Structural Integration of Norse-derived verbs in the *Ormulum*

W. Juliane Elter

wiebke.juliane.elter@uni.mannheim.de

ICEHL 22, 5 July 2023

Outline

Loan word accommodation

Lexical copying

Loan verb accommodation

Accommodation biases

Case study

The Ormulum

Norse-derived verbs in the Ormulum

RQ & hypothesis

Data & Method

Results

Discussion

Ideas & challenges

'Loans' as outcomes of copying

English language shows many **loans** from Old Norse (cf. Durkin 2014; Grant 2009)

- Including basic vocabulary e.g., *to take, to give, to hit*

(1) *Marie Magdeleyne* **tooke** [ON: taka] *an alabaustre box of precious oynement*
    'Mary Magdalene took an alabaster box of precious ointment'
                                                (*Aelred of Rievaulx's De Institutione Inclusarum*)

A loan is a loan is a loan?

Contact between closely related languages like OE and ON is characterized by

- Typological closeness

- sufficient phonological, morphological and structural overlap

- High number of cognates

To investigate the outcomes of copying in **language contact situations between closely related languages** we need to differentiate between

➢ **Non-cognate copies (*casten* < ON *kasta*)**   **= gersum A & B1**

➢ **Copies with a surviving/contrasting OE/WG cognate (*reisen* < ON *reisa*) = gersum A* (& B2)**

➢ **Cognates in contact (*missen* < OE *missan* & ON *missa*)**   **= gersum C**

Integrational outcome of copying

factors affecting number and nature of copies

- e.g. **intensity** of contact (Campbell 1998; Thomason & Kaufman 1988)
- e.g. **morphological complexity** of borrowable categories (Matras 2009: 175f.)
- …

⇒ linguistic closeness facilitates copying, esp. of complexer categories (Winford 2003: 51ff.; cf. Johanson 2002)

loan word accommodation

loan word accommodation

- grammatical **integration** into recipient-language system (Muysken 2000; Poplack, Sankoff & Miller 1988)

loan **verb** accommodation

- still understudied
- often operationalised as a constraint on lexical copying (cf. Winford 2003)
- seminal work by Wohlgemuth (2009) on morphosyntactic accommodation strategies

loan verb accommodation

loan verb accommodation **strategies** (Wichmann & Wohlgemuth 2008; Wohlgemuth 2009)

Direct insertion	Recipient-language inflections are added directly onto word stems of copies
Indirect insertion	An additional affix is added to the word stem of the copy before it can be inflected
Light verb strategy	A copied verb is nominalised and inflections are carried by a dedicated light verb
Paradigm insertion	A copied verb continues to carry its source language inflections in the recipient language

loan verb accommodation

loan verbs can often be inflected like **native verbs** (cf. Wohlgemuth 2009, Poplack et al. 2020)

- Norse-derived verbs are treated like native verbs under direct insertion (cf. Wohlgemuth 2009, appendix)

ME:

- *finden* 'to find'   *find*   *-en*

                                    English stem   ME infinitive marker

- *reisen* 'to raise' (Norse origin)   *reis*   *-en*

                                    Norse stem   ME infinitive marker

constraints on loan verb accommodation

loan verbs can often be inflected like **native verbs**

(Wohlgemuth 2009; Poplack et al. 2020)

loan verbs are **disproportionately** more **frequent**

in **specific** grammatical **structures**

(De Smet 2014, Shaw & De Smet 2022, Elter & Shaw (in prep))

loan word accommodation biases

(1, rep.) *Marie Magdeleyne **tooke** [ON: taka] an alabaustre box of precious oynement*
    'Mary Magdalene took an alabaster box of precious ointment'

(*Aelred of Rievaulx's De Institutione Inclusarum*)

(2)   *and þou shalt **cast** [ON: kasta] hem in-to dampnacioun*
    'And you shall cast them into damnation.'

