretta* or *carrus*]? Or is it just a code-switch into Northern Middle English? No unequivocal answer seems tenable.

We might now move on to <mb>, /ɑː/ (etymologically, OE /a/ with later lengthening) in *wombe* and *kambe*, is always <a> as in **wambe**towes (x8, 1313-1537) and hors**kames** (x3, 1397-1485) in all but one instance (horsse **coumez** Rott. Bursar. 1510-11, 661), which again coincides with the latest attestation. In *lamb* and *wand* (*MED*, s.v. *lŏmb* (n.) and *wŏnd(e* (n.(1))), an environment where there is variable lengthening, <a> is the default form: see **lam**cote (x2, 1447), spanyng **lambes** (x2, 1416-1447), iris**lams** (Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 582), **wandes** (x2, 1479-80), also **wandys** (Rott. Bursar. 1469-70, 642) and **Wande**pen' (x3, 1293-1403), and **Wyndys** (Rott. Celer. 1507-8, 105).

4.2.1.3.3 Other contexts

The more significant presence of <o> spellings from the fifteenth century—contrasting with earlier <a> forms—can be further explored in the 26 *clath*-compounds (1330-1461) vs the 12 *cloth*-variants (1412-1506). 8 lexical items (boutyng **clathe**, Chese**clathe**, **Clath**seck (x2), cole**clath** (x2), Sayl**clathis** (x3), sek**clath** (x2), Serid**clath,** and window**clathe**) appear written only with <a> (x14) and 5 only with <o> (bred**cloth,** Flemysh**cloth**, freynȝes **clothez**, moton**cloth**, and steyned**clothes**). Within the latter group, the combination *steyned (also stevynd) clothes* occurs three times with the Latin lexeme *pan(n)-us/-e* (only one as steyned**clothes** (Rott. Elemos. 1413-14, 224)), which is in fact the equivalent to *cloth* when mentioned as a simplex, a reality which somewhat limits the amount of data available. The most productive group to trace any diachronic variation should be those lexical items containing both <a> and <o>: *bultclath* with <a> is attested in the late fourteenth century (x3, c.1360-1395) and *bultcloth* from the late fifteenth century onwards (x3, 1478-1508); but Straynyoʳ**clath** occurs in Rott. Celer. 1460-61 and streynowr**cloþs** in Rott. Celer. 1505-6, bridging any hypothetical temporal divide between <a> and <o> spelling. This becomes even clearer in cuppbord**clothes** (Rott. Hostill. 1452-53, 147) and copperborde**clathe** (Rott. Hostill. 1458-1459 (verso), 149), where the time gap is just five years; bord**cloths** (note also the first <o>) occurs in Rott. Bursar. 1412-13, earlier than the second instance of burde**clathe** (x2; burde**clathe** tweyld (Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635)); and in the case of *Holand(e)cloth(e)*, <o> spellings are the most common (4:1), the <a> spelling dated to approximately the same period as the <o> ones, that is, the second half of the fifteenth century (see Holand**clathe** (Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635)). Frequency of use might be a factor in the choice of <o> / <a>, but since a significant part of the *DAR* vernacular vocabulary is made up of compounds or complex lexical units, it is more difficult to argue for an earlier shift towards the <o> spelling, which would be typically associated with more frequent words such as *cloth*. A few other stems, *bar(e)*, *la(f)f(e), ra(e), sa(a)(e),* and *salys*, seem to support the hypothesis of a temporal correlation between earlier <a> vs later <o> spellings even if it cannot account for all the data: **Bar**hide (Rott. Bursar. 1375, 582) vs **bore**hede (x2, 1525-1535), and **laf** (x4, 1363-

1430),[250] **Ra**nettes (x3, 1354-1383), **saez** (x6, 1377-1480), and **salys** (Rott. Elemos. 1434-5, 232) which only occur with <a>—also <aa>/<ae>—or, more rarely, with <ay> (**layf** (de suggir) (Rott. Celer. c. 1440, 78) and water**say** (Rott. Bursar. 1487-8, 651)).[251] The survey of both <a> and <o> spellings conflicts with Vikar's assertion that 'popular words'—meaning those denoting household or agricultural items—preserve <a>, even in the last portion of the period covered (late fifteenth/early sixteenth century). While it is true that there is a predominance of <a> spellings, the second half of the fifteenth century and early decades of the sixteenth century witnessed an increase of <o> spellings which does not seem to be related to the popularity of the extralinguistic referents denoted.

4.2.2 Consonants

4.2.2.1 Absence of palatalisation

As has been discussed, some of the tenets of Northern English and Scots, especially in the realm of consonants, have been put under scrutiny over the last two decades: consequently, the variable l-vocalisation in French-origin lexis such as **boutyng** clathe*,* **Bowgez** (also *bowges (del)* and cf. *Boulgys*)*,* **bowt**cloth (cf. *Bultclathis*, *bult clothes*), and **bowtys**, will not be considered here as a ME dialectally specific phenomenon. Absence of palatalisation and <qu->-spellings present a greater regularity and systematicity in terms of dialectal mapping even if they are often lexeme-dependent. In fact, in her discussion of diagnostic features, Kniezsa (1997) sets the <a>-spellings (in the morpheme boundary position or followed by a consonant, more specifically, vowel <a> + nasal + V) and the <k> spellings on equal terms. As has been noted in the section on ON-derived vocabulary, I will only consider (absence of) initial-position

[250] Compare the use of *panibus de Couker* and *pane de zukre* instead of ME *laf/lof* in 510, Rott. Bursar. c. 1310 and 563, Rott. Bursar. c. 1360, respectively.

[251] Unlike Vikar (1922: 24), I do not examine some words such as *strabrod* and *Strakis* (also in *strakenaill'* and *cartstrakes*) because the <a> forms are the most common ones in Middle English and the (early) Modern period (see *MED*, s.v. *strāke* (n.(2)) and *OED* (1917), s.v. *strake*, n.1 and †*strabrod*, n.), so the <a> cannot be considered northern *per se* (NB: *stra* is the northern form for *straw*, so the source vowel is, in any case, different. I will discuss this word further in the vocabulary section).

palatalisation. Most lexemes starting with <sk>/<sc> are borrowings (from AL, ON, AF, and Dutch, among other languages) and only the <sch> lexemes *Schakles* (also *Shakelys*), *schakforkes,* and *scharlyng* (also *Scherlings*) come from OE. There is, nonetheless, an example of northern substitution of <sk> for <sh> in two occurrences of the word *shelf:* **skelfe** (Rott. Elemos. 1395-6, 214) and **skelfes** (Rott. Elemos. 1407-8 (verso), 223)). The *OED* ((1911), skelf, *n.*[1]) claims it probably comes from Dutch/Low German *schelf* and that it is related to *shelf*, and while the *MED* (s.v. *skelf(e* n.) endorses this view, its use in place-names seems to be under the influence of Scandinavian in one of its senses (cp. OIcel *skjālf* 'a seat'). Furthermore, Spone**garn** is a palatalised version of OE *gearn* attested only in the north (*OED*, s.v. *spun-yarn* | *spunyarn*, n., also *DOST*, s.v. *Spun-yarne, -ȝarne*, n., both of which label it as 'northern'). In the late modern English period, as depicted in the *EDD*, *spunyarn* was still in use in Northumbria, Durham, and also in East Anglia (cf. *EDD*, s.v. *SPUN-YARN*, sb). Apart from **skelfe** and Spone**garn**, the only context susceptible to be examined here is <k>/<ch>, which can be clearly polarised into the <k>- and the <ch>- only spelling groups: the total number of lexical items with initial <ch> is 26, of which only 5 stems derive from OE, and exclusively **kes**loppes (x2, 1525-1535), **kyrn** (x5, 1338-1526), and **kyrsettes** (x13, 1448-1535) regularly have <k> in lieu of <ch> (26 lexical items have <k>, but their stems were not liable to palatalisation); this supports Kocel's (2009; 2010; 2012; 2013) view on the role of lexical diffusion in the operation of palatalisation (see above). The sole set where we can find an alternation with the <k> forms is the *chese*-compounds: 4 out of the 5 exhibit <ch> (**Chese**clathe (x2, c. 1330-1348), **chese**clutes (Rott. Instaur. 1338-9, 311), **chese**fleke (Rott. Celer. 1465-6, 91), and **ches**fattes (x7, 1333-1526)) in contrast to **kes**loppes (x2, Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108). The spelling *keslep/keslop* seems to be localised to the north of England and Scotland during the Middle English period, subsequently spreading to the East Midlands (see *OED* (2016), s.v. *cheeselip*, n. cf. the citations from Whiteby, Yorkshire, and Lincolnshire and the *EDD,* s.v. *keslop*, Sc. Nhb. Dur. Cum. Wm. Yks. Lan. Lin.), although influence from a Scandinavian cognate has been discarded. As the *OED* states, the absence of palatalisation and assibilation of the initial consonant is unexplained,[252] so

[252] Absence of palatalisation is usually attributed to ON influence (see Section 3.1.3.1).

the only likely source of input seems to be a cognate form in OHG, *kēsi-luppe*. Because NME was already prone to adopt <k> forms, I argue, the paradigm could have extended by analogy to other lexemes with no ON cognates such as *cheese* (see also *kesfat* (*kesvat*), *EDD*)).[253] If we consider absence of palatalisation in final position, where non-palatalised native variants seem to be chiefly northern (see my discussion in Section 4.1), **birk** (Rott. Elemos. 1373, 211), hors**hek** (Rott. Elemos. 1400-1, 216), **Pyke** 'pitch' (Rott. Bursar. 1395-6, 599) and **thake** deserve special mention:[254] both as a simplex, as **thake** (x2, 1524-1529), also in the constructions 'le thacke et wrak' (x3, 1510-1525), and as part of complex lexical items (lyng**thake** (Rott. Bursar. 1482-3, 648), medew**thak** x9, 1430-1506), **thyk**ston' (Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158), **thak**borde (x2, 1447-1457)); only the sixteenth-century gerund **thachyng** (Rott. Communiar. 1511-2, 292), has the palatalised spelling <ch>, so there is a clear majority of <k> forms in *thack.*

4.2.2.2 Final-position fricatives <f(f)> and <v>

With the loss of final-position /e/, the fricative /v/ became voiceless in the North (13th century), remaining voiced in the southern dialects (Jordan-Crook 1974: §217). The inflectional paradigms were subject to variation and alternation to such an extent that <f> pervaded the stem even in medial position. Devoicing in final <v> is visible in *dogdraf(f)(e), naf(f)(e),* and in just a couple of instances of **thraff** (pl.) (Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108, also **threff** (pl.) Rott. Celer. 1512-3, 106) and *cofe* (Rott. Elemos. 1375-6, 212).[255] *Cove* (*OED* (1893), s.v. *cove*, n.1; *MED*, s.v. *cōve* (n.)) is inflected in <e> x18 (1372-1522) and with <a> x13 (1367-1472), being taxonomically ambiguous (is *cove* ML or ME? (also cf. MLG *cove*)) in most of its occurrences.[256] Noteworthy is the editorial

[253] The earlier (1279) spelling *Kesemakere* seems to be a surname ('Thom. Kesemakere.', *MED*, s.v. *chēse* n.), so it is not possible to determine whether this worker came from the Continent or if his surname was originally from—and adapted in—Britain.

[254] The editor suggests that cloukis is 'problably *clutches*' (Fowler 1898: 905) although it remains unclear whether this is indeed the word intended, which is why I have not included it in the discussion.

[255] Only these morphemes end in etymological <v>; <f>/<v> variation (e.g. in *knyfes(z)/knyves(z)*) is not examined here.

[256] The *DMLBS* does not refer to the devoiced fricative variants—and more generally, any other northern consonants—and so *cova* is only recorded with the <v> spellings (*DMLBS*, s.v. 1 *cova*

intervention in both the <f> spelling (Rott. Elemos. 1375-6) and <w> (Rott. Elemos. 1506-7), where Fowler (1898) writes the presumably intended form(s) in parentheses "del cofe (cove)" (212) and "cowe (cove)" (252).[257] This might have been to facilitate the reading of the word (bearing a readership of historians in mind) precisely because of its ambiguity since it could well have been a different ML/ME lexeme. The other <f>-variants are not editorially signalled in any way: precisely, the spelling with <f(f)> in **nafes** (x4, 1378-1397), a word coming from OE meaning 'the central part or block of a (usually spoked) wheel, into which the end of the axle is inserted, and from which the spokes radiate; a hub' (*OED* (2003), s.v. *nave*, n.1, sense 1) distinguishes it from Latin *nave* 'ship' or 'boat' and—also inflectionally—from *navem pro incenso*, 'an incense-boat' and *navi ecclesie* 'nave of a church' (*DMLBS,* s.v. 2 *navis*), which keep their Latin etymological spelling. *Dogdraf(f)(e)* does not clash graphemically with any other lexemes and there is greater variation concerning the final fricative: the predominant <f(f)> forms occur 14 times (1239-1409), the <v> ones, 8; and there are a couple of instances of **dogdrawe** (x2, 14857-1481), and one **dogdraes** (Rott. Celer. 1416, 54). There is a systematic plural morpheme distribution in the <v> forms, which contain -*ez* (x4) or -*es* (x1), whereas the <f(f)> counterparts have a wider range of suffixes (zero-morpheme, abbreviation mark, -*es*, and -*is*) but not -*ez*. The morphemes ending in a devoiced fricative, therefore, seem to align more closely with the ME prototypical morphological system of plural formation, including NME/ML -*is* (more on morphology in Section 3.1). Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma (2004: 293) found that most lexemes with <f(f)> were pre-1540, a statement applicable to the *DAR* data even if no <v> forms are attested after that date (most are from the fifteenth century).

4.2.2.3 <qw> and <wh>

The typically northern <qw>-spellings are scattered in the accounts: **qwel**timber (x2, 1376-1404) is the only lexeme attested just with <qw>, but variation between the

---

[ME *cove*] 'cove'): '1355 in ·· duabus robis pro servientibus de ~a Ac. Durh. 208; 1451 in ij trelis emptis pro fenestra ~e ib. 240; 1460 in ridacione unius gutteri circa ~am pistrine Ac. Churchw. Som 188'.

[257] Fowler (1898) does not flag up *coue* (Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 219) since <u> and <v> are interchangeable in MS sources.

<qw> and <wh> forms can be noticed in the following pairs: **Qwyp**cord (x2, 1362-1395) and **Whyp**cord (x3, 1353-1364), **whele** barowe (x2, 1459-1481) and **qwhele** harow (Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 399 [NB that the second stem in *qwhele harow* is different]), and **qwit**leþ' (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396) and **White**ledir (x3, 1412-1488).[258] As Fernández Cuesta and Rodríguez Ledesma (2004: 292) pinpoint, in their corpus <wh> spellings for OE <hw> seem more frequent than their <qh> counterparts.[259] In fact, five instances of backspellings of <wh> for <qw> in both native vocabulary and loanwords are remarkable: **Whibibbes** (Rott. Bursar. 1355-1356, 555) for **quibibis** (x2, 1313-1349) < OF *cubèbe* < Arabic *kabābah* (cf. Latin **cubibis** 6, Rott. Celer. 1309-1310) (*MED*, s.v. *quibibe* (n.), suggests input from both OF and ML; cf. *OED* (1893), s.v. *cubeb*, n.); **wharel**wegges (x2, 1356-1374), the original form *quarrel* (not present in this compound in the *DAR*) is either a borrowing from Latin or an alternation of another borrowing, French *quarrer*; **Whik** < OE *quik*, as a simplex (x3, 1468-1508) and in the compound **Whik**wod (1472-1499); **whysshynes** < OF (several source etymons) (Rott. Elemos. 1431-2, 231), which can be compared to the expected <qu->/<qw-> forms in the *DAR* (x4, 1418-1441); and **whilte** (x4, 1453-1516) vs **Qwhylt** (x2, 1341-1454), coming from French too. These <wh>-spellings, interestingly, are labelled in the *OED* and/or the *MED* as *northern* or *chiefly northern* (except for **Whibibbes**, which is not listed as a spelling variant under either the *MED* or the *OED* entries), which gives an indication of how <wh> can also function as an index of 'northernness' in back-spellings.

4.2.2.4 <w> and <v>

The substitution of <w> with <v>,[260] a low-frequency phenomenon in Older Scots, appears in **vaynscot** (Rott. Bursar. 1399, 601), in a 1:10 ratio, and **vodhire** (Rott. Celer.

[258] Note the use of Latin equivalents (for *wheel barrow*) **cenovectorio** or 'Barowe cum rota' (277, Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1453-4 and 529, Rott. Bursar. 1335-6 (verso) and 'correis equinis dealbandis' or a similar paraphrase for *white leather* (Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376, Rott. Bursar. 1278, 487, and Rott. Bursar. 1344-5, 544); hence, the lack of more data for comparative purposes.

[259] In the *DAR* corpus, 7 lexemes (including borrowings) are spelt with the etymologically expected <qu>/<qw> and 5 with <wh>.

[260] In contrast, the replacement of <v> with <w> (as in **warnyshyng** (162, Rott. Hostill. 1528-9) **wernysshynnge** (697, Rott. Bursar. 1536-7) vs. **Vernisshing** (663, Rott. Bursar. 1513-4) is a widespread phenomenon in Middle English.

1439-40, 78) in 1:3. The number of lexical items liable to this /v/ ∽ /w/ interchange with initial-position <w>, followed by a vowel, amounts to 73 (including the numerous complex units with *wod-* or *well-* as their first stems), but taking into account the limited frequency of this phenomenon in Scots itself,[261] its materialisation in two lexemes in the *DAR* is of particular significance.

4.2.3 Summary of the orthographic evidence

The northern spellings in the *DAR* seem to conform to larger trends postulated in the literature on monolingual NME/Scots sources. The digraph representation of originally long vowels—and very occasionally, short vowels, especially when French loanwords are involved—is a late phenomenon (end of the fifteenth century and first half of the sixteenth century). The pair <o> - <u> is more problematic because of the long span encompassed in the *DAR* and the interactions between the northern fronting and the GVS: the <o> spellings are much more common, a trend especially noticeable in the case of *bord,* which occurs many more times in the *DAR* than any other lexemes subject to this alternation. Along with the ongoing spread of supralocal forms and the aforementioned factors, the appropriation of this word in ML (*DMLBS*, s.v. 1 *borda, bordum, bordus*) and Anglo-French (*AND*, s.v. *bord*[1]) may also have had an effect on the preference for <o> in both the simplex and as part of complex lexical units, except for a few compounds which may be linked to local and lower-frequency terms (see **burd**cloges). In contrast, the analysis of <a> - <o> before plosives, nasals, and other contexts (before <th>, <r>, and <ff>) shows a greater preference for the northern <a> spellings, also in environments with variable lengthened vowels. As for northern consonants, there are some traits of absence of palatalisation (also invoked in the discussion of ON-derived lexis in 3.1.3.1) and final-position devoicing of fricatives. Regarding <wh> - <qw> (and variants), the backspellings with <wh>—mostly neglected in the previous literature although identified in dictionaries such as the *OED*—seem better diagnostic features for northernness than the use of <qw>, which is

[261] Johnston (1997: 109) states that there are some instances of the substitution of /v/ for /w/ in Older Scots, but the majority (5:1) was in favour of <w> spellings for /v/. The reverse spellings, according to Johnston, would be 'hyperdialectal spellings really reflecting the lenition of /v/'.

largely variable in the few words subject to scrutiny. Finally, the substitution of <w> with <v>, despite its low frequency, seems to evince the extent to which Scots and, more generally, Northern Middle English permeate these accounts.

4.3 Morphology and vocabulary

4.3.1 Pluralisation

Despite the blurry boundaries between languages in the Middle Ages, Wright (2017: 281) treats *-is* as both Latin and English, and *-ys* categorically as unintegrated (i.e. only English) on the basis of not being 'part of the Latin orthographic system'. Since <y> was indeed an alternative spelling in Medieval Latin as recorded in the *DMLBS*, I will here consider *-is* and *-ys* as allomorphs, particularly productive in northern multilingual accounts for their uses in NME (see also Roig-Marín (2019a: 242) on *The Inventories and Account Rolls of the Benedictine House or Cell of Jarrow*). Suspension marks, emblems, and zero morphemes epitomise a radically neutral linguistic code, so their presence in any lexeme, particularly vernacular vocabulary—regardless of its dialectal distribution— is expected. The French-origin *-ez* is retained in recent borrowings into medieval English, and *-(e)s* can be interpreted as either the widely spread plural morpheme in Middle English (see *MED*, s.v. *-(e)s* suf.(2))[262] or even as Romance (Anglo-French) *-(e)s* (cf. Wright 2017: 281); if we assume that the datives and genitives—the default syntactic structures in the *DAR* rolls—in Medieval Latin do not take *-es,* this suffix would only be operative in the vernaculars. Therefore, along with neutral zero-forms (encompassing suspension marks and emblems as well), *-ez* and *-es* are not characteristically 'northern'. This section overviews the use of *-is* and *-ys* vs. ∅, *-ez*, and *-es* in the northern vocabulary of the *DAR*. The main question here is whether northern vocabulary would favour *-is*/*-ys* as plural-marking morphemes or if it will behave morphologically in the same way as the other vernacular vocabulary in the *DAR*. To this end, I have made use of the underlying taxonomical system devised for this

[262] The *MED* (s.v. *-(e)s* suf.(2)) states that 'All words borrowed from OF or L during the ME period form the plural in *-es* (unless the foreign plural form is retained).'

chapter, which classifies lexical items into four broad categories along a continuum (see section 3.2). I concentrate here on Class 1, the vocabulary containing dialectal specific features (vowels or consonants, see Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2), the largest proportion, and/or on which there is a certain degree of consensus on their status as northern based on the evidence available. The results, only limited to lexemes which were meant to be read in their plural form in any of their *DAR* occurrences, are revealing: 34 'northern' lexical items include *-ys* and/or *-is* in their forms, and 64 do not. Hence, the number of lexical items with do not present *-is/-ys* in any of their plurals is almost double those which do. These figures imply that the potentially northern plural allomorphs represent only a choice within a much broader morphological repertoire. If two of the words discussed in Section 4.2.1 are revisited (see the Appendix for the complete list), *crook/cruk* and *-stone/-stane,* both with attestations from the 14th and the 15th centuries, there is a correlation between <u> and *-is/-ys* in the pluralised *crukis* (see Table 4 below); the *crok*-forms, though, do not only have *-ez* and *-es* but also *-ys* and *-is.* In the case of *stone*, three of the compounds with *ston(e)* as a second element (thereby allowing pluralisation in the northern marked stem) are inflected with *-ys* and one with *-s*, whereas the presumably northern *stan(e)* is pluralised by means of *-ys* just once, the other morphemes being *-es* (x3), *-ez* (x1) and ∅ (x1). The zero-form in "2 gryndystan" (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396) occurs within a paragraph in which "44 Estland burde, 2 trysyng rapis, 6 brydyl rapes" are also next to one another; the possibility of the editor's silently expanding abbreviations was abandoned after the original manuscripts were checked at Durham, so it is then reasonable to assume that the great variability which I have been discussing in the realisation of northern vowels and consonants also materialises in the scribe's morphological strategies to pluralise nouns.

Table 4. Plural renderings of ME *crook* and *-stone* in compounds in the *DAR* (listed by order of appearance).

<o> forms	**<o> forms**
crokez (x2): Rott. Celer. 1479-80, 96 and Rott. Feretrar. 1450-1, 474 *crokes* (x3): Rott. Elemos. 1415-16, 225, Rott. Bursar. c. 1320, 514, and Rott. Bursar. 1347-8, 546 *crokys* Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385, 265 *crokis* Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1398-9, 268	*tapstones* Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294 *sclatstonys* (c. de) Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398 *tabilstonys* Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9 (headless roll), 641 *capestonys* Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9 (headless roll), 642 *Baststonys* (del) Rott. Bursar. 1478-9, 647 *flaxstons* (del) Rott. Bursar. 1480-1, 648 *Grynstonez* Rott. Bursar. 1523-4, 668
<u> forms	**<a> forms**
crukkis Rott. Elemos. 1372-3, 211 *crukys* Rott. Magistr. 1420-21, 269 *crukis* Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398	*morterstanez* Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 97 *milnestanes* (par.) Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239 *gryndystan* (pl.) Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396 *fatstanes* Rott. Bursar. (headless roll of 1377-8, as appears by dates mentioned), 587 *sclatstanys* (c.) Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397 *Sclatestanes* (6 M.) Rott. Bursar. 1427-8, 621

If we consider different kinds of instantiations of northern lexis (not based on orthography, but on other parameters such as the geographical distribution of the word), the picture that emerges is equally complex: the entry for *empcio stauri* of Rott. Sacrist. 1536 contains a non-negligible concentration of dialectal lexis: '4 Trynters, 7 Twynters, 9 Stirks, 20 Dynmontes, 23 Hogges, 8li. 5s. 3d.' **Trynters** is not explicitly labelled as northern in the *OED* (1912, s.v. *thrinter*, adj. and n.) nor is the lexeme included in the *MED*. However, both Sense A and B—the former denoting cattle and sheep of 'three winters' (three years old) and the latter, very similarly, 'a sheep or bovine animal of three years or winters (now applied only to sheep)'—record the ME/eModE reflex of this OE word (*þri-winter*) exclusively in the north. Sense B in the *OED* contains an early record from c. 1000 (Wright & Wülcker's *Anglo-Saxon & Old Eng. Vocab.*); the subsequent citation is from the *DAR*, which is followed by one from *Hist. Soc. Lancashire & Chesh.* (1577). Also from the 16th century is the exclusive record of sense 'A', taken from Raine's *Wills and Inventories of the Northern Counties*

of England (1570). *The YHD* (s.v. *threnter*) furnishes us with evidence for its use in Yorkshire (1446-1564), and the *SND* identifies its immediate etymon as 'North. Mid.Eng. *trynter*, *thrwenter'* (s.v. *thrunter*). Yet, in none of these textual sources is the plural morpheme found as *-ys*/*-is*, only *-s.* The next lexeme in the entry, **Twynters** (< OE *twi-wintre*)—following the same pattern as **Trynters** although **Twynters** is 'chiefly northern', ostensibly in ModEng (Class 3)—does pluralise with *-is/-ys* in two instances amongst all of the *OED, MED, DSL,* and *YHD* records:[263] in the *DAR*, **twynterys** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404-5, 399), and in Douglas's (1513) translation of the *Æneid* (*twinteris*) (cf. *OED* (1916), s.v. *twinter*, adj. and n. (sense B. a)). In Latin *-er* nouns of the second declension would take *-is* as the dative/ablative plural (the base may also contract in the process (*liber/libris*)), so the occurrences analysed seem to adhere more closely with the widely spread ME morphological pattern, also in (Anglo-)French (see its Frenchified version *twyntour* in 1408's *Parl. Papers* (*OED* (1916), s.v. *twinter*, adj. and n.) rather than the Latin/NME paradigm. More variation can be traced across the other northern accounts and inventories I have examined as well as within the *DAR* for **Dynmontes**,[264] also **dynmoth** (pl.) (*DAR*, Rott. Instaur. 1465-6, 321; cf. Coldingham: *dinmouthis*, *dimnouthis*—possibly to be read with <n> rather than <u>, and *dynmothis*;[265] Jarrow: *dynmonthes* (x2) and Finchale: *dynmowthe3*), and **Potclyppez**, **potclyppys**, **potclyps**, and **potcleppes** (Monk-Wear.: *pottclypps*). No morphemes, therefore, seem to be linked to specific sets of words; rather, the choice might have been conditioned by the scribes' own morphological preferences. Both native lexical items and borrowings from languages other than French (see Section 3.1) have *-ez*, so a static conception of morphemes as being part of just one language is repeatedly refuted in these multilingual accounts.

[263] Cf. The occurrences of the word in Jarrow (*twynters* and *qwyntters*) and Finchale (*twynters*, *twynter3*, and *qwynters*).
[264] Labelled as ' Scottish and northern dialect.' in the *OED* (*1896*, s.v. *dinmont*, n.) and the *DSL*; not in the *MED*, s.v. *dinmŏuth* (n.).
[265] Note also the Latinised form *dinmotho* (Coldingham *Raciocinium domus de Coldingham factum pre fratrem Robertum de Walworth*, 1372-3, 69).

4.3.2 The French-origin article *ly*

Le, *lez*, and *les* are present before northern vocabulary as regularly as before other vernacular lexical items:[266] there is variation in the use of the French article (cf. *le gryndystan* and *gryndystan* (pl.), both in Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396), sometimes determined by the syntactic structure employed (cf. *le Straynyo*^{r}*clath* (Rott. Celer. 1460-61, 90) and *14 streynowrclobs* (Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 104); and, within the expected variability, there are also certain clusters of lexemes which tend to be preceded by the French article (see, e.g., *le* (or *del*) *Stan(e)bat(e)* in all its occurrences (x3, 1336-1416) and *le Stankart* and *del Stankart* in 560, Rott. Bursar. headless roll (c. 1357?)). In this section, nevertheless, I want to concentrate on the sparsely attested *ly* for its singularity and not having been discussed in the previous literature. The only information available for this variant is provided in the entry for *le* in the *DOST* (s.v. *Le, Lie,* art.): 'In the Sc. use the same form *le*, *lie* is found with both sing. and plur. nouns, the plur. *Lez* being appar. rare. The forms *ly*, *lie* are later and appar. simply Sc. variant spellings of the older *le*.' Scots characteristically adapted borrowings from French once they had been integrated into the language: Aitken (2015: 2) gives some illustrative examples of their peculiarities such as the forms *ulyie* (for *oil*), *spulyie* (for *spoil*), and *cunyie* (for *coin*). Although there are no formal descriptions of the changes that the vowel in the French article *le* (presumably a schwa) underwent in Northern Middle English or Scottish—since the word did not become a productive unit of the lexical repertoire of the language—it could be hypothesised that, after a prolonged use of the article in multilingual documents, it was subject to the same allographic variation (<ie>/<y>) as integrated borrowings independently of whether at some point in the history of Scottish this was an actualisation of a phonological change or not. The occurrences of *ly* in the *DAR* are from the 16th century (1541-2) except for an excerpt from the year 1443-4 cited in the introduction and which happens to illustrate the use of *ly* twice, 'pro ly horscolers et crupell et sadylbandys . . . pro factura de ly crowpels' (Fowler 1898: lvi). The two other sixteenth-century attestations, found in Miscellanea 1541-2, 742 are 'pro 2us diebus pens ly kyll' and 'etima pro ly armes for...'; the latter

[266] See Section 3.1.2.2 on the use of the French article in these accounts.

seems to be part of a larger code-switch into English (note the use of *for* instead of *pro*), nonetheless embedded in a multilingual (not monolingual) text. Further research is needed in order to better understand the motivations behind the use of *ly* (instead of *le*) within a multilingual context.

4.3.3 Northern vocabulary and lexicographical policies on dialects

As has been discussed in the Introduction, research into Middle English word geography started with Oakden's (1930) study of *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English* and Moore, Meech, and Whitehall's (1935) first article on *Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries*, which would be critically assessed by McIntosh (1973). In order to map out the geographical distribution of lexical items, ideally, a sizeable number of MSS localised to different geographical areas, but containing copies of the same text, should give clues about lexical reproduction and substitution or omission of geographically-restricted lexis. As Carrillo-Linares and Garrido-Anes (2012) illustrate, a large number of MS copies—even if they are not complete or perfect copies, that is, some passages might have been re-elaborated, deleted, or added—is ideal to trace dialectal and diachronic variation and any other factors involved in lexical changes; the other side of the coin of having many textual witnesses is their potentially complex textual history, which would require arranging them by branch of the stemma after having reconstructed the underlying phylogenetic tree (Carrillo-Linares and Garrido-Anes 2012: 147).

Classic works on Northern Middle English lexis include Kaiser (1937), Kristensson (1976), Hudson (1983), and Black (2000), but since the material of this dissertation also falls within the Early Modern period,[267] it is worth referring to Ruano-García's (2010) monograph, drawing on the *Salamanca Corpus* of literary texts (more on this corpus in the Introduction). He identifies a considerable *lacuna* in the study of regionalisms

[267] EModE is conventionally understood as the period encompassing 1500-1700 (following, e.g., Görlach (1991) and Ruano-García (2010)). Lass's (1999) alternative dates (1476-1776) would accommodate most of the *DAR* material without overlapping with the period covered by *LALME* (1350 to 1450), so this could be an alternative way of thinking about the fuzzy boundaries between LME and EModE.

during the EModE period, which are only occasionally mentioned in passing.[268] Despite Ruano-García's (2010) focus on literary sources, the methodological principles underpinning his analysis, as well as his discussion of the treatment of northern lexis in lexicographical works (produced both in the EModE itself and afterwards), are pertinent to this section. He devised a system of four categories: 'regional words that were apparently used in the North/Scotland', 'regional words that were not only used in the North/Scotland', 'regional words that were not seemingly used in the North', and 'words that were not apparently regional'. The *EDD*, the *OED*, and EModE dictionaries, if available, are his sources of information in order to decide whether a particular word is 'northern' or not; these lexicographical searches may unearth a few possible incongruities between the sources and those underlying such dictionaries: for instance, under the category of 'not seemingly used in the North' lexis, Ruano-García (2010: 228) gives *loon* 'land', *petticoat* 'a waistcoast', *rear* 'early', and *twire* 'to peer, peep' whose use in the edited sources available does not support a northern distribution. One may wonder if those lexical items might have been simply reproduced (albeit not really *adopted*) by northern writers or, perhaps more speculatively, if their presence in the north has been underestimated/overlooked in the past. Murray's (1933: xxviii) words on the *OED* policy echo powerfully in this context:

> Down to the Fifteenth century the language existed only in dialects, all of which had a literary standing: during this period, therefore, words and forms of all dialects are admitted on an equal footing into the Dictionary. Dialectal words and forms which occur since 1500 are not admitted, except when they continue the history of a word or sense once in general use, illustrate the history of a literary word, or have themselves a certain literary currency.

The *OED* exclusive use of printed sources (in contrast to., e.g., the *EDD*, which did rely on manuscript sources) might have distorted the dialectal dimension of many words not only in the EModE period but also in ME. As Ruano-García also underscores

[268] See Ruano-García (2010: 23-27) and the references cited therein for an overview of the main studies on EModE and dialectal variation.

(2010), 'the *OED* labels do not generally disambiguate the conflict existing between regional and archaic terms'. 'Obsolete or dialectal' ('Obs. or dial.') is not a helpful characterisation of lexis, which is dynamic: what is nowadays dialectal may not have been so in the past. *OED3* is, nevertheless, finetuning such labels (for example, the revised entry for *farm* v[1] (*OED* (2020)) states that it is 'now *rare* (*English regional* (chiefly *south midlands* and *south-western*) in later use)' while the previous version of *OED2* (1989) indicated that it was '*Obs.* exc. *dial.*'), so predictably the dialect labelling will be much more refined once *OED3* is completed.

There is indeed a historical connection between 'obsolete' and 'dialectal' vocabulary after the 16th century. As Nevalainen (1999: 347) states—see also Görlach's (1987) work—, many words that 'after 1500 fell out of use from the emerging standard appear in northern regional varieties and Scots'. Yet, it is often hard to tell whether a particular word was no longer in widespread circulation when there are vast temporal gaps in the attestations given in the *OED* (see some examples below), sometimes better bridged by the *MED*.

The *MED* policy on dialectal areas—as first put forward in the original *Plan* of the *MED* (1954)—was based on Moore, Meech, and Whitehall (1935). Kurath noted that the dialectal boundaries were not of particular significance for the purposes of the *OED* and that Moore, Meech, and Whitehall's (1935) isoglosses were 'not numerous enough for a definite scheme of the dialect areas of England for the period 1400-1450' (1954: 8a). Despite their limited nature, he acknowledged that they could be a good starting point for 'a convenient scheme for general orientation' (1954: 8a), which would consist of six main isoglosses and five broad dialect areas, namely, the North, East and West Midlands, Southwest, and Southeast.[269] Kuhn first adopted Kurath's policy until he refined it, incorporating more dialect labels for the variant spellings, particularly, from letters L and M onwards (see Lewis, Williams, and Miller 2007: 21). Kuhn also revised and enlarged the list of regional texts and manuscripts, creating further dialectal subdivisions (e.g. West Midland was divided into Southwest Midland and Northwest Midland); these changes were introduced in the *Plan and Bibliography*

[269] The isoglosses were the lines between Northern /ɑː/ and Midland /oː/ (*stan* and *ston*), northern *-es* and Southern *-en* (present plural), Midland *-en* and southern *-eth* (present plural), northern *-es* and southern *-eth* (3rd pers. prest. sing.), Western *hul* and Eastern *hil* (reflex of OE <y>), and Western *mon* and Eastern *man* (reflex of OE /a/ before a nasal).

Supplement I (1984: 1-3). Dialect labelling has been an increasing practice since 1984, always bearing in mind Kurath's view on the prominence of *texts* as representative of dialectal areas. The inevitable blurring of diatopic variation throughout the 400 years of the ME period led editors—including Kurath—to incorporate the descriptive adjective 'early' in an attempt to capture diachronic change. *LALME* appeared much too late for the *MED* to 'take full advantage of its data and observations' (Lewis, Williams, and Miller 2007: 22), but users are encouraged to contrast the mapping of texts in the Hyper-Bibliography of the *Middle English Compendium* (1998-) against *LALME* and *LAEME.*

For dialectal research, therefore, the *EDD* and the *DSL*—for NME and Scots—stand as two of the most comprehensive dictionaries to date. The *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, part of the *DSL*, had its inception in 1921 out of the extensive material (used and unused) inherited from the *OED* which had the potential of being pursed as projects for supplementary dictionaries. Craigie's initial plan was to cover the period up to 1700 since it was not clear to him whether the notion of Scots as a language was applicable from the 18th century; post-1700 Scots would subsequently become the subject of the later *Scottish National Dictionary* (*SND*).[270] The *DSL* often indicates the immediate and remote etymons of the word in question in square brackets, detailing if a Northern Middle English form could be its source (e.g. s.v. *Birk*, *Byrk*, n. '[Northern ME. *birk(e*, *byrk(e*, OE. *birc*, *byrc* str. fem. (also *birce*, *byrce* wk. fem., ME. *birch(e*, *byrche*).]'). Even if this may not necessarily be the case in some instances, such additional information proved useful in the data analysis of this chapter.

For its part, the work of the English Dialect Society, with the publication of numerous glossaries and hitherto unpublished documents, prepared the ground for the *EDD*.[271] The *EDD* mission was to record 'so far as is possible, the complete vocabulary of all English dialect words which are still in use or are known to have been in use at any time during the last two hundred years [i.e. the eighteenth and

[270] On the complete history of the *DOST* and what would become the *DSL*—in total, 22 volumes plus a supplement to the *SND* published in 2005—see Dareau (2002) and the 'History of DOST' at <dsl.ac.uk/our-publications/a-dictionary-of-the-older-scottish-tongue-dost/history-of-dost/>.

[271] See Ruano-García (2010: 163–172) for a very comprehensive discussion of the origins, sources, and policies of the *EDD*.

nineteenth centuries] in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales' (Wright 1898: v).[272] As Ruano-García (2010: 166) observes, the microstructure of the *EDD* (as regards chronological, stylistic, or geographical considerations) seems to resemble that of any other modern lexicographical work, although 'its regional bias makes it no doubt stray from other treatises in that the labels of spatial distribution have a preponderant role and are thus central to the dictionary as a whole'. The *EDD* data, from the late modern period, can only provide evidence for lexemes with a sustained local distribution, that is, words which have been employed in a particular region (or (or set of regions) throughout their history, a scenario which depends on a variety of both linguistic and extralinguistic factors (see some examples below). Problematic as this might seem, the narrower diachronic dimension in the *EDD* (two centuries) can be redressed if its use is complemented by historical dictionaries such as the *OED*, the *DSL*, and the *MED*. The *MED* sometimes includes eModE surviving dialectal forms as in 'Northern; cp. MnE dial. kevel.' *MED*, s.v. *kevel* (n.(2))). Collating the information in all of these dictionaries is, therefore, a *sine qua non* in drawing a more complete picture of the northern vocabulary in the *DAR*.

4.3.3.1 A new taxonomy

So far, the principles on which NME lexis has been identified have been orthography (Sections 1 and 2) and morphology (Section 3). Consistency should not be expected in medieval texts—especially if we consider the multilingual nature of these accounts, spanning centuries—and so the scribes' uses, moving back and forth between allegedly 'northern' and 'non-northern' graphemes or morphemes, are commonplace in late ME texts. The frequency of use, generally, indicates certain trends or general patterns, which give a sense of which forms were predominantly northern or not. I have attempted to prove how, even in texts whose base language is Medieval Latin, the northern provenance of the texts can be demonstrated, taking for granted that the frequency of northern features would be patently lower than in ME monolingual texts.

[272] A 'radiography' of dialect lexis was brought on by Orton and Wright's (1974) *A Word Geography of England*, drawing on Orton's *Survey of English Dialects*, which captured the speech as preserved in rural communities in the timeframe of 1950-1961.

Accordingly, the preliminary list of northern vocabulary in the *DAR* was classified into different categories: (1.a) vocabulary with northern vowels or consonants (I excluded the plural-marking morphemes in light of the widespread use of *-is/-ys* beyond northern vocabulary but *ly* could count); (1.b) vocabulary labelled as northern in one or several dictionaries (the *MED*, *OED*, and/or *DSL*), an assertion substantiated on textual grounds (i.e. northern exclusive attestations) and/or semantics (specifically northern concepts). This raises the first conundrum: if a lexical item was technical and/or was restricted to a few text types, how can we assert it is a northern word if the textual evidence adduced in dictionaries is small? The purpose of category (2) is precisely to compile vocabulary which may not necessarily have been northern taking into account that it only happens to be attested in very few edited ME texts (or even in just one single text); (3) is devoted to words which are northern or 'dialectal' only in the EModE period and/or in PDE; and (4) not northern: the *OED* and the *MED* may have labelled these words as 'Scottish'/'Northern' or the *DSL* as 'Northern ME', but there is no strong supporting evidence to contend it is really so. These categories are not clear-cut and some items may belong to two classes or sub-categories, so it is more fruitful to think of them as being placed on a continuum, as shall be illustrated in the following subsections. The aim with these classes is not to have all the lexis neatly divided but to devise a system in which the taxonomical pitfalls and lexicographic policies of the consulted dictionaries emerge. Dictionaries sometimes treat the dialectal dimension of lexical items (especially their spellings, as we have seen) without a clear justification, which has prevented me from lending too much weight to their considerations.

4.3.3.1.1 Class 1a

147 lexical items (for the individual numbers of occurrences, see Section 4.2) display regular northern vowels or consonants, that is, features that have been systematised and described as northern: <i>-digraphs rendering long vowels, <u> and <a> for etymological /oː/ and /ɑː/, absence of palatalisation, <qw> for <wh>, and <v> for <w>. The spelling developments of a further 17 lexical items are more controversially northern, in the sense that most do not seem to conform to larger northern-specific

patterns but are lexeme-dependent. If in section 4.2.1.2.1, I focused on *-bord/burd*, the first element of the compound *cupboard*, *cope* in **cope**bord (x4, Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 148) and **coppe**bordeclathe (Rott. Hostill. 1458-1459 (verso), 149), is, according to the *OED* ((1893), s.v. *cupboard*, n.), 'frequent in northern sources' and labelled as 'Northern ME *copburde* (15th c.), *-borde*' in the *DOST* (s.v. *Copburd(e, -buird(e*, n.). The *OED* (1893) traces *cup* to a combination of *cup* or/and † *cop*, n.[1] < Old Northumbrian *copp*?, 'a cup, vessel'; *cop* has cognates in ON *kopp-r*, MLG/MDu. *cop(p*), and ML *coppa*, so the <o> spellings may have potentially been reinforced by multiple inputs: ON—in the *MED*, the distribution of the localised <o> attestations seems to be northern at first and then also East Midland—, MLG/MDu. (see *kese* above), and/or ML. It is, therefore, not clear whether the ME word is a northern version of *cup*, a descendant of OE *copp*— which is first found in the Lindisfarne Gospels (*OED* (1893), s.v. † *cop*, n.[1])—or a combination of the two, influenced by a number of languages starting with ON and ending with ML. Its primary usage in the north of England and Scotland, especially in its earliest attestations during the ME period,[273] seems rather solid, which is why it is here included in this separate category. *Shole* in **shole** iryns (cf. 'β. chiefly northern ME–15 schole, ME, 15 schule, ME schoyll, schwll' (*OED* (1914), s.v. *shovel*, n.)) is a spelling not found in any non-northern texts (cf. *MED*, s.v. *shovel(e* (n.), which also lists (N) *shoil*, (N) *shoilles*).[274] **Tylde**stone (also **thill**stone) is 'β. Scottish and northern dialect ME–15 tild, tyld(e' (*OED* (1912), *tile*, n.[1]; cf. *MED*, s.v. *tīle-stōn* (n.)); and **Twel** (also **Twyle** and **Twyll**), according to the *OED* ((1916), s.v. *twill* | *tweel*, n.1), is a 'Northern and Scots [form] of *twĭle twilly* adj. and n.1' (< OE *twili*), although the *MED* (s.v. *twil(e* (n.)) indicates that the word is 'Chiefly N'.[275] Indeed, the *SND* maps out its progression southwards: 'Sc. form of n.Eng. dial. and now St. Eng. *twill*' (s.v. *tweel*, n., v.). Therefore, we can consider it an originally northern spelling variant, competing with the original native stem, and which spread to the Midlands.

---

[273] See also the *DOST Cope-burd(e, -buird(e*, n. and the later form *Capburd(e, -buird*, n. (f. attest.: 1596) possibly once the etymological vowel was not recognised anymore, and the word with <o> started to follow the same pattern of the reflex of /ɑː/ spelled with <a>.

[274] **Shole** iryns also occurs in its non-northern variant as **schovyl**yrnes (Rott. Bursar. 1412, 609).

[275] There are three non-northern attestations in the MED: *Boys Hist.Sandwich* (1375) from Kent, *Invent. Lytham in Chet*. (1446) from Lytham, Lancashire and Cox Churches Derb. (1466) from Derbyshire.

Hawkkes (Rott. Elemos. 1472, 247) is only labelled as 'Eng. regional' in the *OED* ((2016), s.v. *hack*, n.[1]), but this spelling is not in the *MED* or the *OED* except for two very late texts, Heslop's (1893) *Northumberland Words* and the *Jrnl. Royal Agric. Soc.* 9 ii. 505 (1848), the latter explaining the dialectal usage of the word: 'they [sc. turnips] are pulled up by a peculiar drag, or 'hack' as it is provincially called [N. Rid. Yorks.]'. It is my contention here that this spelling variant was a low-frequency northern variant in the late Middle English period and continued to be so diachronically.[276] Likewise, the geographical distribution of the word **yernyng** (Rott. Bursar. 1371-73, 577), classified in the *OED* as ' Scottish and chiefly northern' (see *OED* (2014), s.v. *yearning*, n.[2]) as well as the characteristic <y>-insertion could signify that it is a northern-specific graphematic variant,[277] which alternates with the most widely spread ones (the <e-> and <he-> spellings, are, on the whole, more numerous in the *DAR* (3 and 1, respectively)).

Especially Scottish forms are **cumouk** a 'Sc. Variant of *cammock* n.2' (*OED* (1893), s.v. *cummock*, n.), whose only attestation in the *OED* is from the 18th century, Burns's (1786) *Poems* (cf. the records for *hawkkes* above),[278] and **freynȝes clothez** (also **frenges**), classified as '15 Sc. *frenȝe*' (*OED* (1898), s.v. *fringe*, n.; not under *fringed*, adj.); although this spelling is not attested in the *MED* (s.v. *frenğe* (n.) and *frenğed* (ppl.)), the *DOST* does list the <ȝ> forms (s.v. *Frenȝe*, *Freinȝe*, n.) and describes the letter yogh as 'representing the voiced palatal approximant [j]. In the early Scots period it varied with <y>, <ȝh>, and <yh> but was the dominant spelling form during the Middle Scots period'.

Even if dictionaries label particular forms as 'northern', a scale of probability can sometimes be established: **strabrod** would be at the more secure end. Both *stra* and the compound itself are northern, on the basis of its diatopic usage (*OED* (1917), s.v. † *strabrod*, n.), hence belong to Class 1. The OE source, *strēaw*, from which the present-day *straw* derives presents no doubt, although the northern <a> might have been influenced by ON (cf. the OIcel cognate *strā*).[279] *Aughtyn* in **aughtyn**del seems to

[276] See *EDD*, s.v. *hauk* Lth. [Lothian] (Jam.) n.Cy. (K.); *hawk* Sc. (Jam.).
[277] Johnston (1997: 109) notes that /j/-insertion is first noticed in the ONE lexical group in late sixteenth-century Scots and would affect other words in the seventeenth century, which is historically very late if it is to be connected with the spelling in the *DAR*.
[278] Also in the *EDD*, s.v. *CAMMOCK*, sb.2 Sc. I.Ma. '*cummock* Sc.'; not in the *MED*.
[279] See *MED*, s.v. *strau* n. '(chiefly N) *strā'*, *OED* (1919), s.v. *straw*, n.[1] 'δ. ME–18 *northern stra*'.

be the 'northern form of *eighth*' perhaps also deriving from Scandinavian, ON **ahtandi, cp.* OIcel *āttandi, āttundi* (*MED*, s.v. *eightend* ord. num. and *OED* (1891) s.v.† *eightin*, adj.). The *DOST* (s.v. *Auchtene*, num. and num.) does not attribute ON input and gives the cognate OE *eahtaténe*, *-týne* from which the latterly northern *ahtene*, *auhtene* would descend. **Aughtyn**del as a compound attested in northern sources denotes 'a measure of capacity (the eighth part of some larger measure)', so it could be a northern-specific concept for a measure like those in Class 1b (see below). **Ryg**bandes (also **Rid**bandis (Rott. Celer. 1445-6, 86), probably meant to be read as *Rigbandis*) is also a northern and Scots alteration or variation of the lexical item *ridge* (*OED* (2010), s.v. *rig*, n.[1]).[280] Like *stra* and *aughtyn*, *ryg* may be partly derived from an earlier Scandinavian cognate (see the *OED* (2010), s.v. *rig*, n.[1], for the evidence on place-names). **Rangh**—more commonly in the *DAR*, **raunge** (x3)—can, likewise, be regarded as northern, following the *OED* ((2008) s.v. *range*, n.1 and adv.) and the *DOST* 'north. ME *rangh* (1446-7)' (s.v. *Reinge*, n.). Interestingly, the lemma in the *DOST* coincides with the third spelling found in the *DAR*, namely, **reynge**, not deemed northern in the *OED* or the *MED* (which does not make a geographical tagging of this OF-origin word at all) and which is probably not geographically specific but a different adaptation of the <a> preceding the nasal <n> (French *range*); and **schaffes** does not exemplify the devoicing of the final-position fricative because its OE etymon (*scēaf*) already contained a final-position <f>, so only the vowel, <a>, could be a potentially northern marker. OE <ea> probably had already started to smooth in OE, being simplified to /æ/ c. 1000 and later on progressively to /a/ (Jordan-Crook 1974: §58). Jordan-Crook divides the ME southern alternative spellings of <e, ea, ia, ie, i> (proof of a higher quality of the OE reflex (Hallqvist 1948: 9-46)) from the midland and northern <a>; in light of this convergence between the midland and the northern spelling, it is not evident to what extent the <a> can be so unequivocally equated to the north of England. Equally, **heltyrs/helthyr'** (also **holthyr'** and **heltrez**) allegedly exemplifies northern *heltir, heltyr(e* (midland and southern *halter*, *haltre*) according to the *DOST* (s.v. *Helter*, n.) and the *OED* ((1898), s.v. *halter*, n.[1]). In northern/Scot. *gres* 'grass' (*Gersum*, s.v. *gres*) or *seck* 'sack' input from ON has been claimed (Jordan-Crook 1974:

[280] See also *DOST*, s.v. *Rig, Ryg(g*, n. (cf. the absence of dialectal profiling in the *MED*, s.v. *riğğe* (n.)).

§32, remark 3), but in the case of OE *hælftre*, no ON cognate has been identified (cognates are only found in OHG, MDut, OLG, MLG). *Heltrers* is also recorded in Norfolk ((1417) J.Dernell in Nrf.Archaeol.15) and in a 'probably not East Anglian' text ((1440) *PParv.*(Hrl 221), *LALME* vol. 1. 110, but cf. the other three MSS of this text localised to Norfolk), the other attestations being from Northern English texts (cf. the *MED*, s.v. *halter* (n.(1)) and the cited *LALME* profiles), so one may wonder to what extent *helt-* is northern or, rather, northern/midland, conceivably influenced analogically by other words which were indeed affected by the ON stem. According to Jordan-Crook (1974: §32), WML and Kent kept a more fronted sound, predominantly spelled with <e> and also as <ea>, which would invalidate any alleged influence loosely connected to the former territory of the Danelaw. Since there was a diatopic and diachronic gradual transition to the <a> spelling, yielding numerous variants, the *helt-* can be regarded as a midland/northern feature but not strictly northern for the purposes of this database.

The treatment of other lexical items as 'northern' is similarly slippery: on *warke* in plachyng**warke**, the *OED* writes that it is 'is chiefly northern and north midlands', while neither the *MED* nor the *DSL* point out any particular correlation between the vowel, <a>, and a geographical area. In this respect, Jordan-Crook (1974: 234) states that 'while the change of *e* before tautosyllabic *r* to *a* in the preceding period was only rarely attested in Southumbrian (§ 67 [Jordan-Crook 1974: §67]), it now becomes general', implying there is nothing region-specific in the change from <er> to <ar>. Nonetheless, he adds below that 'in the North to be noted are *wark, warld* < *werk, wereld* §§66 remark 3, 73 remark 1)'. The form *werld*, according to Jordan-Crook (1974: 102), would [win] out in the North (later *warld*)', so there do not seem to be any formal criteria on which to predicate the northern character of the vowel, which is presented just as a possible later variant. Lastly in this sample of complex words from a taxonomical perspective, **schele** (Rott. Sacrist. 1376-7, 386) meaning 'a vessel' or some sort of container is flagged up as a northern form in the *MED* (a practice which is not very common in this dictionary, as has been demonstrated throughout this chapter), but the motivations behind the choice of this label are obscure. If the tendency in the north is toward absence of palatalisation (see Section 4.2.2.1), how can <sh> (which

usually represents ME /ʃ/) be interpreted as a northern variant?[281] The only text containing <sch> variant given in the *MED* is the *DAR* in just one attestation, so it is not clear why it is northern specific. No supporting <sh>/<sch> attestations are given in the *OED* ((1911) s.v. SKEEL, n.) either. After assessing these lexical items formally and empirically—through attestations—, only **cope**bord, **yernyng**, **strabrod**, **Ryg**bandes, and **rangh** could confidently be accommodated to Class 1a.

Class 1a items can also be classified under Class 2 (only attested in the north during at least the ME period (sometimes even beyond)), Class 3 (dialectal, also sometimes labelled 'obsolete' (*OED/EDD*) and northern in PDE/ModE), especially if we consider that these Class 1a items, most of the time, occur in both their northern and non-northern forms in the *DAR*, or more rarely both as Class 2 and 3. Below is a list of the secondary categories to which some of these Class 1a items can be ascribed, indicated in roman numerals:[282]

Class 1a III:[283] *bordnale* (lModE), *whatstane* (lModE whetstone (*EDD*))

Class 1a II: *Brercroke, burdclogges, courtladez, dorecrokez, fatstanes, Hukschaue, landmale, qwele harow, Ranettes, Rygbandes, stanbate, stanetrogh, Stankart, stanyng, Troughstane, wametowshaftes, Wandepenys, wharelwegges, Wodhire*

Class 1a II and III: *morterstanez*

18 items are attested exclusively in localised NME texts, whereas others (3) have a northern distribution in early/late Modern English; those lexemes do not necessarily preserve a consistent northern distribution from medieval times, but could have been narrowed in use to some diatopic varieties (mostly, Northern English or Scottish); only one of these words has a northern distribution in ME and is still 'chiefly Sc. and Eng. regional (northern)' (*OED* (2002) s.v. *mortar stone*, n.). Clearly, some Class 1b lexical items also overlap with those in Class 1a: **strabrod**, **stra** can be placed within Class 1a (formal features) and the whole compound could fit in Class 1b, dedicated to lexical items classified as northern in one or several dictionaries (the *MED*, *OED*, and/or *DSL*) for textual and/or semantic reasons. Yet, the key difference between Class 1a and

[281] *Skele(s)* with <sk> is also the most common spelling of this word in the *DAR.*

[282] I follow the citation system used below and only give the first attested spelling in the *DAR* to refer to the whole set.

[283] The notation II and III refers to the secondary classes (which express the same value as the general Class 2 and Class 3) under which Class 1a lexical items can be sub-classified.

Class 1b is the kind of evidence adduced: formal for Class 1a and semantic/based on attestations for Class 1b.

4.3.3.1.2 Class 1b

A preliminary question in this class (vocabulary labelled as northern in one or several dictionaries on a textual or semantic basis) is whether 'chiefly northern' vocabulary could be included in this category: the problem with the *OED* label 'Chiefly northern and Sc.' is that, even more problematically, it may describe the modern usage of the word, depending on the amount of data available (see, e.g. *OED* (1901) s.v. *keeling*, n.[1]; cf. *EDD*, s.v. *KEELING*, 'sb. Sc. Cum. Yks.'), the criterion for inclusion of Class 3 items. While the *DOST* (s.v. *irne*) may deem the variant form of *iron*, *yrn(e, irne* (a 1300) as 'ME. (chiefly north.)', the *OED* ((2013) *iron*, *n.*[1]) would broaden the syncopated (δ) forms to 'chiefly midland and northern', and the *MED* would not consider them northern at all. Another of the difficulties that arises in the survey of some of the dialectal lexical items of the *DAR* is, as can be expected, the fact they are not found in all of the dictionaries consulted: while the *OED* tends to be inclusive and carefully considers the *DAR* word-stock ever since the first edition of the *OED* was released, the *DSL* and the *EDD* are not always as comprehensive; even the *MED* (which covers 1100-1500) does not include some lexical items such as **drawkyng**, which is recorded quite late in the *OED*, from 1513 to 1855 ((1897) s.v. DRAWK, v.) although there is an antedating in the *DAR*, in an entry from the year 1475-6 (Rott. Bursar. 1475-6, 646). As it is also in the *DOST* (s.v. *Drawk*, v.), most likely, it is indeed a Northern Eng./Scottish lexical item. In other more problematic cases, when it has been impossible to prove they may be northern or rather are 'chiefly northern and midland', they have been included in the 'not northern' section. In fact, the *DSL* sometimes alleges that a given lexeme is northern ME although this information cannot be corroborated in other sources (e.g. **kittez**, *DOST*, s.v. *Kit*, n. 'North. ME. and e.m.E. *kit(t*, *kytt* (15th c.): cf. MDu. *kitte*, *kit* a jug, tankard, drinking vessel, made, according to Kilian, of strips of wood bound round with metal or wooden hoops.'; cf. *MED*, s.v. *kit(te* (n.(1)) and *OED* (1901), s.v. *kit*, n. with mostly, but not all, northern attestations in the *MED* and the *OED*).

What follows is a discussion of relatively secure northern words, denoting northern concepts or using idiosyncratic names distinct from their southern counterparts: for example, **hather** appears to have been 'originally confined to Scotland (with the contiguous part of the English Border); the Northern English equivalent, as in Yorkshire, etc., being *ling* < Norse' (*OED* (1898), s.v. *heather*, n.). The *DOST* traces its use in Scottish toponomy and seventeenth-century Northern English dialects, and acknowledges its uncertain origin (the *MED* suggests an unattested OE **hæddre* and the word *hæþ* as possible etymons). **Hollbarowe** is a variation of *hurlbarrow,* meaning 'a wheelbarrow' in Scotland and the north of England. **Gedde** seems to be the northern equivalent for the fish *Esox lucius*, 'the pike or luce' (see the *OED* attestations (1898), s.v. *ged*, n.1); and **Rigtoues** is a northern term (now obsolete) for 'a backband', 'a rope or strap that passes over a horse's back to be attached to the poles of a cart' (*OED* (2010), s.v. † *rigtow* n.). In complex lexical units such as **Rigtoues** and **plogh pattyl**, sometimes one of their smaller components and the lexical unit as a whole are dialectal (cf. *rig,* a Sc. and north. Eng. variant of *ridge*, and *pattle,* possibly arisen out of *paddle*, a term used in Scotland and the north of England). The main semantic fields with northern vocabulary are measures, payments, utensil or tools, recipients or containers, animals, practices (*-ing* forms), plants, geographical or spatial referents, and plants.[284]

In total, 66 lexical items are included in this Class 1b: according to the general policy of the *MED*, they are rarely singled out as northern (e.g. **whight** and **yetlyng** as 'N only');[285] on the other hand, the *OED* usually categorises them as ' Sc. and northern dialect.' or, more rarely, as 'Sc. Obsolete' (e.g. in **pargenynge**) or 'Now Sc. and/or Eng. regional' (**moldbredez**), depending on the diachronic usage of the word; the *DOST*, in its etymology section, gives them as 'north. ME' (e.g. 'north. ME. *moldebredd* (1343)' (*DOST*, s.v. *Muldebred*, n.) and sometimes specifies the period in which the lexeme could have made its way into Scotland (e.g. 'Late north. ME. *pargenynge* (1449-50), *pergenyng* (1489)'; first. attest. in the *DSL*: 1507; s.v. *(Pargening,) Pergenyng, -inyng,*

[284] I have not used the *Thesaurus* labels because they were not available for most of the vocabulary discussed.

[285] Note also *MED*'s reference to *sarking* as 'N' when only the form *sarking* is recorded in the *MED*, not what appears as the head-word, *serking*; see also 'pl. (N) *scrafishes'* (together with the digraphic spelling '(N) *scraifishe*') under *scrǎ-fish* (n.).

vbl.n.). In cases of doubt, where the *OED* and the *DOST* do not coincide on a particular classification—which can often be accounted for by the *OED* emphasis on present-day usage—the medieval and early modern attestations in the *MED* and *OED* often enabled me to settle the question to a certain extent. **Potclyppez** would suffice to illustrate a potential conflict on the basis of the word's records: the *OED* ((2006), s.v. *pot-clip*, n.) treats it as 'chiefly Sc. and Eng. regional (northern). Now hist. and rare', while the *DOST* (s.v. *(Pott-,) Pot-clip,* n.) provides the information below:

> Chiefly Sc. and Eng. regional (northern) [North. e.m.E. and late north. ME pot-clyp(p (1459–60), -clip(p (1567), also later Sc. (1734) and mod. north. Eng. dial., also north. e.m.E. pot-kylpe (1542), -kilpe, and mod. north Eng. dial. pot-kelp.]

Yet, if we peruse the *OED* and the *MED* attestations (*MED*, s.v. *pot(e* n.(1), sense 5.(b)), a northern distribution of the word survives up to the end of the 19th century, when it is also employed in a book by a writer from the other side of the Atlantic (Earle's (1898) *Home Life Colonial Days*). The word may have been in use in regions far beyond the north of England and Scotland before this date, but the entry for '*Pot cleps*, pot-hooks' in J. T. Brockett's *A Glossary of North Country Words, in use* (1825) seems to indicate it was perceived (even if it was a relic form or receding in use) as a northern word by the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Hence, we can conclude that it was a northern word at the time the *DAR* were produced.

Out of the 66 Class 1b lexical items, only 26 are in the *EDD*: a few preserved their northern distribution well into the Late Modern English period,[286] but most of them progressively advanced southwards from the North (including Ireland) into the West Midlands (e.g., *GRAIP*, sb. Sc. Irel. Nhb. Dur. Cum. and *PEND*, sb.1 and v.1 Sc. Irel. Cum.) until they became relatively widespread in both the north and the whole of the Midlands (e.g. *HURL*, 'v.1 and sb.3 Sc. Irel. n.Cy. Nhb. Dur. Cum. Lei. Also Cor. Also in form horl Nhb.1 [hərl, əl.].'—see the Northumbrian form *horl,* pronounced [əl], as in the *DAR* spelling **hollbarowe**—and *PEND*, sb.1 and v.1 Sc. Irel. Cum. Also in form *pen(n*

[286] *EDD*, s.v. *PERFURNISH*, v. Obs. Sc., *SCRAB*, sb.2 n.Cy. Nhb., *SCRAE*, sb.1 and adj. Sc., *SCULL*, sb.2 Obs. or obsol. Sc., *SOAM*, sb.1 Sc. Nhb. Dur., *SPRET*, sb.1 Sc. Nhb., *THILL*, sb.2 n.Cy. Nhb. Dur. Yks., and *WATER-GATE*, sb. Wm.1.

Sc. (Jam.) Uls. Cum.4). Therefore, the *EDD* allows us to gain insights into the diachronic spread of the northern vocabulary in the *DAR*, from late ME into late ModE.

Those 66 lexemes can be broadly sub-divided into a smaller group of northern semantic developments or local concepts (12 lexical items), mostly measures or quantity names (Table 5 lists the *DAR* attestations and their definitions in the *OED/ME*). All the occurrences of a given word in a text may not necessarily represent northern specific senses: **hoper** and **mele** also occur in their supralocal or more widely-spread sense of 'basket' and 'container, bucket', respectively.[287] Furthermore, there may also be semantic variation within the north of England and Scotland, as well as between the north and the south of England: for instance, a **boll** may contain 6 imperial bushels in Scotland, whereas in the north of England it could vary from being the 'old boll' (6 bushels) to the 'new boll' (2 bushels) (*OED* (1887), s.v. boll, n.2);[288] and **celdre** 'a dry measure of varying capacity' (*MED*, s.v. *chalder* (n.)); in Scotland, '16 bolls or 64 firlots of corn, [which make] nearly 12 quarters Winchester measure' and for lime and coal ' it varied from 32 to 64 imperial bushels', whereas in England, the term was probably 'introduced into the London market with coal' and equals a *chaldron* in reference to coal and lime (*OED* (1889), s.v. *chalder*, n.1). What exact meaning these words, **boll** and **celdre**, had in the production milieu of *DAR* is unknown. Some specialised senses have not been pinpointed until more recently: **hoper** for 'a measure for grain' is only in the *MED* (*MED*, s.v. *hopper(e* n. (c)), which indicates that at the time in which the *OED* entry was published, 1899, it was not apprehended as a separate meaning from the primary sense of the word (i.e. 'a basket') or, more specifically, in the context of a corn or other grinding mill, 'a receiver like an inverted pyramid or

[287] *Hoper* is used in the broader sense of 'basket' in **hopper** (Rott. Elemos. 1395-6, 214), **hoper** (Rott. Sacrist. 1376-7, 386) **hopir** (Rott. Sacrist. 1404-5, 400) and **hoppyr** (Rott. Hostill. 1454, 150) and *mele* is very widely employed (as the attestations are too numerous, I will only give the page numbers of the edition): **mele** (97), **meles** (39, 118, and 176), **mell** (244, 397), **mell.** (18, 76 (x2), and 244), **melle** (18, 33, and 76), **mellis** (23, 30, 41 (x2), 42, 51, 53, 69 (x2), 78, 97, and 105 (x2)), and **melys** (97, 99, 100, 104, 108, and 265).

[288] See the quotation for *mele* in the *MED*, s.v. *mēle* (n.(2)) also in the *OED* (2001), s.v. † *meal*, n.3) from Salzman's *Building in England* (1952) 150 in which this dialectal meaning becomes explicit: [At York lime was bought by the] mele [defined as containing 2 quarters and costing 10 d.] (1327).

cone, through which grain or anything to be ground passes into the mill' (first. attest.: c. 1405 (c.1390); cf. *OED* (1899), s.v. *boll*, n.2, 3).[289]

Table 5. Terms to express measures or quantity in the *DAR*.

DAR spellings	*OED*/*MED* definitions
boll, bollez	*OED* (1887), s.v. *boll*, n.2: A measure of capacity for grain, etc., used in Scotland and the north of England, containing in Scotland generally 6 imperial bushels, but in the north of England varying locally from the 'old boll' of 6 bushels to the 'new boll' of 2 bushels. Also a measure of weight, containing for flour 10 stone (= 140 pounds). (A very full table of its local values is given in *Old Country & Farming Words* (E.D.S. 1880: 168)).
cuttez	*OED* (1893), s.v. *cut*, n.2: 26. A certain quantity of yarn; properly containing 120 rounds of the legal reel, and 91 inches long. (Sc. and Eng. regional (northern)).
celdr., celdre, celdris	*OED* (1889), s.v. *chalder*, n.1: †2. In England = *chaldron* n., but for coal and lime varying in quantity from 32 to 40 bushels, according as the measure was stroked or heaped. (Apparently a northern word, introduced into the London market with coal.) Obsolete.
hop*er* 346, Maresc. Prioris 1392,[290] hopp*er*s 349, Maresc. Prioris 1392	*MED*, s.v. *hopper(e* n.: (c) a measure for grain
ken. ken', ken*nen*	*OED* (1901), s.v. *kenning*, n.1: northern dialect. A dry measure: = two pecks, or half a bushel; a vessel containing this quantity.
meel Rott. Sacrist. 1440, 410	*OED* (2001), s.v. † *meal*, n.3: 2. A measure of lime.

I shall now discuss northern-specific terms for payments. The stems *scat* and *penys* are productively combined to create larger units: on the one hand, *scat* + *haver* and *maltez* distinguish two kinds of tributes, of *haver* 'oats' (**Scathaver**) and of 'malt' (**Scatmaltez**); and *penys*, as a second base in combination with *reke* 'smoke' and *mesyng* (see their definitions in Table 6). **Mesyngpenys** is a term, according to the

[289] Note also the *-ez* plural morpheme in both **bollez** (< ON) and **cuttez** (of uncertain origin, possibly OE), the systematically abbreviated word **ken'/ken.** (an obscure derivation (perhaps from *canne*) surviving in MnE. dialects) which could function across languages.

[290] For the purposes of this section on vocabulary, which does not consider diachronic graphematic variation, I will only include the edition/MS reference to clarify in which specific roll(s) a given word is to be found, especially if it has multiple senses as is the case here and with **meel**. Otherwise, these details are not included to facilitate the reading of the text.

OED, only known from the accounts at the Abbey of Durham, whose origin is uncertain: it may be either an alternation of OE *metsung* 'feeding' + *penny* or a combination of *massing* + *penny* (the *OED* gives the later *mass-penny* for comparative purposes (*OED* (2000), s.v. † *massing-penny*, n.). In addition, a specific term for a rent book was created on the basis of **landmale** > **landmalebok**, only attested in the *DAR* (Rott. Bursar. 1416-7, 614). Specific semantic developments, as we have seen, might not be readily identified by dictionary makers, so the possibility of finding more northern specific items in the future remains; **stothes** meaning 'studs or knobs' is now an obsolete sense, which was only found in the north of England and Scotland, so we could either include it here or under Class 3 below[291] (cf. the *OED* (1917), s.v. *stooth*, n., sense †2, and the attest. from 1397 to 1540, and *MED*, s.v. *stǫ̆th(e* (n.), which only gives three Surtees Society publications as attestations; and the *DOST*, s.v. *Stuth*, n.1, which exclusively gives this sense). However, because some of them are explicitly explained or signalled even in the original MSS (e.g. 'vocati le landmalebok'), as much technical or specialised vocabulary is, they are more salient than other lexical items not preceded by this textual marker.

Table 6. Terms for payments or charges in the *DAR*.

DAR attestations	*OED*/*MED* definitions
landmale, also *landmalebok*	*OED* (1901), s.v. † *land-male* n.: Obsolete 'a reserved rent charged upon a piece of land by the chief lord of the fee, or a subsequent mesne owner' (Wright Provinc. Dict. 1857); also attributive *land-male-book*.
mesyngpenys, mesyngpenez, messyngpennys, messyngpennez, Mesinpenys	*OED* (2000), s.v. † *massing-penny* n.: Obsolete. A kind of payment or rent known from the account books of the medieval Abbey of Durham.
Rekepenys, Rekyngpenys, rokpen'	*OED* (2009), s.v *reek penny* n.: [compare Middle Low German rōkpenninc] Sc. and Eng. regional (northern) (now hist.) a tax paid to the clergy by each householder in a parish; cf. smoke-penny n.

[291] The fact that *stooth* is not explicitly labelled as exclusively northern in any of the aforementioned dictionaries (see, *DOST*, s.v. *Stuth* 'ME and e.m.E. (chiefly north.) *stoth(e* (1397), *stuth(e* (1428), *stud(de* (1555)) could make us think that it is a Class 3 lexical item. Yet, there is a clear semantic difference between sense 1 in the *OED* ((1917), s.v. *stooth*, n.) 'a post, an upright lath; now only one of the upright battens in a lath-and-plaster wall', found all around England, and the sense under which the *DAR* material is cited '†2. A stud or knob. Obsolete', which could potentially be due to a northern-specific development of *stooth* (usually spelled with <u>).

Scathaver	*MED*, s.v. *scat* n.: (b) in cpds.: ~ haver (malt, mele, etc.), a tributary rent of oats (malt, meal, etc.).
Scatmaltez, Scaltmaltes	[same sub-entry as above]

As can be expected from the context of the religious community of Durham Cathedral, vocabulary associated with manual labour and activities, instruments, tools, recipients, and the natural world (animals and plants) feature prominently in the northern vocabulary of the *DAR*, which is here listed by semantic field:

- INSTRUMENTS and TOOLS: **clypes** 'a pothook', **forhamer** 'a sledge-hammer', **grape**, meaning in the *DAR* both 'a three- or four-pronged fork used as a dung-fork or for digging.', and also, mostly likely, '(b) ?a trowel.' (*MED*, s.v. *grāpe* (n.(2))), **hollbarowe** 'a wheelbarrow', **kevell** 'a mason's hammer', **Potclyppez** (see **clypes**), **plogh pattyl** ' a plough paddle', **sarkyngnale** 'a nail for the wooden lining underneath a lead roof' (cf. *MED*, s.v. *serking* (n.)), **spekkes** 'strips or trimming of undressed hide used in making size' (cf. *OED* (1913), s.v. *speck*, n.2), **sprettis** 'a kind of rush, esp. the joint-leaved rush; coarse, reedy, or rush-like grass; a stalk or stem of this (*OED* (2019), s.v. *spret*, n. | *sprat*, n.3), **Spultes**, 'spouts', **Syle** 'a sive (esp. for milk)', **trammys** 'each of the two shafts of a cart or wagon, a hand-barrow, or a wheelbarrow' (*OED* (1914), s.v. *tram*, n.2), **whight** 'a farm utensil resembling a sieve in form, with a bottom of sheepskin or wood (unperforated), used for winnowing corn, also as a measure' (*OED* (1926), s.v. *weight*, n.2). Interestingly, plough-related vocabulary (**plogh pattyl** and see also **sok** 'ploughshare') gets further expanded in the subsection on mechanical parts or pieces with **moldbredez**, the 'moldboards of ploughs' and **moldebredclut** 'an iron piece protecting the moldboard'. Other terms include **rans** 'a bar for a cart', **Rigtoues** 'bands or ropes to pass over a horse's back', **stryndle** 'a trindle' (also present in the *DAR*),[292] and **syles** 'one of a pair of timbers rising from ground level and curving to meet at the top to form a roof

[292] *DAR*: **tryndyls** (*le*) (Rott. Elemos. 1456-7, 242), **tryndylles** (*le*) (Rott. Elemos. 1455-6, 241), **tryndylles** (*le*) (Rott. Elemos. 1508-9, 252), **Trindelis** (Rott. Bursar. c. 1343?, 543).

ridge, acting as the framework of the roofs and walls of a building, a cruck' (*OED* (1910), s.v. *sile*, n.1).