(*The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter*)

(3)   *To **kinndlenn** hemm soþ lufess fir; Inn hannd. & ec inn herrte.*
    'To kindle (in) them true loves fire; in hand and also in heart'

(*Ormulum* 13442-13443)

Outline

Loan word accommodation

Lexical copying

Loan verb accommodation

Accommodation biases

Case study

The Ormulum

Norse-derived verbs in the Ormulum

RQ & hypothesis

Data & Method

Results

Discussion

Ideas & challenges

The Ormulum – text and relevance (Cooper, 2022)

- An **invaluable and essential source of key changes in the English language in the 12th century**

- The **only text in its dialect for this time =** **East Midlands, transitional OE > ME**

- Due to the location & dialect of composition an **invaluable testimony to the Norse element** in East Midland English at the end of the OE period

Norse-derived verbs in the Ormulum

- Ormulum (Johannesson & Cooper 2023) complete glossary with etymologies, variant spellings and all attested inflectional forms

- New work by Pons-Sanz: Re-assessment of Norse-derived lexis in Ormulum following *GERSUM* typology
  - 30 additional verbal lexemes classified

➤ **82 verbs** with some degree of evidence for Norse-derivation are attested in the full Ormulum

➤ **only 25** of those also occurr in the PPCME2 sample from the text as lemmatized in *BASICS* project (cf. Trips & Percillier 2020)

Norse-derived verbs in the Ormulum– the role of cognates

82 lexical verbs showing (some) evidence for Norse derivation

➢ **Non-cognate copies** (*casten* < ON *kasta*)   = A & B1   = 8 lemmas

➢ **Copies with a surviving contrasting OE/WG cognate** (*reisen* < ON *reisa*)
                                                                = A* (& B2)   = 16 lemmas

➢ **Cognates in contact** (*missen* < OE *missan* & ON *missa*)
                                                                = C   = 40 lemmas

➢ **Lemmas with uncertain source forms, minor or contested evidence of Norse derivation**
                                                                = D   = 17 lemmas

➢ **Other e.g.,** *primmseȝȝnenn* **classified as CCC4 with Latinate model**   = 1 lemma

The idea

High number of Norse-derived verbs in *Orrms* language is a valuable basis for

- Investigation of **accommodation biases** of cognate and non-cognate verbs in comparison to non-cognate English verbs

Research question

Do accommodation biases shown by Norse-derived verb copies in the Ormulum differ in strength depending on the existence and closeness of a native cognate in English?

Hypothesis:

Accommodation biases are stronger for copies of non-cognate verbs than for copies of non-contrasting cognate verbs copied into Middle English from Old Norse

➢ due to their closer etymological relation and resulting identifiability and higher formal and structural compatibility with the basic code

Methodology for Johannesson & Cooper (2023) edition

- Making Johannesson & Cooper (2023) edition preprint searchable using RegEx in AntConc (Anthony, 2023, version 4.2.0)

- Set of Norse-derived verbs
  - Previous work using dictionaries & GERSUM database = list used for PPCME2 prestudy
  - New work by Pons-Sanz on Norse lexis in Ormulum
  - Ormulum glossary

- Creating queries for verb lemmas in AntConc:
  - ➤ Formulating RegEx using the Ormulum glossary
  - ➤ Making note of homograph forms for data cleaning protocol

- Querying all Norse-derived lemmas using RegEx and extracting all hits per lemma into a dataframe

Methodology for Johannesson & Cooper (2023) edition

- Data cleaning
  - Identification and exclusion of homographs across lexemes (conversions & accidental) using the Ormulum glossary
  - Manual disambiguation and exclusion of homograph nouns, adjectives, etc.

- Manual anntotation of all instances for category of verb (finiteness)
  - finite (present, past, imperative)
  - non-finite (infinitive, present participle, perfect participle, passive participle)

Methodology for Johannesson & Cooper (2023) edition

- Calculating the proportion of non-finite uses for all three subgroups
  - Non-cognate copies
    - n (lemmas) = 8; 5 are first attested in Ormulum
    - High frequency lemma *takenn* is attested earliest (OE) according to OED
  - Contrasting cognate copies
    - n (lemmas) = 16
    - High frequency lemma: *gifenn*
  - Cognates in contact (i.e., Non-contrasting cognate copies)
    - n (lemmas) = 40; hits = 609
    - partially disambiguated for usage of Norse-derived senses and forms (C2 and C3 categories only)
    - High(er) frequency lemmas (26 hits < *fasstenn, fraʒʒnenn, mælenn, þennkenn, arrn, þinnkenn, sekenn* > 69 hits)