- PRACTICES: **drawkyng** 'saturating with moisture', **pargenynge** 'plastering', and **perfurnisyng** 'furnishing'.
- ANIMALS: **dinmouthis** 'male sheep between the first and second shearing', **spanyng** lambes 'weaning lambs', **Stottez** 'young castrated oxen', and **Trynters** 'three-winter old cattle or sheep'; and within animals:
  - FISH and *associated vocabulary:* **Gedde** 'the pike', **parys** young salmons 'between the stages of fry and smolt, distinguished by dark rounded patches evenly spaced along its sides, and formerly supposed to be a distinct species' (note that the first attest. in *OED* (2005), s.v. *parr*, n.1 is from 1771), **Scrafisse** 'crawfish', **sprottis** 'A kind of fish; ?a young turbot or halibut; sproutes de turbotes, turbot ~, turbotes sproutes.' (*MED*, s.v. *sprūt* (n.)). **Kippers** is a more problematic case hinging on its semantic interpretation: if we assume that *kippers* in the *DAR* indeed means 'a kippered fish (salmon, herring, etc.)' (the preferred sense also in the *MED* although the OED is doubtful of the *DAR* quotation belonging to that sense)[293] rather than 'a name given to the male salmon (or sea trout) during the spawning season', it could illustrate a northern-Scottish semantic development. According to the textual records in the *OED*, the quotes from the *DAR* are firstly followed by a passage from Defoe's (1769) *Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain* in which he says that the Scottish would preserve 'this Fish, by making it into what they call Kipper' and two 19th-century excerpts of works by Scottish writers (W. Scott's *Guy Mannering* (1815) and *T. Carlyle Let. 20 Dec*. in Coll. Lett. T. and J. W. Carlyle (1824)). None of the vernacular dictionaries consulted (*MED*, *OED*, and *DSL*) suggest a northern/Scottish distribution; yet the *EDD* (s.v. *KIPPER*, sb.1 and v.1, sense 2) traces this sense to Stirling (Sc.), Renfrew (Sc.), S.Sc., Lothian (Sc.), Selkirk (Sc.), Galloway (Sc.), and northern Yks.2. The dilemma here is, thus, the semantic interpretation of the term in the *DAR*, which could

[293] See *OED* ((1901), s.v. *kipper*, n.1 and adj.), sense A.2, 'It is doubtful whether the quots. from the Durham Acc. Rolls belong here; they may relate to the fish in sense A.1, without reference to any particular mode of preparation'.

be either of the two listed above (e.g., in Rott. Celer. 1333-4, 19, 'kyppres salsis' is preceded by a list of fish/seafood which consists of 'j salmone, playces, et lopsters'). It would be reasonable to include this lexical item in this Class if we stick to the sense of 'kippered fish'; otherwise, it would have to be put with Class 4 lexical items, 'not northern' (see *OED* (1901), s.v. *kipper*, n.1 and adj., sense A.1). Related to fish are the concepts of **Hemmyngyar** '?a fish trap made of netting' (MED, s.v. yǎre n. (c)), **yar** 'an enclosure in a river or pond for keeping fish; also, the barrier used to form such an enclosure' (*OED* (1921), s.v. *yair* | *yare*, n.), and **Polte Nett** 'a fishing net'.

- Another minor group of semantically-related vocabulary is RECIPIENTS: **rubbours** 'vessels of some kind'—the *MED* (.v. *rubbŏur* (n.)), remarks doubtfully that (?for transporting goods)'—, **keylfulis** 'the load of a *keel*, that is, "a flat-bottomed vessel, esp. of the kind used on the Tyne and Wear for the loading of colliers"' (*OED* (1901), s.v. keel, *n.*[2]) **Skyll'** 'a strong, shallow basket (now sometimes made of iron wire) of a circular or oval form and considerable size, used esp. for farm produce, fish, and fishing-lines' (*OED* (1911), s.v. *skull* | *scull*, n.2). Finally, miscellaneous lexical items connected with the natural world and human habitation and its parts are the following: **coddis** 'bolsters or bearings of an axle' (a sense only found in the North and possibly deriving from ON),[294] **hather** 'any plant of the genus *Erica*', **hope** in the sense of 'a narrow valley' (see also toponymic evidence), **Scrabbez** 'crab apples', **Cambe** 'a cam, a hedge-bank', two terms for *huts*, **schele** 'a hut' and **tofall** 'a hut or a lean-to', **hallandes** 'partition walls in a cottage', **lumbe** 'a chimney', **silorynge** 'a ceiling', spekkes 'a piece, strip, or trimming of undressed hide used in making size' (*OED* (1913), s.v. *speck*, n.2) and **Thyll** 'the thin stratum of fire-clay, etc. usually underlying a coal-seam; underclay; the floor or bottom of a seam of coal' (*OED* (1912), s.v. *thill*, n.2).

From an etymological viewpoint, OE and ON feature prominently in the make-up of these northern words: there are 10 OE-origin simplexes (**bollez**, **clypes**, **hope**, **hoper**,

[294] *OED* ((1891), s.v. *cod*, n.2) 'northern' and *MED* (s.v. *cod* (n.(1)), 'sense 4 is N'. More on this word in Section 4, Section 3.1.3 on ON-derived lexis.

meel, **Stottez**, **Trynters**, **whight**, **yar**, and **yetlyng**) and 13 complex lexical units, 9 made up OE+OE elements (**Hemmyngyar**, **moldbredez**, **Potclyppez**, **rokpen'**, **tofall**, **forhamer**, **sarkyngnale**, and **watergate**), one OE+OE+OE combination (**moldebredclut**), and 2 unknown/prob. OE+OE bases (**hollbarowe** and **mesyngpenys**) and the unattested OE/less likely MDut./MLG + OE **mudfyss**. Probably derived from OE (even if the source stem may not be extant) are **grape**, **hallandes**, **hather**, **kippers**, **schele**, **syles**, and **Thyll**. As for ON, there are 6 likely borrowings (**came**, **coddis**, **drawkyng**, **Gedde**, **Syle**, and **sowmes**), 1 ON + ON combination (**Scathaver**) and 4 ON + OE (or vice versa) combinations: **Scatmaltez** (OE + ON), **landmale** (OE + ON), **landmalebok** (OE + ON + OE), and **Rigtoues** (OE + ON). After ON, the largest contributing language is French: **pargenynge**, **perfurnisyng**, **rans**, **celdr.**, **Scrafisse** (with substitution of ME *fish* n. for OF *-vice*, *-visse* (cf. *MED*, s.v. *scrǎ-fish* (n.)), **silorynge**, **sok** (cf. ML *soccus*), and for **spanyng** lambes, the *OED* ((1913) s.v. *spane*, v.) suggests French or MLG/MDut. as possible sources but the *MED* (s.v. *spāning*(e (ger.)) only MLG/MDut. There are two further likely borrowings from MDut/MLG: **Spowte** and **trammys** (a word of difficult history first used in Scots c. 1500). Finally, a notable number of these northern lexemes (9) are of unknown, 'obscure' or unclear origin: **dinmouthis**, **hather**, **ken'**, **kevel**, **lumbe** (according to the *OED* (1903), s.v. *lum*, n.' possibly an application of Old French lum light'; also cf. Welsh *llumon* 'chimney'), **Skyll'** (perhaps OF, *DOST*, s.v. *Scul(l, Skul(l,* n.[1]), **spekkes**, **sprettis**, and **stryndle** (a variation of *trindle,* corresponding to MHG *trindel*).

Terms for measures, payments, instruments, and tools make up the largest part of the *DAR* northern-specific vocabulary in Class 1. Most of these are of native origin, followed by borrowings from ON and French. In the identification of northern lexis, the presence of regular northern features (vowels and consonants), idiosyncratic semantic developments, and attestations are primary. Nonetheless, textual evidence cannot be the sole parameter for a word to be considered geographically specific to the north, as Class 2 items will demonstrate.

4.3.3.1.3 Class 2

With 126 lexical items, Class 2 (not necessarily northern but exclusively attested in northern texts during the ME period) represents a large group in this survey. For 70 of them the *MED* and/or the *OED* only provides evidence of their use in the *DAR*, either through just one quotation (e.g. **Betynghamyrs, courtsyngyls, dorecrokez, fot ax**, and **Fysshlardar**) or several illustrative citations from these Durham Account rolls (e.g**. Avergarner, Buthavant, Egge Silver, fischors, frayns,** and **medowethak**). The overwhelming majority, 61 out of 70, are compounds or combining forms (e.g. **gelypoke, helterschaftes, lamcote, louerstringes, overcorde, penyhennis, persouryrnes, Pulterpanyers,** and **Sandpoke**) and only 10 are simplexes or uncompounded words (**Buthavant, floryng,**[295] **frayns, Hastiller, hausynges, Saretree, scakar, skers, spendement**, and **Totenays**). Their technical or specialised nature may explain why they are not attested in any other edited collections (e.g. see **walkstoke** 'a trough in which cloth is fulled in a fulling mill' (*MED*, s.v. *walk-stoke* (n.)) or, perhaps more speculatively, because an equivalent paraphrase in Medieval Latin was preferred in the vocabulary of multilingual administrative texts: compare **Waxhous** 'a building in a monastery where wax candles were made' (*OED* (1926), s.v. † *wax-house* n.; cf. *MED*, s.v. *wax-hŏus* (n.)) (391, Rott. Sacrist. 1385-6 and **Waxhouse** (Rott. Sacrist. 1472-3, 413)), both occurrences preceded by *le*) and *domum cream* (Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396); and **Saretree** (Rott. Camer. 1447-8, 186, also **Sarteryn** (Rott. Bursar. 1429-30, 710)) 'a tailor's workshop' and ML *sartrino* (x2, 1310-1415) and *sartrina* (x3, 1324-1348).[296] Allegedly, two of these items are not bona fide 'English': **Buthavant**, 'an article of furniture', possibly coming from French (*MED*, s.v. *botevaunt* (n.); not in the *AND*) and **spendement** (cf. AL *spendimentum*) 'a monastic treasury' (*MED*, s.v. *spendement* (n.)) are not in the *OED*, only in the *MED*, the latter having a more flexible approach to what constitutes *English* vocabulary in multilingual Britain.

The definition of some of these technical terms may not be very transparent from context, as can be seen in the somewhat speculative *MED* definitions (*OED2* does not

[295] There is only one attestation of this word in the *MED* (s.v. *flǭring* (ger.)) and three later (1632-1866) clearly not dialectal quotations in the *OED* ((1897) s.v. *flooring*, n.) so this is an evident case of a non-northern word.
[296] On the widespread use of the ML forms, see the *DMLBS* (s.v. *sartrina*, *sartrinum*).

lemmatise or define the following lexical units): **crabbelok** '?a lock on some kind of hoisting machine' (*MED*, s.v. *crabbe-lok* (n.)), **gliders** '?one of the runners on a sledge used in coal pits' (*MED*, s.v. *glīder* (n.)), or **Hastiller** '?a building where roasting spits are stored, spit house' (*MED*, s.v. *hastillĕr* (n.)). In the revised *OED* entries, tentative definitions are introduced by 'perhaps': see, e.g., **polepike** 'obsolete rare (perhaps) a spike fixed to the end of a pole, or a long-handled pick, a pikestaff' (*OED* (2006), s.v. † *polepike* n.) and **pyntracez** 'obsolete a part of a horse's harness, (perhaps) a pin attaching a trace to the collar' (*OED* (2006), s.v. † *pintrace* n.). Generally speaking, all these '*DAR*-only' lexical items are not labelled as northern/Scottish or dialectal except for an element of the compounds or combining forms: *stank* in **Stank**hede 'a pond or pool. Also a ditch or dyke of slowly-moving water, a moat. Now Sc. and dialect' (*OED* (1915), s.v. *stank*, n.1), and *stower* in dalbyng**stowres** 'Obsolete exc. dialect' (for all its senses (cf. *OED* (1917), s.v. *stower*, n.1)).

44 lexical items are recorded in northern medieval—and sometimes early modern—texts in the *MED* and/or the *OED* (which, apart from administrative documents, may also include northern copies of literary manuscripts, glossaries, etc.). Among them, the Surtees Society publications (see Section 1.3 for details) feed the *MED* and the *OED* with quotations for **pomple**, **fleme**, **helterschaftes**, **heltyrreyns**, **blandcorne** (cf. *OED* quotations from ?1523 to 1855), **knoll**, **bednale fiss'** (only present in the *MED*), and **eche** (only in the *MED*). In 9 cases the temporal gap between the (northern) medieval and (not necessarily) early modern attestations is wide enough to potentially indicate the spread of a lexeme from the north to other territories.[297] Table 7 lists these 9 lexical items along with the diachronic 'leaps' from the *MED* to the *OED* or within the *OED*:[298] **burningwod** (1411 ~ 1642), **colfysch** (1337 ~ 1524), **Fisshebate** (1347 ~ 1792), **fruth'** (1446 ~ 1605), **ernyng** (1348 ~ 1615), **payllbordes** (1484 ~ 1682), **rowthselyn** (1307 ~ 1771), **Souuelpenys** (1461 ~ 1556), and **stendez** (1480 ~ 1688). All these items are documented in the north up to approximately the second date given in

[297] It is also worth stressing that lack of textual coverage over more than a century is not unusual at all in dictionaries, although this has substantial implications for the purposes of tracing potentially northern vocabulary according to the records in the *MED* (or the early records of the *OED*) and the later *OED* attestations.

[298] Since the date of occurrence does not affect the tracing of these not necessarily northern words, I will only include the different spellings in the *DAR*.

parentheses, which exposes the flaws of adopting an approach to northern Middle English lexis exclusively based on the edited (mostly, monolingual) records of the word.

Additionally, I have also included any passages which can be broadly identified with a specific region: the first attestation of *fish-boat* in the *OED* happens to come from a text written by Scottish historian (John Spalding), but this quotation on its own is not a substantial enough piece of evidence to claim it is a northern-specific concept (note that *fish-boat* is not in the *DSL*, so it is not possible to compare its historical development on the Scottish side). As for *earning,* quotations from the years 1857 (Douglas's *Hist. Ferryden*) and 1868 (J. C. Atkinson's *Gloss. Cleveland Dial*.) could give the impression that *earning* might have been northern at least during the 19th century (see *SND*, s.v. *earnin*, *earning*, vbl.n.); yet, the 1615 attestation in the *OED*—which creates the historical discontinuity of the northern distribution of the word—is not localised, and the immediately following one is from Wodds and Doggerybaw's (1995) *Lincolnshire Dialect Dictionary*. This would confirm the *OED* statement on *earning,* that is, that it is simply 'regional in later use' (*OED* (2015), s.v. *earning*, n.2); *stend* is in Heslop's (1892) *Northumberland Words*, but its inclusion in this lexicographical work *per se* is not diagnostic of northernness in earlier or later periods than the nineteenth century. Heslop's (1892) glossary is based on years of *in situ* observation in the area which corresponded to Northumberland and 'that portion of the county of Durham lying on the right bank of the river Tyne from Wylam to Jarrow' (Heslop 1892: vii). He gives the district(s) in which a given word or phrase was heard (xxv) and collated his own collection with Brockett's (1846) *Glossary of North-Country Words.*

Table 7. Gaps between the medieval and modern attestations of the *DAR* Class 2 material (within the *OED* or between the *MED* and the *OED*).

DAR forms	*OED* and/or *MED* quotations
burningwod	*MED*, s.v. *bren(ning)-wŏd*, *-wǭd,* n.: (1411) in Rec.B.Nottingham 2 86: j barow et brenwod, ij d. (c1457) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.99 277: In j fuder de burningwod. *OED* (1888), s.v. *burning-wood* n. 1642 Accts. St. John's Hosp., Canterbury (Canterbury Cathedral Archives: CCA-U13/5) For fellinge..ashes and other burning wood vjs.

colfysch, kolfysch	*OED* (2013), s.v. *coalfish*, n.: 1337-8 in J. T. Fowler Extracts Acct. Rolls Abbey of Durham (1898) I. 34 (*MED*) ccc Stokfysch et Schrafysch, et 60 Colfysch. 1524-30 in N. S. B. Gras Early Eng. Customs Syst. (1918) v. 194 Pro uno centum cole fysch ii d.
Fisshebate	*MED*, s.v. *fish*, n.: (1347-8) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.100546 : In emendacione del Stanebate et del Fisshebate. (1446) Doc.Coldingham in Sur.Soc.12app.lxxxiv : iiij fysbottis. *OED* (1896), s.v. *fish-boat* n.: 1792 Spalding's Hist. Troubles Scotl. (new ed.) I. 111 18 gentlemen..passing the water of Findorn in a fish-boat [c1650 (1850) ferry-boat], were pitifully drowned. [1919 citation]
fruth'	*MED*, s.v. *frith*, n.(2): (c) (1384) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.103 593: Item 1 laboranti apud Rilly pro Fruth' extrahendis, 18d. (1391) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.99 50: In frethys, 6d. In girthys, 3d. In flokis, 3d. (1429) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.99 60: Item in fridys, 6d. Item in cirpis, 6d. *OED* (1898), s.v. *frith*, n.2: 1605 Rec. Chippenham 194 in Wilts [Wiltshire] Gloss. (1893) (at cited word) Itm to James Smalwood for an Acre and halfe of hedginge frith out of Heywood..Item for felling the same frith. 1631 G. Markham Inrichm. Weald of Kent (1668) ii. i. 2 It will grow to frith or wood, if it be not continually..laboured with the plough. [1699 cite and two from the year 1670 and the same text] 1796 W. Marshall Provincialisms W. Devonshire in Rural Econ. W. Eng. I. 326 Frith, brushwood. [Three further citations from 1811, 1836, and 1863]
ernyng, ernyng' Erthening' [transmission error acc. to the OED], hernyng, herdyng	*OED* (2015), s.v. *earning*, n.2: c1330 in J. T. Fowler Extracts Acct. Rolls Abbey of Durham (1899) II. 518 In Erthening' [read Erning], Cheseclathe, Meles, et Skeles emp. pro Deyria de Beaurep. 1347-8 in J. T. Fowler Extracts Acct. Rolls Abbey of Durham (1899) II. 545 (MED) In ernyng et cheseclathis et vasis emptis pro dayaria. 1615 G. Markham Eng. House-wife (1668) ii. vi. 149 When your Runnet or Earning is fit to be used. [1676, 1727, 1778 citations] 1857 A. Douglas Hist. Ferryden (ed. 2) 120 Ye've drucken my haill bottle o' earnin I bocht fae Mr Addison just yesterday. 1868 J. C. Atkinson Gloss. Cleveland Dial. Earning, rennet, the substance which is used to turn or curdle milk. 1995 J. M. Sims-Kimbrey Wodds & Doggerybaw: Lincs. Dial. Dict. 90/2 Earnings, the rennet used for 'turning' and separating milk into curds and whey in order to make cheese.

payllbordes palebordes, paylbordes	OED (2005), s.v. *pale board* n.: 1483-4 in J. T. Fowler Extracts Acct. Rolls Abbey of Durham (1899) II. 98 12 plaustratorum de lez payllbordes. 1682 in Jrnl. Statist. Soc. (1858) 21 394/2 100 pale boards, 12s.; 2 horse brigs with gates, 13s. 4d. [1986 quotation]
rowthselyn	*MED*, s.v. *rough(e*, adj. 3. (a) ~ *sele*: (1306-7) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.100 505: In 11 furur. de Rowthselyn, 66 s. *OED* (2011), s.v. *rough seal*, n.: 1771 T. Pennant Synopsis Quadrupeds 341 Rough [Seal]... Perhaps what our Newfoundland Seal-hunters call Square Phipper. [1866 and 1970 citations]
Souuelpenys, Soulepen'	*MED,* s.v. *sŏuel*, n.(2) (b) ~ *peni* (*silver*): [Latest record in the *MED*]: (1460-61) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.99 90: Liberaciones: Et Johanni Stele, Cantori, pro suo soulesilver per annum ut patet per Indentur, 26 s. 8 d. *OED* (2012), s.v. † *soul pence* n.: a1556 R. Chancellor in R. Hakluyt Princ. Navigations (1598) I. 242 They bee great offerers of Candles, and sometimes of money, which wee call in England, Soule pense. [1847 and 1870 citations] 1876 J. Porter Hist. Fylde Lancs. iv. 107 The youths of Marton..on the day of the ancient festival solicited money, under the name of Soul-pence, from their neighbours.
stendez	*MED*, s.v. *stend*, n.: (1480-81) Acc.R.Dur.in Sur.Soc.99 97: Slaughterhous..iij capistra, v stendez, ij credyls. *OED* (1916), s.v. *stend*, n.1: 1481 in J. T. Fowler Extracts Acct. Rolls Abbey of Durham (1898) I. 97 Slaughterhous..j fleshaxe, j dresyng knyfe, iij capistra, v stendez. 1688 R. Holme Acad. Armory iii. 313/1 Butchers Instruments..A Stan. 1894 R. O. Heslop Northumberland Words Stend.

More generally, one of these 44 lexical items is explicitly considered 'northern' by the *DOST* (s.v. *Lempet*, n. 'North. ME. (1312) and e.m.E. (1577) *lempet*'). In the *MED* there is only one attestation (from the *DAR*) and in the *OED*, despite the two northern attestations from 1312-1313 and c. 1560 (the other non-northern attestations are from 1602 onwards), there is no mention of the possible northern character of the word at first. The *EDD*, on the contrary, records it as Scottish (*EDD*, s.v. *LIMPET*, sb. 'Sc. Also in forms lempad Cai.1; lempit Sh.I.'), which remains a highly likely possibility. **Oxclose** is the only lexeme not included in the *MED* (neither is it in the *DSL*); in the *OED*, its first attestation is from 1546 (*Certificates Chantries County of York* edited by

W. Page (1895)), and its second and last one given is from Waterton's (1871) *Essays on natural history*, so, again, it is impossible to pinpoint any dialectal patterns. Similarly, a number of lexical items include mostly northern attestations and some which are unlocalised and, therefore, may not be northern: for example, **petehous** (all publications by the Surtees Society + (1395) *Inquis.Miscel*.(PRO)) and **grotsilver** (3 from the *DAR* and one unlocalised: c1460(?c1435) *Lydg.Let.Glo.*(Hrl 2255)). Two recurrent references are the *Mayer Nominale* (c.1500) ((*LALME*: vol. 1. 161. 'Language possibly of Lincs.') and the *Catholicon Anglicum* (*Cath. Angl.*) (*olim* Lord Monson MS 168 (whereabouts unknown)). *Nominales* were word-lists with a focus on *nouns* (hence, their titles) written in Latin and the vernacular.[299] The *Mayer Nominale*, which belonged to a schoolmaster in Liverpool (Wright and Wülcker 1884, Stein 1985, Hüllen 2006), is one of the most extensive glossaries from the fifteenth century (it has seven *capitula* and numerous sub-divisions), and it cites many of the lexical items in the *DAR*. The *eLALME* linguistic information about this text is quite scarce, the only comment being 'Language possibly of Lincs. Note that *eskyng*, p. 732, is recorded only from Lincs in modern dialect: see *EDD*, and *MED*, s.v. 'esking'' (where no ME example other than that from *Nominale* is given). The many northern words attested in the *Nominale* as well as in other publications by the Surtees Society and/or other texts localised to the North may favour the hypothesis that the dialect represented in this work is that of North Lincolnshire, which shares many features with northern dialects. From a lexical viewpoint, the presence of just a single lexical item is not sufficient to reach any valid conclusions. The *Nominale* could have been a text of the East Midlands under the influence of lexis mostly attested in the North which might have spread southwards by c. 1500; or the purely lexicographical aim of the text may have led the compiler to put together words coming from different dialect traditions, thus creating a more hybrid dialectal text. A similar scenario could be speculated about the *Cath. Angl.*, whose linguistic profile has not been identified. This hypothesis is here tentatively formulated on the basis of the words **bygbern** (1 from the *DAR* + *Nominale*), **tedyr** (6 Surtees (incl. 4 *DAR*), *Cath.Angl*., and *Nominale*), **Rosell** (2 Newcastle, 1 *DAR* + *Nominale*), **slot**—also in yren**slottes**—(some unlocalised texts in both the *MED* and the *OED* although most

[299] See Stein (1985) on bilingual *adiectivales* and *verbales* and Hüllen (2006: 66-68) on topics covered in *nominales* and the *Mayer Nominale* (68-77), in particular.

are northern throughout the period covered (1300-1874) + *Cath.Angl*. and *Nominale*),[300] and **Weyscill** (4 northern (Lancs., 3 Surtees (2 *DAR* and 1 Finchale) + *Cath.Angl*.), plus some more secure northern words (Class 1b): apart from the northern attestations, the records for **grape**, **sok**, **Scrafisse**, **spanyng**, and **whight** (all Class 1b) cite the *Cath.Angl.* and for **Syle** both the *Cath.Angl* + *Nominale*. A counterexample of this could be **myour**, which occurs in Surtees Society publications (*DAR*, Jarrow, and York (1316-1459)) but also in an even larger number of *Nominales*.[301] The *Roy.17.C.17 Nominale* is securely localised to Lincolnshire (*LALME*, vol. 1. 115)—the *Lndsb.Nominale* is linked to Lord Londesborough (whereabouts unknown)—so the lexis just listed may not have been originally northern and have spread southwards (although a northern distribution is tentatively put forward in the *DOST* entry, s.v. *My-, Miour*, n. '(? chiefly or only north.)' and in the *OED* ((2003), s.v. † *myour*, n.) 'the word is chiefly attested in Northern Middle English and Scots texts') but already be common to several Middle English dialects. Further research needs to be conducted in order to either disprove any of the aforementioned possibilities or to substantiate them. All in all, attestations are a key component in our understanding of dialect vocabulary and how it may operate, although they are by no means conclusive. Mobility, genre conventions, and other factors might have ostensibly influenced the choice of vocabulary not part of the expected scribe's geographical repertoire.

4.3.3.1.4 Class 3

While Class 2 lexical items might be claimed to be northern in Middle English to some extent, Class 3 vocabulary should be understood as northern in later periods of the language. It is worth stressing that some of the items discussed in the section on Class 1a/b could also fall within this category, for instance, **Morkokes** (**murkokes**) 'Now Sc. and Eng. regional (northern)' (*OED* (2002), s.v. *moorcock*, n.); but because they already had a mostly northern distribution during the Middle English period (at least as far as

[300] Also in another *nominale*—cited in the *MED* (s.v. *slot* n.(1))—in which several possible vernacular words are given: 'c1350 Cmb.Ee.4.20.Nominale (Cmb Ee.4.20)470: Sere, veroil, et cerrure: Barre, slot, and stapul'.

[301] *Cath.Angl*., *Mayer Nominale*, a1425 *Roy.17.C.17 Nominale* (Roy 17.C.17), and ?a1500 *Lndsb.Nominale* (Lndsb).

the northern variants are concerned), they are included under Class 1. The *OED* also classifies *watergate* as 'English regional (northern) and Scottish' (*OED* (2015), s.v. *watergate*, n.[1]), but the *EDD* presents a different picture (*WATER-GATE*, sb. 'Wm.1'). As has been pointed out earlier (cf. Görlach 1987; Nevalainen 1999), after the emergence of the standard, the survival of ME vocabulary in Northern English and Scottish after 1500 was particularly noticeable. Out of the 25 lexical items that belong to this group, 8 are, according to the *DOST*, also 'North ME and e.ME.' (**hespes**, **Hogges**, **lambr'** beedes, **martes**, **mell**, **morehennes**, **pepir qwerns**, and **trystez**).[302] The *OED* and, mainly, the *MED* citations for all these lexemes seem to contradict a northern distribution during the Middle English period. Only later on in time do these lexical items seem to be northern specific, as the *DSL* elucidates in the entries for **hog** 'current in later and mod. Eng. local use' (*DOST*, s.v. *Hog*, *Hogg*, n.) and **martes** 'also in the mod. Sc. and north. Eng. dial.' (*DOST*, s.v. *Mart*, n.[1]).

Another case in point is **staggis**, 'chiefly N' in the sense (b) of the *MED* 'a young male horse' (*MED*, s.v. *stagge* (n.)) and 2 of the *OED* 'northern and Sc.' (*OED* (1915), s.v. stag, n.1). The EDD details the 'var. dial. and slang uses in Sc. Irel. Eng. Aus. and Amer.', quoting James (1808) to denote 'one that has not been broken for riding nor employed in working' (Sc.) and 'N.Cy.1 Nhb.1 Applied to a year's old stallion'. Even if the modern distribution of the word is northern, the word was not necessarily northern in the Middle Ages: out of the five quotations in the *DMLBS* (s.v. *staggus*, *staggis* [ME *stag(ge)*], sense 2), three are from northern accounts (*DAR* and *Finchale* (x2)) and the other two are not (*KR* Ac (Accounts, Various (Hen. II–), E 101, year 1295) and *MinAc* 1090/3 r. 1 (Ministers' and receivers' Accounts, Year 1337)).

In three instances, **almary**, **clewes**, and **leeching**, the *DSL* details the word's development through time: '[*almary*] appears in ME. towards the end of the 14th cent., and remained in common use in various forms down to the 17th. It survives, though now obsolescent, in Sc. and northern Eng. dial. in the forms *aumery*, *aumry*, *aumbry* or *ambry*' (*DOST*, s.v. *Almery, Ambry*, n.); *clewes* is 'in Sc. common after 1570, prob. from English' (*DOST*, s.v. *Clew*, n.2); and *leeching* 'after the 15th c. appar. only

[302] Note that the other Class 3 items are not equally treated in the *DOST*, see, e.g. *Doore-, Dore-cheek*, n. 'e.m.E. *dorecheke* (1535)' and *Fraucht*, n. 'ME. *fraght, fraught, frauȝte, frauht* (c 1330), MDu. and MLG. *vracht*.'

Sc.' (DOST, s.v. *leching*, *leiching*). The *OED* or *EDD* do seem to confirm these later developments: the sense 3a of *aumbry* (*OED* (2012), s.v. *aumbry*, n.), the one found in the *DAR*, 'a place for storing food' is 'now rare (chiefly Scottish and English regional (northern) in later use)'; *clew*, 'a ball of thread or yarn', is 'the regular name in Scotland and north of England' (*OED* (1889), s.v. *clew*, n., 2.a); and *leech* is 'Obs. Sc.' (*EDD*, s.v. *LEECH*, v. and sb.4). In addition to *leech,* 8 lexical items were northern at the time of compilation of this dialect dictionary: the form **flytt** (*EDD*, s.v. *FLIT*, *v.* and sb.1 'Sc.'), **fraght** (*EDD*, s.v. *FRAUGHT*, sb. and v. 'Sc.'), **hespes** (*EDD*, s.v. *HASP*, sb.2 'Sc.'), **hog** (note that the *EDD* (s.v. *HOG*, sb.1 and v.1) indicates it has different dialect uses in Scotland, Ireland, and England, and quotes James (1808) to indicate its Scottish usage,[303] which aligns with the one found in the *DAR*), **keling** (*EDD*, s.v. *KEELING*, sb. 'Sc. Cum. Yks.'), **martes** (*EDD*, s.v. *MART*, sb.2 'Sc. Nhb. Dur. Cum.'), **spald** (*EDD*, s.v. *SPALD*, sb.1 Sc. 'Nhb.'), and **tolbothe** ('tolbooth Sc.', *EDD*, s.v. *TOLL-BOOTH*, sb. and v.).

Since the *OED* provides less dialectal information than the *EDD*, 9 lexical items that were labelled as northern/chiefly northern in the *OED* were tentatively excluded from this section.[304] Only the *OED* revised entries (amounting only to 4) could give a more updated view on the dialect distribution of some of these lexical items:[305] **mell** (*OED* (2001), s.v. *mell*, n.1) 'now Sc., Eng. regional (northern), and Irish English', **nattis** (*OED* (2003), s.v. *nat*, n.1) 'now Eng. regional (northern)', **pepir qwerns** (*OED* (2005), s.v. *pepper-quern*, n.) 'now rare (Sc. and Eng. regional (northern)', and **ripp's** (*OED* (2010), s.v. rip, n.1) 'Eng. regional and Sc. (now chiefly hist.)'. Sometimes the unrevised *OED* entries are rather unspecific and do not conflict with the information in the *EDD*: **lowkyng** (*OED* (1903), *louk*, v.2) is loosely classified as 'Obsolete exc. dialect.', although

[303] 'It retains this name [hog] till it be a year old. Then it is called a *dimmond*, if a wedder; and a *gimmer* if a ewe' (Jam.).

[304] The not northern lexical items in the *EDD* are **clewes** (CLEW, sb.1 'Sc. Irel. Nhb. Cum. Wm. Yks. Lan. I.Ma. Lin. War. e.An. Dev. Cor.'; see also the *DMLBS*, s.v. *clewa*), **lowkyng** (*LOWK*, v. and sb.1 'Nhb. Dur. Lakel. Yks. Lan. Chs. Stf. Lin. Wor.'), **mell** (*MELL*, sb.1 and v.1 'Sc. Irel. Nhb. Dur. Cum. Wm. Yks. Lan. Lin. Suf.'), **nattis** (NAT, sb.2 Obs. 'n.Cy. Yks. Lin. Nrf.'), pepir **qwerns** (*QUERN*, sb.1 Obs. or obsol. 'Sc. Irel. Cum. Yks. Lan. Lin. e.An. Ken. Sus. Dev.'), **ripp's** (*RIP(P*, sb. and v. 'Sc. Dur. Mid. e.An. Suf. Ken. Sus. Hmp.'), **stopez** (*STOUP*, sb. 'Sc. Nhb. Cum. Yks. Lan. e.An.'), **trystez** (TREST, sb. 'Sc. n.Cy. Nhb. Yks. Lan. Der.'), and **twynters** (*TWINTER*, sb. 'Sc. Nhb. Dur. Cum. Wm. Yks. Lan. Chs. Midl. Stf. Der. Lin. Lei. Nhp. Oxf. Bdf. e.An.').

[305] See also the first element of the class 2 lexical item **Aver**garner—only attested in the *DAR* as a compound (see *MED*, s.v. *hǎver* (n.(2)) 1.b. ~ *gerner*)—which is described as widely spread across British dialects (*EDD*, s.v. *HAVER*, sb.2 'Sc. Nhb. Dur. Cum. Wm. Yks. Lan. Lin.') but in *OED* ((2015), s.v. *haver*, n.2) as 'Chiefly Eng. regional (northern) and Sc. Now rare'.

the term is in Trotter Brockett's (1825) *Glossary of North Country Words*, so it was at least northern at the beginning of the 19th century but not necessarily later, and **trystez** is 'now only Scottish and dialect' (*OED* (1914), s.v. *trest*, n.[2]). Yet, the dialectal distribution of **stopez** (*OED* (1917), s.v. *stoup*, n.) 'Now only Sc.', **clewes** (*OED* (1889), s.v. *clew*, n.) 'the regular name in Scotland and north of England', or **twynters** (*OED* (1916), s.v. twinter, adj. and n.) 'chiefly northern and Scottish' is narrower than in the *EDD*. The dates of these entries roughly coincide with the publication of the *EDD*, so the *OED* information cannot be taken as fully reliable. As a result, out of these words, only **mell**, **nattis**, **pepir qwerns**, and **ripp's** are Class 3.

Some terms, especially compounds or combining forms, are not in the *EDD*, so the *OED* (apart from the *DSL*, whose scope is more limited) is the only diachronic source available for the study of the following dialectal vocabulary: among others, for **dorechekez**, **hek**, and **Wawes**, we only have the *OED* unrevised description as 'now northern dialect' (*OED* (1897), s.v. *door-cheek*, n.), 'chiefly Sc. and northern dialect' (OED (1898), s.v. *heck*, n.1), and 'Scottish and northern dialect. Obsolete' (*OED* (1926) † *waw*, n.2), respectively. The *DOST* only mentions 'e.m.E. dorecheke (1535)' and 'ME and e.m.E. weye (?c1300), waw(e (1316, north)' and later variants, except for *hek* (*DOST*, s.v. Hek, Heck, *n*.) 'ME. (chiefly northern) *heke*, *hecke*, *hekke*, *hek*',[306] so we can observe a spectrum of likelihood: **hek** (a non-palatalised version mostly associated with the North) could have survived—in parallel to the more widely-spread *hatch*—into later stages of the language in the North (see the last three records of the word in the *OED* from dialect treatises of Yorkshire (Marshall's (1788) *Provincialisms E. Yorks. in Rural Econ. Yorks.*, Robinson's (1876) *Gloss. Words Whitby*, and Helop's (1893) *Northumberland Words*) while **dorechekez** and **Wawes** do not show any chiefly northern regular features and can only be deemed northern to the extent that the *OED* unrevised records allow;[307] because **Wawes**, as a general measure of weight used with lead, iron, and glass was widespread in ME (cf. *MED*, s.v. *wawe* (n.)) and the *OED* records are not much later than those in the *MED* (1316-1474)—as discussed, it is not in the *EDD*—their northern status in eModE can only be speculated about. The *DOST*

[306] Not in the *MED* as northern forms.

[307] The last quotation of *doorcheek* ((*OED* (1897), s.v. *door-cheek*, n.) is from E. Waugh's *Sketches Lancs. Life* (1857 [ed.: 1855]) and the last two of *waw* from the sixteenth-century J. B. Paul's *Accts. Treasurer Scotl.* (1501 and 1541-2 [ed. 1900]).

(s.v. *waw, wall(e, wey*, n.[1]) offers more senses such as 'a measure of weight of salt', and what seems to be a Shetland-only specific sense, 'a measurement, prob. of weight, of fish', unrelated to the *OED* Scottish quotes (with *stane/irne*, etc.).

Crell' is, according to the *OED* ((1893), s.v. *creel*, n.1), 'originally northern, and chiefly Scotch'. The *MED*, which has expanded its materials in draft form (s.v. *crēl* (n.)), now includes two further citations from *Doc.Beverley* in Seld.Soc. (1367-1377), from Beverley, Yorkshire, apart from the several attestations from the *DAR*, the Surtees Society *Fabric Rolls of York Minster*, and the *Promptorium Parvulorum* ((1440) *PParv.* (Hrl 221)), for which there is no clear linguistic profile, only the hypothesis that it is 'probably not East Anglian' (*LALME*: vol. 1. 110). Therefore, it is probable that the word, at the time it was borrowed,[308] was only northern. The second piece of the *OED2* etymological information, 'chiefly Scotch', is partly endorsed by the *DOST* (s.v. *Crele*, *Creill*, Creel, n. 'rare in older Eng., but still common in northern dialects.'); not so much so in the *EDD* (s.v. *CREEL*, *sb.1* and *v.1*), although the word still keeps a mostly northern distribution: 'Sc. Irel. and n. counties to Lin.', which is why it is included as a Class 3 lexical item as well.

Unlike the entries previously examined, **milksyle** 'Chiefly Eng. regional (northern) and Sc' is in an *OED* entry which was significantly revised to better account for a more nuanced and updated understanding of this word (*OED* (2002), *milksile*, n.).[309] **Hottys** and **palet** are also less dubious modern northern dialectal words; in the definition of *hot*, the *OED* ((2008), s.v. *hot*, n.2) refers to the *SND*, which traces its use until at least 1957:

[308] The etymology of *creel* is somewhat obscure: the *MED* (s.v. *crēl* n.) suggests that it comes from OF *grëil* < L *cratīcula*, a possibility also mentioned in the *OED* ((1893), s.v. *creel*, n.1). See also Old Irish *criol* 'chest'.

[309] The alterations from one edition of the *OED* to another become particularly noticeable in some entries such as this one in which *OED2* (1989) describes *milksile* as 'Obs. exc. dial.' and there is only one attestation (from the *DAR*) in comparison to the 5 under sense †1 'a strainer for milk. Obsolete', the word as a whole being 'chiefly English regional (northern) and Scottish' in *OED3*. Less major changes are also sometimes introduced in the labels of the different editions (compare, e.g., *OED* (2005) † *pallet*, n.[1] 'obsolete (Scottish in later use)' and *OED* ((1989) *pallet*, n. [1]) 'Obs. exc. Sc.'). The *OED* textual records are, nevertheless, usually modified.

'now Sc. and Eng. regional (northern) and Irish English (northern). 1. a. A large basket or pannier for carrying earth, sand, lime, manure, etc. Sc. National Dict. (at cited word) records this sense as still in use in Kirkcudbrightshire in 1957' [cf. *SND*, s.v. *HOT*, n., v].

As discussed with Class 1b lexical items, semantics (region-specific semantic developments) can sometimes be a better marker for the identification of northern lexis: for instance, sense 2 of **morehennes** 'the female of the red grouse, *Lagopus lagopus*. Cf. *moorcock* n.' is 'Eng. regional (northern), Sc., and Irish English' and labelled northern in the *DOST* too (*DOST*, s.v. *Mure-, Muir-hen*, n.). The case of **palet** ('Obsolete (Sc. in later use)', *OED* (2005) † *pallet*, n.1) is more complicated in so far as several possible meanings can be sketched out, all of which are obsolete: in the *DOST*, it is 'the head, pate', coming from 'North. ME. *palet* (1352), e.m.E. *palette* (Skelton), *pallet*, taken as identical with ME. (c 1330) and e.m.E. *palet(te*, *pallett(e*, a type of helmet or head-piece (appar. more or less close-fitting), OF. *palet*' (*DOST*, s.v. *Pallat*, *-et*, n.). *Palet* as a term for 'a helmet or head-piece'—the closest sense to its use in the *DAR*—is only in the *MED* and the *OED*. The last attestation in the *OED* is again from a Scottish source (*Edinb. Test.* LVIII. f. 216v (1637), a text in the *DOST* itself) whereas in the *MED* it does not show a special northern distribution but rather quite the contrary, so the *DOST* allusion to a North ME form *palet* can only be understood as a form encountered in the north by that date (1352). Because these two senses are related, the question is whether *palet* only survived in Scots in the sense of 'head, pate'.[310] Both senses are encompassed under the description of 'Obsolete (Sc. in later use)' in the *OED*, so for the purposes of this chapter, I will stick to this taxonomy despite the inconsistencies noted after collating the information in the two dictionaries.

More broadly, there are other difficult dialectal lexical items such as the adjective *aller* in **aller**hennes 'alther / all of our hens', which seems to be the reflex of ONhb *alra*, *allra* (gen. pl.) (*DOST*, s.v. *Aller*, a.). The spelling *aller* is given as a variant form in the *MED* (s.v. *alder-* (pref.)), but only the form *aler* is recorded (just once) in one of the quotations provided (a1500(1422) Yonge SSecr.(Rwl B.490), from Ireland). In the *DOST*, (s.v. *Aller*, a.) there is also only one quotation (cf. *Alleris*, a. and *Alther*, *All-thair*, a. with

[310] See the *SND* entry for *pallet* which gives a slightly different etymology from the *DOST* entry: 'O.Sc. form *pallatt*, the head, *c*.1500, Mid.Eng. *palet(e)*, 14th c., the head, pate, a piece of armour for the head, O.Fr. *palet*, id., dim. of *pal*, a stake. Cf. *pall*, n.

more testimonies to its use in Scots), and in the *OED* it is recorded as *allers*, with *-s* from the genitive ending (*OED* (2012), s.v. † *allers*, adj.) '*Obsolete* (chiefly *Scottish* in later use)' and in the γ. forms under (*OED* (2012), s.v. *alther*, adj.) 'ME *aller*, lME *allere*'. The c.1480, c.1500, a.1522 attestations of *allers* are Scottish, contrasting sharply with the medieval non-northern ones under *alther*; there are no later records in the *OED* or the *DSL* beyond the very beginning of the sixteenth century, so its northern distribution cannot be traced further. The reanalysis of the word boundary in *lambr'* (< French *l'ambre* 'amber'; now obsolete)—in **lambr'** beedes—is 'chiefly northern' according to both the *OED* ((1901) s.v. † *lamber*, n.1) and the *DOST* (s.v. *Lamber, -bre, -bor,* n. ME. (chiefly north.) and e.m.E. *lambre* (a 1387), *laumb(e)re*, *lambur*). Yet, based on its general currency in ME, not just in Northern Middle English (see *MED*, s.v. *laumbre* (n.)), it is problematic to surmise that this morphologically reananlysed form would have survived chiefly in the north and not in other regions (the *DOST* gives what they consider a 'more common Scottish form', *lammer*), although this possibility cannot be fully ruled out. In the last section of this chapter, I will discuss 'not northern' lexical items, some of which seem to rest on inconclusive pieces of evidence but were, nevertheless, labelled as northern.

4.3.3.1.5 Class 4

In total, there are 32 lexical items which are not northern despite the labels or the apparently northern attestations in a given dictionary. In tracking down northern spellings or forms in the *OED*, *MED*, and *DSL*, the dictionary user (especially in the case of the *OED*) is confronted with a range of spellings under the 'forms' section labelled as 'Scottish', 'northern', or 'chiefly northern'. Closer inspection and comparison against the *MED* attestations demonstrates that these are much more widely distributed than what seems to be suggested in the dictionary entries. Furthermore, sometimes the *OED* itself gives almost identical spellings for both the Scottish and English variants:[311] **deis** 'Sc. *deiss* / ME–15 *deis*' (*OED* (1894), s.v. *dais*, n.), **dressour** 'ME–15 (16 Sc.) *dressour* / ME *dressoure'* (*OED* (2018), s.v. *dresser*, n.1), **credill** 'ME Sc. *creddil(l* / ME–

[311] The slash is used to indicate parallel forms (if any) under the different headings of the 'forms' section in the *OED*.

15 *credil(le*' (*OED* (1893), s.v. *cradle*, n.), **merling'** 'Sc. pre-17 *merling* / ME–15 *merlinge*' (*OED* (2001), s.v. *merling*, n.), **raken**crake 'γ. Chiefly northern. lME–15 *raken* and α. ME *rakent* (north-west midlands),' (*OED* (2009), s.v. *reckon*, n.1), and **wolte** 'ME–15 *wolte*, Scottish *wolt*' (*OED* (1916), s.v. *vault*, n.1). There is also variation of the same form through time: the closest form to **parcellas**, the Latin-inflected version of *parcell* in the *DAR* (Rott. Bursar. 1412-13, 610), is 'ME *parcell*' (β. forms) but also 'regional (northern) 17– parcel' (*OED* (2005), s.v. *parsley*, n.). The *OED* documents spelling variants found in dialect texts and are, thus, different from those of the emerging eModE standard. This variant, *parcell-*, however, does not seem to exhibit a particularly northern distribution in Middle English (cf. *MED*, s.v. *perselī* n.). **Freswardes** is included in Heslop's (1893) *Northumberland Words* but seems to be dialectal in more general terms: the *OED* suggests that there is a late <fr>-dialectal variant related to **freswardes** (18th c. *freshwood*, under the ε forms; cf. its use in the *DAR*, Rott. Elemos. 1516-7, 254) also in some texts which are mostly likely not northern (e.g. Briggs's *Remains* (E.D.D.) 201 (1825) and Simmons's *Lay Folks Mass Bk.* Notes 399 (1879)).

Some of the words that are very problematically classified as northern in the *MED* include **chyne** '(N) chine' (*MED*, s.v. *chaine* (n.)) (cf. *OED*, s.v. *chain*, n. 'ME and 18 dialect *chyne*, *chine*' and the *DOST* (s.v. *cheyn(e*, *chyne*), which does not treat it as northern or dialectal at all) and **schewtells** '(N) *scheutel*' (*MED*, s.v. *scutel* (n.)), which is only attested in the *DAR* and it is not included in any other dictionaries apart from the *MED*. The word's appearance in just one single edited text (*DAR*) does not provide sufficient evidence for its northern character.

Those challenging items in the *DSL*, which prove not to be northern in the *MED* and/or the *OED*, are the following:[312] **byre** 'Northern e.m.E. byre, bire (1521)' (*DOST*, s.v. *Byre*), **gavill** (x3) 'Northern ME. gavill, -yll, -ell, gavel (1374)' (*DOST*, s.v. *Gavill*, *Gavell*, n.), **lyn pynnys** 'North. ME. lyn-pin (c 1330)' (*DOST*, s.v. *(Lin-pin,) Lyn(e-pyn*, n.),

[312] In the following cases the word is not explicitly associated with NME/NeModE, but rather its inclusion in parentheses gives the date at which it was first found in a northern edited text: **langalds** 'ME. *langald* (north., 1394–5)' (*DOST*, s.v. *Langald*, *Langelt*, *Langet*), **Lymkilne** 'ME. (north.) lim- (1296), *lymkilne*', **pepyn** 'ME. (north.) *pepin* (Cursor M.), -yn' (*DOST*, s.v. *Pepin*, *Peppine*), and **redell'** 'e.m.E. and late ME *redell*' (north., 1382–3)' (*DOST*, s.v. *Redill*).

the combining form **mud-** (in **mud**fyss),[313] whose 'Sc. usages' are not clear (cf. *SND*, s.v. *mud*, n. [1], v.[1] and the numerous formations in the *OED* (2003), s.v. *mud*, n.[1]), and **rym** 'Late north. ME and north. e.m.E. rym (1473-4)' (*DSL*, s.v. *Rim*, n.1).

Among other notable Class 4 lexical items is **styrket**. The stem *stirk* does not present a northern-specific distribution, but the attestations of the derived form with the suffix *-et* attached are exclusively northern in the *OED*, the *MED* (s.v. *stirket* (n.)), and the *YHD* (s.v. *stirket*). Likewise, the *OED* ((*1917*), s.v. † *ˈstirket*, n.) defines it as 'northern. Obsolete.? A stirk'. Yet, the Latinised versions in the *DAR* (*stirketti* (Rott. Sacrist. 1384-5, 390) and *stirkettorum* (Rott. Sacrist. 1403-4, 394)) and the other northern accounts I surveyed[314] could not be neglected, which is why it was looked up in the *DMLBS*, where it transpired that earlier and non-northern texts in Medieval Latin also recorded its use, so it might be the case that the derivative was first coined in Medieval Latin (despite its looking French, it is not in the *AND*). The *DMLBS* entry is reproduced below.[315]

> stircetta, stircettus [ME *stirket(te)*] (young) heifer (f.) or bullock (m.), ? small or young stirk, 'stirket'.1225 j vaccar' precium iiij s., et j ~catam precium xx d. ‥ iij ~catas precium iiij s. *KR Tax* 242/127 m. 20;1297 ~kett': idem respondet de x ~kect' utriusque sexus de etate unius anni et dimidii *Ac. Lenton* 6;1298 de j ~kecto taurino *ib.*; 1298 de xvj ~kettis utriusque sexus de etate dim' anni *ib.* 36; 1308 item iij ~kett', precium cujus [libet] iij s. (Yorks) *AncExt* 18/7; 1322 de iiij affr', xviij grossis averiis et j ~kett' agistatis in parco ibidem (Yorks) *MinAc* 1145/21 m. 24; 1331 [*with free access ‥ for oxen, cows, stirks*] ~ketis [*or horses*] *CalCh* IV 243; 1345 item in bostaria sunt ‥ xxiiij ~ketti etatis iij annorum, et xij ~ketti etatis ij annorum *Pri. Cold. app.* xvii; 1365 pullanos, vitulos, ~kettos, seu aliqua alia averia *Hal. Durh.*41.

---

[313] The use of *mud* in **mudfyss** may have arisen from the fact that 'the salt removed slime and pigment from the fish, and produced a kind of muddy brine, making the flesh itself brown and muddy-coloured' (*DOST*, s.v. *MUD*, n.1; see also *OED* (2003), s.v. *mudfish*, n.), but it is not first attested in the north.

[314] *Stirket* is, in fact, widely attested in the northern texts that I have surveyed: Coldingham: *stirketti* 17 [page number of the edition], *styrketti* 20; Finchale: *stirketti* ('stirketti ij annorum') 34, *styrkettis* 56, *stirketts* 158, *stirkettis* 236; Jarrow: *stirkett* 24, *stirketti* 20, 35, *sturketti* 34; Monkwearmouth: *stirketto* 151.

[315] Unlike the vocabulary in other sections of this dissertation, the inclusion of the vernacular vocabulary discussed in this Chapter in the *DMLBS* is overall rare (see the few references to this dictionary in this chapter).

Other 'chiefly northern/Scottish' or 'northern' lexical items—according to one or several of the aforementioned dictionaries—which are Class 4 include ON-derived lexis. **Gersuma** '2. Chiefly Scottish. A premium or fine paid to a feudal superior on entering upon a holding' (*OED* (1899), s.v. *gersum*, n., where it is attested more broadly) exemplifies a common tendency, equating ON-origin lexis with a northern distribution, also noticed in **brakennez** 'Middle English (northern) braken' (*OED* (1888), s.v. *bracken*, n.1), **gabelarum** (see the *DOST*, s.v. *Gavill*, *Gavell*, n. given above), **Sloknyng** 'northern and Sc.' (*OED* (1912), s.v. *slocken*, v.; see also the *DSL*, s.v. *Slok(in)ning*, *Sloknyng*, 'Late ME and north. e.m.E. *sloknynge'* and the *EDD*, s.v. *SLOCKEN*, v. 'Sc. Irel. Nhb. Dur. Cum. Wm. Yks. Lan. Der. Not. Lin.'). The <-y->/<-i-> variants of *hangings* in **hyngynges** seem, nevertheless, to be correctly identified as 'ε. northern and north midlands ME– *hing*- (ME–15 *hyng*-)' (*OED* (1898), s.v. *hanging*, n.; see also the *MED*, s.v. *hŏ̄ngen* v.).

Class 4 also includes lexical items which could be misinterpreted as northern by looking into either the *MED* or the *OED* records, since they use different texts as their material. The only attestation of **fleshaxe** in the *MED* (s.v. *flĕ̄sh* (n.) is from the *DAR* and the one in the *OED* is from the non-northern Kennett's *Parochial Antiq.* (1424 [1818])); similarly, **fleme** is attested in Surtees Society publications in the *MED* (s.v. *flēm* (n.(2)) but in various lexicographical works and texts from different regions in the *OED* ((1896), s.v. *fleam*, n.2, sense 2 'now only dialect'; see also the *EDD*, s.v. *FLEAM*, sb.2 'Nhb. Dur. Yks. Stf. Lei. War. Shr.'); and just the opposite phenomenon holds true for **Tunnyngmell** and **Wakyngsilvyr**, for which the *OED* attestations could potentially suggest they are northern words (with attestations from the *DAR*, Durham, and York, respectively (*OED* (1915), s.v. † *tunning mell* n. and *OED* (1921), s.v. † *waking-silver* n.) although more widely spread according to the *MED* (s.v. *tŏnning* (ger.), 1. (b) ~ *mele*, and *wāking(e* (ger.) 4. (b) ~ *silver*). A cross-dictionary comparison again stresses the need for assessing all the materials individually.

4.4 Final remarks on Northern Middle English

In this chapter, I have attempted to highlight the pitfalls and opportunities in assessing Northern Middle English in such multilingual texts as the *DAR* on several fronts. From a spelling/graphematic viewpoint, allegedly northern marked forms sometimes co-occur with their non-northern, supralocal, variants, and even if we find a certain degree of spelling consistency in the writing of a given lexical item, there may be other surrounding lexical items which are not written in their expected (from our modern viewpoint) northern versions; this combination of northern and non-northern is not unique to the *DAR* material and therefore should not deter us from its value in the study of Northern Middle English. Besides, the considerable time span covered in the *DAR* cannot be overlooked, so the temporal dimension and the growing pressure of the supralocal forms, competing with the northern ones, operates and interacts in multifaceted ways with Medieval Latin. In light of the evidence, the possibility of having a scribal community of northerners producing the Durham Cathedral accounts remains strong.

Variation is also noticeable in the morphological make-up of these lexical items: *-is* and *-ys* are just part of a larger multilingual repertoire, which signifies that both *-is* and *-ys*—the latter being traditionally associated with NME—are present in all kinds of lexemes regardless of their dialectal distribution. The analysis of the French article *ly* in the *DAR* has opened up a new line of enquiry, as this variant had not been considered in the past, let alone in multilingual accounts. Northern vocabulary would, in theory, have been the most readily classifiable component of these texts. A preliminary, yet pressing, question was what our definition of *northern* vocabulary was. If spellings are not as consistent as one would expect, what other parameters can be used? Attestations are a pivotal piece of evidence in trying to measure the likelihood of a word being northern. Yet, a word may only be documented in a few texts (or even in just one) without implying it is northern. Semantics and the later distribution of the word in Modern English can help us to establish to what extent it could have been northern, even if a significant proportion of OE/early ME vocabulary fell out of use after the standardisation process. Regardless of whether we are interested in the medieval dialectal usage of the lexeme or in its diachronic, later, developments, the

records often give partial and fragmented answers, especially if we bear in mind the technicality—and, hence, limited contexts of use—of much of the vernacular vocabulary in the *DAR*. I have endeavoured to devise a taxonomical continuum based on the strength of the evidence suggesting a northern distribution which could, at least, help to resolve some practical dilemmas: the classification of northern vocabulary in dictionaries such as the *OED* does not generally clarify at what point the word was northern, except for some cases which may sometimes be challenged in light of the larger amount of textual material that has been (and continues to be) progressively incorporated into lexicographical resources and made available online. Apart from the northern graphemic component or the form of the word, I have grouped the vocabulary by common features, although a word-by-word analysis and assessment is essential. This resulted in 4 main classes—by no means definitive—depending on what kinds of pieces of evidence were available to us in assessing the word's northernness. Dictionaries such as the *OED*, *MED*, and *DSL* are essential in this enterprise.

I hope that this piece of research, to the best of my knowledge the first of its kind in mapping out the manifestation of the ME northern dialect in texts which were for long ignored for their linguistically hybrid nature, shows how multilingual texts can enhance our understanding of the push-and-pull forces underlying what scribes produced when writing in a Medieval Latin context: there is a constant interplay between the scribes' vernacular and the Latin that was bestowed on them in these monastic communities, with their own uses and functions. An epitome of this idiosyncrasy is the novel development of *ly* from the French definite article.

Conclusions

The fundamental premise of this dissertation is the impossibility of establishing clear boundaries between the vernaculars and Medieval Latin in these rolls. An analysis of the vocabulary in the *DAR*, often potentially belonging to several languages, has exposed the difficulties in labelling these texts 'mixed-language', as if those languages were patently distinguishable in their unmixed varieties. I contend that the term *multilingual* or the neologism *translingual*—the latter radically moving beyond the notion of monolithic languages—seem more suitable alternatives. Because of the novelty of the label *translingual* in research into medieval languages and literatures (see, nonetheless, Hsy 2013), the conventional term *multilingual*, more widely found in the literature, has been preferred. The approach adopted in this dissertation has followed the tenets of traditional philology, gauging the probability of several competing hypotheses for the explanation of etymologies and specific linguistic phenomena in the *DAR*.

Given the bulk of lexical material in question (c. 1,600 lexical items), it has been impossible to examine all the *DAR* vernacular vocabulary in detail. The vocabulary has been primarily organised by its etymology: important commonalities emerged throughout these sections (3.1.1-3.1.4), all covering etymological conundrums, morphology, and, to a lesser extent, semantics. The first one (Section 3.1.1) was devoted to Old English, the only 'native' source of vocabulary in the *DAR*. Special attention has been given to how early Latin borrowings into OE are rendered in these rolls, concluding that their classification in binary terms, that is, as either Medieval Latin or vernacular, is rather problematic unless the lexeme in question exhibits morphological/phonological changes unparalleled in the Latin etymons which are not mediated by English. This is a recurrent pitfall in the analysis of typologically proximate languages in both the Germanic and Romance branches, which became even more apparent in the present data analysis.

The plural formation mechanisms of nouns and their alleged integration into Medieval Latin through declensional endings are not regular and, therefore, cannot be invoked as a reliable parameter. Many of the early Latin borrowings into OE were also later on influenced/reinforced by French lexemes deriving from the same Latin root,

which complicates their categorisation from a modern viewpoint. Even Germanic OE-origin lexemes which were not incorporated into continental French varieties could have been employed in Anglo-French, so the presence of *-ez* in such lexemes as *futhrez, grotez,* or *hakkez* should not be surprising. Neither should it be in ON and MDut origin lexemes for the same reason, as demonstrated in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4. However, dictionaries like the *MED* or the *OED* do not generally consider *-ez* in any of its manifestations.[316] Only the *MED* presumes its occurrence in French-origin lexis in its early stages of borrowing: 'all words borrowed from OF or L during the ME period form the plural in *-es* (unless the foreign plural form is retained)' (*MED*, s.v. *-(e)s* suf.(2)). To what extent *-ez* or Latin plural forms like *-is* are really 'foreign' is a matter open to debate. Based on the empirical evidence adduced throughout this dissertation, I argue that *-is/-ys, -es, -ez,* and the zero-plural form are part of a large translingual repertoire that was available to scribes and that these were used non-distinctively in multilingual texts regardless of the etymological origin of the word.

A tendency towards the Anglicisation of the language of accounts, roughly coinciding with the process of Standardisation, has been pointed out in other archival descriptions (see, e.g., Wright 1998; 2012; 2013; 2017). Yet, a variety of morphemes occur close to each other in late fifteenth/early-sixteenth century rolls (see, e.g., *kittez*, *bollys*, or *corda* in Rott. Celer. 1469-70, 93, and 'lez drissour, bordez, tristez, et ostii lardarie piscium' in one of the latest rolls, Rott. Celer. 1512-3, 105, when French-origin vocabulary should presumably have been completely integrated into English and *lez* would only be used as a textual marker), and the language of the rolls herein considered remains overall stable, which would be at odds with the trend reported by Wright (1998, 2012) and Alcolado Carnicero (2019). Likewise, in the discussion of the *DAR* northern vocabulary in Section 4, the incidence of *-is/-ys* is not higher than in 'non-northern' vocabulary, which again would reinforce this hypothesis of a large multilingual repertory beyond the language/dialectal constraints and conventions that we, as modern users of the language, expect to encounter (see Section 4.3.1).

[316] Some online *MED* entries now include a draft of 'supplemental materials' in which the list of variant spellings has been revised in order to acknowledge the use of other recorded forms such as plural variants containing the endings *-ez* and *-us* (see, e.g., *MED*, s.v. *hǭk* n.).

Because French contributes the most to the vocabulary of the *DAR*, detailed sub-sections on broader socio-historical and linguistic issues have accompanied the survey of Anglo-French. After an overview of the Romance-Latin continuum, inherent to these rolls, I contextualise the learning and teaching of French and Latin in medieval England: an understanding of the socio-historical context and the underlying pedagogical framework enables us to better assess the data presented in the subsequent sections. The predominant view was that Anglo-French was no longer a vernacular by the end of the 12th century, only taught in formal settings during the 13th and 14th centuries. This claim has been widely contested on account of the extant historical sources, especially from occupational and administrative domains. Until about the mid-14th century, French would have been learnt in a natural way, being the language of instruction at English schools and used in aristocratic and courtly circles for longer, at least until the beginning of the 15th century. In the late 14th century, however, the status of Anglo-French changed; teaching materials (e.g. grammars and *manières de langage*) evidence that French would be then learnt through English. A major disruption to the existing pedagogical system and a progressive loss of linguistic competence seem to have been triggered by the Black Death, which took its toll on the population, including the clergy, responsible for the transmission of Anglo-French in non-aristocratic groups by exposing pupils to the language from a very early age (see Ingham 2012 and Section 3.1.2.1). In line with this detriment to the learning of French, the definite article in these multilingual texts started to develop an independent course from its French model: from the 15th century, it started to be used in unpredictable syntactic environments, not conforming to the prototypical usage of the determiner in French, and variants like *ly* also emerged in NME and Scottish texts (see Section 4.3.2). I also highlight the use of the definite article before Latinised and abbreviated lexis, proving that its usage is not intrinsically linked to 'non-integrated' vernacular vocabulary, a finding which has been mostly neglected in the previous literature except for a brief mention of contexts involving measures and weights.

The parameters for identifying lexis as coming only from French, Latin, or both have been likewise revisited. The occurrences in the *DAR* usually encompass a whole spectrum of possible morphological manifestations ranging from Latin to French; vocabulary mediated through French may present Latin inflectional suffixes, Latin

etymons can be 'Frenchified', and there are also ambiguous (potentially, both Latin and French) stems. It is here hypothesised that the teaching of Latin through French and the extensive exposure to French that scribes had both in formal and non-formal settings had an impact on their 'translingual' practices. No metalinguistic markers signalling the language of origin (e.g. such as 'in gallice, -o') are encountered in multilingual administrative rolls.[317] The only recurrent marker, apart from the French article, is the Latin participle *vocat*., *-a*, *-e*, *-ur* 'called/is called', which introduces lexical material irrespective of its etymological origin. This marker, not described in the literature, generally establishes a hyperonymic-hyponymic relationship between the head and the noun introduced by *vocat.* Since a large number of hyponyms or basic-level lexical items come from the vernaculars, the terms (both common and proper nouns) that follow *vocat.* are generally those that would be expected in the vernaculars even if they can also be partly expressed with Latin-origin lexis not mediated by the vernaculars (see 3.3.3). I have also attempted to move beyond the immediate donor language (in this case, Anglo-French) and probe into the remote etymons or the languages from which the immediate source language borrowed (Occitan, Italian, etc.), thereby broadening the linguistic and geographical scope of this dissertation.

The section on Old Norse mostly concentrates on the challenges in assessing the different kinds of evidence available for establishing the relative plausibility for a word being derived from ON. I draw on Dance's exhaustive taxonomy—Type A relying on formal (phonological, morphological, and phonological and morphological) features, and from Types B to D, the evidence is gradually less secure in ascending alphabetical order—and apply it to the *DAR* multilingual material, an enterprise which had not been undertaken beyond the analysis of monolingual English sources. My dissertation also leaves the door open for devising a similar classification for assessing MDut-origin input on a larger scale while accounting for the peculiarities of the contact situation

[317] Signalling languages is a common practice only in content tables and in the description of rolls/codices/single sheets. However, as Putter (personal communication) points out, it is important to distinguish text-type (will, account, table of contents, letter, etc.) or function from the codicological aspects of a text (roll, book, etc.). Comments on the ways in which languages of production are flagged up are more relevant to make in relation to text-types than to codicological types.

between two West Germanic languages, which are hence typologically closer to each other. The possible borrowings from MDut only represent a small part of the total *DAR* vernacular lexis and, hence, the productivity of this classification here could only be limited. Yet, the analysis of these borrowings from both a lexicographical and a socio-historical perspective taps into Anglo-Dutch relationships, commercial and otherwise. This is the angle that the section on commodities named after place-names or described as being (not necessarily produced but imported) from particular regions pursues.

The dissemination of these rolls was usually confined to the institution or businesses involved. This alleged archival seclusion, however, contrasts sharply with the dynamic nature of the commodities listed in these records: a significant number of the lexical items encountered in these accounts is expected to have circulated widely across the country and even travelled from far away (e.g. **Estlandbordes** 'timber from eastern (Baltic) region'). Certainly, this does not preclude a local lexical development, that is, products—and, hence, the words denoting them—exclusively associated with a particular region. The fact that NPs like **Flemyshcloth** or **ryniswyne** are embedded in the rolls without being rendered (partially or totally) into Latin indicate that they would have been used like regular collocations in the scribes' discourse and that the extralinguistic referents would have been sufficiently salient as to be readily identified. The final section in 3 goes in-depth into multi-word lexical units and their status in the *DAR*. Naturally, not all combinations of two or more words such as NPs are compounds although the boundaries between the two are not always clear in both historical and present-day data. I approach compounding as a word-formation mechanism from OE to ME and discuss the strategies at work in the *DAR* through a multilingual lens.

The semantic distribution discussed in all these sections points towards several semantic sub-domains as being particularly prone to make use of vernacular vocabulary. Common across languages are those denoting equipment (utensils, tools, and containers), materials, textiles and clothing, fees or taxes, means of travel, and to a lesser extent, animals and plants. For instance, despite the small numbers of MDut-origin words, some of the main semantic sub-domains can be found (e.g. containers, equipment, materials, and textiles). While it is true that there are more OF-origin lexemes denoting refined commodities and ornaments than those of OE origin,

vocabulary from AF, ON, MDut, and OE equally spans many spheres, from farming to building. The only notable exceptions seem to be furniture (e.g. household linen or hangings), architectural concepts, and names for spices which seem to come only from French, and some narrow terms for transportation by water from MDut. The large number of French- and Latin/French- origin terms means that there are a few semantic sub-domains not represented in other languages, but this does not seem to be motivated by the input language but arises out of the scarcity of those terms. Major trends rather than individual instances of lexical items belonging to more specific domains have been highlighted throughout this dissertation. The data available is conditioned by the scribes' expressive necessities and frequency of usage in their own vernaculars rather than by linguistic preferences based on extra-linguistic reasons, so no firm conclusions grounded in etymology-semantics correlations can be drawn from the *DAR* data.

This dissertation has also followed up on Hulbert's (1936) pointer to future research in which he already acknowledged the untapped potential of manorial records in obtaining dialectal information about the places in which the rolls were produced. The readership of the rolls examined and of the modern editions thereof were mainly concerned with the content in the accounts and not with the specific scribes responsible for their production or their language. This may explain why so little has been researched and is known about them: the editions with which I have been working do not give any information about the hands involved, the scribal division of work, or any perceived continuities on palaeographical grounds. That is why after carrying out an analysis of the material collected for each account, the collation and close palaeographical scrutiny of all the extant material would enable us to reassess these documentary sources, transcending the immediate relevance that the materials, people, and products listed have to our understanding of medieval transactions and moving into the sphere of scribal production. This is a rather ambitious project which can only be conducted in collaboration with other researchers in the longer term.

Nonetheless, the rolls as they stand give a surprisingly high amount of information about the northern dialect surrounding their production. The central aim in this PhD—the first comprehensive study of the vocabulary of the *DAR*—has been to examine what the choice of the vernacular over Latin may reveal in terms of language and

dialectal use, thereby contributing to refining our knowledge of Northern Middle English, particularly in widely unexamined, non-monolingual, textual contexts. Two central questions underlying this thesis have been how do scribes working in the North represent Middle English in these multilingual texts? And in what ways does the Middle English embedded in them evince northernness? In order to answer these questions, I have cited orthographic, morphological, and lexicographical evidence from texts hitherto uninterrogated from this broad philological perspective. Even if the data shows great variation, northern features and lexis are present in the *DAR*.

All in all, the focus of this dissertation has been on vernacular lexis although, rather than presenting the vocabulary in a vacuum, I have attempted to give a more comprehensive view of how the *DAR* lexical make-up should be understood in the context of the rolls at large and of multilingual medieval England more broadly. Not only does the present survey teach us something about the *DAR* themselves but also about the multilingual nature that characterises the word-stock of the English language.

References

Aitken, Adam J. 1984. "Scottish accents and dialects." In *Language in the British Isles*, edited by Peter Trudgill, 94–118. Cambridge: CUP.

Aitken, Adam J. [1954] 2015. "Sources of the vocabulary of Older Scots" in *Collected Writings on the Scots Language*, edited by Caroline Macafee. Scots Language Centre <d3lmsxlb5aor5x.cloudfront.net/library/document/aitken/Sources_of_the_vocabulary_of_Older_Scots.pdf>_ (Accessed July, 1 2020).

Aitken, Adam J. and Caroline Macafee, ed. 2002. *The Older Scots Vowels: A History of the Stressed Vowels of Older Scots from the Beginnings to the Eighteenth Century*. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society.

Alcolado Carnicero, José Miguel. 2013. "Social networks and mixed-language business writing: Latin/French/English in the Wardens' Accounts of the Mercers' Company of London, 1390–1464." Unpublished PhD thesis, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.

Alcolado Carnicero, José Miguel. 2015. "Dating the shift to English in the financial accounts of some London livery companies: A reappraisal." *Multilingua* 34 (3): 373–404.

Alcolado Carnicero, José Miguel. 2017. "Bridges of innovation and change: The English language around the networks of the Mercery of London." In *Merchants of Innovation: The Languages of Traders.* Studies in Language Change Series 15, edited by Esther-Miriam Wagner, Bettina Beinhoff and Ben Outhwaite, 40–67. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Alcolado Carnicero, José Miguel. 2018. "Merchant taylors of London's shift to business english: New insights on the languages of record in their Master and Wardens' Accounts." *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 4 (1): 1–32.

Alcolado Carnicero, José Miguel. 2019. "Diachrony of code-switching stages in medieval business accounts: The Mercers' livery company of London." *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 9 (3): 378–416.

Anderson, Peter. 1987. *A Structural Atlas of the English Dialects.* London: Croom Helm.

Ashtor, Eliyahu. 1983. *Levant Trade in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bailey, Charles, and Karl Maroldt. 1977. "The French lineage of English." In *Langues en Contact: Pidgins-Créoles*, edited by Jürgen Meisel, 21–53. Tübingen: Narr.

Baldinger, Kurt et al. 1974–. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de l'Ancien Français* [*DEAF*]. Québec/Tübingen/Paris: Presses de l'Université Laval/Niemeyer/Klincksieck.

Bartlett, Robert. 2000. *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings: 1075–1225*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bauer, Laurie. 1998. "When is a sequence of two nouns a compound in English?" *English Language and Linguistics* 2: 65–86.

Bauer, Laurie. 2003. *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*. 2nd edn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bauer, Laurie. 2017. *Compounds and Compounding*. Cambridge: CUP.

Baugh, Albert. 1935. *A History of the English Language.* New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.

Baugh, Albert, and Thomas Cable. 1993. *A History of the English Language.* 4th edition. London: Routledge.

Behrens, Dietrich. 1886. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Sprache in England: I, Zur Lautlehre der französischen Lehnwörter im Mittelenglischen*. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Beltrami, Pietro G., Pär Larson, and Paolo Squillacioti, eds. 1997-. *Tesoro della lingua italiana delle origini*. <tlio.ovi.cnr.it/TLIO/>. Accessed March, 1 2020.