Methodology for Johannesson & Cooper (2023) edition

- Evaluating difference in proportion of non-finite usages as the measure for accommodation bias
  - Between Norse-derived verb sets and the baseline for native English verbs
    - **Baseline: English origin verbs in the PPCME2 Ormulum sample**, excluding OE-ON cognates, (cf. BASICS etymologies and lemmatization (Trips & Percillier 2020) Dance, Pons-Sanz & Schorn 2019; OED; MED)

- Comparison of accommodation biases between subgroups of Norse-derived copies
  - Evaluating difference in proportion of non-finite usages as the measure for accommodation bias using **Fisher's exact probability test**

Results – finiteness proportions

etymological verb set	non-finite	finite	NF/F	total
Cognates in contact	**44.83%**	55.17%	273/336	609
Copy with contrasting OE cognate	**63.87%**	36.13%	76/43	119
Non-cognate (including *taken*)	21.53%	78.47%	79/288	367
Non-cognate (excluding *taken*)	**60.00%**	40.00%	12/8	20
Norse_all	39.09%	60.91%	428/667	1095
English baseline (PPCME2 Orm sample)	**54.66%**	45.34%	2715/2252	4967
All cognates (contrasting & non-contrasting)	54.53%	45.47%	349/379	728

- non-cognate copies show non-finiteness bias i.e., higher non-finite usage proportions than baseline of English verbs
- Effect of highly frequent lemma *takenn* (347/367) instances in non-cognate set

Results

Hypothesised:

Non-cognate copies show higher non-finite usage proportions than native English verbs

➢ There is a non-significant difference in finiteness proportions between native English verbs and Norse-derived non-cognate copies in the Ormulum
  – Fisher exact test statistic value is p = 0.661 (not significant)
  – Likely due to (very) small data set in relation to English baseline

➢ **No significant accommodation bias for Norse-derived non-cognate copies**

Results

Comparison of accommodation biases between subgroups of Norse-derived copies

- **Non-cognate** copies show non-significant accommodation bias
- **Contrasting cognate** copies have the highest proportion of non-finite usage across subgroups & in comparison to native verbs (not significant)
- Non-finite proportions are **lower** than for native English verbs for **cognates in contact**

contrasting cognate copies > **non-cognate copies > English** > cognates in contact

Results

When controlling for half verse and verse final position and only comparing accommodation biases for non-final instances

- **Non-cognate copies** have the highest proportion of non-finite usage across subgroups & in comparison to native verbs
- significant accommodation bias for non-finiteness (p < .01)

non-cognate copies > contrasting cognate copies > **English** > cognates in contact

For instances of Norse-derived verbs in final position

- both sets of cognate copies show higher non-finite usage proportions than English verbs (non-significant, p = 0.0773)
- non-cognate copies predominantly occurr in finite forms (60%).

contrasting cognate copies > cognates in contact > **English > non-cognate copies**

Outline

Loan word accommodation

Lexical copying

Loan verb accommodation

Accommodation biases

Case study

The Ormulum

Norse-derived verbs in the Ormulum

RQ & hypothesis

Data & Method

Results

Discussion

Ideas & challenges

Ideas & challenges

- Improving on the operationalisation of metre influencing inflection/finiteness

- Investigation of **variation**/ idiosyncrasies of *Orrms* use of non-cognate Norse-derived verbs concerning **argument structure patterns** in comparison to non-cognate English verbs

- Lemma specific constructions & formations
  - Collocations of OE & Norse-derived copied near synonyms e.g*., flittenn & farenn*
  - ?

- Frequency effects for high & low frequency lemmas (Shaw 2022, Elter & Shaw, in prep.)
  - High frequency: *takenn, gifenn, fasstnenn, sekenn, …*
  - Low frequency: any lemma occurring ≤2 ?

Thank you!

sources

Anthony, L. (2023). *AntConc* (Version 4.2.2) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software

Burchfield, R.W. (1956). The Language and Orthography of the Ormulum MS. 1. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 55 (1). 56–87: 57

Campbell, L. . 1998. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cooper, A. T.. (2022). *Ormulum*. *The Johannesson edition – principles, practice, products*. Presentation given at International Conference on Middle English (ICOME 2022) in Glasgow, UK on 26.08.2022. https://www.english.su.se/polopoly_fs/1.623472.1661518071!/menu/standard/file/Ormulum%20presentation%20Glasgow%20August%2022 %20%5BAutosaved%5D.pdf.