Bennett, Judith M. 1996. *Ale, Beer, and Brewsters in England: Women's Work in a Changing World, 1300-1600.* New York/Oxford: OUP.

Bense, Johan Frederik. 1924. *Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third*. Den Haag: Nijhoff.

Bense, Johan Frederik. 1926-1939. *A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Benskin, Michael, and Margaret Laing. 1981. "Translations and mischsprachen in Middle English manuscripts." In *So Meny People Longages and Tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English Presented to Angus McIntosh*, edited by Michael Benskin and Michael L. Samuels, 55–106. Edinburgh: The Editors.

Benskin, Michael. 1989. "Some Aspects of Cumbrian English, Mainly Mediaeval." In *Essays on English Language in Honour of Bertil Sundby*, edited by Leiv Egil Breivik, Arnoldus Hille, and Stig Johansson, 13–46. Oslo: Novus Forlag.

Berndt, Rolf. 1972. "The period of the final decline of French in medieval England (14th and early 15th centuries)." *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 20: 341–369.

Betz, Werner. 1936. *Der Einfluss des Lateinischen auf den althochdeutschen Sprachschatz. I. Der Abrogans.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Betz, Werner. 1949. *Deutsch und Lateinisch. Die Lehnbildungen der althochdeutschen Benediktinerregel.* Bonn: Bouvier u. Co.

Betz, Werner. 1974. "Lehnwörter und Lehnprägungen im Vorund Frühdeutschen." In *Deutsche Wortgeschichte* 1, edited by Friedrich Maurer and Heinz Rupp, 135–163. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Björkman, Erik, 1900-1902. *Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English*, 2 vols. Studien zur englischen Philologie 7, 11. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Black, Merja. 2000. "Putting words in their place: An approach to Middle English word geography." In *Generative Theory and Corpus Studies: A Dialogue from 10 ICEHL*, edited by Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero, David Denison, Richard M. Hogg, and Christopher B. McCully, 455–479. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brate, Erik. 1885. "Nordische Lehnwörter im Orrmulum." *Beiträgen zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 10: 1–80, 580–586.

Britnell, Richard. 2009. "Uses of French language in medieval English towns." In *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c.1100-c.1500*, edited by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al., 81–89. York: York Medieval Press.

Britnell, Richard. 2014. *Durham Priory Manorial Accounts, 1277–1310*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Britton, Derek. 2002. "Northern Fronting and the North Lincolnshire Merger of the Reflexes of ME /u:/ and ME /o:/." *Language Sciences* 24 (3-4): 221–229.

Burchfield, Robert. 1985. *The English Language*. Oxford: OUP.

Burnley, David. 1992. "Lexis and Semantics." In *The Cambridge History of the English language*, vol. 2, edited by Norman Blake, 409–499. Cambridge: CUP.

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

Carrillo-Linares, María José, and Edurne Garrido-Anes. 2012. "Lexical variation in late Middle English: Selection and deselection." In *The Use and Development of Middle English: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Middle English, Cambridge 2008*. Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature 38, edited by Richard Dance and Laura Wright, 145–177. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Carstensen, Broder. 1968. "Zur Systematik und Terminologie deutsch-englischer Lehnbeziehungen." In *Wortbildung, Syntax und Morphologie. Festschrift zum Geburtstag von Hans Marchand am I. Oktober 1967*, edited by Herbert E. Brekle and Leonhard Lipka, 32–45. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Cercignani, Fausto. 1983. "The development of */k/ and */sk/ in Old English." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 82: 313–323.

Chambers, Mark C., and Louise Sylvester. 2010a."Lexicological confusion and medieval clothing culture: redressing medieval dress with the Lexis of Cloth and Clothing in Britain Project." In *Everyday objects: medieval and early modern material culture and its meanings*, edited by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson, 71–84. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Chambers, Mark C., and Louise Sylvester. 2010b. "From *Apareil* to *Warderobe*: Some observations on Anglo-French in the Middle English lexis of cloth and clothing." In *The Anglo-Norman Language and its Contexts*, edited by Richard Ingham, 63–73. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Chamson, Emil. 2014. "Revisiting a millennium of migrations: Contextualizing Dutch/Low-German influence on English dialect lexis." In *Contact, Variation, and Change in the History of English*, edited by Simone E. Pfenninger et al., 281–304. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Christensen, L. Peter. 2000. *Raisin Production Manual.* California: University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Cifoletti, Guido. 1989. *Lingua Franca Mediterranea. Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica Monografie 5*. Padua: Unipress.

Cole, Marcelle. 2018. "A native origin for present-day English *they*, *their*, *them*." *Diachronica* 35 (2): 165–209.

Coleman, Julie. 1995. "The chronology of French and Latin loan words in English." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 93: 95–124.

Coleridge, Herbert. 1859. "On the Scandinavian Element in the English Language." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 6: 18–31.

Conde Silvestre, Juan Camilo. 1998. "Spanish words in medieval English lexicon: Sources and problems." *SELIM* 8: 91–100.

Craigie, William A., et al. 1937–2002. *Dictionary of the Older Scots Tongue* [*DOST*], 12 vols. Oxford: OUP. <www.dsl.ac.uk>. Accessed June, 1 2020.

Croft, William, and D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Cunningham, William. 1910. *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce during the Early and Middle Ages*, volume I, 5th edn. Cambridge: CUP.

Dakhlia, Jocelyne. 2008. *Lingua franca. Histoire d'une langue métisse en Méditerranée*. Arles: Actes Sud.

Dalton-Puffer, Christine. 1996. *The French Influence on Middle English Morphology: A Corpus-Based Study of Derivation.* New York: Gruyter.

Dance, Richard. 2003. *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midland texts*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 246. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Dance, Richard. 2012. "English in contact: Norse." In *English historical linguistics: An International Handbook.* Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 34, 2 vols., edited by Alexander Bergs and Laurel J. Brinton, II. 1724–1737. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dance, Richard. 2013. "'Tor for to telle': Words derived from Old Norse in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." In *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain (c. 1066–1520)* (Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe 15), edited by Judith A. Jefferson and Ad Putter, 41–58. Turnhout: Brepols.

Dance, Richard. 2014. "Getting a word in: Contact, etymology and English vocabulary in the twelfth century (The Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture 2013)." *Journal of the British Academy* 2: 153–211.

Dance, Richard. 2018. "The horns of a dilemma: Finding the Viking influence on Medieval English vocabulary." In *Textual Reception and Cultural Debate in*

Medieval English Studies, edited by María José Esteve Ramos and José Ramón Prado Pérez, 101–128. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Dance, Richard. 2019. *Words Derived from Old Norse in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight: An Etymological Survey*, 2 vols. Publications of the Philological Society 50 (Volume 116). Oxford: Philological Society.

Dareau, Margaret G. 2002. "DOST: Its History and Completion." *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 23: 208–31.

Davis-Secord, Jonathan. 2016. *Joinings: Compound Words in Old English Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

De Vries, Tiemen. 1916. *Holland's Influence on English Language and Literature*. Chicago: W. B. Conkey.

Dekeyser, Xavier. 1986. "Romance loans in Middle English: A reassessment." In *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries*, vol. 1, edited by Dieter Kastovsky and Aleksander Szwedek, 253–65. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dictionary of the Scots Language. <www.dsl.ac.uk>. Accessed June, 1 2020.

Dictionnaire du moyen français 1330-1500 [*DMF*] (3rd ed.). 2012. Nancy: ATILF-CNRS. <www.atilf.fr/dmf/>. Accessed June, 1 2020.

DMLBS. n.d. "Latin in the Middle Ages." in *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. <http://www.dmlbs.ox.ac.uk/british-medieval-latin/language/latin-in-the-middle-ages>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Dobson, Eric J. 1968. *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*, vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dobson, Richard B. 1980. *The York City Chamberlains' Account Rolls 1396-1500*. Durham: Surtees Society.

Donalies, Elke. 2004. *Grammatik des Deutschen im europäischen Vergleich: Kombinatorische Begriffsbildung*, vol. 1: *Substantivkomposition.* Mannheim: Institut für deutsche Sprache.

Dubois, Elfriede. 1992. "Words in cross-channel traffic: Successive fashions of Anglicisms and Gallicisms." In *Language and Civilization. A Concerted Profusion of Essays and Studies in Honour of Otto Hietsch*, 2 vols, edited by Claudia Blank, 626–640. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Durkin, Philip. 2009. *The Oxford Guide to Etymology.* Oxford: OUP.

Durkin, Philip. 2014. *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford: OUP.

Durkin, Philip. 2016. "The *OED* and *HTOED* as tools in practical research: A test case examining the impact of loanwords on areas of the core lexicon." In *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*, edited by Merja Kytö, 390–406. Cambridge: CUP.

Durkin, Philip. n.d. "Middle English–an overview". <https://public.oed.com/aspects-of-english/english-in-time/middle-english-an-overview/>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Eames, Penelope. 1977. "Furniture in England, France and the Netherlands from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century." *Furniture History* 13: 1–303.

Edwards, A. S. G. "Books and manuscripts." In *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Literature in English,* edited by Elaine Treharne and Greg Walker, 17–32. Oxford: OUP.

Ekwall, Eilert. 1918. *Scandinavians and Celts in the North-West of England*. Lund: Lunds Universitets Årsskrift.

Emerson, Oliver Farrar. 1923. *A Middle English Reader. Grammatical Introduction and Glossary*. London: Macmillan.

Faiss, Klaus. 1992. *English Historical Morphology and Word-Formation: Loss versus Enrichment.* Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia. 2014. "The voice of the dead: Analyzing sociolinguistic variation in early Modern English wills and testaments." *JEL* 42 (4): 330–358.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia, and Mª Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma. 2004. "Northern features in 15th-16th-Century legal documents from Yorkshire." In *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology*, edited by Marina Dossena and Roger Lass, 287–308. Bern/Berlin: Peter Lang.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia, and Mª Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma. 2007. "From Old Northumbrian to Northern Middle English: Bridging the divide." In *Studies in Middle English Forms and Meanings*, edited by Gabriella Mazzon, 117–133. Bern: Peter Lang.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia, and Mª Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma. 2008. "Northern Middle English: towards telling the full story." In *English Historical Linguistics 2006. Volume III: Geo-historical Variation in English*, edited by Marina Dossena, Richard Dury, and Maurizio Gotti, 91–109. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia, Mª Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma, and Inmaculada Senra Silva. 2008. "Towards a history of Northern English: Early and late Northumbrian." *Studia Neophilologica* 80: 132–159.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia, and Mª Nieves Rodríguez Ledesma. 2009. "The Northern echo: Continuities in contemporary Northern English." In *Studies in English and European Historical Dialectology*, edited by Marina Dossena and Roger Lass, 153–186. Bern: Peter Lang.

Fernández Cuesta, Julia, Luisa García García, and J. Gabriel Amores Carredano. 2012. "Compilation of an electronic corpus of Northern English texts from Old to Early Modern English." In *The Use and Development of Middle English: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Middle English, Cambridge 2008*, edited by Richard Dance and Laura Wright, 35–59. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Fischer, Andreas. 2003. "Lexical borrowing and the history of English: A typology of typologies." In *Language Contact in the History of English*. 2nd revised edn. (1st edn. 2001), edited by Dieter Kastovsky, and Arthur Mettinger, 97–115. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Fischer, Olga. 2006. "On the position of adjectives in Middle English." *English Language and Linguistics* 10 (2): 253–288.

Fischer, Olga. 2013. "The role of contact in English syntactic change in the Old and Middle English periods." In *English as a Contact Language*, edited by Marianne Hundt and Daniel Schreier, 51–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fisiak, Jacek. 1968. *A Short Middle English Grammar 1: Graphemics, Phonemics, and Morphemics.* Warszawa: PWN.

Fouché, Pierre. 1959. *Traité de prononciation française.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Fowler, Joseph Th. 1898–1901. *Extracts from The Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, from the Original MSS.*, 3 vols. Durham: Surtees Society.

Friedman, John B. 1995. *Northern English Books, Owners, and Makers in the Late Middle Ages.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Fulk, Robert D. 2003. "On argumentation in Old English philology with particular reference to the editing and dating of *Beowulf*." *Anglo-Saxon England* 32: 1–26.

Fulk, Robert D. 2016. "Philological methods." In *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics*, edited by Merja Kytö, 95–108. Cambridge: CUP.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2009. *Code-Switching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Gersum Project. Dance, Richard, Sara Pons-Sanz, and Brittany Schorn. 2019. *The Gersum Project: The Scandinavian Influence on English Vocabulary*. Cambridge, Cardiff and Sheffield. <www.gersum.org>. Accessed March 3, 2020.

Gevenich, Olga. 1918. *Die englische Palatalisierung von k > č im Lichte der englischen Ortsnamen*. Studien zur englischen Philologie. Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Girvan, Ritchie, ed. 1939. *Ratis Raving and Other Early Scots Poems on Morals*. Edinburgh and London: Scottish Text Society.

Godefroy, Frédéric. 1880-1902. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du 9e au 15e siècle* [*Gdf*]. Paris: Viewieg/Bouillon.

Görlach, Manfred. 1987. "Lexical loss and lexical survival: the case of Scots and English." *Scottish Language* 6: 1–20.

Grant, Alison. 2002. "A new approach to the inversion compounds of North-West England." *Nomina* 25: 65–90.

Hallqvist, Henning. 1948. *Studies in Old English Fractured ea*. Lund: Gleerup.

Haspelmath, Martin and Uri Tadmoor, eds. 2009a. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, Martin and Uri Tadmoor, eds. 2009b. *World Loanword Database*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <wold.clld.org>. Accessed March 3, 2020.

Haugen, Einar. 1950. "The analysis of linguistic borrowing." *Language* 26 (3): 210–231.

Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Haumann, Dagmar 2003. "The postnominal '*and* adjective' construction in Old English." *English Language and Linguistics* 7: 57–83

Hendrickson, John R. 1948. *OE Prepositional Compounds in Relationship to their Latin Originals.* Language Dissertation no. 43. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Hickey, Raymond. 2015. "The North of England and Northern English." In *Researching Northern English*, edited by Raymond Hickey, 1–24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hirsch, Theodor. 1858. *Danzigs Handels–und Gewerbsgeschichte unter der Herrschaft des Deutschen Ordens*. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Hogg, Richard M. 1979. "Old English palatalization." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 77: 89–113.

Hogg, Richard M. 1992. *A Grammar of Old English*. Vol. 1: Phonology. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hogg, Richard. 1992. "Introduction." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language,* vol. 1, edited by Richard M. Hogg, 1–25. Cambridge: CUP.

Hogg, Richard. 1992. "Phonology and morphology." In *The Cambridge history of the English language*, vol. 1, edited by Richard Hogg, 67–167. Cambridge: CUP.

Holthausen, Ferdinand. 1934. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (2nd edn). Heidelberg: Winter.

Hone, Nathaniel J. 1906. *The Manor and Manorial Records*. London: Methuen.

Horobin, Simon C.P. 2001. "J.R.R. Tolkien as a philologist: A reconsideration of the northernisms in Chaucer's *Reeve's Tale*." *ES* 82 (2): 97–105.

Hsy, Jonathan. 2013. *Trading Tongues: Merchants, Multilingualism, and Medieval Literature*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Hudson, Anne. 1983. "Observations on a northerner's vocabulary." In *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson*, edited by E.G. Stanley and Douglas Gray, 74–83. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.

Hughes, Geoffrey. 2000. *A History of English Words*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hulbert, James R. 1936. "English in manorial documents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries." *Modern Philology* 34 (1): 37–61.

Hüllen, Werner. 2006. *English Dictionaries, 800-1700. The Topical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunt, Tony. 1991. *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*, 3 vols. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Hunt, Tony. 2011. "The languages of medieval England." In *Mehrsprachigkeit im Mittelalter,* edited by Michael Baldzuhn and Christine Putzo, 50–68. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Imbs, Paul, and Bernard Quemada. 1971-1994. *Trésor de la langue française. Dictionnaire de la langue du 19e et 20e siècle (1789-1960)*, 16 vols. Paris: Éditions du CNRS (vol.1-10) / Gallimard (11-16). Online as *Trésor de la langue française*

informatisé (2002–) [*TLFi*]. Paris/Nancy, CNRS/Université de Nancy 2/ATILF. <atilf.atilf.fr/>. Accessed June 1, 2020.

Ingham, Richard 2010. *The Anglo-Norman Language and its Contexts*. York: York Medieval Press.

Ingham, Richard, and Imogen Marcus. 2016. "Vernacular bilingualism in professional spaces, 1200 to 1400." In *Multilingualism in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Communication and Miscommunication in the Premodern World*, edited by Albrecht Classen, 145–64. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ingham, Richard, Louise Sylvester, and Imogen Marcus. 2019. "Penetration of French-origin lexis in Middle English occupational domains." In *Historical Linguistics 2015. Selected Papers from the 22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Naples, 27-31 July 2015*, edited by Michela Cennamo and Claudia Fabrizio, 460–478. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ingham, Richard. 2007. "Bilingualism and language education in medieval England." World Universities Network video-link seminar, October. <www.wun.ac.uk/multilingualism/seminar_archive/07_08_program/ingham.html>. Accessed April 27, 2020.

Ingham, Richard. 2009. "Mixing languages on the manor." *Medium Ævum* 78 (1): 80–97.

Ingham, Richard. 2012. *The Transmission of Anglo-Norman: Language History and Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ingham, Richard. 2013. "Language-mixing in medieval Latin documents: Vernacular articles and nouns." In *Multilingualism in medieval Britain (c. 1066-1520): Sources and Analysis* (Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe 15), edited by Judith A. Jefferson and Ad Putter, 105–121. Turnhout: Brepols.

Jacquemin, Christian. 2001. *Spotting and Discovering Terms through Natural Language Processing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Jamieson, John. 1808. *An Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1905. *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jespersen, Otto. 1909. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Part I, Sounds and Spellings*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Johnston, Paul. 1997. "Older Scots Phonology and its Regional Variation." In *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language,* edited by Charles Jones, 47–111. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jordan, Richard. 1925. *Handbuch der mittelenglischen Grammatik: Lautlehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Jordan, Richard. 1974. *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, trans. and rev. by Eugene Joseph Crook [Jordan-Crook]. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Jørgensen, Jens Normann, Martha Sif Karrebæk, Lian Malai Madsen, Janus Spindler Møller. 2011. *Polylanguaging in Superdiversity*. *Diversities* 13 (2): 23-37.

Kaiser, Rolf, ed. 1961. *Medieval English: An Old English and Middle English Anthology.* 3rd edn. Berlin-Wilmersdorf: Author.

Kaiser, Rolf. 1937. *Zur Geographie des Mittelenglischen Wortschartzes.* Leipzig: Mayer & Müller.

Kay, Christian, Jane Roberts, Michael Samuels, and Irene Wotherspoon. 2009. *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* [*HTOED*]. Oxford: OUP. <http://www.oed.com/thesaurus/>.

Keen, Maurice. 1973. *England in the Later Middle Ages.* London/New York: Routledge.

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

Kibbee, Douglas A. 1996. "Emigrant languages and acculturation: The case of Anglo-French." In *The Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages*, edited by Hans F. Nielsen and Lene Schøesler, 1–20. Odense: University Press.

Kluge, Friedrich. 1901 [1891]. "Geschichte der englischen Sprache" (mit Beiträgen von D. Behrens und E. Einenkel). In *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, Vol. 1 (2nd edn), edited by Hermann Paul, 926–1151. Strassburg: Trübner.

Kniezsa, Veronika. 1984. "The problem of the merger of Middle English /aː/ and /ai/ in Northern English." *Acta Linguistics Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 34 (1-2): 87–94.

Kniezsa, Veronika. 1997. "The origins of Scots orthography." In *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language,* edited by Charles Jones, 24–46. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Knigge, Friedrich. 1885. *Die Sprache des Dichters von Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, der sogenannten Early English Alliterative Poems und De Erkenwalde*. Marburg: Universitäts-Buchdruckerei.

Kocel, Agnieszka. 2009. "Much, such and each: k-palatalization and distribution of (non)palatal forms in Northern Middle English." *Anglica* 18: 7–22.

Kocel, Agnieszka. 2010. "Nonpalatalized dorsals in Southumbrian Middle English grammatical words: A Scandinavian influence?" In *Studies in Old and Middle English*. Warsaw Studies in English Language and Literature 1, edited by Jacek Fisiak, 165–182. Łódź: Academy of Management.

Kocel, Agnieszka. 2012. "Palatalization in grammatical words as reflected in unclassified Late Middle English sources." *Anglica* 21 (2): 5–15.

Kocel, Agnieszka. 2013. "Palatalization as a non-uniform process affecting grammatical words: a comparison of data from dialectally identified and unidentified late Middle English texts." *Anglica* 22 (2): 5–25.

Kocel, Agnieszka. 2016. *Palatable Palatalization. A Story of Each, Much, Such, and Which in Middle English Dialects*. Warsaw Studies in English Historical Linguistics, Volume 6. San Diego: Æ Academic Publishing.

Kohler, Klaus J. 1967. "Aspects of MSc phonemics and graphemics." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 32–61.

Kolb, Eduard. 1965. "Skandinavisches in den nordenglischen dialekten." *Anglia* 83: 127–153.

Kornexl, Lucia, and Ursula Lenker. 2011. "Culinary and other pairs: Lexical borrowing and conceptual differentiation in early English food terminology." In *More Than Words: English Lexicography and Lexicology Past and Present, Essays Presented to Hans Sauer on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday—Part I*, edited by Renate Bauer and Ulrike Krischke, 179–206. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern: Peter Lang.

Kowaleski, Maryanne. 2009. "The French of England: A Maritime Lingua Franca?" *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c.1100-c.1500*, edited by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al., 103–117. York: York Medieval Press.

Kristensson, Gillis. 1976. "A note on palatalization of Germanic k in English." *Studia Neophilologica* 48: 321–324.

Krygier, Marcin. 2000. "OE (non-)palatalized */k/: Competing forces of change at work in the “seek”-verbs’." In *Placing Middle English in context*. Topics in English Linguistics 35., edited by Irma Taavitsainen, Terttu Nevalainen, Pävi Pahta, and Matti Rissanen, 461–473. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kurath, Hans, and Sherman M. Kuhn. 1954. *Middle English Dictionary: Plan and Bibliography*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Kurath, Hans, Sherman M. Kuhn, and Robert E. Lewis, eds. 1952–2001. *Middle English Dictionary* [*MED*]. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>.

Laing, Margaret. 2013. *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* [*LAEME*]*, 1150–1325*, 3.2. <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html>. Accessed April 27, 2020.

Laing, Margaret, and Roger Lass. 2003. "Tales of the 1001 nists. The phonological implications of litteral substitution sets in 13th-century South-West-Midland texts." *English Language and Linguistics* 7 (2): 257–278.

Laing, Margaret, and Roger Lass. 2013. "A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English. Introduction. Part I: Background. Chapter 2: Interpreting Middle English". In *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English* [*LAEME*]*, 1150–1325*, 3.2. <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme_intro_ch2.html>. Accessed 27 April 2019.

Laing, Margaret, and Roger Lass. 2019. "Old and Middle English Spellings for OE *hw-*, with Special Reference to the ‘qu-’ Type: In Celebration of LAEME, (e)LALME, LAOS and CoNE: In Memoriam Angus McIntosh." In *Historical Dialectology in the Digital Age*, edited by Rhona Alcorn, Joanna Kopaczyk, Bettelou Los, and Benjamin Molineaux, 91–112. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lass, Roger, 1997. *Historical linguistics and Language Change*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 81. Cambridge: CUP.

Lass, Roger, Margaret Laing, Rhona Alcorn, and Keith Williamson. 2003–. *A Corpus of Narrative Etymologies from Proto-Old English to Early Middle English and*

Accompanying Corpus of Changes. <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/CoNE/CoNE.html>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Lass, Roger, and Margaret Laing. 2016. "Q is for WHAT, WHEN, WHERE? The 'q' spellings for OE hw." *Folia Linguistica Historica* 37 (1): 61–110.

Latham, Ronald E., David R. Howlett, and Richard K. Ashdowne. 1975-2013. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* [*DMLBS*]. Oxford: British Academy. <http://www.dmlbs.ox.ac.uk/>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Legge, Maria-Domenica. 1950. *Anglo-Norman in the Cloisters: The Influence of the Orders upon Anglo-Norman Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Legge, Maria-Domenica. 1980. "Anglo-Norman as a spoken language." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 2: 108–17.

Lewis, Robert E. 1984. *Middle English Dictionary: Plan and Bibliography. Supplement I*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lewis, Robert E., and Mary Jane Williams. 2007. *Middle English Dictionary: Plan and Bibliography*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Liberman, Anatoly. 2007. "Palatalized and velarized consonants in English against their Germanic background, with special reference to i-umlaut." In *Studies in the History of the English Language III, Managing Chaos: Strategies for Identifying Change in English*, edited by Christopher M. Cain and Geoffrey Russom, 5–36. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Liberman, Anatoly, 2008. *An Analytic Dictionary of English Etymology: An Introduction*. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.

Lieber, Rochelle, and Pavol Štekauer. 2009. *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*. New York: OUP.

Lloyd, Cynthia. 2011. *Semantics and Word Formation: The Semantic Development of Five French Suffixes in Middle English*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Lloyd, Terrence Henry. 1977. *The English Wool Trade in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: CUP.

Logan, F. Donald. 2002. *A History of the Church in the Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge.

Lombard, Alf. 1930. *Les constructions nominales dans le français moderne. Etude syntaxique et stylistique*. Uppsala/Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Luick, Karl. 1914. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, Vol. I, Part 1 [reprint]. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Luick, Karl. 1935. "Zur Palatalisierung." *Anglia* 59: 273–286.

Lusignan, Serge. 2008. "Parler français: les enjeux linguistiques des négociations entre Français et Anglais à la fin du Moyen Âge." In *Zwischen Babel und Pfingsten: Sprachdifferenzen und Gesprächsverständigung in der Vormoderne* (*8-16. Jahrhundert*), edited by Peter von Moos, 409–429. Zürich and Berlin: Lit.

Lutz, Angelika. 2002. "When Did English Begin?" In *Sounds, Words, Texts and Change: Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, 7-11 September 2000*, edited by Teresa Fanego, Belén Méndez-Naya, and Elena Seoane, 145–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lutz, Angelika. 2008. "Types and degrees of mixing: A comparative assessment of Latin and French influences on English and German word formation." *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis* 13: 131–65.

Macquoid, Percy, and Ralph Edwards. 1927. *The Dictionary of English Furniture*. Vol. 3. London: Country Life.

Maguire, Warren. 2015. "The North above the North: Scotland and Northern English." In *Researching Northern English*, edited by Raymond Hickey, 437–457. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Martinet, André. 1964. "The Foundations of a Functional Syntax." *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics* XVII, 25–36. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: CUP.

McClure, J. Derrick. 1994. "English in Scotland." In *The Cambridge History of the English Language,* vol. 5, edited by Robert Burchfield, 21–93. Cambridge: CUP.

McIntosh, Angus. 1952. *An Introduction to a Survey of Scottish Dialects.* Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson & Sons for the University of Edinburgh.

McIntosh, Angus. 1956. "The Analysis of Written Middle English." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 55 (1): 26–55.

McIntosh, Angus. 1963. "A new approach to Middle English dialectology." *ES* 44 (1-6): 1–11.

McIntosh, Angus. 1969. "Review article of Kristensson (1967)." *Medium Ævum* 38 (2): 210–216.

McIntosh, Angus. 1973. "Word geography in the lexicography of Medieval English." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 211: 55–66.

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

McWhorter, John. 2002. "What happened to English?" *Diachronica* 19 (2): 217–272.

Miller, D. Gary. 2000. "The death of French in medieval England." In *Romance Phonology and Variation*, edited by Caroline R. Wiltshire and Joaquim Camps, 145–159. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Miller, D. Gary. 2010. *Language Change and Linguistic Theory, Volume I: Approaches, Methodology, and Sound Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, D. Gary. 2012. *External Influences on English: From its Beginnings to the Renaissance*. Oxford: OUP.

Miller, D. Gary. 2014. *English Lexicogenesis.* Oxford: OUP.

Miller, D. Gary. 2019. *Oxford Gothic Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.

Minervini, Laura. 1996. "La Lingua Franca mediterranea: Plurilinguismo, mistilinguismo, pidginizzazzione sulle coste del Mediterraneo tra tardo medioevo e prima eta moderna." *Medioevo Romanzo* 20: 231–301.

Minkova, Donka. 2003. *Alliteration and Sound Change in Early English*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 101. Cambridge: CUP.

Minkova, Donka. 2014. *A Historical Phonology of English.* Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language (Advanced). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Minkova, Donka. 2016. "From stop-fricative clusters to contour segments in Old English." In *Studies in the History of the English language VII: Generalizing vs. Particularizing Methodologies in Historical Linguistic Analysis* (Topics in English Linguistics 94), edited by Don Chapman, Colette Moore, and Miranda Wilcox, 29–59. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Molineaux, Benjamin et al. 2019. "Early Spelling Evidence for Scots L-vocalisation: A Corpus-based Approach." In *Historical Dialectology in the Digital Age*, edited by Rhona Alcorn, Joanna Kopaczyk, Bettelou Los, and Benjamin Molineaux, 61–87. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Momma, Haruko, et al. 2009–. *Dictionary of Old English* [*DOE*]. Toronto: University of Toronto. <https://www.doe.utoronto.ca/>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Mooney, Linne Ruth. 2000. "Professional scribes? Identifying English scribes who had a hand in more than one manuscript." In *New Directions in Medieval Manuscript Studies*, edited by Derek Pearsall, 131–141. York: York Medieval Press, in association with Boydell & Brewer.

Mooney, Linne Ruth. 2008. "Locating scribal activity in late-medieval London." In *Design and Distribution of Late Medieval Manuscripts in England,* edited by Margaret Connolly and Linne R. Mooney, 183–204. York: University of York Medieval Press.

Mooney, Linne Ruth. 2011. "Vernacular Literary Manuscripts and Their Scribes." In *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1500*, edited by Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin, 192–211. Cambridge: CUP.

Mooney, Linne Ruth, and Estelle Stubbs. 2013. *Scribes and the City: London Guildhall Clerks and the Dissemination of Middle English Literature 1375-1425*. York: York Medieval Press.

Moore, Samuel, Sanford B. Meech, and Harold Whitehall. 1935. "Middle English dialect characteristics and dialect boundaries. Preliminary report of an investigation based exclusively on localized texts and documents." In *Michigan Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, edited by University of Michigan, Dept. of English Language and Literature, 1–60. Michigan: University of Michigan Publications in Language and Literature XIII.

Morris, Richard, ed. 1877.*Cursor Mundi*, vol. iv (*EETS* OS 66). London: N. Trübner & Co.

Morsbach, Lorenz. 1896. *Mittelenglische Grammatik.* Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Munro, John H. 1994. "Patterns of trade, money, and credit." In *Handbook of European History 1400-1600. Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, edited by Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy. 147–195. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.

Murison, David. 1971. "The Dutch Element in the Vocabulary of Scots." In *Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots*, edited by A.J. Aitken, Angus McIntosh, and Hermann Pálsson, 159–176. London: Longman.

Murray, James A. H. 1873. *The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland*. London: Asher & Co.

Murray, James A. H. 1933. "General Explanations." In *The Oxford English Dictionary*, edited by James A. H. Murray et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: OUP.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 1999. "Early Modern English lexis and semantics." In *The Cambridge History of the English language*, vol. 3, edited by Roger Lass, 332–458. Cambridge: CUP.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006. *An Introduction to Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nevalainen, Terttu, and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2017. *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England* (second ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Oakden, James P. 1930. *Alliterative Poetry in Middle* English. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Oliva, Marilyn. 2009. "The French of England in female convents: The French kitcheners' accounts of Campsey Ash Priory." In *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England, c.1100-c.1500*, edited by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al., 90–102. York: York Medieval Press.

Olsen, Susan. 2000. "Composition." In *Morphologie/Morphology: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbuildung/An International Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*, edited by Geert Booji, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan, 897–916. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Orme, Nicholas. 1973. *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.

Orr, John. 1962. *Old French and Modern English Idiom*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Orton, Harold. 1936. *The Phonology of a South Durham Dialect.* London: Kegan Paul.

Oudin, César. 1616. *Tesoro de las dos lenguas francesa y española*. Paris: Marc Orry.

Palmer, Chris C. 2009. "Borrowings, Derivational Morphology, and Perceived Productivity in English, 1300–1600". Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Paul, Hermann. 1886. *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte.* Halle: Max Niemeyer.

Pegolotti, Francesco Balducci, and Allan Evans, ed. 1936. *Pratica della mercatura*. Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America.

Penzl, Herbert. 1947. "The phonemic split of Germanic *k* in Old English." *Language* 23: 34–42.

Peters, Hans. 1988. "On the state and possible aims of Middle English word geography." In *Historical Dialectology Regional and Social*, edited by Jacek Fisiak, 397–416. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pickvance, Chris. 2012. "Medieval domed chests in Kent: a contribution to a national and international study." *Regional Furniture* 26: 105–147.

Picone, Michael D. 1994. "Lexicogenesis and language vitality." *Word* 45 (3): 261–285.

Pons-Sanz, Sara M. 2004. "A sociolinguistic approach to the Norse-derived words in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels." In *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics: Selected Papers from 12 ICEHL, Glasgow, 21–26 August 2002, II: Lexis and Transmission*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 252, edited by Christian Kay, Carole Hough, and Irené Wotherspoon, 177–192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pons-Sanz, Sara M. 2013. *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 1. Turnhout: Brepols.

Pope, Mildred Katharine. 1934. *From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman: Phonology and Morphology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Poplack, Shana and Marjory Meechan. 1998. "How languages fit together in codemixing." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 2 (2): 127–138.

Postan, Michael M. 2002. *Medieval Trade and Finance.* Cambridge: CUP.

Pouzet, Jean-Pascal. 2011. "Book production outside commercial contexts." In *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1500*, edited by Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin, 212–38. Cambridge: CUP.

Prescott, Andrew. 2012. "Administrative records and scribal achievement." In *English Manuscripts Before 1400. English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, edited by A.S.G. Edwards and Orietta Da Rold, 173–199. London: The British Library.

Price, Glanville. 1984. "Anglo-Norman." In *The Languages of Britain,* edited by Glanville Price, 197–206. London: Arnold.

Price, Glanville. 1991. *An Introduction to French Pronunciation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Prins, Anton. 1941. "On the loss and substitution of words in Middle English." *Neophilologus* 26: 280–298, and 27: 49–59.

Putter, Ad. 2018. A review of Victoria Flood, *Prophecy, Politics, and Place in Medieval England: From Geoffrey and Monmouth to Thomas of Erceldoune*. *Medium Ævum* 87 (2): 378.

Rackham, Oliver and Jennifer Moody. 1996. *The Making of Cretan Landscape.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Raine, James. 1837. *Charters of Endowment, Inventories and Account Rolls of the Priory of Finchale in the County of Durham*. London: Surtees Society.

Raine, James. 1841. *Correspondence, Inventories, Account Rolls and Law Proceedings of the Priory of Coldingham*. London/Edinburgh: Surtees Society.

Raine, James. 1844. *The Durham Household Book or the Accounts of the Bursar of the Monastery of Durham*: *From Pentecost, 1530 to Pentecost, 1534*. London/Edinburgh: Surtees Society.

Raine, James. 1854. *The Inventories and Account Rolls of the Benedictine Houses or Cells of Jarrow and Monkwearmouth in the County of Durham*. London/Edinburgh: Surtees Society.

Richardson, Henry Gerald. 1942. "Letters of the Oxford dictators." In *Formularies which Bear on the History of Oxford, c. 1204–1420* (vol. 5), edited by Herbert Edward Salter, William Pantin, and Henry Gerald Richardson, 329–450. Oxford: Oxford Historical Society.

Ringe, Don. 2004. "Old English *maþelian*, *mæþlan*, *mǣlan*." In *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, edited by J. H. W. Penney, 417–435. Oxford: OUP.

Roig-Marín, Amanda. 2018a. "When the vernaculars (Anglo-Norman and Middle English) and Medieval Latin fuse into a functional variety." *Studia Neophilologica* 90 (2): 176-194.

Roig-Marín, Amanda. 2018b. "On Middle English *Spanysyren'*." *Notes & Queries* 65 (4): 480–482.

Roig-Marín, Amanda. 2019a. "Medieval Latin, Middle English, or Anglo-Norman? Lexical choice in the Inventories and Accounts from the Monastic House of Jarrow." *Neophilologus* 103: 239–254.

Roig-Marín, Amanda. 2019b. "Challenges in the study of "Spanish" Loanwords in Late Medieval and Early Modern English." *Anglica Wratislaviensia* 57: 137–147.

Roig-Marín, Amanda. 2019c. "Towards a Multilingual Approach to the History of English." *Atlantis* 41(1): 185—194.

Roig-Marín, Amanda. Forthcoming [2020]. "Spanish Arabic loanwords in Late Middle and Early Modern English." *SELIM* 25: xx.

Rose, Susan. 2011. *The Wine Trade in Medieval Europe 1000-1500*. London: Continuum.

Rosenbach, Anette. 2004. "The English s-genitive – A case of degrammaticalization?" In *Up and Down the Cline – the Nature of Grammaticalization*, edited by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Perridon, 73–96. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rothwell, William, Stewart Gregory, David Trotter, Geert De Wilde, Virginie Derrien, and Heather Pagan, eds. (1977–). *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* [AND]. <www.anglo-norman.net/>. Accessed April 27, 2020.

Rothwell, William. 1976. "The role of French in thirteenth–century England." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 58: 445–66.

Rothwell, William. 1980. "Lexical borrowing in a medieval context." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 63 (1): 118–143.

Rothwell, William. 1991. "The missing link in English etymology: Anglo-French." *Medium Aevum* 60: 173–196.

Rothwell, William. 1994. "The trilingual England of Geoffrey Chaucer." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 16: 45–67.

Rothwell, William. 1996. "The Anglo-French element in the vulgar register of Late Middle English." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 97: 423–436.

Rothwell, William. 1998. "Arrivals and departures: The adoption of French terminology into Middle English." *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* 79 (2): 144–165.

Rothwell, William. 1999. "Sugar and spice and all things nice: From oriental bazar to English cloister in Anglo-French." *The Modern Language Review* 94 (3): 647–659.

Ruano-García, Javier. 2010. E*arly Modern Northern English Lexis: A Literary Corpus-based Study*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Salamanca Corpus: Digital Archive of English Dialect Texts (2011). <http://www.salamancacorpus.usal.es/DL_N_1500-1700_LAN_Robin_ans_Gonny.html> Accessed April 27, 2019.

Sampson, Rodney. 1999. *Nasal Vowel Evolution in Romance*. Oxford: OUP.

Samuels, Michael L. 1981[1988]. "Spelling and dialect in the late and post-Middle English periods." In *So Meny People Longages and Tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Mediaeval English Presented to Angus McIntosh*, edited by Michael Benskin, and Michael L. Samuels, 43–54. Edinburgh: Middle English Dialect Project. Reprinted in 1988 in *The English of Chaucer and his Contemporaries*, edited by Jeremy J. Smith, 86–95. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Samuels, M. L. 1985. "The great Scandinavian belt." In *Papers from the Fourth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics.* Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 41, edited by Roger Eaton et al., 269–281. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sauer, Hans. 1985. "Laȝamon's Compound Nouns and their Morphology." In *Historical Semantics: Historical Word-Formation*. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 29, edited by Jacek Fisiak, 483–532. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Scheler, Manfred. 1977. *Der englische Wortschatz* (Grundlagen der Anglistik und Amerikanistik 9). Berlin: Erich Schmidt.

Schendl, Herbert. 2013. "Multilingualism and code-switching as mechanisms of contact-induced lexical change in late Middle English." In *English as a Contact Language*, edited by Daniel Schreier and Marianne Hundt, 41–57. Cambridge: CUP.

Schendl, Herbert, and Laura Wright. 2011. *Code-Switching in Early English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schlücker, Barbara, ed. 2019. *Complex Lexical Units. Compounds and Multi-Word Expressions.* Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Seiler, Friedrich. 1907-13. *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Kultur im Spiegel des Lehnwortes*, 4 vols. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

Selbach, Rachel. 2017. "On a famous lacuna: Lingua Franca the Mediterranean trade pidgin?" In *Merchants of Innovation: The Languages of Traders.* Studies in Language Change Series 15, edited by Esther-Miriam Wagner, Bettina Beinhoff, and Ben Outhwaite, 252–271. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Serjeantson, Mary S. 1935. *A History of Foreign Words in English*. London: K. Paul.

Seville Corpus of Northern English (2008). <ingles3.us.es/>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Siegel, Jeff. 1985. "Koines and koineization." *Language in Society* 14: 357–378.

Simpson, John A., and E.S.C. Weiner. 1989. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. <http://www.oed.com/>. Accessed April 27, 2020.

Simpson, John A., and Michael Proffitt. 1990-in progress. *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd edn. <http://www.oed.com/>. Accessed April 27, 2020.

Skeat, Walter W. 1882. *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Smith, Jeremy J. 1994. "A Philologist's View." In *Speaking in our Tongues: Proceedings of the Colloquium on Medieval Dialectology and Related Disciplines*, ed. Margaret Laing and Keith Williamson, 93–97. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Smith, Jeremy J. 1996. *An Historical Study of English*. London: Routledge.

Smith, Jeremy J. 2007. *Sound Change and the History of English*. Oxford: OUP.

Spencer, Andrew. 2003. "Does English have productive compounding?" In *Topics in Morphology. Selected Papers from the Third Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, *Barcelona 20-22 September 2001*, edited by Geert Booji, Janet DeCesaris, Angela Ralli, and Sergio Scalise, 329–341. Barcelona: Institut Universitari de Lingüística aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Steenstrup, Johannes C. H. R. 1882. *Normannerne*, Vol. 4: Danelag. København: Klein.

Stein. Gabriele. 1985. *The English Dictionary before Cawdrey.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Stenbrenden, Gjertrud Flermoen. 2013. "The diphthongisation of ME *ū*: the spelling evidence." In *English Corpus Linguistics, Variation in Time, Space and Genre:*

Selected Papers from ICAME 32 (Language & Computers), edited by Gisle Andersen and Kristin Bech, 53–67. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Stenbrenden, Gjertrud Flermoen. 2015. "The development of early Middle English *ō:* Spelling evidence." In *Historical Linguistics 2013: Selected Papers from the 21st International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Oslo, 5-9 August 2013*, edited by Dag T. T. Haug, 41–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stenbrenden, Gjertrud Flermoen. 2016. *Long-Vowel Shifts in English, c.1050–1700: Evidence from* Spelling (Studies in English Language, p. I). Cambridge: CUP.

Stenroos, Merja. 2016. "Regional language and culture: The geography of Middle English linguistic variation." In *Imagining Medieval English: Language Structures and Theories, 500–1500* (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature), edited by Tim William Machan, 100–125. Cambridge: CUP.

Stenroos, Merja. 2019. "*Langage o northrin lede*: Northern Middle English as a written medium." In *Revisiting the Medieval North of England: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, edited by Anita Auer, Denis Renevey, Camille Marshall, and Tino Oudesluijs, 39–57. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Stenroos, Merja, Kjetil V. Thengs, and Geir Bergstrøm. 2017–. *A Corpus of Middle English Local Documents* [*MELD*] (2017.1). Accessed April 27, 2019. <http://www.uis.no/meld>.

Stockwell, Robert P. and Donka Minkova. 1988a. "The English Vowel Shift: problems of coherence and explanation." In *Luick Revisited*, edited by Dieter Kastovsky and Gero Bauer 355–94. Tübingen: Narr.

Stockwell, Robert P. and Donka Minkova. 1988b. "A Rejoinder to Lass." In *Luick Revisited*, edited by Dieter Kastovsky and Gero Bauer, 411–417. Tübingen: Narr.

Suggett, Helen. 1946. "The use of French in England in the later Middle Ages." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 28: 61–83.

Surtees Society. n.d. <http://www.surteessociety.org.uk/>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Sykes, Frederick Henry. 1899. *French Elements in Middle English*. Oxford: Hart.

Sylvester, Louise. 2016. "The language of textiles in Anglo-Saxon wills." In *Text, Intertext, Textiles: Essays in Honor of Gale R. Owen-Croker,* edited by Maren Clegg Hyer and Jill Frederick, 27–41. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Sylvester, Louise. 2017. "A semantic field and text-type approach to late-medieval multilingualism." In *Multilingual Practices in Language History: English and Beyond*, edited by Päivi Pahta, Janne Skaffari, and Laura Wright, 77–96. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.

Sylvester, Louise. 2018. "Contact effects on the technical lexis of Middle English: a semantic hierarchic approach." *English Language & Linguistics* 22 (2): 249–264.

Sylvester, Louise, and Imogen Marcus. 2017. "Studying French origin Middle English lexis using the Bilingual Thesaurus of Medieval England." In *Studies in Language Variation and Change 2: Shifts and Turns in the History of English*, edited by Elise Louviot and Catherine Delesse, 217–228. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Sylvester, Louise, and Mark C. Chambers. 2012. "Multilingualism in the vocabulary of dress and textiles in late medieval Britain: Some issues for historical lexicology." In *English Historical Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 16)*, *Pécs, 23-27 August 2010*, edited by Irén Hegedűs and Alexandra Fodor, 313–326. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sylvester, Louise, Mark C. Chambers, and Gale R. Owen-Crocker, eds. 2014. *Medieval Dress and Textiles in Britain: A Multilingual Sourcebook.* Woodbridge: Boydell.

Sylvester, Louise, Imogen Marcus, and Richard Ingham. 2017. "A Bilingual Thesaurus of Everyday Life in Medieval England: Some Issues at the Interface of Semantics and Lexicography." *International Journal of Lexicography* 30 (3): 309–321.

Taylor, Joseph. 2010. "Chaucer's Uncanny Regionalism: Rereading the North in *The Reeve's Tale*." *JEGP* 109 (4): 468–489.

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

Thompson, A. Hamilton. 1939. *The Surtees Society, 1834–1934*. Durham/London: Surtees Society.

Thorson, Per. 1936. *Anglo-Norse Studies: An Inquiry into the Scandinavian Elements in the Modern English Dialects. Part I*. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Threlfall-Holmes, Miranda. 2005. *Monks and Markets: Durham Cathedral Priory 1460-1520.* Oxford: OUP.

Timofeeva, Olga, and Richard Ingham. 2018. "Special issue on mechanisms of French contact influence in Middle English: diffusion and maintenance." *English Language and Linguistics* 22 (2): 197–205.

Tobler, Adolf, and Erhard Lommatzsch. 1925-2002. *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, 11 vols [*TL*]. Berlin: Weidmann; Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Tolkien, John Ronald R. 1934. "Chaucer as a Philologist: *The Reeve's Tale*." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 33 (1), 1–70.

Toll, Johannes Michael. 1926. *Niederländisches Lehngut im Mittelenglischen: ein Beitrag zuer englischen Wortgeschichte*. Studien zuer englischen Philologie 69. Halle: Niemeyer.

Townend, Matthew. 2002. *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 6. Turnhout: Brepols.

Tranel, Bernard. 1987. *The Sounds of French.* Cambridge: CUP.

Trotter, David, ed. 2000. *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.

Trotter, David. 2003. "*Oceano vox*: You never know where a ship comes from. On multilingualism and language-mixing in medieval Britain." In *Aspects of Multilingualism in European Language History*, edited by Kurt Braunmüller and Gisella Ferraresi, 15–33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Trotter, David. 2007. "Building bridges in Anglo-Norman: The lexical evidence." Paper given at the *Symposium on Middle English and Anglo-Norman*, University of Central England, February 2007.

Trotter, David. 2009. "Stuffed Latin: vernacular evidence in Latin documents." In *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c.1100-c.1500*, edited by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al., 153–163. York: York Medieval Press.

Trotter, David. 2011. "Death, taxes and property: Some code-switching evidence from Dover, Southampton, and York." In *Code-Switching in Early English*, edited by Herbert Schendl and Laura Wright, 155–189. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Trudgill, Peter. 2004. *New Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Turner, James. 2014. *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.

van Bavel, Bas. 2010. *Manors and Markets: Economy and Society in the Low Countries 500-1600*. Oxford: OUP.

van Eyndhoven, Sarah, and Lynn Clark. 2020. "The <quh->–<wh-> switch: an empirical account of the anglicisation of a Scots variant in Scotland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." *English Language and Linguistics* 24 (1): 211–236.

Van Goethem, Kristel. 2009. "Choosing between A+N compounds and lexicalized A+N phrases: The position of French in comparison to Germanic languages." *Word Structure* 2(2): 241–253.

Varenbergh, Emile. 1874. *Histoire des relations diplomatiques entre le comté de Flandre et* l'*Angleterre au Moyen Age*. Brussels.

Vennemann, Theo. 2011. "English as a contact language: Typology and comparison." *Anglia* 129: 17–57.

Versloot, Arjen. 2017. "On the nature of mixed languages: The case of Bildts." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 248: 113–136.

Vikar, Anders. 1922. *Contributions to the History of the Durham Dialects: An Orthographical Investigation*. Malmö: Röhr.

Villoing, Florence. 2012. "French compounds." *Probus* 24: 29–60.

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, translated and edited by Juan C. Sager and Marie-Josée Hamel. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

von Wartburg, Walther. 1922-2002. *Französisches Etymologisches Wörtebuch. Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes* [*FEW*]. Basel: Zbinden.

Wade, John F., ed. 1995. *The Customs Accounts of Newcastle upon Tyne 1454-1500*. Durham: Surtees Society.

Wales, Katie. 2006. *Northern English: A Cultural and Social History*. Cambridge: CUP.

Watson, John W., Jr. 1947. "Non-initial *k* in the north of England." *Language* 23: 43–49.

Weigert, Roger-Armand. 1962. *French Tapestry.* London: Faber and Faber.

Wells, John Christopher. 1982. *Accents of English* (3 volumes). Cambridge: CUP.

Wełna, Jerzy. 2011. "*Leal/real/viage* or *loyal/royal/voyage*: On the distribution of the forms of loanwords from Norman and Parisian French in Middle English." In

Foreign Influences on Medieval English, edited by Jacek Fisiak and Magdalena Bator, 303–14. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

West, V. Royce. 1936. *Der etymologische Ursprung der neuenglischen Lautgruppe [sk]*. Anglistische Forschungen 83. Heidelberg: Winter.

Whitwell, Robert J. 1904. "English monasteries and the wool trade in the thirteenth century." *Vierteljahrschrift fur Sozial und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 2: 1–33.

Williamson, Keith. 2002. "The dialectology of 'English' north of the Humber, c. 1380-1500." In *Sounds, Words, Texts and Change: Selected Papers from 11 ICEHL, Santiago de Compostela, 7-11 September 2000*, edited by Teresa Fanego, Belén Méndez-Naya, and Elena Seoane, 253–285. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wilmanns, Wilhelm. 1896. *Deutsche Grammatik*: *Gotisch, Alt- Mittel- und Neuhochdeutsch*. Vol. 2. *Wortbildung*. Strasbourg: Trübner.

Winford, Donald. 2005. "Contact-induced change: classification and process." *Diachronica* 22: 373–427.

Wise, Hilary. 1997. *The Vocabulary of Modern French. Origins, Structure and Function.* London/New York: Routledge.

Wogan-Browne, Jocelyn et al. 2009. *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England c.1100-c.1500*. York: York Medieval Press.

Wollmann, Alfred. 1993. "Early Latin loan-words in Old English." *Anglo-Saxon England* 22 1–26.

Wright, Joseph and Elizabeth Mary Wright. 1928. *An Elementary Middle Grammar*. 2nd edn. London: OUP.

Wright, Joseph. 1896–1905. *The English Dialect Dictionary* [*EDD*]*,* 6 vols. Oxford: Henry Frowde.

Wright, Joseph. *EDD online.* 2017. <http://eddonline-proj.uibk.ac.at/edd/index.jsp>. Accessed April 27, 2019.

Wright, Laura. 1994. "Early Modern London business English." In *Studies in Early Modern English*, edited by Dieter Kastovsky, 449–465. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wright, Laura. 1995. "A hypothesis on the structure of macaronic business writing." In *Medieval Dialectology,* edited by Jacek Fisiak, 309–321. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wright, Laura. 1996. *Sources of London English: Medieval Thames Vocabulary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wright, Laura. 1998. "Mixed-language business writing. Five hundred years of code-switching." In *Language Change: Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics*, edited by Ernst Håkon Jahr, 99–118. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wright, Laura. 2002. "Code-Intermediate phenomena in medieval mixed-language business texts." *Language Sciences* 24 (3-4): 471–489.

Wright, Laura. 2010. "A pilot study on the singular definite articles *le* and *la* in fifteenth-century London mixed-language business writing." In *The Anglo-Norman Language and its Contexts*, edited by Richard Ingham, 130–142. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Wright, Laura. 2011. "On variation in medieval mixed-language business writing." In *Code-Switching in Early English*, edited by Herbert Schendl and Laura Wright, 191–218. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wright, Laura. 2013. "On historical language dictionaries and language boundaries." In *Evur Happie & Glorious, Ffor I Hafe at Will Grete Riches (Medieval English Mirror 9)*, edited by Liliana Sikorska and Marcin Krygier, 11–26. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Wright, Laura. 2017. "A multilingual approach to the history of standard English." In *Multilingual Practices in Language History*, edited by Päivi Pahta, Janne Skaffari, and Laura Wright, 339–358. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wright, Laura. 2020. *Sunnyside: A Sociolinguistic History of British House Names*. Oxford: OUP.

Wyld, Henry Cecil. 1927. *A Short History of English* (3rd edition). London: Murray.

Xandry, Georg. 1914. *Das skandinavische Element in den neuenglischen Dialekten*. Münster: Neulsenburg.

Yorkshire Historical Dictionary <yorkshiredictionary.york.ac.uk>. Accessed June, 1 2020.

Zgusta, Ladislav. 1967. "Multiword lexical units." *Word* 23: 578–587.

Appendices[1]

Appendix 1. *DAR* spelling variants of OE-origin simplexes classified in the *HTOED*[2]

ANIMALS
animals » birds
cranys, **capon'**, capone, caponibus, caponum, caponibus, capones

animals » fish
koles, **sprottis**, sprot, sprott'

animals » invertebrates
Crabbs, crabb', crabbes, **lempetis**

animals » mammals
bevyre, **Hogges**, hoggez, **seall**, ceel (?) zele, sele, seylle, sely, Sealles, porcus maris, seall, **Scharlyng**, Scherlings, **Stottez**, stottis, stott',[3] **stirkis,** Stirks, styrk', styrkis, **Schoyth**, **staggis**, stagg, stag, **Trynters**, **twynterys**, Twynters

animals » domestic animal » [noun] » work animals
Draughes, draughs, drattes (multon. drattes)

animals for food » seafood » [noun] » fish » quantity of fish
stickes ('A measure of quantity for eels')

FARMING
farming » animal husbandry » animal enclosure
powndes (lez), powndis (le), Poundez (lez)

animal husbandry » fish-keeping, farming, or breeding
yar, yare

animal husbandry » general equipment
yokys, **salys**

animal husbandry » keeping of cattle
bier, **busys** (le)

animal husbandry » keeping or management of horses » horse-gear
helteres, helthyr' (pl.), heltrez, **stirropes**, steropez, styroppys (par del), strepis, Stiraps, stirropis

farming » cultivation or tillage
croppez, croppis, croppys (le), **draghtes**, **rickland.**, **wryk**

farming » farm » farmland
croftis, Croft, **Hope** (le)

farming » forestry or arboriculture

---

[1] The full preliminary database (the 'master' spreadsheet) can be found at <shorturl.at/ADFQS>.
[2] An explanation of the *HTOED*'s system can be found at <www.oed.com/thesaurus>.
[3] All the forms in the appendix which contain <.> or <'> denote plural entities unless otherwise specified.

Byll, **ernyng**, ernyng', Erthening' [transmission error acc. to the OED], hernyng, **Toppys**

farming » hedging
hardyn (le), Herdyng (vocat.), hardyng (le), **floryng** (le), **pynnyng**, **ʒedders**

farming » tools and implements
culter, harows, hawkkes, hakkis, Hakkes, hakkez, **mattokis**, **pikkes**, pikes, pica, pikkes (lez), pike, pikys, pykys, pykkez, pykkez, **sythys**, sythe

FOOD AND DRINK
food and drink » food
Berme, **Grotis**, grotez, grotis, grotes, **pynes**, pynnys, **thirlyng**

food » additive » sweetener » [noun] » sugar
laff, laf

food » animals for food » seafood
herrings, **lenges**, leng', ling, Leenges, leyng, **lopisters**, lopster', lopsters, **Moskylles**, moskyll, muscles, muskyls, muscull., **Ostree** (pl.), oysters, Oystres, hosters, **stickes** [» fish » quantity of fish], **Troutes**, trut', trutis, Truttis, trout, Troutys, trutes, **Wilkes**, wylkes, Wilkes, Welkys

food » dairy produce
boutiri, butir, butir', Butir., butiro, butir, butiri

food » providing or receiving food » feeding animals
hekkys (le), hekes

food » food manufacture and preparation » equipment for food preparation
calver, kalver, **ketil**

» preparation of grain
fanna, **flailes**, **mylne**, **scutellis**, scotil, scuttyl, scoteles, scutell., scutell (pl.), schewtells, scotlys, scuteles, scotellez (cf. scutella, scutello), **temys**, **whight**

» preparation for table or cooking
Kalver

food and drink » drink
bere, ber

food and drink » drink » containers for drink
cannez, **cuppa**, Cuppis, **Shellez**

food and drink » table utensils
dischis, disshes

PLANTS
the world » plants
coclis, kocles, kokells, cokles, cokylles, cokelys, kokyllez (bus. del), **fruth'**, **hather**, hathir, **mapill**, **mosse** (le), mosse (lez), mosse, mossez (le), **Whik**, qweke, qwyke, **sallowys**, **sprynges** (le), Spryng (le), Sprynge (le), Spryng (le), **thornes** (lez), **wedys**

plants » particular plants » cultivated or valued plants » particular food plant or plant product
eree, **pyone**

plants » part of plant
stovens (lez)

INDUSTRY
industry » building or constructing » build or construct
Settyng, settyng (le)[4]

industry » building or constructing » building or providing with specific parts » build or provide with specific parts » floor
fellyng, fellyng (le), fellynge (le), fyllyng

industry » manufacturing processes » mending or repairing
drawyng (le)

MEASUREMENTS
measurement » measurement by weighing » equipment for weighing » [noun] » a weighing apparatus » a balance
Wegh, Weez, Weys, Wey

measurement by weighing » [noun] » unit or denomination of weight
fothyr (pl.), fothre, fothr', fother, fodir, futhrez, fothir, fuder, fudr., **lades**, laad (pl.), ladz, **stane** (pl.)

measurement » the scientific measurement of volume » measure(s) of capacity » [noun] » dry measure
bollez, boll, **ken'**, ken.

measurement » measurement of length
ells, **fadomys**, fadomes, fadome (pl.), fadom (pl.), **rod.**, rod', Rude, rode

SOCIETY
inhabiting and dwelling » inhabited place » a building » parts of building
freswardes, **friste**, frystys, **Ribs** (printed Rylbys), Rylbys (read rybbys), **roofe**, **Syles**, syles, sylez, **lattes**, lattis

inhabiting and dwelling » inhabited place » a building » furniture and fittings
bolsteres (le), bolsters, bolster, bolstourz, **mattes** (lez), matte, mattis, **strail**, strailez, stralez (le), stralys (le), strayls, strayles

society » occupation and work » duties » [noun] » piece of work or task
char (le)

occupation and work » equipment for food preparation » cooking vessel or pot
yettelyng

occupation and work » materials » fuel
fyre, **wick**, weke

[4] Changes in the use of the initial capital letter are not listed as different variants, only those which variably present *le* are listed individually.

occupation and work » materials » derived or manufactured material
plastr', **Pyke** ['resinous material'], **seme**, seym

» derived or manufactured material » metal
bras, **clout**, clitta, clout., **hirnes**, **lynynges**, **Schaffes**, shaff', sheffe, shaffe (pl.), shaff, shafe, scheff., scheffe (pl.)

occupation and work » materials » raw material » wood
balk, balke, **bemes**, beem, **birk**, **bordis**, bordez, bordarum, burdarum, **ryss** (del) ('brushwood'), rysez, Riesse, **Spone** ((pl.) 'roofing-shingles'), spone (pl.), spone (del)

» materials » raw material » plants, grasses, or reeds
thacke (le), thak (le), thake (le)

occupation and work » equipment » building and constructing equipment » fastenings
bowtys (le), boltes, **clyppez**, **hespes**, hesp, hespe, **henges**, **hopys**, hopis, **Rapys**, ropez, **Rynges**, ryngis, **staples**, stapels, stapillez, stapill, stapyls (lez), stapul

» equipment » clutching or gripping equipment
clammys, clamys, **hokes**, hukes, **tangs**

» equipment » cutting tool
twybil

» equipment » digging or lifting tools
shovele, shole, sholez, shouill, shulys

» equipment » driving or beating tools
betours, **hamer**

» equipment » furnace or kiln
kilne (del)

» equipment » lever or crowbar
gavelok, gaywylloke, Gowfleg' [error?], gaveloc, gavelokis, **wedgez**, wegges, weggez, weggis, Wegg.

equipment » piercing or boring tools
nallez

equipment » receptacle or container
boll, bollez, bollys, bollis, **chyme** (le), **fattes**, fatt', fattez, **ladels**, ladyls, laddils, ladyll, ladill, ladell (pl), ladyll, **lepe**, lepez, lepes, leippez, **mellis**, melys, mele, meles, mell, meel, **sakys**, sekkes, **Synkys** (le), synke (le), synk (le), **trough**

equipment » shaping tools or equipment
fyle, fylys, **schaves**

equipment » tool » parts of tools generally
handylles, handyll'

equipment » tool » types of tools generally
sparrys (le), sparrez (del), **stayff'**

occupation and work » industry » working with tools or equipment » fastening
messlyng, m'shellyng

occupation and work » workplace » workshop
shoppe (le)

SOCIETY (other domains)
society » armed hostility » military equipment » weapon
shafte, shafth

society » authority » punishment » public or popular punishments
thewe

society » faith » artefacts
bedys, beedes, **creba**

society » leisure » the arts » music » musical instrument
knoll

» leisure » gardening » garden
orchard (le)

» leisure » the arts » visual arts » ornamental art and craft
frethyngs, frethyng'

society » trade and finance » money » place for keeping money
bigirdill

TEXTILES AND CLOTHING
textiles and clothing » clothing
bakkes, **lowkyng** (le)

textiles and clothing » textiles » textile manufacture » manufacture of thread or yarn
Spynnyng (le)

» textiles » textile fabric or an article of textile fabric
halyng (le)

» textiles » textile fabric or an article of textile fabric » ornamental textiles
heggeyng (le)

TRAVEL
travel » means of travel » a conveyance » vehicle » vehicles according to means of motion » vehicle moving on wheels » [noun] » parts of vehicle moving on wheels » axle » fastening for
axes

» parts of vehicle moving on wheels » wheel » rim » section of
strakes, strakis

travel » means of travel » a conveyance » vehicle » cart, carriage, or wagon » parts of cart or carriage

polis, **schacles**, schakyll, schaklys, Schakles, Shakelys

travel » transport » [noun] » of loads
gang, ganges, gange

THE WORLD
the world » the earth » minerals
Thyll (le), thill (le), Thill, Tyldez (lez)

» the earth » water
byrtenyng, **fleme** (le), fleyme (le)

» the earth » land » landscape
Deynez (les)

the world » matter » colour » named colours » white or whiteness » whitening
beyttyng (le), **blechynges**

» matter » colour » named colours » grey or greyness » [adjective]
gray

» matter » light » artificial light » an artificial light » candle
candel

» matter » properties of materials » temperature » heat » heating or making hot » that which or one who heats
harth (le), harthe (le)

the world » movement » impelling or driving » pushing and pulling
demmyng

the world » space
rowmez, rowme

» space » relative position » condition of being open or not closed » an opening or aperture
yate (del)

» space » relative position » closed or shut condition » that which or one who closes or shuts » a barrier
hayes, **hirdeles**

» space » place » removal or displacement
laynge (le), layng (le)

Appendix 2.1. ML/AF forms and their temporal and textual distribution

alkenemy	Rott. Sacrist. 1403-4, 394
akamy	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398

amerciamentis	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 68
amerciamentorum	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 68
amerciamentis	Rott. Camer. 1362-3, 177
amerciamento	Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 216
am*er*ciam*entum*	Maresc. Priori 1392, 347
amerciamentis	Rott. Bursar. c. 1299, 494

amita	Rott. Elemos. 1338, 199
amicta (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1343, 205
amictis	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1423-4, 271
amita	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1384-5, 264
amitis	Rott. Sacrist. 1407-8, 401
amittarum	Rott. Sacrist. 1413-4, 404

argenti (x2)[5]	Rott. Celer. 1333-4, 29
argent.	Rott. Celer. 1347, 42
argentum	Rott. Celer. c. 1350, 44
argento (x4)	Rott. Celer. 1393, 50
argenti	Rott. Hostill. 1355-6, 121
Argent.	Rott. Hostill. 1371, 130
argentiis	Rott. Hostill. c. 1380?, 132
argento	Rott. Sacrist. 1351-2, 382
argento	Rott. Sacrist. 1356-7, 383
argento	Rott. Sacrist. 1361-2, 385
argento	Rott. Sacrist. 1367-8, 386
argento	Rott. Sacrist. 1382-3, 389
argentum (x2)	Rott. Sacrist. c. 1410 (verso)
argento (x11)	Liber de Reliquiis 1383, 426-433
argento (x4)	Rott. Feretrar. 1397, 445
argentum	Rott. Feretrar. 1397, 445
argento	Rott. Feretrar. 1397-8, 446
argenti	Rott. Feretrar. 1401, 450
argento (x3)	Rott. Feretrar. (verso) 1401, 453
argento	Rott. Feretrar. 1411-2, 458
argento (x3)	Rott. Feretrar. 1418 (verso), 461-2
argento	Rott. Feretrar. 1441-2 (verso), 471
argenteorum	Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 528
argenteis	Rott. Bursar. 1357, 559
argento	Rott. Bursar. 1358, 561
argent.	Rott. Bursar. 1390-1, 597

[5] I only consider here the use of *argent* as a noun not as an adjective, the latter occurring as *argentei*, -a, -*o*, and *argent'*.

Bowges	Rott. Bursar. 1443, 82
Boulgys	Rott. Bursar. 1309?, 506
Bulgis	Rott. Bursar. 1300-1, 502
Bowgez	Rott. Bursar. 1453-4, 633
cabils	Rott. Sacrist. 1350-1, 381
cabyll (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396
cabyllys	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396
cablys	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397
capelle[6]	Rott. Celer. 1375?, 46
capella (x2)	Rott. Hostill. 1355-6, 122
capelle	Rott. Hostill. 1361-2, 126
Chapl.	Rott. Hostill. 1361-2, 127
Capelle	Rott. Hostill. 1460-1, 153
capelle (x2)	Rott. Hostill. 1528-9, 162-3
Capella	Rott. Hostill. 1303, 164
capell.	Rott. Elemos. 1368-9, 209
capelle (x5)	Rott. Elemos. 1372-3, 210
capellam	Rott. Elemos. 1372-3, 210
capella	Rott. Elemos. 1372-3, 210
capell.	Rott. Elemos. 1374, 211
capelle	Rott. Elemos. 1378-9, 212
capella	Rott. Elemos. 1391-2, 213
capelle	Rott. Elemos. 1399-1400, 216
capelle (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1403-4, 217-8
capellis	Rott. Elemos. 1403-4, 217
capella	Rott. Elemos. 1403-4, 218
capella (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 220-1
capelle	Rott. Elemos. 1406-7, 222
capelle	Rott. Elemos. 1407-8, 223
capella (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1413-4, 224
capelle	Rott. Elemos. 1413-4, 224
capellis (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1416-7, 225
capelle	Rott. Elemos. 1416-7, 225
capella (x3)	Rott. Elemos. 1416-7, 225-6
capella	Rott. Elemos. 1418-9, 227
capellam (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1423-4, 229
capelle	Rott. Elemos. 1431-2, 231
capella	Rott. Elemos. 1432-3, 232
capellas	Rott. Elemos. 1432-3, 232
capella	Rott. Elemos. 1434-5, 232
capella	Rott. Elemos. c. 1430-40, 234
capella	Rott. Elemos. c. 1447-8, 236
capella	Rott. Elemos. c. 1449-50, 239
capelle (x4)	Rott. Elemos. 1450, 240
capellam	Rott. Elemos. 1450, 240

[6] N.B. For space limitations, only the attestations from volume 1 (Fowler 1898) are here reproduced. All of the *capelle/-a* forms occur in an oblique case (the ablative singular), so the variation in the final vowel is not due to the word's syntactic function. *Capellam* is usually preceded by a prep. which requires an accusative form (e.g. *ad* and *juxta* (CL *iuxtā*)).

capella Rott. Elemos. 1456-7, 242
capelle (x3) Rott. Elemos. 1458-9, 242
capellam Rott. Elemos. 1470-1, 245
Capella (x2) Rott. Elemos. 1470-1, 1472, 246
capelle Rott. Elemos. 1480-1, 248
capelle Rott. Elemos. 1492-3, 249
capelle Rott. Elemos. 1494-5, 250
capella Rott. Elemos. 1506-7, 250
capellam Rott. Elemos. 1516-7, 254
capelle (x3) Rott. Elemos. 1522-3, 255
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1354-5, 261
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1355-6, 261
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1381-2, 263
Capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1384-5, 264
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1388-9, 266
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1390-1, 267
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1397-8, 267
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1397-8, 267
capelle (x2) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1398-9, 268
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1414-5, 268
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1424-5, 271
capellam Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1424-5, 272
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1426-7, 272
capelle (x2) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1428-9, 273
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1428-9, 273
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1437-8, 274
capellam Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1439-41, 274
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1439-41, 274
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1441-2, 275
capelle (x2) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1439-41, 275
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1442-3, 275
Chapelende (vocata) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1447-8, 275
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1448-9, 276
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1448-9, 276
capellam Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1449-50, 276
chapelende (le) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1450-1, 276
capellam Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1458-9, 278
capella Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1467-8, 280
capelle Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1467-8, 280

crate Rott. Elemos. 1397-8, 215
cratis Rott. Sacrist. 1360-1, 385

cubibis Rott. Celer. 1309-10, 6
Cubibb' Rott. Bursar. 1302-3, 503
quibibis Rott. Bursar. 1313-14, 512
Quybibbis Rott. Bursar. 1348-9, 549
Whibibbes Rott. Bursar. 1355-1356, 555

frontellorum Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1424-5, 271
frontali Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1448-9, 276
frontell Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1458-9, 278
frontali Rott. Sacrist. 1407-8, 401
frontalis Rott. Sacrist. 1409-10, 402

frontall’	Rott. Sacrist. 1485-6, 416
frontello (x3)	Rott. Feretrar. 1397, 445
frontello (x4)	Rott. Feretrar. 1401, 453
frontell. (x2)	Rott. Feretrar. 1418, 461
frontell	Rott. Feretrar. 1418, 461
frontell (x3)	Rott. Feretrar. 1441-2 (verso), 471
frontell. (x3)	Rott. Feretrar. 1441-2 (verso), 471
frontell.	Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 518
frontel.	Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 519
frontello	Rott. Bursar. 1341, 542

Ginger	Rott. Celer. 1366, 45
Gingiberis	Rott. Bursar. 1299, 495
Gingiberis	Rott. Bursar. 1302-3, 503
Gynger	Rott. Bursar. 1363-4, 566
Grenginger	Rott. Bursar. 1384-5, 594
ginger	Rott. Bursar. 1399, 602
gynger	Rott. Bursar. 1523-4, 666

granis	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 74
granis	Rott. Hostill. 1454, 150
grayn	Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 527
granes	Rott. Bursar. 1523-4, 666

gummis	Rott. Celer. 1344, 40
gummis	Rott. Hostill. 1333-4, 115
Gummi	Rott. Bursar. 1300-1, 503
gummis	Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 527
gummis	Rott. Bursar. c. 1335, 530
gumme	Rott. Bursar. 1336, 533
gummis	Rott. Bursar. 1341, 542
Gummis	Rott. Bursar. c. 1364-5, 568