Dance, R. (2012). English in Contact: Norse. In L. Brinton & A. Bergs (eds.). *English Historical Linguistics - An International Handbook*. (Vol. 2, pp. 1724–1737). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110251609.1724

Dance, R., S. Pons-Sanz, and B. Schorn. (2019). *The Gersum Project: The Scandinavian Influence on English Vocabulary* (Cambridge, Cardiff, and Sheffield, 2019)

De Smet, Hendrik. 2014. De integratie van Engelse leenwerkwoorden in het Nederlands. In Freek Van de Velde, Hans Smessaert, Frank Van Eynde & Sara Verbrugge (eds.), *Patroon en argument: Een dubbelfeestbundel bij het emeritaat van William Van Belle en Joop van der Horst*, 75– 87. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed words: A history of loanwords in English*. Oxford: OUP.

Elter, W. J. & Shaw, M. (manuscript in preparation). *Loan Verb Accommodation: A Comparison of Old Norse and French in Middle English*. Paper presented at the 15th International Conference for Historical Linguistics, August 1. – 5. 2022, Oxford, UK.

sources

Grant, A.. 2009. Loanwords in British English. In Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, 360–383. Berlin/ New York: De Gruyter Mouton. https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110218442/html

Johannesson, Nils-Lennart & Andrew Cooper (Eds.). 2023/forthcoming. *The Ormulum*. Early English Text Society Original Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johanson, L.. 2002. Contact-Induced Change in a Code-Copying Framework. In Mari C. Jones & Edith Esch (eds.), *Language Change*. pp.285–313. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110892598.285

Kroch, Anthony & Ann Taylor. 2000. *The Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English, second edition (PPCME2)*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania https://www.ling.upenn.edu/ppche/ppche-release-2010/PPCME2-RELEASE-3/

Lewis, R. E. (1952, 2001). Middle English Dictionary. In Frances McSparran et al. (Eds.), *Online Edition in Middle English Compendium.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000–2018. http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809873.008

Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parkes, M. (1983). On the Presumed Date and Possible Origin of the Manuscript of the "Ormulum": Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Junius 1. in Stanley, E.G. and Gray, D. (eds) Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson.

sources

Percillier, M. (2016-2021). BASICS Toolkit. Accessible at http://basics-toolkit.spdns.org/ Accessed 14.05.2022.

Pons-Sanz, S. M. (2013). *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English* (Vol. 1). Brepols Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1484/M.SEM-EB.5.106260

Pons-Sanz, S. M.. 2023*. Norse-derived terms in the Ormulum: A re-appraisal*. (Paper presented at ICEHL-22, July 2023, Sheffield, UK. manuscript provided by the author).

Poplack, Shana, David Sankoff & Christopher Miller. 1988. The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26(1). 47–104. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1988.26.1.47

Proffitt, M. (n.d.). *OED Online*. Oxford English dictionary. Online-Version. http://www.oed.com/

Randall, B. (2010). CorpusSearch (Version 2.003.00) [Computer Software]. http://corpussearch.sourceforge.net/

Shaw, Marlieke & Hendrik De Smet. 2022. Loan Word Accommodation Biases: Markedness and Finiteness. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 120(2). 201–217. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.12233.

Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press.

Townend, M. (2002). *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Norse and English*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages (Vol.6). Turnhout: Brepols.

Trips, C., & Percillier, M. (2020). Lemmatising Verbs in Middle English Corpora: The Benefit of Enriching the Penn-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English 2 (PPCME2), the Parsed Corpus of Middle English Poetry (PCMEP), and A Parsed Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English (PLAEME). *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, 7170–7178. https://aclanthology.org/2020.lrec-1.888

sources

Wichmann, S., & Wohlgemuth, J. (2008). Loan verbs in a typological perspective. In T. Stolz, D. Bakker, & R. Salas Palomo (Eds.), *Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on romancisation processes* (pp. 89–122). Mouton de Gruyter.

Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics* (1. publ.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.