Kameka	Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 375
Camaka	Rott. Sacrist. 1344-5, 379

lagenis	Rott. Celer. 1307-8, 6
lagen.	Rott. Celer. 1314-5, 10
lagena	Rott. Celer. 1346, 41
lagen.	Rott. Celer. 1375?, 46
lagen.	Rott. Celer. 1390, 49
lagen.	Rott. Celer. 1403, 51
lagen ((pl.) lagen mellis)	Rott. Celer. 1403, 51
lagenis	Rott. Celer. c. 1420, 56
lagen. (x9)	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 69-76
lagenis	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 69
lagenas	Rott. Celer. 1448-9, 87
lagena	Rott. Hostill. 1361-2, 126
lagene (pl.)	Rott. Hostill. 1371, 129
lagen.	Rott. Hostill. 1485-6, 157
lagena (x2)	Rott. Camer. 1324-5, 166
lagene	Rott. Elemos. 1338, 199
lagenis	Rott. Elemos. 1412-3 (verso), 224
lagenas	Rott. Elemos. 1419 (verso), 227

lagenis	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1369-70, 263
lagen.	Rott. Communiar. 1480-1, 289
lagenis (x3)	Rott. Inst. 1338-9, 310
lagen.	Rott. Sacrist. 1318, 373
lagenis	Rott. Sacrist. 1376-7, 386
lagen.	Rott. Sacrist. 1401-2, 393
lagenis (x3)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 398
lagene (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1439-40 (verso), 409
lagenis (x3)	Rott. Bursar. 1278, 485-7
lagen.	Rott. Bursar. c. 1299, 494
lagen.	Rott. Bursar. 1310-1 (verso), 509
lagen.	Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 527
lagena	Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 528
lagenis	Rott. Bursar. 1341, 541
macez	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 70
Maces	Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 527
mace	Rott. Communiar. 1511-2, 291
palefrido	Rott. Celer. 1307-8, 5
palefrid.	Rott. Celer. 1337-8, 34
palefrido (x2)	Rott. Hostill. 1370-9, 131
palefrido	Rott. Camer. 1324-5, 167
palefrid.	Rott. Camer. 1324-5, 167
palefridis	Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 170
palefr.	Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 171
palefrido	Rott. Camer. 1350-1, 173
palefridus	Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376
palefrido	Rott. Bursar. 1278 (verso), 488
palefrido	Rott. Bursar. c. 1333?, 521
palefridi	Rott. Bursar. 1333, 522
palefr. (x2)	Rott. Bursar. 1333-4, 523
palefrido	Rott. Bursar. 1336 (verso), 533
palefrido	Rott. Bursar. 1338-9, 535
palefrido	Rott. Bursar. 1341, 542
palefrido	Rott. Bursar. 1344-5, 544
palefridis	Rott. Bursar. 1344-5, 544
palefridis	Rott. Bursar. 1350-1, 551
palefr.	Rott. Bursar. c. 1366-8, 569
Palefrido	Rott. Bursar. 1368-9, 575
papiro	Rott. Celer. 1391, 50
papiri	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 72
papiro	Rott. Celer. 1445-6, 84
papiro	Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
papiro	Rott. Celer. 1534-5, 112
papirum	Rott. Hostill. 1385-6, 133
papirum	Rott. Hostill. 1427-8, 142
papirum	Rott. Hostill. 1464-5, 154
papiro	Rott. Hostill. 1480-1, 157
papiro	Rott. Hostill. 1528-9, 163
papiro	Rott. Hostill. 1450-1, 189
papirum	Rott. Elemos. 1398-9, 215
papirum	Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 219

papiro	Rott. Elemos. 1523-4, 257
papirum	Rott. Elemos. 1436-7, 274
papiro	Rott. Communiar. 1416-7, 284
papirum	Rott. Communiar. 1416-7, 286
papiro	Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 296
papiro	Rott. Terrar. 1425-6, 303
papiro	Rott. Terrar. 1507-8, 307
papiro	Rott. Instaur. 1480-1, 322
papiro	Rott. Sacrist. 1536, 419
papiro	Rott. Feretrar. 1386-7, 442
papiro	Rott. Feretrar. 1389-90, 444
papiro	Rott. Feretrar. 1397-8, 446
papiro	Rott. Feretrar. 1399-1400, 448
papirum	Rott. Feretrar. 1430-1, 467
papiro	Rott. Feretrar. 1480-1, 479
papir.	Rott. Feretrar. 1501-2, 480
papyr	Rott. Bursar. c. 1358, 561
papiro	Rott. Bursar. 1374, 580
papiro	Rott. Bursar. 1379-80, 589
papiro	Rott. Bursar. c. 1440, 626
papiri	Rott. Bursar. c. 1440, 626
papiri	Rott. Bursar. 1473-4, 645
papiri	Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 655
papiri	Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 659
papiro	Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 698
parure	Rott. Elemos. 1338, 199
paruris	Rott. Elemos. 1338, 199
parure	Rott. Elemos. 1343, 205
parur'	Rott. Elemos. 1373, 211
paruris	Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376
paruris	Rott. Sacrist. 1407-8, 401
paruris	Rott. Sacrist. 1415-5, 405
parures	Rott. Bursar. 1313-4, 512
paschali	Rott. Elemos. 1367-8, 208
Paschalis	Rott. Sacrist. 1423-4, 408
paschali	Rott. Sacrist. 1423-4, 408
pipa	Rott. Celer. 1328-9, 16
pipa	Rott. Celer. c. 1340, 36
pipa (x2)	Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97
pipa	Rott. Celer. 1490-1, 100
pipa	Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
pipa	Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108
pypez	Rott. Hostill. 1441-2, 144
pipa (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1438-9, 233
pipa	Rott. Elemos. 1438-9, 234
pype	Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245
pypes	Rott. Sacrist. 1352-3, 382
pipes	Rott. Feretrar. 1397, 445
pipes	Rott. Feretrar. 1401 (verso), 453
pypes	Rott. Feretrar. 1418 (verso), 461
pipes	Rott. Feretrar. 1441-2 (verso), 471

pipes	Rott. Bursar. c. 1310, 511
Pipes	Rott. Bursar. 1313-4, 512
pipes	Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 518
pipes	Rott. Bursar. 1333-4, 523
pipez	Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635
pipa	Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 582
pipa	Rott. Bursar. 1403-4, 605
pipa	Rott. Bursar. 1407-8, 607
pipa	Rott. Bursar. 1418-9, 615
pipa	Rott. Bursar. 1497-8, 655
pipa	Rott. Bursar. 1499-1500, 656
pipa	Rott. Bursar. 1503-4, 657

resinis	Rott. Celer. 1307-8, 2
rosen	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1448-9, 276
resina	Rott. Sacrist. 1421-2, 407
rosyn	Rott. Sacrist. 1458-9, 411
rosine	Rott. Sacrist. 1367-8, 386

regardis	Rott. Celer. 1462-3, 90
regardis (x2)	Rott. Celer. 1465-6, 91
regardo	Rott. Celer. 1469-70, 93
regardis	Rott. Celer. 1498-9, 101
regard.	Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
regardis	Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108
regardo	Rott. Hostill. 1444-5, 144
regardo	Rott. Camer. 1450-1, 189
regardis	Rott. Camer. 1532-3, 197
rewardo	Rott. Elemos. 1416-7, 225
rewardo	Rott. Terrar. 1414-5, 301
regardis	Rott. Sacrist. 1483-4, 415
regardo	Rott. Feretrar. 1448-9, 573
rewardo	Rott. Bursar. 1367-8, 571

salis	Rott. Celer. 1345, 41
sal. (x2)	Rott. Celer. 1439-40, 78
salis	Rott. Celer. 1439-40, 78
salis	Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 583

sarpleriis	Rott. Bursar. 1347-8, 546
Sarplers	Rott. Bursar. 1349-50, 550
Sarplers	Rott. Bursar. 1349-50, 552
sarplers	Rott. Bursar. 1353-4, 554
sarplers	Rott. Bursar. 1355, 556
sarplar	Rott. Bursar. 1408-9, 607
sarplez	Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635

sportis	Rott. Celer. 1337-8, 35
sportis	Rott. Celer. 1345, 41
sporta	Rott. Hostill. 1429-30, 142
sportis	Rott. Elemos. 1369-70, 209
sporte (pl.)	Rott. Elemos. 1407-8 (verso), 223
sportis	Rott. Bursar. 1334-5, 525

sportis Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 528
sportis (x2) Rott. Bursar. 1360-1, 563
sporta Rott. Bursar. 1416-7, 614

stamyn Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 169
stamyn (pl.) Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 171
stamyns Rott. Camer. 1362-3, 178

strigili (sing.) Rott. Camer. 1324-5, 167
strigilis Rott. Bursar. 1302-3, 504

Towell Rott. Celer. 1429, 60
towailles Rott. Hostill. 1371, 130
wessyngtowellez (lez) Rott. Hostill. c. 1452-3, 147
towelles Rott. Elemos. 1472, 246
tuella (x2) Rott. Elemos. 1515-6, 253
tuelli Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1432-3, 273
tuellis Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1432-3, 273
wessyng towell (pl.) Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398
towellis (x2) Rott. Feretrar. 1397, 445
towellis (x4) Rott. Feretrar. 1401, 453
towellis (x4) Rott. Feretrar. 1418 (verso), 461
tuellis Rott. Bursar. 1352-3, 553
tuels Rott. Bursar. 1364-5, 567
towell' Rott. Bursar. 1408-9, 607
towell Rott. Bursar. 1471-2, 643

tramale Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 88
Tramale Rott. Celer. 1467-8, 92
tramellez Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 106

vestimenta[7] Rott. Camer. 1324-5, 166
vestimentis Rott. Camer. 1344-5, 172

Rott. Elemos.
vestimentorum Rott. Elemos. 1416-7, 225
vestimento Rott. Elemos. 1416-7, 225
vestimentis Rott. Elemos. 1472, 246
vestimentorum (x2) Rott. Elemos. 1496-7, 250
vestimento
vestment Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239

Rott. Bursar.
vestimentorum Rott. Bursar. 1302-3, 505
vestment. Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 518

[7] Since the occurrences of *vestment* were too numerous, here are reproduced those from the rolls which showed greater morphological variability (both in the stem and the use of Latin inflectional endings and/or abbreviated forms). The edited rolls which consistently exhibited the Latinisation of this word are excluded apart from the Rott. Camer., where it only occurs twice.

Vestimentis	Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 518
vestimentis	Rott. Bursar. 1350-1, 551
vestimento	Rott. Bursar. c. 1365-5, 567
vestiment.	Rott. Bursar. 1378-9, 587
vestimento	Rott. Bursar. 1381-2, 592
vestimenti	Rott. Bursar. 1381-2, 592
vestimento	Rott. Bursar. 1401-2, 604
vestimento	Rott. Bursar. 1421-2, 619
vestimento	Rott. Bursar. 1444-5, 629

Appendix 2.2. *DAR* spelling variants of AF-origin simplexes: main semantic fields

ANIMALS

» birds (10)

capon', capone, caponibus, capon., caponum, capones, **corleu**, curleus, curlus, kurlew, curlows, Curlews, **emerliones**, **fesaund**, **grue**, **heronseus**, **Mallard**, mallertis, maulars, **pertrikis**, pertrykes, pertryke, **pluvers**, plovers, pluver, pluverse, **pulcin'**

» fish (17)

burbot, **coungres**, cungr., conger, **creuis**, crevese', **darre**, **gurnard**, **lamprays**, Lamprouns, lamprones, laumpronis, lamprayss, lawmpray, lawmprays, lampreys, laumprayez, laumpron, lampray, lamprons, **Luc'**, **makerell** (pl.), macrell (pl.), Makrell (pl.), **merlinges**, merling', merleng', **perchez**, **pykerells**, pikerels, **rayes**, **rochez**, **sp'linges**, sp'linge', sperling', sperl., sp'l, spalderlyngg', spalderlyng, sp'ling', spaldirlinges, spalderlinges, sperlyng', sperlynges, Spalgerlyngges, **Sturgun**, sturgeon, Sturgeown, strugon, **storion**, Storione, sturgon', Sturgeon, **tenchez**, **turbot**, torbotes, t'botes, turbot', turbotes, turbutt, Turbott, turbyt

» mammals (8)

ferretz, **Grapays**, gape, Graspais, **somer**, Somer (le), sommer, **squirrell**, **hoggastrez**, hoggastris, hoggastr., hoggastr', hoggastrorum, hoggastri,, **palefr.** (cf. palefrido, palefrid., palefridarius, palefridus, palefridis), **sor** (equo sor), **stalone**, stalonis

FARMING

» animal husbandry (14)

arsuns, **bates**, **cyng'lis**, houce, houces, Houzes, **langalds**, **panell** (also sadill panell, 'saddle cloth'), panel, panell', panels, **pastrons**, Pastronnes, **paytrel**, peytrell, **reynis**, **sursinglis**, **trace**, tracez, traicez, trays, Trayse (pl.), **traynell**, traynels, Traynell', **turettes**, **viuer** (le)

FOOD AND DRINKS

food and drinks (mainly food and utensils)

braune, Braun, Brawne, braunys, **chargeours**, chargeour, chargors, chargers, Chargiours (lez), **Charlet**, **Confecions**, **cowrans**, curawns, Coreyns , Curance, racemi corenc', corencz, Corencz, **drage**, dragee, drages, Dregy, dragy (drageti, draget), **flaun'**, flaunes, **froys**, **gastell**, **Gruello**, gruel', gruelle, gruelli, gruellum, **leauin**, **mangerse** (le) (pl.), manugerium, maunjoriis, **pant'** (le), pantr, **Rasynges**, Raysyng, Rasinez, Rasyns, **Salsisters**, salsisteriis, saucestr', sawsestyrs, **stuffo**, **suet**, Swhett, Swett, sweth, suett, **tret**, treit, tret', **Wafirs**, **Waynpayn** (le), Waypane, Waynpane, Wanpayn, Wanpan, Waynpayn (vocato)

» additives (15)

canell', kanell, **clowes**, clowys, clowez, **cubibis**, Cubibb', quibibis, Quybibbis, Whibibbes, **cynamomy**, synamon, **ferys** ('some kind of sauce'), **geloffers**, Gelofre, **macez**, Maces, mace (del), **madryan**, Madryam, **saffron**, **saus'**, salsis, **saundres**, saundris, zawndre, zaunders, saundresz, Saundrez, sanders, **caffatyne**, Skaffatyne, Caffatyn, **veryous**, vergeous, vergieux (le) (cf. veriuto), **vineger**, vinager, **zukur**, zukur', Sogyr, couker [sic], zuker, sucere

» animals for food (11)

bacon, bacones, bakones, bacon', baconibus, **beyffe**, **brusket'**, bruskett', **Ostree**, Oystres, **plaices**, plaises, playces, playc', plais, **scalopp**, **soles**, **sows** (le), **Scrafisse**,

scrafisch (pl.), scrafisches, scrafish (pl.), scrafyss', **spald.**, spald, (pl.), **til'**, till, Tyles, tyld, teill, tyll, Tyldez (lez)

» containers (4)
godettum, Godet, **pipa,** pipez, pypez, pypes, pype, **pynte**, **vessell**

» drink (7)
bastard', basterd, **claret**, **malvesin**, malvasy, malvaset, malwaset, **parry**, **Rumnay**, Rumney, romney, Rumnay, Romney, **vernagio**, **ypocras**

food manufacture » equipments (8)
bultell, bultellorum, **caldrun**, Caldrons, cawdrons, **furgun**, furgoun, frogonys, furgons, **grate**, grates, **grydel**, **Myour**, myowr, miour, Mioure, **posnett**, postinet, posnet, posnet (le), postenet, postnetta, **rangh** (le), raunge (del), raunge (le), reynge, Raunge (le)

» table utensils (7)
Crowettes, crowetys, Crowets, **dublers**, doblerz, doublers, **garnyssh**, Garnysche, Garneshe, garnyshe, garnys (vasorum), **Gathes**, gates, gatis, gata, **napkyns**, napkins, napkyns (le), **platers**, plater, plateres, **sawsars**, salserez, salsar. (cf. salsaria, salsarium, salsario)

OCCUPATION AND WORK
occupation and work » equipment (22)
basynges, basyns (le), **braces**, braccis, braciae, brassez (lez), **broches**, Brochez, **buckett** (le), bukkett, **crampones**, **chesels**, chysel (pl.), chesalys, **Condetz** (lez), **Doules**, **funell**, **furness** (le), furnayse, **gemoose** (lez), gemmis, Gemowes, gemmys (del), **grosers**, **maliotis**, **martelli**, martell, **pinsers**, pinsours, pynceours, pynsours, **pumysch**, **takett'**, **trenchours**, trencheours, trenchour (payre le), **trowell**, **tuyrne**, **wyndas**, wyndesse (le), **wymbillez**, wymbill, Wymbles, Wyndys (le)

» materials (26)
achellariis, acheleys, achellarii, Achelers (lez), achelers, achlars, **asseres**, **bazan**, baszan, **buggy**, **brasill**, **byrels**, **curbe** (le), **fagottes**, fagot', fagotis, fagot., **Geete**, Gete, geth, **gloy**, **gravell** (le), **Grouayr**, **laton**, **mazero**, **Menivieyr**, meyneueir, Menevayr, **Omeraud** (le), emeraud (le), **pewder** (le), peudr., peudre, **planche** (pl.), **planchours**, playnshorez, **plumby**, **quarerariis**, querrere, querrera, **Sclat**, sclatis, **soudur**, saudore, Souwdour, sowder, **stromill**, stromell, **templez** (del), **Terbentyn**

TEXTILES AND CLOTHING
textiles and clothing (49)
amita, amitis, amittarum, **baudekyn**, baudekennys, baudek'n, baudekynes, baudekyns, **banquers**, banqwer, banqwers, bankquer', bankquer, bankors, bankcouer, bankhour, banquererez (sic), banko^{r} (le), banko^{r}, Bankquers, **bewras**, **blankets**, blanket, blanketti, Blanketo, blanket., **blonket** ('a fabric presumably of light grey or blue colour'), **bukasyn**, bukesyn, **buklis**, bukkeyles, **burall**, burell, burallo, burelli, byrels, **burnet**, Burneto, **bustyngs**, **canevaces**, canvace, canveys, canvas, canvays, canvase (del), canvace (del), **chaumpe**, **Cheker**, Chekery, **colars**, collers, colers, coler', coler, Coleris, Coleriis, Colers (lez), **cordele**, **cordewan**, Cordewayn, corvays, **corset**, **dyaper**, **frenges**, **frissonibus** ('? Some kind of woollen stuff'), **furrura**, furrur., furrur', furruris, **fustyan**, fustians (lez), **Galoches**, galag., Galag', galog., galog', kaloges, **garniamentis**, garniamento, garniament., garniamentorum, garniamenta, **gown**, gowneis, gowneys, **hoyrs**, huyrs, **Jaks**, jake, jak, **Kameka**, Camaka, **leese**, leys,

lyour, **melle** ('cloth made of wools dyed'), **murras**, murra, **Naperouns**, naprons, Naprouns, **orfrays**, orfrays, Orfrayes, **reynes**, reyns, **ryben**, rybbon, Rybane, rybane, **samyt**, **Saretree** (le), Sarteryn (le) (cf. sartrine, sartrina, sartrino), **say**, saye, **stamyn**, stamyns, **tartryn**, **Teris**, tera, tyr', **tysshews**, **Wampas**, **velueth**, wlvettum.

MEASUREMENT
the world » relative properties » measurement » measures [of different kinds] (12), equipment (3)
ancer, **Barello**, barell, barell', barella, barell', barellez, barrellys, barell., **busse**, **carr'**, kerre, **celdr.**, celdre, chald., chaldr., celdris, **dakyr**, daker (pl.), daker (le), **galons**, **parcellas**, parcell., **potell.**, potel, potellum, **quarteroun**, quarterouns, quarter (pl.), quarteriis, quarter., quarters, quarter (le), quarterona, quarteron, **ras'**, rase, rasarium, raserium, **Rollez**.

» equipment (3)
balancium, Balance (del (pl.)), balanc., balanx', Balance (lez), Balance (les), **buss.** (pl. 'bushels'), buschell, bussell (vocantur), **pek**.

SOCIETY (other domains)
society » armed hostility » military equipment
military equipment (10)
basinet, bacynet(e) [abbreviation mark in the <e>] (pl.), **gesseraunt** (vocata), **greves**, **harnayse**, harnes (les), Harnesiis, harnesia, **palets**, paled, **pauncs**, **peytrell**, **Spryngald**, **vambras**, **ventale**.

society » faith » artefacts
capelle, capella, **jurnal**, **lavers** (le), **serges**

» artefacts » cloths (3)
frokis, frokkes, frokys, froccis, **ridels**, redall, ridellez, redell' (le), redellis, redell, Riddels, Ryddell', **Towell**, towailles, towelles, tuella, tuelli, tuellis, towellis, tuellis, tuels, towell'.

» artefacts » vestments (5)
fanun, **parures**, parurae, parure, **tays**, tais, tayses, teyses, **tunakyll'**, **vestimenta**, vestimentis, vestimentorum, vestimento, vestimenti, vestment.

society » inhabiting and dwelling » inhabited place » a building » furniture » household linen (6), covers or hangings (4)

» household linen (6)
chalones, Schalonne, Chalone, **cowerlettes**, coverlyde, coverlettez, cowerlettez, **napre** (le), **qwhiltez**, Qwhylt, whilte, whiltys (le), wiltez, wyltez, **Sanappes**, saunapes, sannap, sannaps, Sannapes, sawnapes, savenaps, sanaps, sanappez, sanapys, sawnaps, sawnape, sanapps, sanapys (le), sawnape, Sawnapes, salvenap'., **langeles**, laungels, Lanugell., lanugells, lanugell, langels, langell', lanugellis, langels

» covers or hangings (4)
costeris, costers, **curtyns** (lez), **dorsalis**, dorsale, dorsali, dorsalle, dorsall (cf. dorsaria, dorseria, dorsorio, dorsor, dorsorio, dorsorium), Dosour (le), **sim'l**.

Appendix 3. List of ON-derived lexis alphabetically ordered by the ON-derived stem and according to the type of evidence available

A1

Brandreth (le), brandrethe (le)
broddis, **brod**nales, lat**brodes**, latbroddes, Spon**brod**, stan**brod**, stanebrod, stanebrod', stanebroddez, staynbroddes, Stra**brod**
bygbern (le), Bygbarne (le)
castyng (le)
drawkyng (le)
Rent **Egges**, renthegges, Rentges
Spone**garn**
berne**garth,** ymp**garth** (vocati), Impgarth (le), ymppeyard (le), ympyard, swynhous**garth** (le), connyn**garth** (le), cunyngarth (le), Stak**garth** (le), stakgarth, stakgarthez (lez), Wode**garth**
gersuma, gersumis
girthys, girthes, girthez, gyrthes, gyrthis (le), **girth**bukyls, gyrthbokeles, girthbokyls, girthbukles, **Girth**webbs, gyrthwebbez, girthweb, girthwebb', girthwebbes, gurthwebbis, gyrthwebs, **Girthe**tres
gonnys, gonnez, gun, Gonnis, Gunnis
kerr
keruyngknyves, kirvyngknyffes (del), kirvyngknyffez (le), kyrvyngknyffez (lez)
kydsape
kyrn, kyrnez, kyrne (le), kirne, kirn
Lym**kilne**, lymekiln, lymekilne
land**male**, landmall, layndmayle, landmale, land**male**bok (le), medow**male**
scale (pl.), Scalez, Skalez, merow**scales**, Wey**scalez**, weyscalez (del), weyscill
scappes, skepe, Skeppys, skeppez, Skeppez (les), scepys, skeppis, skepis
scates, Schat, **Scathaver, Scat**maltez, Scaltmaltes
skelez, skelys, skeyllys, skelys (le), skeles, schele
skers
may **skynnes**, whiteledir**skynnes**
plough**swayn**landes
stowpys, stowpes, stopez, stopis, stoppes, stopys, stowpez
wyndowclath
Hemp**yard** (le), Wod**yard**, Wodeyard (del), Wodyard (le), Wodyarde (le), Wodyard (del)
ymppe**yard** (le), ympyard

A2
twhertsawes

B1

aughtyndel, aughtindel, Auȝghtindel, Agktyndell anguill., aghtendell, Aghtyndell (pl.)
bandeȝ, bandis, bely**bandes**, dore**bandez**, doorbandez, **bondis**
barkhous
brakennez (lez)
eldyngpan
flaggez (lez), flagez (del/lez), flagges, **flaggyng**
flaxstons
Gedde
hale

hanyng (le)
Kelinges, kelyngs, keling, kyling, keling'
Lyng, **lynge**laund (le), **lyng**house, **lyng**thake (del)
mukforkez, muk fork, **muk**hak, mukhakkys, mukhakkez
rove
ryvyng (le)
Scrabbez, Scrabbez (lez)
Sloknyng (le)
Staikes (le), stakes (del), stakez, stakez (le/lez), Stake (le), **stak**garth (le), Stakgarth, stakgarthez (lez)
staures, stoowrys, stowrys, dalbyng**stoures**, dalbyngstourez, dalbyngstowres, dalbyng stowres, dalbyng stowris, dalbyngstowrys, doubyngstoures, hek**staures**, rung**stoures**
Syle (vocata), milk**syle**
thraff, thrave, thraves, thrawe, thrawez, thravis, threff
toft., tofto, toft
wadmale
fly**winge**s

B2

Scat**haver** (vocatur)
bag, bagges, **Bag**sadle, **bag**sadiltres
banke (le)
bothis, bothe, boyth (le), tol**bothe** (le), Tolboth (le)
Cob Iryns
crokez, crokes, crokys, crokis, croke, crok, crukkis, crukys, cruke, cruk, crukkis, Brer**croke**, dore**crokez,** Shepe**croke,** Shepcroke
dam (le), dampe [sic]
flakes, fleke, flekes, flekys, scaffalde **flakes,** chese**fleke** (cf. Cart**fleykkes**)
gabelorum, Ganeyls [Fowler's note: read *gauelys*], gabellorum, gabell**,** gabali, gavill (le), gavill, gawellez
gaddis
haverbarne (le), **Aver**garner (le), Havergarner (le), **haver**maltes, **Aver**penys, Haverpennez, Colte**hauer**, Colthaver, colthelter
kagges
keruyng**knyves**, kirvyngknyffes (del), kirvyngknyffez (le),, kyrvyngknyffez (lez)
linkis
ripp's
snypys
tedyr, teder, tethirdez, tethyr
wyndyng

C1

Bonesilver
flyttyng (le)
hyngynges (lez)
croce**loft**
slawters, Slaughters, **Slawghter**house (le), Slaughterhouse (le), slaughterhouse (le), slaughterhous (le), Slaughterhows (le), Slawghterhosse, slawghterhouse, **Slaughter**manhous, Slawghtermanhows, slawghterman housse, Slaughtermanhowse

wandes, wandys, **Wande**penys, wandpenis, Wandpenys, Sayl**wandis**, Saylwandes

C2

Cartbod., cartbodyes, **Cartfleykkes**, **Carth'**neys, Carteharnas, cartharneyse, **cart**rapes, Carterapis, Carterapes, cartropez, kartrapes, **Carte**sadle, Cartesadyll (le), **cart**sadiltrees, **cart**silver, **Cart**strakes, Lang**cart'**, Stan**kart** (le)
stothes, dore**stothez**, dorestothis (le), dorstothez

C3

bollez
coddis
ferybote (le), ferybott.
mosse, mosse (le), mossez (le)
Sponbrod, **spon**yarn
thyxtyll goug

C4

axilnayl (pl.), **axillyng'**, **axil**tre, axiltreys, axiltres, axhiltriss, axyltres
blandcorne

C5

crosez (lez)

D1

schele, schell, sheyll, Sheele
sowmes
stevynd, stevynd, **steyned**clothes.

D2

cloukis

Appendix 4. MDut-origin lexis

bumkyns, bomkyns

clampez

Curtebys

Drevill, dryvell

fraght (le)

gloy

grotsilver, grottsilvere

hamis, hamys

keylfulis

kipstryng, kypstringges, kypstringes, kypstrings, kipstrynges

kittez, kyttes, kytte

malt**spout** (le)

modhylles (lez), moldhillez (del), moldhyllez (lez)

morterstanez [or OE + OE]

mudfyss (pl.))

nopsekez, nopseke

Pakkis

Paknedel

Pakthrede, Paktrede

pegyng

plogheuedez [or Gmc (uncertain) + OE]

poleax

porr, porr., porris, por

rynd, ryndes, rynde (le), rynde

ryndspindellis

scope, scopys, scopez

scowrynge (le), scowryng (le), Scourynge (le), scurrying (le)

shotnayll, shotnaill (del), Schotnayle

slede

slott, slot

Soddez (lez)

spanyng lambes, spanynglamez

sparryng

gret**spikyngez**

splentes (le)

Spowte (unius le) [cf. **Spultes**]

yren**slottes** (le))

stande

Stocfisse, stokfysses, stokfisch, stokfyss', Stokfish, Stokfissh, stokfyssh (le), stokfish, stokefisshe, stokfysh (pl), Stokfysche, Stokfissh, Stokfisshe (pl.), **stokefisshe** hambers, Stokfisshammers, **Stokfisshe** Leenges

tankardorum

toppes (cf. toppettis (lez), tappetes racemorum (le))

trammys

trysyng rapis

tubbez, tubba, tubbe, tubbes, tubbarum, flesh**tubbez**, stepyng**tubbez**

tyngilnaill, tyngylnalles (le), tyngylnaile (pl.))

wainscot, waynscot (pl.), vaynscot, Waynscottez, waynscottes, waynscott (pl.)

Wawes

weyscill, weyscalez (del)

Qwypcord, qwipcord, Whypcord, Whepecorde

wrak

wymbillez, wymbill, Wymbles

Appendix 5. Commodities linked to place-names ordered chronologically and alphabetically by region[8]

Aylsham

uln. de Aylsam	Rott. Bursar. c. 1337, 534

Bagdad

panni de baudekyn	Rott. Elemos. 1338, 199
pannus de baudekyn	Rott. Elemos. 1343, 205
pannus de baudekyn	Rott. Elemos. 1352-3, 208
baudekennys	Rott. Sacrist. 1318, 374
baudek'n (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1318, 374
baudekynes (x2)	Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 375
baudekyn (x2)	Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 375
baudekyn	Rott. Sacrist. 1388-9, 391
baudekyns (rec. del)	Rott. Sacrist. 1388-9, 391

Beadnell

bednale fiss' (x3)	Rott. Celer. 1389, 49
bednalfish ((pl.) x2)	Rott. Celer. 1409, 53
bednall.	Rott. Celer. 1409, 53
bednelfysch (pl.)	Rott. Celer. 1442-3, 81
bedenelfysh (pl.)	Rott. Bursar. 1408-9, 608
bidnelcodlynge (del (pl.))	Rott. Bursar. 1449-50, 632

Birmingham

panni de Berm'	Rott. Camer. 1324-5, 165
panni de Berm'h^{a}m	Rott. Camer. 1324-5, 167
ells de Bermegeham	Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 169
ulne de albo Bermegeham	Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 171

Caffa

caffatyne (pane de zukre)	Rott. Bursar. c. 1360, 563
Skaffatyne (zukr. de)	Rott. Bursar. c. 1348, 547
Caffatyn (zukr. de)	Rott. Bursar. 1348-9, 549

Coggeshall

blodio mixto vocato Cogsale	Rott. Bursar. c. 1419?, 616

Corinth

Razynges cowrans	Rott. Celer. 1388, 48
racemis curawns	Rott. Celer. 1390, 49
Rasinez de corencz	Rott. Hostill. 1415-6, 139
Rasyns de Corencz	Rott. Hostill. 1418-9, 140
rasinis corent.	Rott. Communiar. 1511-2, 291

Crete

Crete (1 pynte de)	Rott. Bursar. c. 1360, 563

[8] Reference to the manuscript roll, edition page, and year is provided in both this Appendix and Appendix 6 because of the scope of these sections (i.e. Section 3.2 and 4).

‘**Eastland**’ [here the Baltic regions]

bordis de Estland	Rott. Elemos. 1338, 200
bordis de Estland (panelli de)	Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376
Estlandbordes	Rott. Elemos. 1340?, 203
bordis de Estland	Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 170
bord’ de Estland	Rott. Sacrist. 1347-8, 380
bord’ de Estland	Rott. Sacrist. 1350, 381
Estlandborde	Rott. Sacrist. 1359-60, 384
estlandbordes	Rott. Hostill. 1366-7, 128
estlandburd (pl.)	Rott. Camer. 1374-5, 180
Estlandbord’ (spere de)	Rott. Hostill. 1379, 131
estlandbordes	Rott. Feretrar. 1383-4, 425
Estland burde (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396
Estlandburdez	Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635

Hackney

hakenay	Rott. Elemos. 1343, 205
hakenays	Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376
haken’	Rott. Bursar. c. 1337, 534
Hakenaysadyll	Rott. Hostill. 1379, 131
hakenaysadil	Rott. Camer. 1414-5, 184
hakenaysadilles	Rott. Elemos. 1398-9, 215

Iceland

pisc. sals. de Iseland	Rott. Celer. 1417, 55
Iselandfish (pl.) (x2)	Rott. Celer. 1419, 56
yselandfish (pl.) (x2)	Rott. Celer. 1419, 56
yslandfyss'	Rott. Celer. c. 1420, 58
Iselandfishs	Rott. Celer. c. 1430, 60
pisc. sals. de yseland	Rott. Celer. 1442, 79

Ireland

furur. de irislams	Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 582

Jordan

jordan (pl.)	Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 217
jurdanus	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1384-5, 265
jordan (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 398
iordanem	Liber de reliquiis 1383, 430
Jornadum	Rott. Bursar. 1278, 486

Lincoln

ulnis de Lyncolnesaye	Rott. Bursar. 1310-11, 507

Lombardy

powderlomberd (dell)	Rott. Celer. 1466-7, 91

Poitou

salis grossi de Paytouse	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 72
salis de pattow	Rott. Celer. 1363-4, 565
salis de patters	Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 583
Pattowsalt	Rott. Bursar. 1377-8, 586
salis de Patews	Rott. Bursar. 1408-9, 608

Prussia
sprwys fisc. (pl.) Rott. Celer. 1378, 47
spruisfische (pl.) Rott. Bursar. 1388-9, 596

ferro de Sprois Rott. Bursar. 1379-80, 588

Rennes
Reynes Rott. Bursar. 1341, 542
reynes Rott. Bursar. 1365-6, 568
panno de Reynes Rott. Bursar. 1381-2, 592
reyns Rott. Bursar. 1396-7, 600
Reynes Rott. Bursar. 1421-2, 619

Rhine
ryniswyne Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 582
Rinischewyn (una pipa de) Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 582

Scotland
Skotisadell Rott. Bursar. 1386-7, 595

Totenais
panno de Totenays Rott. Bursar. 1333-4?, 522
ulnis de Totenays Rott. Bursar. 1334-35, 525

Westphalia
Westfal (uln. de) Rott. Hostill. 1394-5, 135
panni linei de Westwale Rott. Bursar. c. 1380, 590
panno lineo et Westwale Rott. Bursar. 1394-5, 598

Worstead
lectus de worset' Rott. Hostill. possibly 1369, 130
pannis de worset' Rott. Camer. 1344-5, 172
pannis de nigro worseto Rott. Camer. 1350, 173
pannis et di. nigri worseti Rott. Camer. 1360-70, 175
worsett Rott. Camer. 1362-3, 178
tribus roll de worset Rott. Camer. 1378-9, 181
panno de Worset Rott. Bursar. 1377-8, 586

Appendix 6.1. NME vowels and consonants

6.1.1 <o> - <u>

bord

<o>

bordis Rott. Celer. 1337-8, 34
bordarum Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 73
bord. Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
bordyng Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 105
borddyng (le) Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 105
bordis Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 106
bord. Rott. Hostill. 1333-4, 116
bordez quarccuum Rott. Hostill. 1453-1454 (verso), 150
bordarum Rott. Hostill. 1466-7, 154
bordis Rott. Elemos. 1413-14, 224
bordarum Rott. Elemos. 1451-2, 241
bordarum (x2) Rott. Communiar. 1524-25, 297
bord' Rott. Sacrist. 1360-1, 385
Bord. Rott. Bursar. 1278 (verso), 489
Bord. Rott. Bursar. 1310-11 (verso), 509
Bord. Rott. Bursar. 1316-17, 514
bord. de Waynscot (pl.) Rott. Bursar. 1357, 560

<u>

burdarum Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 102
Burdarum Rott. Celer. 1507-8, 104

burdclath

<o>

bordcloths (hemmyng de) Rott. Bursar. 1412-3, 610

<u>

burdclath Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 398
burdeclathe tweyld Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635

bordeclogge

<o>

borde clogge Rott. Celer. 1466-7, 91

<u>

burdclogges Rott. Elemos. 1466-7, 244
burdeclogge (le) Rott. Elemos. 1469-7, 244
burdcloges Rott. Elemos. 1472, 245

bordnails

<o>

Bordnalis Rott. Celer. 1509-10, 105
bordnale (pl.) Rott. Communiar. 1517, 293
bordnails Rott. Communiar. 1524-25, 296

<oy>

boyrdnailles Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103

<u>

burdnaylles Rott. Celer. 1534-35, 111
burdnalles Rott. Hostill. 1528-9, 162
Burdnall' Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 698

cuppe**board**
cuppebord (le) Rott. Hostill. [1371], 130
cuppbordclothes (lez) Rott. Hostill. 1452-3, 147
copebord Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 148
coppeborde (le) (x2) Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 148
coppeborde Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 148
coppebordeclathe Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 149

cownting**burd**
cowntingburd (le) Rott. Elemos. 1515-16, 253

dressyng**bord**
<o>
drissyngborde Rott. Celer. 1468-9, 92
dressyngbordez (x 2) Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97
dressyngborddes Rott. Celer. 1516-7, 106
dressyngborde Rott. Elemos. 1472, 247

<ou>
dressyngbourde Rott. Elemos. 1465, 244

<u>
dressyngburdez Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97

estland**bordes**
<o>
estlandbordes Rott. Hostill. 1366-7, 128
Estlandbord' (spere de) Rott. Hostill. 1379, 131
bordis de Estland Rott. Camer. 1342-3, 170
bordis de Estland Rott. Elemos. 1338, 200
Estlandbordes Rott. Elemos. 1340?, 203
bordis de Estland Rott. Sacrist. 1338, 376
bord' de Estland Rott. Sacrist. 1347-8, 380
bord' de Estland Rott. Sacrist. c. 1350, 381
Estlandborde Rott. Sacrist. 1359-60, 384
estlandbordes Rott. Feretrar. 1383-4, 425

<u>
estlandburd (pl.) Rott. Camer. 1374-5, 180
Estland burde Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396
Estlandburdez Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635

fyrre**boordez**
<oo>
fyrreboordez Rott. Elemos. 1447-8, 236

mete**bord**
metebord Rott. Celer. 1485-6, 99

pale**bordes**
payllbordes (lez) Rott. Celer. 1483-4, 98
palebordes (lez) Rott. Celer. 1502-3, 102
paylbordes (le) Rott. Celer. 1507-8, 105
paylbordes (lez) Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 105

sawne **bordes**
sawne bordes Rott. Communiar. 1517, 293

shil**bord**clogge
shil**bord**clogge Rott. Elemos. 1451-2, 241

thak**borde**
thakborde Rott. Camer. 1447-8, 186
thakbordes Rott. Camer. 1456-7, 192

Other <o> - <u> pairs

blud

<o>		<u>	
blodeyrn	Rot. Feretrar. 1401, 451	**blud**hous (le)	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385, 265

busys
busys (le) Rott. Celer. 1461-2, 90

culynge leyd
culynge leyd Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294
culyng leyd Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294
culyng leydes Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294
culyngledes (voc.) Rott. Bursar. 1492-3, 652
Culyngleydez (vocat.) Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 656
Culynglede (lez) Rott. Bursar. 1506-7, 658

crokez

<o>		<u>	
crokez	Rott. Celer. 1479-80, 96	crukkis	Rott. Elemos. 1372-3, 211
crokes	Rott. Elemos. 1415-16, 225	crukys	Rott. Magistr. 1420-21, 269
crokys	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385, 265	cruke	Rott. Comm. 1517, 293
crokis	Rott. Magistr.Inf. 1398-9, 268	cruk	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397
croke	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396	crukis	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398
crok	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396		
crokez	Rott. Feretrar. 1450-1, 474		
crokes	Rott. Bursar. c. 1320, 514		
crokes	Rott. Bursar. 1347-8, 546		

Brer**croke**

<o>		<u>	
Brercroke	Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89	breercrukez	Rott. Bursar. 1498-9, 655
Brerecroke	Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 98		

dore**crokez**
dorecrokez Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239
durecroks Rott. Comm. 1524-25. 296

flesh**croke**
<u>
flesshcruke Rott. Elemos. 1472, 247
fleshcruk Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398

Shep**croke**
Shepcroke Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 98
Shepecroke Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89

dore
durbandes
durbandes Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 296

dorechekez
dorechekez Rott. Elemos. 1492-3, 249

dorecrokez
<o>
dorecrokez Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239

<u>
durecroks Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 296

dorestothez
dorestothez Rott. Celer. 1472, 94
dorestothis (le) Rott. Elemos. 1516-7, 254
dorstothez Rott. Bursar. 1453-4, 634

trap**dure**
trapdure (vocato) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1423-4, 271

fothyr
<o>
fothyr (pl.) Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 88
fothre (pl.) Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 88
fothre (pl.) Rott. Celer. 1474-5, 94
fothre (x 2 (1 sg. and 1 pl.)) Rott. Celer. 1476-7, 95
fothr' (x2) Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 149
fothr' (x3) Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 150
fothr' Rott. Hostill. 1456-7, 151
fother (pl.) Rott. Hostill. 1459-60, 152
fodir Rott. Hostill. 1463-4, 154
fothir Rott. Elemos.1419-20, 228
fother (pl.) Rott. Elemos. 1444-5, 235
fother (x3 pl. + x1 sg.) Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 238
fother (x2 (pl.)) Rott. Elemos. [undated fragments with the above decade 1449-50], 239
fother (x 2 (pl.)) Rott. Elemos. 1456-7, 241

<u>
futhrez Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158
fuder Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1420, 270
fuder Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1456-7, 277
futhers Rott. Bursar. 1375-76, 583
futhirs Rott. Bursar. 1376, 585
fudr. (x4) Rott. Bursar. 1487-8, 650-1

fut
futebrace
<o>
fott Brassys (lez) Rott. Bursar. 1509-10, 661

<u>
futebrace (le) Rott. Bursar. 1503-4, 657

fotmale
fotmale Rott. Bursar. 1348-9, 549

hokes
hokes Rott. Elemos. 1415-6, 225

Hukschaue
Hukschaue Rott. Bursar. 1350-1, 551

stan**hokes** Rott. Elemos. 1395-6, 214

tentur**huke**
tenturhuke Rott. Hostill. 1513-4, 160
tenturhukis Rott. Feretrar. 1501-2, 480

wed**hukez**

<o>		<u>	
wedhoks	Rott. Elemos. 1391-2, 213	wedhukez	Rott. Hostill. 1454, 150
wedhokys	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398		

hopez
axiltre hopez Rott. Hostill. 1454, 149

<o>		<u>	
hopys	Rott. Elemos. 1417-18?, 226	huppe (lez)	Rott. Comm. 1511-12, 291
hope	Rott. Elemos. 1480-81, 248	Hupis	Rott. Bursar. 1349-50, 550

Morkokes

<o>		<u>	
Morkokes	Rott. Celer. 1329-30, 16	murkokes	Rott. Celer. 1329-30, 16
morecok	Rott. Celer. 1417, 55	murkokes	Rott. Celer. c. 1340, 36

Nayltoll
naytole Rott. Sacrist. 1350-51, 381 [Fowler's (376: 1898) footnote 1: Nayltoll, 1338, *bis*. Nayltole, 1343-4. Naylletole, 1345-6. Naultole, 1346-7. Nailtole, 1347-8, 1348-9. Nayltulle, 1349-50. Naytole, 1350-51.]

Spone
Spone Rott. Rott. Bursar. 1316-17, 558
spone (del) Rott. Bursar. 1414-15, 611
spone (del) Rott. Bursar. 1421-2, 618
spone (pl.) Rott. Bursar. 1415-16, 613
spone (del) Rott. Bursar. 1416-17, 614

Sponayl
Sponayl Rott. Bursar. c. 1310, 511
Sponail Rott. Bursar. 1328-9, 515

Sponbrod
Sponbrod (pl.) Rot. Hostill. 1361-2, 127

spurres
spurres Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 697

studmer
studmer Rott. Sacrist. 1404-5, 399

Wodkys
Wodkys Rott. Celer. 1388, 47
Wodcokkes Rott. Celer. 1366, 45
wodcokkes Rott. Celer. 1430, 61
wodcokkis Rott. Celer. 1430, 61
Wodcoks Rott. Bursar. 1378-9, 588
Wodcokis Rott. Bursar. 1390-1, 597

<a> - <o>
Before plosives

bot
Only <o>
botstede
botstede (lez) Rott. Communiar. 1508-9, 290

fery**bote**
ferybote (le) Rott. Camer. 1494-5, 194
ferybott Rott. Bursar. 1508-9, 660
Ferybott Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 676
ferybott (le) Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 702

Only <a>
Stan**bate**
Stanbate (le) Rott. Bursar. c. 1336, 533
Stanbat' (le) Rott. Bursar. 1338-9, 536
Stanbate (del) Rott. Bursar. 1350-51, 552
Stanebate (le) Rott. Bursar. 1415-16, 612
Fisshe**bate**
Fisshebate (del) Rott. Bursar. 1347-8, 546

laad
laad (pl.) Rott. Elemos. 1447-8, 237
laad (pl.) Rott. Elemos. 1447-8, 237
laad (pl.) Rott. Magistr. 1447-8, 275
lada Rott. Bursar. c. 1365-6 (headless roll), 568

ladsadell (pl.) Rott. Hostill. 1397-8, 136

ladesilver Bursar. 1425-6, 620
ladysilver Rott. Bursar. 1536-37, 672

court**ladez** Rott. Bursar. 1454-5, 634
Courtladez Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635

rapes
cart**rapes**

<o>		<a>	
cartropez	Rott. Bursar. 1536-37, 697	cartrapes	Rott. Hostill. 1371, 129
		Carterapis	Rott. Bursar. c. 1320, 514

Carterapes	Rott. Bursar. 1341, 543
cartrapes (x 2)	Rott. Bursar. c. 1365-6, 568
cartrapes	Rott. Bursar. 1396-7, 600
cartrapis	Rott. Bursar. 1399, 601
kartrapes	Rott. Bursar. 1440-41, 627

fut**roppe**

futroppe	Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 659

lang**rape**

langrape	Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635
longe (sic) rapys	Rott. Bursar. 1473-4, 644

stir**ropes**

<o>		<a>	
stirropes	Rott. Hostill. 1523-4, 162	Stiraps	Rott. Bursar. 1394-5, 599
steropez	Rott. Camer. 1498-9, 195		
steropleders	Rott. Camer. 1486-7, 194	Stirhaplethirs	Rott. Bursar. 1394-1395, 599
steropledders	Rott. Camer. 1494-5, 194		
steropledders	Rott. Camer. 1498-9, 195		
Stiroplethers	Rott. Camer. 1504-5, 195		
styroppys (par del)	Rott. Elemos. 1431-2, 231		
stirroppis	Rott. Bursar. 1508-9, 661		
stirroplethirris	Rott. Bursar. 1508-9, 661		
stirropleders	Rott. Bursar. 1536-37, 697		

Wayn**rapes**

<o>		<a>	
wayneroppes	Rott. Bursar. 1536-37, 697	Waynrapes	Rott. Celer. 1441-2, 79
		waynraps	Rott. Hostill. 1371, 129
		waynrape	Rott. Sacrist. 1388-9, 391
		wayn rapis	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398
		Waynrapp	Rott. Bursar.1399-1400, 601

Kyd**sape**

Kydsape	Rott. Bursar. 1377-8, 587

spaks

spaks (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1396-7, 214
spakes (jugis spakes)	Rott. Sacrist. 1356-57, 384
spakes	Rott. Bursar. 1334-35, 525

wadlede

wadlede	Rott. Hostill. 1485-6, 157

Before nasals
<m>

hors**kames**

<o>		<a>	
horsse coumez	Rott. Bursar. 1510-11, 661	horskames	Rott. Hostill. 1397-8, 136
		horskambe	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397
		horskam	Rott. Sacrist. 1484-5, 415

Wambtowes

Wambtowes	Rott. Celer. 1337-8, 34
wambetowes	Rott. Celer. 1340, 37
Wambtowes	Rott. Celer. 1337-8, 38
wambtowe	Rott. Celer. 1343, 40
Wambtow	Rott. Celer. 1404, 52
Wambtoues	Rott. Bursar. c. 1310, 511
Wambetowes	Rott. Bursar. 1313-4, 512
Wambtowes	Rott. Bursar. c. 1343? (headless roll), 543
wametowshaftes	Rott. Bursar. 1536-37, 697

<m> before vowels with variable lengthening
lam

lamcote

lamcote (le)	Rott. Instaur. verso 1447, 320
lambecote	Rott. Instaur. verso 1447, 320

Anton**lam**

Antonlam	Rott. Instaur. 1447 (verso), 319

iris**lams**

irislams	Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 582

spanyng **lambes**

spanyng lambes	Rott. Instaur. 1416-7, 317
spanynglamez	Rott. Instaur. 1447 (verso), 319

layndmale

layndmayle	Rott. Celer. 1429, 60

landmale	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 73
landmale	Rott. Celer. 1439-40, 78
landmall (x2)	Rott. Hostill. 1351-2, 120
landmale	Rott. Elemos 1402-3, 220
landmale	Rott. Elemos. 1522-23, 255
landmale	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1381-2, 263
landmale	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1385, 265
landmale	Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 296
landmale	Rott. Sacrist. 1390-1, 392
landmale	Rott. Sacrist. 1401-2, 393
landmale	Rott. Sacrist. 1535-6, 417
landmale (le)	Rott. Bursar. 1432-3, 622

landmale (x7) Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 704-705
landemalebok (vocati le) Rott. Bursar. 1416-7, 614

Landleve
Landleve Rott. Busar. 1357, 560

longe (adj.)

<o>
longe carecte Rott. Celer. 1309-10, 7
longe cathedre Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 217
longsedle (le) Rott. Elemos. 1515-16, 253
longe carecte Rott. Bursar. 1334-5, 526
longe carecte Rott. Bursar. 1335-6, 527
longe carecte Rott. Bursar. 1341, 542
longe carecte Rott. Bursar. 1344-5, 544
longe carecte Rott. Bursar. 1375-6, 582
longe carecte Rott. Bursar. 1381-2, 592
longe formule Rott. Bursar. 1464, 640
long Roppe Rott. Bursar. 1513-4, 663

<a>
langsedile Rott. Hostill. 1453-4 (verso), 148
langsedil Rott. Elemos. 1352-3 (verso), 208
Langcart' Rott. Bursar. c. 1343? (headless roll), 543
langcartsadill Rott. Bursar. c. 1343?, 543
langrape Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635

stan

Only <a>
stanebarowes Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 96
stane barowe Rott. Hostill. 1454, 149

stanebrod
stanebrod (pl.) Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 96
staynbroddes Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
stanebrod Rott. Hostill. 1454, 149
stanbrod Rott. Elemos. 1370-71, 209
stanbrod Rott. Elemos. 1374, 211
stanebrod' Rott. Elemos. 1434-5, 232
stanebroddez Rott. Elemos. 1447-8, 237
stanbrodys Rott Sacrist. 1404, 395

Stankart (le) Rott. Bursar. c. 1357?, 559
Stankart (del) Rott. Bursar. c. 1357?, 560

stanhokes Rott. Elemos. 1395-6, 214

stanlat Rott. Elemos. 1370-71, 209
stanlat. Rott. Elemos. 1372-73, 210

stane of lede (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397
stanetrogh	Rott. Elemos. 1402-3, 217
stanyng (le)	Rott. Elemos. 1462-3, 242
fat**stanes**	Rott. Bursar. 1377-8, 587
milne**stanes**	Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239
morter**stanez**	Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 97
swet**stan**	Rott. Elemos. 1465, 244
Trough**stane** (le)	Rott. Bursar. 1470-71, 643
what**stane**	Rott. Elemos. 1472, 247

Only <o>

Bast**stonys** (del)	Rott. Bursar. 1478-9, 647
cape**stonys**	Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9, 642
flax**stons** (del)	Rott. Bursar. 1480-1, 648
tabil**stonys**	Rott. Bursar. c. 1467-9, 641
thyk**ston'** (del)	Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158
Tylde**stone** (pl.)	Rott. Bursar. 1500-1501, 657
thillstone (lez)	Rott. Bursar. 1500-1501, 657

Both <o> and <a>

cap**stane**

<o>		<a>	
tapstone (x11)	Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294	capstane [printed as *capstane*]	Rot. Hostill. 1456-7, 151
tapston	Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294		
tapstones	Rott. Communiar. 1517, 294		

Gryn**dstone**

<o>		<a>	
Gryndstone	Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 98	gryndystan (le)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396
Grynstonez	Rott. Bursar. 1536-7, 668	gryndystan (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396
		gryndystan (pl.)	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398
		gryndstan	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398

sclat**stan**

<o>		<a>	
sclatstonys	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 398	sclatstan	Rott. Camer. 1360-70, 176
		sclatstan (pl.)	Rott. Elemos. 1370-1, 209

sclatstan (pl.)	Rott. Elemos. 1372-3, 210
sclatstan	Rott. Sacrist. 1361-2, 385
sclatstanys	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397
Sclatestanes	Rott. Bursar. 1427-6, 621

<n> before vowels with variable lengthening

tangs

tangs	Rott. Magistr. 1384-5 (in dorso) 265
tangys	Rott. Bursar. 1412-13, 610

Wandpen'

Wandpen'	Rott. Bursar. 1293, 490
Wandepenys	Rott. Bursar. 1351-2, 552
Wandpenys	Rott. Bursar. 1402-3, 604

Other contexts

borehede

<o>		<a>	
borehede (le)	Rott. Celer. 1525-26, 108	Barhide	Rott. Bursar. 1375, 582
borehede (le)	Rott. Celer. 1534-35, 112		

clath

Only <a>

Clathseck

Clathseck	Rott. Bursar. 1339-40, 536
clathset [sic]	Rott. Bursar. 1375, 582

boutyng **clathe**

boutyng clathe	Rott. Bursar. 1408-9, 607

Chese**clathe**

Cheseclathe	Rott. Bursar. 1330, 518
cheseclathis.	Rott. Bursar. 1347-48, 545

cole**clath**

coleclath	Rott. Sacrist. 1407-8, 401
couleclath	Rott. Mineris Carbonum 1428-9, 709

sayl **clas** [clath]

newe sayl clas	Rott. Camer. 1455-6, 191
Saylclathis (x2)	Rott. Bursar. 1351-2, 553
saylclathes	Rott. Bursar. 1353-4, 554

sek**clath**

sekclath	Rott. Sacrist. 1484-5, 415
Sekklath	Rott. Bursar. 1373-1374, 578

Serid**clath**

Seridclath (le)	Rott. Sacrist. 1438-9, 408

Seridclath (le) Rott. Sacrist. 1439-40 (verso), 409

window**clathe**
windowclathe Rott. Hostill. 1458-1459, 150
windowclath Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 398

Only <o>

bred**cloth** Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 659
Flemysh**cloth** (le) Rott. Bursar. 1486-7, 650
freynȝes **clothes** Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 102
moton**cloth** Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 659
steyned**clothes** Rott. Elemos. 1413-14, 224

Both <o> and <a>
bult**clothe**

<o>		<a>	
bultclothe	Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 97	bultclate	Rott. Sacrist. 1383-4, 390
bultclothe	Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 97	bulteclathes	Rott. Bursar. c.1360, 564
bult clothes	Rott. Bursar. 1478-9, 647	Bultclathis	Rott. Bursar. 1395, 598
bowtcloth	Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 660		

burd**clath**

<o>		<a>	
bordcloths	Rott. Bursar. 1412-13, 610	burdclath	Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 398
		burdeclathe tweyld	Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635

cuppbord**clothes**

<o>		<a>	
cuppbordclothes (lez)	Rott. Hostill. 1452-53, 147	copperbordeclathe	Rott. Hostill. 1458-1459 (verso), 149

Holand**cloth**

<o>		<a>	
Holandcloth	Rott. Hostill. 1466-7, 154	Holandclathe (vocati)	Rott. Bursar. 1456-7, 635
Holandecloth (vocat.)	Rott. Hostill. 1485-6, 157		
Holandeclothe (lez)	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1448-9, 276		
Holandeclothe (del)	Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1452-3, 277		

Straynyo͛**clath**

<o>		<a>	
streynowrcloþs	Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 104	Straynyo͛clath (le)	Rott. Celer. 1460-61, 90

layf
layf (de suggir) Rott. Celer. c. 1440, 78
laf Rott. Bursar. 1363-4, 566
lafes (de Sugour) Rott. Bursar. 1373-4, 578

Sugyr**laffe**
Sugyrlaffe Rott. Celer. 1422, 59
sugerlafe Rott. Celer. 1430, 61

Ranettes
Ranettes [printed *Rauecces*] Rott. Bursar. 1354-5, 555
Ranet (le) Rott. Bursar. 1378-9, 588
Raanet (le) Rott. Bursar. 1383-4, 593

saez
saez Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97
sae Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97
sa Rott. Hostill. 1387-8, 134
saa Rott. Hostill. 1459-1460, 152
saae Rott. Elemos. 1472, 247
sae Rott. Sacrist. 1376-7 (verso), 387
sa Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 397
saa Rott. Bursar. 1383-4, 593
water**say** Rott. Bursar. 1487-8, 651

Non-palatalised and palatalised variants (if any)

birk
birk Rott. Elemos. 1373, 211

hors**hek**
horshek Rott. Elemos. 1400-1, 216

kesloppes
kesloppes Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108
kesseloppes (le) Rott. Celer. 1534-5, 112

vs.

Cheseclathe
Cheseclathe Rott. Bursar. c. 1330, 518
cheseclathis Rott. Bursar. 1347-8, 545

cheseclutes
cheseclutes Rott. Instaur. 1338-9, 311

chesefleke
chesefleke Rott. Celer. 1465-6, 91

chesfattes
chesfattes Rott. Celer. 1446-7, 85
chesfattez Rott. Celer. 1359, 89
Chesfattes Rott. Celer. 1469-70, 93
Chesfattez Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 97
chesfattis Rott. Celer. 1512-13, 105
chesfattes (le) Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108

chesefat Rott. Instaur. 1338-9, 311
chesfattes Rott. Instaur. 1338-9, 311
Chesfattes Rott. Bursar. 1333-4?, 525

Kirsettez
Kirsettez (le) (x3) Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 88
kirsettez (lez) Rott. Celer. 1469-70, 93
kirsettes Rott. Celer. 1471-2, 93
kirsettes (lez) Rott. Celer. 1490-1, 99
kyrsettes (le) Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 104
kyrsett (le) Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 104
kirsettes (le) Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 107
kyrsettes (le) Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 107
kirsett (le) Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 107
kyrsettes (le) (x2) Rott. Celer. 1534-35, 109
kyrsettes (le) Rott. Celer. 1534-35, 110
kyrsettes (le) Rott. Celer. 1534-35, 112
kyrsettes (lez) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1448-9, 276
kyrsettes (le) Rott. Magistr. Inf. 1452-3, 277

kyrn
kyrn Rott. Celer. 1459, 89
kyrnez Rott. Celer. 1479-80, 97
kyrne (le) Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108
kirne Rott. Instaur. 1338-9, 311
kirn Rott. Bursar. 1374, 581

Pyke 'pitch'
Pyke Rott. Bursar. 1395-6, 599

thake
thacke (le) Rott. Communiar. 1510-12, 291
thak (le) Rott. Communiar. 1516-7, 292
thake (le) Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 297
thake Rott. Communiar. 1524-5, 297
thak (le) Rott. Hostill. 1528-9, 164

thachyng (le) Rott. Communiar. 1511-2, 292

thakborde
thakborde (pl.) Rott. Camer. 1447-8, 186
thakbordes Rott. Camer. 1456-7, 192

thykston'
thykston' Rott. Hostill. 1486-7, 158

lyng**thake**
lyngthake (del) Rott. Bursar. 1482-3, 648

medowe**thak**
medowethak (del) Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 88
medowthake (le) Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
Medowthak (le) (x2) Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103

medowthak (le) Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
medewthak (le) Rott. Elemos. 1430-1, 231
medowthake Rott. Elemos. 1444-5, 235
Medowthake Rott. Elemos. 1448-9, 237
medowthake Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239
medowthak (le) Rott. Instaur. 1480-1, 322

skelfe
skelfe Rott. Elemos. 1395-6, 214
skelfes Rott. Elemos. 1407-8 (verso), 223

skelez
skelez Rott. Celer. 1459, 89
Skelys Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 98
skeyllys Rott. Celer. 1512-1513, 105
skelys (le) Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108
skeles Rott. Instaur. 311, 1339-40
skelys Rott. Instaur. 1387-8, 314
schele Rott. Sacrist. 1376-7, 386
Skeles Rott. Bursar. c. 1330 518

Spone**garn**
Sponegarn Rott. Bursar. 1376, 584
<f(f)> and <v>

dogdraff

<f(f)>		<v>	
dogdraff (x2 (pl.))	Rott. Celer. 1329-30, 16	dogdravez (x2)	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 69
dogdraff (pl.)	Rott. Celer. c. 1330 (verso)	dogdravez (x3)	Rott. Celer. 1438-9, 76
dogdraffes (x3)	Rott. Celer. 1333-34, 30	dogdraves	Rott. Celer. 1442, 79
dogdraffis	Rott. Celer. 1333-34	dogdravez	Rott. Celer. 1449, 80
dogdraff (x2 (pl.))	Rott. Celer. 1337-8, 34	dogdravez (pl.)	Rott. Bursar. 1449-50, 632
dogdraffes	Rott. Celer. 1339, 35		
Dogdraff. (x2 (pl.))	Rott. Celer. c. 1340, 36	<w>/vowel	
dogdraf	Rott. Celer. 1338, 47	dogdraes	Rott. Celer. 1416, 54
dogdrafe (pl).	Rott. Bursar. 1408-9, 608	dogdrawe (pl.)	Rott. Celer. 1480-81, 97
		dogdrawe	Rott. Bursar. 1457, 636

thraff

<f(f)>		<v>	
thraff (pl.)	Rott. Celer. 1526-6, 108	thrave (pl.)	Rott. Celer. 1525-6, 108
threff (pl.)	Rott. Celer. 1512-3, 106	thraves	Rott. Hostill. 1455-6 (verso), 123
		thrave	Rott. Elemos. 1448-9, 237
		thrave	Rott. Elemos. 1449-50, 239
		thravis	Rott. Elemos. 1450, 240
		thraves (x2)	Rott. Elemos. 1522-3, 255

<w>
thrawez Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
thrawe (pl.) Rott. Celer. 1505-6, 103
thrawe (x2, pl. and sing.) Rott. Elemos. 1479-80, 248

nafes
nafes Rott. Elemos. 1396-7, 214

naffs	Rott. Sacrist. 1388-9, 391
nafs	Rott. Sacrist. 1393-4, 392
nafes	Rott. Bursar. 1378-9, 587

<qw> and <wh>

<qw> for <wh>

qweletymber

qweletymber	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (recto), 396
qweltimber	Rott. Bursar. 1376, 584

Qwypcord

<qw>		<wh>	
Qwypcord	Rott. Bursar. 1362-3, 565	Whypcord	Rott. Bursar. 1353-4, 554
qwipcord	Rott. Bursar. 1394-5, 599	Whepecorde	Rott. Bursar. 1362?, 566
		Wypcord	Rott. Bursar. 1363-4

whele barowe

<qw>		<wh>	
qwhele harow	Rott. Sacrist. 1404 (verso), 399	whele barowe	Rott. Celer. 1459-60, 89
		whelbarowe	Rott. Celer. 1480-1, 97

Both <qw> and <wh>

qwitleþ’

<qw>		<wh>	
qwitleþ' [printed as qwitley'] Rott. Sacrist. 1404, 396		whitlether	Rott. Sacrist. 1487-8, 417
		Whiteledir	Rott. Bursar. 1412-13, 609
		whiteledirskynnes	Rott. Bursar. 1418-9, 615

<wh> for <qw>

Whibibbes

quibibis	Rott. Bursar. 1313-14, 512
Quybibbis	Rott. Bursar. 1348-9, 549
Whibibbes	Rott. Bursar. 1355-1356, 555

wharelwegges

wharelwegges	Rott. Elemos. 1374, 211
Wharelwegges	Rott. Bursar. 1356-7, 557

Whik

Whik	Rott. Celer. 1468-9, 92
Wykkes (les)	Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 660
Whikkes (le)	Rott. Bursar. 1507-8, 660

Whikwod (lez)	Rott. Celer. 1498-9, 101
Whikwod (le) (pl.)	Rott. Celer. 1498-9, 101
Whikwod (le)	Rott. Bursar. 1472-3, 645

whilte

<qw>		<wh>	
qwhiltez	Rott. Hostill. 1453-4, 148	whilte	Rott. Hostill. 1453-4, 148

Qwhylt	Rott. Bursar. 1341, 541	whiltys (le) (pl.)	Rott. Elemos. 1515-16, 253
		wiltez	Rott. Elemos 1465, 243
		wyltez	Rott. Elemos. 1472, 246

whysshynes

<qw>		<wh>	
quissyns	Rott. Feretrar. 1419-20, 463	whysshynes	Rott. Elemos. 1431-2, 231
Qwyssons	Rott. Bursar. 1418-9, 615		
quyssons	Rott. Bursar. 1418-9, 615		
qwisshyng	Rott. Bursar. 1440-1, 627		

<w> and <v>

vaynscot

<v>		<w>	
vaynscot	Rott. Bursar. 1399, 601	waynscot (pl.)	Rott. Elemos. 1370-1, 209
		waynscot (pl.)	Rott. Elemos. 1370-1, 211
		Waynscot	Rott. Bursar. 1357, 560

vodhire

<v>		<w>	
vodhire	Rott. Celer. 1439-40, 78	Wodhire	Rott. Celer. 1438-9 (dorso), 74
		Wodhire (le)	Rott. Bursar. 1496-7, 654
		Wodhire	Rott. Bursar. 1511-2, 705

Appendix 6.2. Reassessing northern vocabulary: a new classification

Class 1a[9]
- Lexical items with regular northern features (listed in Appendix 6.1.).

- List of lexical items with (non-systematic) northern features:

aughtyndel, aughtindel, Auȝghtindel, Agktyndell anguill., aghtendell, Aghtyndell (pl.)
Cumouk
cuppbordclothes (lez), coppebordeclathe, **cuppe**bord (le), copebord, coppeborde (le), coppeborde, Cupburde, Cupburde
freynȝes (freynȝes clothez), frenges
hawkkes (variant of *hack* (hak, hake, hakkis, Hakkes, hakys, hakkez))
heltyrs, helthyr' (also helteres, holthyr', heltrez)
mell
plachyng**warke**
rangh (le) (also raunge (del), raunge (le), reynge, Raunge (le))
rigbandis (printed as ridbandis), rygbandes
Schaffes, shaff', sheffe, shaffe (pl.), shaff, shafe, scheff., scheffe (pl.)
shole, sholez (also shovele, shouill, shulys, shovell), Sholyrnez, shole iryns, schovylyrnes
skelez, skelys, skeyllys, skelys (le), skeles, schele
Strabrod
Twel, Twyle, Twyll
Tyldestone (pl.), thillstone (lez)
yernyng (cf. ernyng')

Class 1b

bollez
Cambe (le) (also came)
celdr., celdre, celdris
clepys, clyppez (also in Potclyppez (par del), potclyppys, potclyps, potcleppes (le))
coddis
Crell', crell, crellys (le), crelys, krelis
cuttez
Dynmontes, dynmoth
drawkyng (le)
forhamer
Gedde
grape, grapez, grape, grapys
hather, hathir

[9] In this appendix, I do not lemmatise all the multi-word lexical items containing a given root lest they be wrongly identified as 'northern'. Even if both a root and a compound may be 'northern' for the purposes of this classification, their lexicographical status may be different (see, e.g., **syle** and **milksyle** listed under different Classes). In this respect, I depart from the approach followed in the appendices devoted to etymology in which all multi-word lexical items were counted in order to measure the amount of lexical material coming from the various input vernacular languages.

Hemmyngyar (vocata le)
hallandes, hallandorum
hollbarowe, holl barowe
hoper, hopp*er*s
ken'
kevyll
landmale (also landmalebok (vocati le))
lumbe (le)
mellis, melys, mele, meles, mell, meelz
mesyngpenys, mesyngpenez, messyngpennys, messyngpennez, Mesinpenys
moldbredez, moldebredd., moldebred (pl.)
moldebredclot, moldebredcloute, moldbredclote, moldebredclout, moldibredclout
pargenynge (le), pargynging (lez), pargenyng (le), pargenynge (le)
parys
perfurnisyng
peudes (lez), pendez (le)
plogh pattyl
Potclyppez (del), potclyppys, potclyps, potcleppes (le)
Rans
Rebbours (?) [sic], rubbours
Rekepenys, Rekyngpenys, rokpen'
rokpen', Rekepenys, Rekyngpenys
Rigtoues, Rigtowes
sarkyngnale (pl.)
Scathaver
Scatmaltez, Scaltmaltes
schele, schell, schelle
Scrabbez, crabbez, Scrabbez (lez), Scrabbys
Scrafisse, scrafisch, Skrafysch, Schrafysch, scrafisches, scrafish, scrafyss', skrafisshes
shepe**hekkys**, shephekkez (le)
silorynge (le), sylorynge (le)
Skyll' (le)
sokkis, sok
spanyng lambes, spanynglamez
spekkes (le)
sprettis, sprittis
sprottis (cf. torbotes sproutes), sprot, sprott', spruitt, sprout, sprut, Sprot', sprettis (?)
Spultes
stothes (also in dorestothez)
Stottez, stottis, stott'
stryndle (le)
Syle (vocata) ['a sieve'] (see also the compound **milksyle** under Class 3)
Syles, syles, sylez ['iron or wooden bars']
tedyr, teder, tethirdez, tethyr
Thyll (le), thill (le), Thill, Tyldez (lez)
tofall (le), tofall
trammys
Trynters

watergate (lez), Watergat (uno/le)
Weyscill, weyscalez (del)
whight
yar, yare
yettelyng, yetlyng

Class 2

Avergarner (le), Havergarner (le)
bednale fiss', pisc. de bednale, bednalfish (pl.), bednelfysch (pl.), bednall., bedenelfysh (pl.)
Betynghamyrs
blandcorne
burningwod (fuder de)
Buthavant (le), Botyvayunt (le), Botifant (le), Botevaunt (del) (also in Hauteboutavant (le))
bygbern (le), Bygbarne (Le)
colfysch (pl.), kolfysch (pl.)
courtsyngyls (cf. cowntersigla)
crabbelok
dalbyngstowres, dalbyngstowrys, dalbyng stowris, dalbyngstoures, dalbyngstourez, doubyngstoures, dalbyng stowres
dorecrokez
eche, neche, ecchys
Egge Silver (le), Egsilver, egsylver, eggesylu' [sic] (le), eggesilver
ernyng, ernyng', Erthening' [transmission error acc. to *OED*], hernyng
Estlandborde, Estlandbordes, estlandburd (pl.), Estlandbord', estlandobordes, Estland burde (pl.), Estlandburdez (cf. bordis de Estland)
fischors, Fischehors (del), fyshors, fyschorses, fyschors (le), fysshors, fyschhors, fishhorse (le)
Fisshebate (del)
flaggez (lez), flagez (del/lez), flagges
floryng (le)
fot ax
frayns, freyns, frenys (le), freyneysse
fruth'
Fysshlardar
gavelok, gaywylloke, Gowfleg' [error?], gaveloc, gavelokis,
gelypoke (le)
Girthetres, girthtrees
gliders
goyshous (le), gowsehouse (le)
grotsilver, grottsilvere
hardyn (le), Herdyng (vocat.), hardyng (le)
Hastiller (le)
hausynges
helterschaftes, heltershaftes
heltyrreyns

Heryng-house (le)
Ilynges (lez)
kipstryng, kypstringges, kypstringes, kypstrings, kipstrynges
knoll
lamcote, lambecote
langeles, laungels, Lanugell., lanugells, lanugell, langels, langell', lanugellis, langels
layng (le), laynge (le)
lempetis
louerstringes, louerstryng, louerstryngges
lymeridyll
Lyncolnesaye
Malesadell, malesadill, malesadil, malesadell, malesadyll
maltspout (le)
medowethak (del), medowthake, medowthak (le), medewthak, medowthake
medowmale
merowscales, meruscalis
Milnpikkes
mors
mylnstep
Myour, myowr, miour, Mioure
nappekett'
overcorde
Overdeyhous
oxclose (le), Oxclosse
palfraypage
Pastehouse, Pastehous (le)
payllbordes (lez), palebordes (lez), paylbordes (le)
penyhennis, penihennes, Penyhennes, Pennyhennez, Pennyhennes
persouryrnes
petehous (le) (also in Petehousdore)
ploughswaynlandes
polepike
pomple
porr, porr., porris, por
powderlomberd
Provandpok
Pulterpanyers
pyntracez, pyntrase, pyntrace
quarell mell, qwharellmell
rabitstoke
redeyll (voc. le)
Rosell, rosell (del)
rowthselyn
ryndspindellis (cf. le spyndellez et rynd)
rynnygorfrays

Saltarke
Sandpoke, sapndpokes
Saretree (le), Sarteryn (le) (cf. sartrine, sartrina, sartrino)
sawyers
scaffalde flakes (as a compound)
skafald
scakar, scakker
schacles, schakyll, schaklys, Schakles, Shakelys
schethes
Sethyng (lez) (also in Sethynghwose)
shepehekkys, shephekkez (le)
shilbordclogge
skers
slott, slot
somersercortes
Soulepen', Souuelpenys
sparryng
spendement (le)
Sponbrod (pl.)
sprwys fisc., spruisfische (pl.)
spycehouse, Spycehous (le)
stakgarth (le), Stakgarth, stakgarthez (lez)
Stankhede (le)
staunkmedowe
stendez
stopped salmon, Stopedsalmon, salmon stopp. (pl.), Stopedsalmon
swyngtreys
tapstone
tedyr, teder, tethirdez, tethyr
til', till, Tyles, tyld, teill, tyll, Tyldez (lez)
Totenays
tretrogh
tribullez, tribuez
trottersadill
troyweȝtes
venello
wadlede
walkstoke (le), walkstoke, walkestoke, walkestocke, walkestok (le)
watersay
Waxhous (le), Waxhouse (le) (cf. manu Magistri cere)
Welhousdore
Weyscill, Weyscalez (del)
whetgarner (le)
Wodecartes (del), Wodkart (del), Wodecart (le), Wodcart (lel), Wodcarte (le), Wodcartes (les), Wodecartes (del)
yowecote

yrenslottes (le)

Class 3

Almary (le) (cf. almariolum, almariolo, almarioli, almaria)
clewes
Crell', crell, crellys (le), crelys, krelis
dorechekez
flyttyng (le)
fraght (le)
hekkys (le), hekes
hespes, hesp, hespe
Hogges, hoggez
hottys
Kelinges, kelyngs, keling, kyling, keling'
lambr' beedes
lechyngknyfes, lechyngknyves, lechyngknyfe, lechyngknyffes
martis
mell
milksyle
morehennes
nattis
palets, paled
pepir qwerns
ripp's
trystez, tristez, trestes
spald. (spald. Multon), spald. (pl.), spald
tolbothe (le), Tolboth (le)
Wawes

Class 4
brakennez (lez)
byre (le), byer (le)
capestonys
chyne
credill, credyls, kredill (le), credyll
deis
dressour (le), dressor., drissour (le), dressors, dressers (le), drissour (lez)
freswardes
gabelorum, Ganeyls [Fowler's note: read *gauelys*], gabellorum**,** gabell**,** gabali, gavill (le), gavill, gawellez
gersuma, gersumis
hyngynges (lez)
langalds
Lymkilne, lymekiln, lymekilne

lyn pynnys, lynpinnes
lyttynglede, littyngleyde
merlinges, merling', merleng'
mudfyss (pl.)
parcellas, parcell.
pepyn (Resyns sanz)
quarell, qwarrell (le)
rakencrake
ridels, ridellez, redell' (le), redellis, redell, Riddels, Ryddell'
reme paper, Rymez
schewtells (also scutellis, scotil, scuttyl, scoteles, scutell., scutell (pl.), scotlys, scuteles, scotellez (cf. scutella, scutello))
Sloknyng (le)
styrket (pl.), Stirkett, Stirkett', Stirkett. (also stirketti and stirkettorum)
wolte (le)
bakyng **yrnys**, bakyngyrns, sowdyng**yrns**, soudynghyrnes, sowdyngyrn, rostyng **yrn**
fleme (le), fleyme (le)
fleshhaxe, fleshaxe, fleshe ax
Tunnyngmell
Wakyngsilvyr